



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1999

No. 146

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 25, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CONSTANCE A. MORELLA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. McDevitt, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 441. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the requirements for the admission of non-immigrant nurses who will practice in health professional shortage areas.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1692. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

URGING REJECTION OF H.R. 2260, PAIN RELIEF PROMOTION ACT

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday the House will consider H.R. 2260, called the Pain Relief Promotion Act. The legislation is seriously misnamed and is designed simply to undercut Oregon's death with dignity law. I find it ironic, because nobody outside the Beltway is interested in criminalizing doctors' decisions that deal with some of the most profound and difficult that they will ever make. In fact, every day in America we see instances where life support is withdrawn; every day in America drugs are administered to alleviate pain which actually hasten the onset of death; every day in America some drugs are withheld which cause a shock to the system and in turn cause death; every day in America there are some very tragic incidents where people are driven to desperate acts because they cannot control their situation, often painful and traumatic for their families, occasionally involving actual suicide. Most of America looks the other way.

My State of Oregon has taken the lead to try and provide a framework for these end-of-life decisions. Oregon voters have not once but twice approved a thoughtful approach to give patients, their doctors and families more control under these most difficult of circumstances. Despite the dire predictions of a tidal wave of assisted suicide, the evidence suggests that when people actually have control in these difficult situations, the knowledge that they have such control means that they are less likely to use assisted suicide. In fact, last year it appears that there were only 15 cases in Oregon.

But with the legislation that is proposed under H.R. 2260, doctors are

going to have to fear being second-guessed by prosecutors, police and non-medical drug enforcement bureaucrats on a case-by-case basis, for the very initial section of that bill points out that prescribing pain medication can often hasten death. But that is okay under this bill, as long as the intent is pure. In essence, it means that the doctors are going to be caught looking over their shoulders, having each and every one of their decisions subject to second-guessing and potentially subjected to life in prison if the intent appears in the judgment of others to be wrong.

This is another sad example of where politicians are out of step with Americans on key personal health issues. I find of great interest one other area that sort of indicates where we are going. The medical use of marijuana was approved by eight States before last year. Six other States had their voters approve it and the District of Columbia. Citizens are indicating that they want more freedom to have pain managed and have personal control. I think it would be sad if this Congress decided to penalize the one State that is trying not to sweep it under the rug but provide a framework for making these decisions.

I strongly urge my colleagues to make a careful examination of H.R. 2260. They will find why the Oregon Medical Association, the associations of eight other States, the American Nurses Association and the American Academy of Family Physicians have all urged its rejection. If you want to outlaw assisted suicide, go ahead and do it if you must, but certainly we should not subject our physicians to criminalization of their basic medical decisions.

□ 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.

H10727

THE CLOCK IS TICKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, there are only 67 days left before we ring in the new year. Billions of people around the world will start to prepare to celebrate the first day of the year 2000 and, of course, I as many of my colleagues look forward to this day also. But this afternoon I am concerned about this next year with what all of us know as the Y2K problem, or millennium bug, the inability of many computer systems to process dates correctly beyond December 31, 1999. The problem results from computers programmed to process and use only the last two digits for the year field.

Madam Speaker, I am confident that Americans are well prepared and well ahead of the game when it comes to being ready for any possible glitches resulting from the Y2K. Congress has directed the Federal Government to go through billions and billions of lines of computer codes in order to make computers Y2K compliant. It is also Congress that has worked hand in hand with State and local governments to ensure that they have the necessary tools to function properly.

Congress, led by the majority here, is helping the private sector when it comes to the Y2K problem. We fought hard and have signed into law the Small Business Year 2000 Readiness Act, which directs the Small Business Administration to establish a loan guarantee program to address Y2K problems for small businesses. And it was, of course, this Republican Congress which successfully fought and passed the Year 2000 Readiness and Responsibility Act, setting limits on lawsuits against businesses and individuals for Y2K failures. But, Madam Speaker, my concerns are whether the rest of the world is ready.

Hearings within the last several weeks held in both the House and the Senate have raised some serious concerns. Many nations have done little, if anything, to combat the Y2K bug. These nations lack both the expertise and the funds to upgrade and convert their computer systems. Take, for example, the government of Indonesia, which is preparing for the possible Y2K malfunctions. Their National Electricity Board strategy is to watch what happens at midnight on January 1 in Australia and New Zealand, to use those 6 hours to develop and implement suddenly their Y2K plans. Now, this would be comical if it were not so serious and disturbing.

The worldwide ramifications of Y2K disturbances, of course, can have a domino effect. It is just not enough that the United States is prepared. Potential disruptions abroad caused by Y2K problems would impact millions of Americans who are living abroad, or who are traveling overseas. Though the

Central Intelligence Agency is confident that the Y2K computer failures overseas will not lead to accidental launch of ballistic missiles by any country, according to the testimony by the Central Intelligence Agency before the House Committee on International Affairs last week, nuclear power plants in nations such as Russia and the Ukraine could be susceptible to year 2000 malfunctions resulting from power grid failures.

Now, this is according to testimony presented by Lawrence Gershwin, National Intelligence Officer for Science and Technology for the CIA, and this is what he said, "In the worst case this could cause a meltdown and in some cases an accompanying release of radioactive fission gases." Furthermore, according to the CIA, Soviet power plants cannot even be tested for Y2K compliancy "given the age of the computer system and the fact that many of the original manufacturers have all gone out of business."

If the threat of another Chernobyl-like meltdown is not disturbing enough according to the CIA, there still remains the potential for Russia to misinterpret early warning data of ballistic missile launches resulting from the Y2K problem. That means during an international political crisis where tensions are already heightened, the Russians may misinterpret their missile data, leading them to believe and possibly to respond.

As a result, I am pleased to say the United States and Russia have set up a joint program to share information on their missile and space launches to prevent any misunderstanding resulting from any Y2K malfunctions.

I will not even begin in this short amount of time, Madam Speaker, to discuss all the possible problems with other countries not bringing their Y2K problem into compliance dealing with foreign energy and of course financial markets. I encourage other nations to expedite their conversions and look to the United States for leadership.

Madam Speaker, I encourage other nations to expedite their Y2K conversions before time runs out. Our Y2K compliance and success is not only contingent on the fact that this nation's computer and information systems function properly and smoothly, but also on the fact that we not feel side effects from disruptions in other countries.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Madam Speaker, I have the privilege of representing one of America's most diverse Congressional districts, representing the South Side of Chicago and the South Bushes, Cook and Will Counties, bedroom communities as well as farm towns and corn fields. When you represent such a

diverse district as city and suburbs and country, you learn to listen. You listen to the common message. One common message that we are hearing from back home is that we should be working together to solve the challenges that we face. As I look back as one of those who was elected in 1994 to come to Washington to change how Washington works, I am proud to say we have listened to that message and we have held together and we have held firm even those who said that we should not be doing what we are doing, those who opposed our efforts to balance the budget and cut taxes for the middle class, to reform the welfare system and also to restructure the IRS.

I am proud to say in the last 4½ years, this Republican Congress has made a big difference. Balancing the budget for the first time in 28 years, cutting taxes for the middle class for the first time in 16 years, reforming our welfare system for the first time in a generation, and for the first time ever, taming the tax collector by restructuring the IRS. Those are big accomplishments and much appreciated by the folks back home in Illinois but they tell me that's history now, what are you going to do next? They ask us to respond to the questions, the common concerns that we are often asked.

While Republicans are committed to strengthening our schools and strengthening Medicare and Social Security and paying down the national debt and, of course, lowering the tax burden, we also want to respond to some of those big concerns and big questions that I hear, whether at the union hall or the VFW, the Chamber of Commerce or down at a coffee shop on Main Street or a local grain elevator. That is one of those questions that the first question I often hear is a pretty basic one and, that is, when are you folks in Washington going to stop raiding the Social Security trust fund, when are you going to stop dipping into Social Security and spending Social Security on other things?

I am proud to say, Madam Speaker, that the Republicans in this Congress have made a commitment that for the first time since the 1960s when LBJ, President Johnson, began a bad habit that is hard to break in Washington, we are walling off the Social Security trust fund. This year is the first year that our budget has been balanced without dipping into Social Security. We want to continue that. That is why I am proud to say the Congressional Budget Office on September 30 of this year stated in a letter to Speaker HASTERT that the Republican balanced budget does not spend one dime of the Social Security trust fund. We are committed to stopping the raid on the Social Security trust fund.

I would also point out that with the Social Security Medicare lockbox that Republicans are proposing, we set aside \$200 billion more for Social Security and Medicare than the President's budget alone.

I would also point out, Madam Speaker, that we are responding to another important question that we hear from folks back home in the south side of Chicago and the south suburbs, and that is how come nobody ever talks about the national debt, how come no one ever talks about the need to pay down that national debt that ran up all those years that Washington had deficit spending? I am proud to say that last year we paid down \$50 billion of the national debt, this year we are going to pay down a hundred billion dollars, and under the Republican budget plan we paid down almost \$2.2 trillion of the national debt, over two-thirds of our national debt over the next 10 years.

Madam Speaker, the third question that I often hear back home is when are we going to do something about taxes. People tell me their taxes are too high, they are too complicated, they are unfair. They are frustrated that our tax burden on American today is at its highest level in peace time history. Forty percent of the average family's income goes to government. In fact, 21 percent of our gross domestic product, 21 percent of our economy, goes to Federal Government and taxes, and that is too high.

We passed earlier this year a measure to address the need to lower taxes, particularly for the middle class, and we had legislation which would have eliminated the marriage tax penalty for the majority of those who suffer, that would have eliminated the death tax on small businesses and family farmers, that would have rewarded those who save for retirement, those who save for their children's and college education and also would have rewarded providing health care coverage for one's employees as well as their family, and unfortunately President Clinton vetoed that effort to help families by bringing fairness to the Tax Code, and he stated, and he was very blunt; he said he vetoed this tax cut because he wanted to spend that money instead.

That is really what this is all about over the next week or so as we wrap up this legislative session. President Clinton has made it very clear he wants to spend a lot more money than Republicans do, and he says that we can do it if we increase taxes, and the President says we could do it if we raid the Social Security Trust Fund.

Madam Speaker, I very proud last week when this House of Representatives cast a vote 419 to 0, which means that every member who cast a vote voted in opposition to the President's proposal for \$238 billion in tax increases. That is a very clear message to the President that we oppose his tax increases, and I also want to point out that this House also went on record in opposition to the President's plan to raid Social Security. We need to oppose his tax increases, we need to stop the raid on Social Security, but we can balance the budget without those.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Robert Dvorak, The Evangelical Church, Middletown, Connecticut, offered the following prayer:

Let the House be in a spirit of prayer. Lord, our God, we enter into this week's schedule, mindful again of the duty to work hard and well for others. Many are waiting and hoping; even nations observe. You, the living God, see and hear us, too, taking note of all things.

We pray, then, for ourselves that You will sharpen the focus on responsibilities rightly asked of us, keeping us true to our trust. Grant us firmness in thinking, tempered by allowances for honest, contrary thought. Send a few moments our way wherein we may seek true advantage for ones around us, thereby refreshing them and ourselves.

At day's end, encourage us with a sense that life in Washington and the world is better because of the part we have played in things. Now, for this day, keep in Your protecting hand all Members of this House, its leadership, officers, and staff. Make the spirit of each to prosper with new grace the call of this prayer to You, O God. 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.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. 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 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 22, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 22, 1999 at 9:52 a.m.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2367.

Appointment: Board of Directors of the Mickey Leland National Urban Air Toxics Research Center

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHLL,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 25, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 22, 1999 at 4:50 p.m.

That the Senate agreed to conference report H.R. 2466.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHLL,
Clerk of the House.

PAIN RELIEF PROMOTION ACT

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Pain Relief Promotion Act. There is a question currently pending in the country of Holland. It is this: Is the Netherlands ready for the killing of sick children?

There is a bill in their parliament that would allow the killing of seriously ill children, as young as between 12 years old, if they are considered terminal.

A spokeswoman for the Royal Dutch Medical Association said, "The doctor will do his utmost to try to reach an agreement between the patient and parents. But if the parents do not want to cooperate, it is the doctor's duty to respect the wishes of her patient." So much for the Hippocratic Oath for civilized medical institutions.

This situation in the Netherlands gives us all the more reason to pass the Pain Relief Promotion Act. This act will provide doctors with the ability to aggressively treat their patients' pain while prohibiting assisted suicides or euthanasia.

We never want to see the day when our young kids or our elderly parents legally and intentionally die at the hands of a so-called doctor.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to promote pain management and palliative care and positive alternatives to euthanasia.

WACO STILL A BURNING QUESTION

(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, after 6 years, Waco is still burning. These fires will not stop until our government tells the truth. Ninety Americans killed, and nobody, nobody has been held accountable to this date, even though the Government used deadly gas, used a bulldozer, and could have arrested David Karesh any morning out jogging.

Now, despite government denial, they find a high caliber shell casing near a position stand of an FBI sniper.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. One can fool some of the people some of the time, but one cannot fool all of the people all of the time. The Government is lying about Waco.

I yield back the fact that the Justice Department, by the way, investigates themselves.

STOP RAIDS ON SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND ONCE AND FOR ALL

(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, being a leader means making some tough choices. This year, we have a historic opportunity to lock away 100 percent of the Social Security surplus and put an end to the Democrats' practice of raiding the Social Security Trust Fund.

It means we have to make tough choices between saving Social Security or funding some other goal, like the President's desire to increase foreign aid by approximately 30 percent, taking it all out of Social Security.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is not whether we want to spend more on foreign aid or other programs. The question is whether we want to spend more on these programs if it comes out of the expense of Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, we Republicans have chosen to say no to more government spending and yes to stopping the Democratic leadership's raid on Social Security.

The American people have already made that choice as well. They would rather protect Social Security and Medicare than continue funding the fraud, waste, and abuse that runs rampant in government bureaucracy. Americans have to make tough financial choices every day, and I would encourage the Democratic leadership to stop demagoguing this issue and to join our bipartisan effort to end the raid on Social Security once and for all.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE HIT KING

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, last night was a special night for Cincinnatians and for baseball fans across the country. For the first time in over 10 years, the Hit King himself, Cincinnati's own Pete Rose, was back on the baseball field to the ovation of thousands. He had the honor of being selected to baseball's All-Century team by the American people.

Charlie Hustle, who graduated from Western Hills High School in my district, was always known for his hard work, his extra effort, and head-first slides. Pete Rose was one of the greatest ball players of all time, winning three batting titles, three world championships, and setting the all-time major league record for most hits.

Although the night was tainted by the senseless inquisition of an overzealous reporter, it still belonged to baseball fans everywhere.

So congratulations to the Cincinnati Reds' Pete Rose and Johnny Bench, as well as all the other members of the All-Century team. Their accomplishments will be remembered well into the next millennium.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any rollcall votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

EXEMPTING CERTAIN REPORTS FROM AUTOMATIC ELIMINATION AND SUNSET

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3111) to exempt certain reports from automatic elimination and sunset pursuant to the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3111

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN REPORTS FROM AUTOMATIC ELIMINATION AND SUNSET.

Section 3003(a)(1) of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note) does not apply to any report required to be submitted under any of the following provisions of law:

(1) The following sections of title 18, United States Code: sections 2709(e), 3126, and 3525(b), and 3624(f)(6).

(2) The following sections of title 28, United States Code: sections 522, 524(c)(6), 529, 589a(d), and 594.

(3) Section 3718(c) of title 31, United States Code.

(4) Section 9 of the Child Protection Act of 1984 (28 U.S.C. 522 note).

(5) Section 8 of the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act (42 U.S.C. 1997f).

(6) The following provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968: sections 102(b) (42 U.S.C. 3712(b)), 520 (42 U.S.C. 3766), 522 (42 U.S.C. 3766b), and 810 (42 U.S.C. 3789e).

(7) The following provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act: sections 103 (8 U.S.C. 1103), 207(c)(3) (8 U.S.C. 1157(c)(3)), 412(b) (8 U.S.C. 1522(b)), and 413 (8 U.S.C. 1523), and subsections (h), (i), (o), (q), and (r) of section 286 (8 U.S.C. 1356).

(8) Section 3 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (22 U.S.C. 1622).

(9) Section 9 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. App. 2008).

(10) Section 13(c) of the Act of September 11, 1957 (8 U.S.C. 1255b(c)).

(11) Section 203(b) of the Aleutian and Pribilof Islands Restitution Act (50 U.S.C. App. 1989c-2(b)).

(12) Section 801(e) of the Immigration Act of 1990 (29 U.S.C. 2920(e)).

(13) Section 401 of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (8 U.S.C. 1364).

(14) Section 707 of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691f).

(15) Section 201(b) of the Privacy Protection Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 2000aa-11(b)).

(16) Section 609U of the Justice Assistance Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10509).

(17) Section 13(a) of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.).

(18) Section 1004 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000g-3).

(19) Section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414).

(20) Section 11 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 621).

(21) The following provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978: sections 107 (50 U.S.C. 1807) and 108 (50 U.S.C. 1808).

(22) Section 102(b)(5) of the Department of Justice and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (28 U.S.C. 533 note).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3111, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 provided that all periodic reports provided to Congress will sunset on December 21, 1999, unless reauthorized by Congress. The intent of the act was to spur Congress to reexamine all the periodic reports it receives and eliminate the obsolete reports.

After careful review, the Committee on the Judiciary determined that about 40 reports, out of the thousands of reports subject to subset, are required for the committee to perform its legislative and oversight duties. Examples include the U.S. Department of Justice's annual report on crime statistics and the Immigration and Naturalization Service's annual statistical report.

This bill in its present form is a manager's amendment that includes 16 additional reports requested by my Democratic colleagues. Again, the bill merely continues existing report requirements. It does not authorize any new reports.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims of the Committee on the Judiciary. We have worked out the differences in this measure.

I have to let the RECORD show that it would have been nice to have held hearings on this measure; but, nonetheless, H.R. 3111 is a bill supported by myself, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. We think that the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 requires the end of the submission of various periodic reports to Congress by December 21 of this year.

The Act forces Congress to reexamine the usefulness of the various reporting requirements that have been mandated of Federal agencies, including the Department of Justice. This review process is important and a practical exercise in that we must be sure that Federal dollars and personnel time are not being wasted on obsolete reports to Congress.

But all reports are not obsolete. So together we have reviewed and have

been able to agree on a reduced list of reports from the Department of Justice that will continue to provide information important to the legislative and oversight process.

One should not minimize the importance of these reports. For example, we have retained reports on pen register orders and wiretap applications to monitor the activities of the Department to ensure that its activities do not invade our society's expected right to privacy.

Other reports help Congress monitor the Department's undercover operations, the conduct of various justice programs in areas including immigration. These should not sunset.

So, again, my commendations to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the subcommittee chair, for the spirit of cooperation in working out this measure. The review process required to produce this bill represents an essential function of good government that we can all support on a bipartisan basis.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the generous comments of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3111, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

MADE IN AMERICA INFORMATION ACT

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 754) to establish a toll free number under the Federal Trade Commission to assist consumers in determining if products are American-made, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 754

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 "Made in America Information Act".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF TOLL FREE NUMBER PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—If the Secretary of Commerce determines, on the basis of comments submitted in rulemaking under section 3, that—

(1) interest among manufacturers is sufficient to warrant the establishment of a 3-year toll free number pilot program, and

(2) manufacturers will provide fees under section 3(c) so that the program will operate without cost to the Federal Government, the Secretary shall establish such program solely to help inform consumers whether a

product is "Made in America". The Secretary shall publish the toll-free number by notice in the Federal Register.

(b) CONTRACT.—The Secretary of Commerce shall enter into a contract for—

(1) the establishment and operation of the toll free number pilot program provided for in subsection (a), and

(2) the registration of products pursuant to regulations issued under section 3, which shall be funded entirely from fees collected under section 3(c).

(c) USE.—The toll free number shall be used solely to inform consumers as to whether products are registered under section 3 as "Made in America". Consumers shall also be informed that registration of a product does not mean—

(1) that the product is endorsed or approved by the Government,

(2) that the Secretary has conducted any investigation to confirm that the product is a product which meets the definition of "Made in America" in section 5 of this Act, or

(3) that the product contains 100 percent United States content.

SEC. 3. REGISTRATION.

(a) PROPOSED REGULATION.—The Secretary of Commerce shall propose a regulation—

(1) to establish a procedure under which the manufacturer of a product may voluntarily register such product as complying with the definition of "Made in America" in section 5 of this Act and have such product included in the information available through the toll free number established under section 2(a);

(2) to establish, assess, and collect a fee to cover all the costs (including start-up costs) of registering products and including registered products in information provided under the toll-free number;

(3) for the establishment under section 2(a) of the toll-free number pilot program; and

(4) to solicit views from the private sector concerning the level of interest of manufacturers in registering products under the terms and conditions of paragraph (1).

(b) PROMULGATION.—If the Secretary determines based on the comments on the regulation proposed under subsection (a) that the toll-free number pilot program and the registration of products is warranted, the Secretary shall promulgate such regulation.

(c) REGISTRATION FEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Manufacturers of products included in information provided under section 2 shall be subject to a fee imposed by the Secretary of Commerce to pay the cost of registering products and including them in information provided under subsection (a).

(2) AMOUNT.—The amount of fees imposed under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) in the case of a manufacturer, not be greater than the cost of registering the manufacturer's product and providing product information directly attributable to such manufacturer, and

(B) in the case of the total amount of fees, not be greater than the total amount appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for salaries and expenses directly attributable to registration of manufacturers and having products included in the information provided under section 2(a).

(3) CREDITING AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Fees collected for a fiscal year pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be credited to the appropriation account for salaries and expenses of the Secretary of Commerce and shall be available in accordance with appropriation Acts until expended without fiscal year limitation.

(B) COLLECTIONS AND APPROPRIATION ACTS.—The fees imposed under paragraph (1)—

(i) shall be collected in each fiscal year in an amount equal to the amount specified in appropriation Acts for such fiscal year, and

(ii) shall only be collected and available for the costs described in paragraph (2).

SEC. 4. PENALTY.

Any manufacturer of a product who knowingly registers a product under section 3 which is not "Made in America"—

(1) shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$7500 which the Secretary of Commerce may assess and collect, and

(2) shall not offer such product for purchase by the Federal Government.

SEC. 5. DEFINITION.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "Made in America" has the meaning given unqualified "Made in U.S.A." or "Made in America" claims for purposes of laws administered by the Federal Trade Commission.

(2) The term "product" means a product with a retail value of at least \$250.

SEC. 6. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or in any regulation promulgated under section 3 shall be construed to alter, amend, modify, or otherwise affect in any way, the Federal Trade Commission Act or the opinions, decisions, rules, or any guidance issued by the Federal Trade Commission regarding the use of unqualified "Made in U.S.A." or "Made in America" claims in labels on products introduced, delivered for introduction, sold, advertised, or offered for sale in commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 754, and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I am pleased today to rise in support of H.R. 754, the Made in America Information Act. The bill's sponsor, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), should be commended for his commitment to American products and the American worker. This bill is a fitting tribute to that commitment.

The legislation is designed to assist consumers when they are thinking about purchasing a major appliance or other product. For instance, a family looking for a new refrigerator could call the number to find out which brands and models of refrigerators are manufactured in the United States. Consumers have consistently demonstrated their desire to purchase products made in America, and I believe that if this information is provided, they will use this as another major factor in their purchasing decisions.

An important feature of this legislation is that the creation of the service is conditional both on market demand

and the presence of private sector funding. This toll-free number will only be implemented if there is sufficient interest on the part of manufacturers in listing their products and funding the cost of the program through annual fees. Thus, there is no cost to the taxpayer for implementing this program to promote American-made products.

As my colleagues know, the House has passed this bill on a number of previous occasions, but the other body has repeatedly failed to act. The bill before the House today is essentially the same bill passed by the House during the 105th Congress, and I hope that the other body will take this opportunity to send this important measure to the President. This legislation, as reported by the Committee on Commerce, creates a much-needed consumer service, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 754, the Made in America Information Act. This legislation, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), is an important step in reversing the damage that unfairly priced imports are wreaking on workers and small businesses in this country. It is supported by three of my Democratic colleagues on the Committee on Commerce as cosponsors, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. Speaker, regardless of what mainstream economists say, regardless of what the media and talk show hosts say, the fact is there is no greater long-term threat to our economic prosperity than our ballooning trade deficit. Just ask the millions of American workers and small businesses that every month are being asked to compete against billions of dollars of goods that roll onto our shores, many of them made in places where trying to form a union or fight for environmental standards will land a person in jail.

In other cases, some of our workers and small businesses are competing against goods that masquerade as American made, especially those from Saipan, where we know that U.S. corporations exploit tens of thousands of, mostly, young women, and most with families in China, and force them to make garments for pennies an hour. We know this happens because of the efforts of their employers on Wall Street and their political allies here in Washington who continue to block our efforts to even give those very young women the minimum wage or provide the working conditions that we give to American teenagers working at a McDonald's.

Mr. Speaker, the premise behind H.R. 754 is very simple. It requires the Commerce Department to establish a toll-free telephone hot line to give the

American public, the men and women who vote and pay our salaries, help in determining if the products they are buying are, in fact, made by American workers. This hot line will take the guesswork out of whether or not a product that claims to be made in America is really made here or, conversely, assembled in a sweat shop in Saipan or somewhere else. Only those products that meet the Federal Trade Commission standard for making a claim that its product is made in the USA are eligible to be listed on the registry, which the Commerce Department will use to identify American-made products for consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I would also note that, except for minor differences, H.R. 754 is the same legislation that has passed this Congress in each of the last three sessions. Unfortunately, the other body has never taken action on it, and the bill has not been enacted. I sincerely hope that will not be the situation in this Congress and that the bill finally can be enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) for this legislation and urge my colleagues to support H.R. 754 and stop sacrificing fair trade on the altar of free trade.

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

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), the author of the bill.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman, who has done a great job, and I appreciate his helping me on this with all the other issues he has before him on his powerful committee. I also want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), who has worked hard on so many issues on commerce and education.

This is an unusual bill. Both the chairman and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) have mentioned the fact that we have passed it before. I am a little bit frustrated. I would like to talk briefly about that frustration and then talk about mitigating that frustration by the actions of our consumers.

The Congress of the United States has moved in a trade program, in my opinion, that is very flawed. It has produced a negative balance of payments over \$300 billion now, and we are now talking about \$330 billion next year as a trade deficit for 1 year, which will be a new record. In the last 3 months, an \$81 billion trade deficit. Think about that.

China is now taking \$7 billion a month out of America. Nearly everything our consumers buy is made in China. If China's is better, fine. But China is not opening up the doors to Uncle Sam. And while we wait for all of these legislative gurus to fashion some remedy, I think it is time to give the American people information and give the consuming public an opportunity

to at least be conscientious about American-made goods.

What this bill says is this: "Look, if you are buying a refrigerator in Chicago, you can call that 1-800 hot line and say, what refrigerators, if any, are still made in the United States of America." And then they would give that inquiring consumer a list. And maybe when they go out to buy, they would say to the retailer, "Do you have one of these refrigerators on sale? We would like to price them. We would like to look at their quality in comparison to the foreign-made product."

It is not a sophisticated program, for sure. It is not paid for by the taxpayers. It is paid for by the companies, whom I hope would be proud of still being in America and making and building a product in America. I think it is a straightforward bill.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY). He has a tremendous amount of important issues right now facing his committee, but he has always taken the time to give each and every Member an opportunity to appeal to that committee, and I also thank my neighboring colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate the support, overwhelming support, on this bill.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 754, the Made in America Information Act, Introduced by Representative TRAFICANT of Ohio.

This important piece of legislation establishes a toll-free hotline consumers can call to determine if a product is "Made in America."

The self-financed hotline established by H.R. 754 applies to those products with a sale price of over \$250, and the bill imposes a fine of up to \$7,500 on any manufacturer who falsely registers a product as "Made in America."

The Made in America Act has passed the House the last three Congresses, and enjoys strong bipartisan support.

Many Americans want to "Buy America," and we have an obligation to provide consumers with the information they need to make informed choices about how to spend their money.

Mr. Speaker, this is a win-win proposition, and I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support passage of the Made in America Information Act.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 754, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HISTORY OF THE HOUSE AWARENESS AND PRESERVATION ACT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (2303) to direct the Librarian of Congress to prepare the history of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2303

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 "History of the House Awareness and Preservation Act".

SEC. 2. WRITTEN HISTORY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to available funding and in accordance with the requirements of this Act, the Librarian of Congress shall prepare, print, distribute, and arrange for the funding of, a new and complete written history of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Committee on House Administration. In preparing this written history, the Librarian of Congress shall consult, commission, or engage the services or participation of, eminent historians, Members, and former Members of the House of Representatives.

(b) GUIDELINES.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Librarian of Congress shall take into account the following:

(1) The history should be an illustrated, narrative history of the House of Representatives, organized chronologically.

(2) The history's intended audience is the general reader, as well as Members of Congress and their staffs.

(3) The history should include a discussion of the First and Second Continental Congresses and the Constitutional Convention, especially with regard to their roles in creating the House of Representatives.

(c) PRINTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Librarian of Congress shall arrange for the printing of the history.

(2) PRINTING ARRANGEMENTS.—The printing may be performed—

(A) by the Public Printer pursuant to the provisions of chapter 5 of title 44, United States Code;

(B) under a cooperative arrangement among the Librarian of Congress, a private funding source obtained pursuant to subsection (e), and a publisher in the private sector; or

(C) under subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(3) INTERNET DISSEMINATION.—Any arrangement under paragraph (2) shall include terms for dissemination of the history over the Internet via facilities maintained by the United States Government.

(4) MEMBER COPIES.—To the extent that the history is printed by the Public Printer, copies of the history provided to the Congress under subsection (d) shall be charged to the Government Printing Office's congressional allotment for printing and binding.

(d) DISTRIBUTION.—The Librarian of Congress shall make the history available for sale to the public, and shall make available, free of charge, 5 copies to each Member of the House of Representatives and 250 copies to the Senate.

(e) PRIVATE FUNDING.—The Librarian of Congress shall solicit and accept funding for the preparation, publication, marketing, and public distribution of the history from private individuals, organizations, or entities.

SEC. 3. ORAL HISTORY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Librarian of Congress shall accept for deposit, preserve, maintain,

and make accessible an oral history of the House of Representatives, as told by its Members and former Members, compiled and updated (on a voluntary or contract basis) by the United States Association of Former Members of Congress or other private organization. In carrying out this section, the Librarian of Congress may enlist the voluntary aid or assistance of such organization, or may contract with it for such services as may be necessary.

(b) DEFINITION OF ORAL HISTORY.—In this section, the term "oral history" means a story or history consisting of personal recollection as recorded by any one or more of the following means:

(1) Interviews.

(2) Transcripts.

(3) Audio recordings.

(4) Video recordings.

(5) Such other form or means as may be suitable for the recording and preservation of such information.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) orientation programs for freshman Members of the House of Representatives should contain a seminar on the history of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Speaker of the House of Representatives should conduct a series of forums on the topic of the history of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

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

Mr. Speaker, this measure would require that there be created a history of the House of Representatives. The intent is to create a popular illustrated and chronologically ordered volume that covers the entire history of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the fact that the House has a House historian, this particular history is required in the bill to be prepared with no appropriated funds.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the chairman for his comments and his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this important legislation, sponsored by my good friend and our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON). This legislation has 311 cosponsors, including the Speaker and the minority leader. I understand that a few more have been added even this day.

H.R. 2303 is an extraordinarily timely initiative, given the massive institutional changes which have affected the House over the last few years, and as we move into the 21st century.

Earlier this year, the House recodified its rules for the first time since 1880, another recent useful effort to re-examine and hopefully to improve things which we tend to take for granted. We benefit as Members of the House, and the American people benefit, when Members can take some

time away from the constant pressures of legislating, meeting our constituents, traveling back and forth from our districts and keeping hectic schedules, to think about the environment in which we work and the legacy of all those who came before us. And we have so little time even to do that.

In my earlier career, I was president of the State Senate in Maryland, and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) was president pro tempore of the Senate in Connecticut, roughly equivalent positions in two parliamentary bodies which are older than this House of Representatives. As such, we had some responsibility for managing the work of our legislative institutions and the environment in which State Senators worked, environments rich in history.

Here in Washington it takes real work and effort for Members to learn about the history of the House, however. We rarely think of the historic figures who populate artwork throughout the Capitol as having been persons of great accomplishment in legislation, oratory, and the philosophy of democracy, rather than figures we may notice momentarily as we dart through the corridors from meeting to meeting.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution requires that Congress assemble to do its work and that we can exercise our priorities only by working collectively. Too often Members can feel isolated managing their individual offices tending to constituent problems in their district and come to the floor only for a few minutes to vote. But it was not always like that in this chamber, and we do well to remember that.

It would benefit this House if the public had a better understanding of not only what we do on a daily basis, but what our predecessors did and how we stand up compared to them. Certainly, the public has more than enough exposure to the politics of the House.

The bill offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) would offer interested citizens a chance to appreciate, in addition to the politics of the House today, the historic role of the House as the representatives of the popular will.

Mr. Speaker, the bill would direct the Librarian of Congress, at no cost to the Government, I might add, and with the ability to accept private funds, to prepare an illustrated narrative history of the House of Representatives.

The Librarian could use the extensive scholarly resources at his command and would be authorized to consult, commission, or engage the services of eminent historians, Members, and former Members of the House to produce a book accessible to the public at large as well as to the House and to the scholarly community.

The Librarian has informed us, Mr. Speaker, that once the bill is enacted into law he intends to appoint a schol-

arly advisory board to engage an eminent historian or historians who would conduct the principal work of writing the book.

The Librarian will also consult with the House Administration Committee led by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS). The bill would also authorize the Librarian to accept materials relating to an oral history of the House as told by its Members and former Members.

The bill states the sense of the House that orientation programs for freshmen Members of the House should include a seminar on the history of the House and that the Speaker should conduct forums on the history of the House.

As ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, I participate in orientation sessions on many occasions; and I believe that they would be benefited greatly from the inclusion of a big picture view of the House, the Members' place in it, and its historical role.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation and that it has received the strong bipartisan and leadership support needed to give the history of the House project momentum to get it underway quickly and do it thoroughly.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), the former President pro tempore of the Connecticut Senate, now a very, very active and effective leader in the House of Representatives, the sponsor of this legislation.

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

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2303, an act concerning the history of the House Awareness and Preservation Act.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, let me profoundly and deeply thank the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS) and his staff for taking a good concept and making it into a much better bill.

I would also like to thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for his constant advice and mentoring. As a former Senate president, as well, he understands how important it is, especially amongst freshmen Members, to make sure that we receive the appropriate kind of guidance at all times. So I want to thank the staffs, as well, who have labored on this bill.

The bill has over 300 sponsors, Mr. Speaker, and in large part because of two prominent cosponsors on the bill, the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT). So I foster no illusions that my name on the top of this bill attracted so many sponsors, but would point out that at the heart of this bill is a deep and abiding respect for this chamber and its history; and the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) and the gentleman from Mis-

souri (Mr. GEPHARDT) personify all the Members who care deeply about this Chamber and its history.

A special thanks must go, as well, to the staff of the Speaker and Ted VanDerMeade as well in our leader's office, DAN BURTON for the tireless work they performed, as well.

I would be remiss if I did not mention George Shevlin and my entire staff who have shepherded this bill to this point.

How fitting, Mr. Speaker, that as it approaches its 200th year that the Library of Congress will undertake this important local legacies project as it reaches out and asks every congressional district in return to report back to it the legacies of the 435-Member body here.

I wanted to thank the Members, especially the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), who, on a trip to Hershey, talked to me about how important the history of this institution is and reflecting on her husband Bill; and to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), who, also during that sojourn, talked about its importance, talked about his service with Bob Michel. They were enormously helpful.

Also, I want to thank for her constant encouragement the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

This bill had its genesis actually at the John Fitzgerald Kennedy School in Harvard in meetings with Alan Simpson and David Broder, when they challenged the freshmen class of the 106th Congress to return to a time of civility. This charge was further echoed when we went on to Williamsburg by Cokie Roberts, talking about her dad, Hale Boggs and, of course, the beloved Lindy Boggs and the feeling that they had for this great institution. And at a dinner in Virginia with the dean of the House, to be able to hear the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who has been here since 1954, talk about the Presidents and the speakers that he has served with was incredible.

All of that led me to believe that we deserved a history of our own here. I had observed, having traveled over to the other body to listen to debate, that there appeared a four-volume history of that body written by Senator BYRD. And to my chagrin, I learned that we had no such works for the People's Chamber.

Just a walk through Statuary Hall will indicate to anyone the magnitude of the history of the House of Representatives. In the very short time that I have been here, the number of important speeches that have taken place in this Chamber and the fond memories that were recalled of people like Moe Udall, of people like George Brown, who when I came here was the ranking member of the Committee on Science and had chaired that committee and, as we all know, has passed on.

The richness of the political experience and the governmental experience are the people that come here and the people that serve, and that is why this

history is so important. And yet this seeks to accomplish more than just the writing of history, but the capturing of its membership in oral history, as well.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has discussed what the bill proposes and what it actually carries out. First is to have the Librarian of Congress summon both Members of this House, past and present, and eminent historians to decide how to go about and write this great history of this institution, not only including this Congress but the Continental Congress, as well. It also calls on the Library of Congress to become a repository for oral history.

The Former Members of Congress Organization, for example, has already set out on this task. But, in talking to many of them, it has been piecemeal and catch as catch can. And to come under the vast umbrella of the Library of Congress will aid it immensely because there are unique stories to be told by all the Members of this body. It truly is what makes this a representative institution.

And the last, of course, is to provide a sense of the Congress, a sense of the Congress in terms of instructing incoming freshmen about the rich history of the House of Representatives and having our more learned Members and providing them with the opportunity to meet and discuss the great history of the House of Representatives.

It also provides for the Speaker, as he may choose, to conduct forums and to provide the same kind of meetings where dialogue can take place. In discussing this with the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT), he was reflecting, as we are both former school teachers, how interesting it would be to have Bob Michel and Dan Rostenkowski discussing the Congress in Statuary Hall and its importance and significance.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to stand here today as a sponsor of this bill and continue to be humbled every time I walk into this Chamber. I believe that history is important. I believe this bill is important, not so much because it is a bill that I have introduced and care deeply about, but because what it means to this grand institution.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a letter of support from James H. Billington, the Librarian of Congress.

THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, June 22, 1999.

Hon. JOHN B. LARSON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LARSON: I very much appreciate the opportunity to review the final version of your draft bill authorizing the Library of Congress to oversee the preparation of a written history of the House of Representatives. I believe the legislation you have developed allows the Library to bring together a number of necessary elements to produce an authoritative publication that will fill a void in the annals of the Congress, and I support both the bill's goal and substance.

Your legislation will allow the Library's publishing office and curatorial staff to work

together to develop the project, identify primary source material in our collections, and explore various options for its publication. As I indicated in my comments on an earlier draft of the legislation, I envisage appointing a scholarly advisory board, including historians as well as current and former Members of Congress, to assist in the selection of one or more historians to provide the text of the book, and to continue to be involved through the publication stage. The legislation provides sufficient discretion for the Librarian to work out the details of funding, publication, marketing and distribution in a manner consistent with the best interests of the House of Representatives.

The legislation also reflects the appropriate roles of the Library of Congress and the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress in the collection and preservation of oral histories of the Congress. These will undoubtedly prove invaluable to some future historian in continuing the narrative begun by your legislation.

I would like to extend again my offer to hold a lecture series on the history of the House of Representatives in the Members' Room, as a way of both stimulating interest in the published history and drawing together Members, former Members, historians and the Library's incomparable collections for the enjoyment and enlightenment of all.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. BILLINGTON,
The Librarian of Congress.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time that has been yielded to me, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 2303. I would like to give a couple of observations, primarily as a history teacher I think.

For most of my career before coming to Congress, I taught history both at the university level and at the high school level. Sometimes historians make the wry observation that historians are people who, those who cannot make history, are condemned to teach it.

As a consequence, I think, in trying to meld these two experiences together, those of us who have a unique appreciation of history and also have a unique appreciation and understanding of this institution, I think this kind of legislation is very critical and much needed. I certainly congratulate all the cosponsors and in particular applaud the efforts of our colleague the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) to educate, inform, and ultimately preserve the legacy of this body for future generations.

What we are seeking to preserve here is not so much history but the raw material of history. And there is a little bit of a distinction in the profession of history in understanding that history is really what historians write. It is not the raw data; it is not the raw material, but what we are seeking to do here is provide the historian with an opportunity to sift through the mul-

titude of information which this institution can provide in a more organized fashion.

Like the other Members who support this legislation, I, too, am in awe of the institution.

□ 1445

I would like to point out, because I know that perhaps this debate, or this discussion that we are having here will be part of the legacy for this legislation which hopefully will get the history of the House awareness and preservation projects under way, that I am not one of those 435 Members alluded to. The official title of the office I hold is Nonvoting Delegate. Sometimes it gets a little bit cumbersome and awkward when people come to the floor and talk about the 435 Members of the House, and you are one of five people who regularly come here and try to do business and represent your constituents and you are not one of those 435 alluded to.

So I would certainly hope that in the course of conducting this project and in the course of writing this history, that certainly those people who were Delegates, and the first Delegate, I believe, was William Henry Harrison, so there is hope for Delegates. They could become President, although they would die 1 month in office. But certainly he was the very first Delegate elected to this office. Since that time there have been a couple of models on how to represent people, in a slightly imperfect way, for those people who are not representatives of various States ranging from the Resident Commissioner model which is used currently for Puerto Rico and previously for the Philippines.

In light of that, I want to take the time to point out that in support of this legislation, we should make every effort to include all of the people who have served here.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Guam for his contribution. I might want to say, as well, that I had the opportunity of being on the West Coast just a few days ago and there was a former broadcaster on Guam, a journalist with whom I talked, and she said whenever there was a problem from an historical or political perspective that the media had in Guam and wanted some expert information, they would call Dr. Underwood who was a distinguished historian and teacher and get advice and counsel and he always knew the answers. He makes an appropriate point, the 440 Members indeed that make an impact on this body.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut for his leadership.

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

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

As I indicated, I moved to suspend the rules on H.R. 2303 with an amendment, and there was no discussion of

the amendment, so I will briefly for the Members review the amendments. There were three.

One, based upon the number of cosponsors and an indication that we want to extend it to every person who has had an affiliation with the House, whether they be Member or Delegate, that the oral history portion may in fact be of a considerable length, and so in the amendment, one of the items is that "in consultation with the Committee on House Administration" was added so that there could be some minimal institutional control over the history in terms of its overall purport and direction.

Secondly, there was a provision of changing "may" to "shall." The language was that "the librarian may use private funds" and it was changed to "the librarian shall use private funds." One only need pick up current newspapers and examine the way in which "may" and "shall" will be of significance.

There was to be an event in Lisbon, Portugal which was to be funded by private dollars. It turns out that they became public dollars, including an \$18,000 a month apartment for former Member Tony Coelho who headed that operation, and that was one of the reasons we stressed "shall" instead of "may."

And then finally, based upon the description about what folks thought was important in presenting this legislation to the Members, the third amendment, and probably ultimately the most important amendment, required that on the Internet, not, as the bill originally stated, excerpts of the history would be presented but, in fact, the entire history.

It seems as though as time goes on, people tend to have their own particular view of what was important and what was not, of who was important and who was not. And to ensure that no future majority is able to distort the full history of the House of Representatives, the third item was added, and I think all Americans will be supportive of the fact that the entire history is made available, not someone's version of what the history of the House of Representatives ought to be.

And so with those amendments, I am pleased to support the measure.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2303—The History Of The House Awareness And Preservation Act. I wish to commend my colleague from Connecticut for introducing this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we all know how easy it is to forget our history. In the hectic days and weeks that make up our lives on Capitol Hill, many of us rush from meeting to meeting through this magnificent building, often not even glancing at the beautiful artwork that adorns its walls, or to consider the awesome achievements of the men and women who preceded us.

As a freshman legislator, I am still struck with a sense of awe when I walk in this chamber to cast a vote, representing more than

600,000 Americans in their national legislature. As I walk in Statuary Hall, I am still halted by the serene statue of Wisconsin's Fighting Bob LaFollette, a progressive champion who represented my district nearly a hundred years ago. What I think is great about this institution, and why it is valuable to record its history, is that members who have been here for decades still get those feelings too.

This legislation will help us all take a moment to reflect on the importance of what has been decided here and its context in history. By having the Library of Congress create the first history of the House of Representatives, the Nation will have a resource to remind us of the how and why the 13 colonies came together in something called a Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is not fashionable to praise this body. I know that pundits and critics make healthy livings denigrating Congress and the work we do here. This legislation, this history, may give them pause to consider the underpinnings of this institution, and realize that the nobler calling of the Founding Fathers are still with us, and that all of us—Republican and Democrat—are still trying to do our best to live up to those high standards established more than two centuries ago.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2303, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of H.R. 2303, the legislation just considered.

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

There was no objection.

PERMITTING NON-CONGRESSIONAL FEDERAL EMPLOYEES TO ENROLL THEIR CHILDREN IN THE HOUSE CHILD CARE CENTER

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3122) to permit the enrollment in the House of Representatives Child Care Center of children of Federal employees who are not employees of the legislative branch.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3122

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN OF OTHER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHILD CARE CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 312(a)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1992 (40 U.S.C. 184g(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (A);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) if places are available after admission of all children who are eligible under subparagraphs (A) or (B), for children of employees of other offices, departments, and agencies of the Federal government."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to children admitted to the House of Representatives Child Care Center on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

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

Mr. Speaker, I have been a supporter of the House Child Care Center since its initiation. Actually the wife of one of our former colleagues, Al Swift, Mrs. Swift, was instrumental along with others, both staff and Members and spouses, in initiating the House Child Care Center. However, today, eligibility for that center is restricted, first to the children of House employees, then to the children of employees of the Senate, and other legislative branch agencies. While clearly the supportive costs were initiated by the House, this has become a self-funding structure. One of the concerns that we have is that this not be in direct competition with the private sector but that it be able to have a broad enough scope to sustain itself.

And so this measure provides for the extension of the House Child Care Center to a third category, which would assume its position below the others in terms of a prioritization of admittance of students, and that would be children of other employees of the Federal Government, i.e., the executive branch. This expansion of eligibility was requested by the board of directors, supported by the chief administrative officer and as evidence of our general support here on the floor of the House today.

As I said, there is no direct subsidy from the House of Representatives today, and, frankly, the budget for the House Child Care Center is one that is very tight. It performs a needed and very useful service to the legislative branch, and we would not just want this useful and needed service to fail because of our failure to extend it to other areas of the Federal Government. When a request for this change was made, the board of directors wrote this: "If we are allowed to fill vacancies with children of other Federal agencies, our budget will be augmented,

more children and families will get high quality services, and no House family will be worse off. This new policy, then, will produce lots of winners and no losers."

It seems to me that a Child Care Center closely associated with the place of work is a winner to begin with, but it also must be financially viable. The step that we take with this bill today ensures indeed that we will continue to be winners.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, a timely bill, and hopefully every Member will support it. The House is indeed fortunate to have such an excellent Child Care Center. At present, Mr. Speaker, the center is open only to children of employees of the legislative branch, with Members and employees of the House having priority. Numerous Members and staff have entrusted their children to the center over the years. My own granddaughter Judy, as a matter of fact, when my daughter was working here was at the Child Care Center and she was enriched immeasurably by that experience. The House Child Care Center is a wonderful place, and I wish there were many more like it for parents across the country who desperately need safe, reliable, high quality child care.

The House center, which occupies space in the Ford House Office Building, receives no direct appropriations. Except for its space, utilities and benefits for its staff who are House employees, the center must sustain itself through its tuitions. Like many child care centers, the House center has difficulty filling all its places for 3- and 4-year-olds. There is a long waiting list, Mr. Speaker, for infants and strong demand for places for 1- and 2-year-olds. This is because new working parents without family-based child care alternatives often find few options for child care outside the home. However, as children approach the school age, other options become available to many parents. These options may include free or low cost public preschool programs. Parents may enroll in prekindergarten programs that virtually assure later acceptance in a particular school. The arrival of younger siblings may render it more economical for one parent to stay home or to hire a nanny to care for children in the home, if that is financially possible. For child care centers, the loss of 3- and 4-year-olds, who are the most profitable since child-to-adult ratios can be higher, has a great effect on the bottom line.

This legislation will ease this problem for the House center by expanding the population it can serve to include employees of other Federal agencies. The center will continue to give first

priority to children of the House, then to other legislative branch children. If places remain, however, available thereafter, it will then be offered to children of other Federal employees. This is a sensible move that will make the House center more efficient. It will ease the upward pressure on the center's tuition rates which are already frankly beyond the reach of many House employees. Equally important, it will make the benefits of the House Child Care Center available to Federal employees throughout the Washington region. There are undoubtedly numerous Federal workers across this area who would appreciate the chance to enroll their children in the House Child Care Center. We should certainly offer them placements in our center that would otherwise go unfilled, and that is the key. We are simply providing for vacant spaces being available. We will not in any way compete with the House employees.

Mr. Speaker, by strengthening the House Child Care Center, this bill is good for the House and other legislative branch employees who need child care. By expanding the eligible population to include all Federal employees, it is good for Federal workers in this area and the government generally. I certainly rise in strong support of this legislation and ask for an affirmative vote.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, H.R. 3122 that allows federal employees who do not work for the legislative branch to enroll their children in the House of Representatives Child Care Center. Every parent that works for the federal government should have access to quality child care.

Child care is critical to the success of working families and to ensuring that every child enters school ready to learn. The need for child care has become a necessity for many parents.

It is estimated that 65 percent of women with children younger than six, and 78 percent of women with children between the ages of six and 17 are in the work force. Almost 60 percent of the women with infants are also in the work force. The majority of working women provide half or more of their family's income.

Every day, 13 million preschoolers, including six million babies and toddlers are in child care. Children enter child care programs as early as six weeks of age.

Quality child care has a lasting impact on children's well-being and ability to learn. Poor quality child care can result in delayed language and reading skills.

Many parents struggle to find affordable, quality child care because of the high costs. Full day care costs as much as \$4000 to \$10,000 per year—close to the cost of one year of public college tuition.

The Child Care Center that serves the House of Representatives is a high quality center that currently benefits the children of employees of the House. This center offers the quality services that parents need, and this center should be made available for other employees of the Federal government.

I urge my Colleagues to support this measure. All children deserve quality care early in

life for a healthy start this bill will make these services available for more working families.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3122.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of H.R. 3122, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF 4-H CLUBS

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 194) recognizing the contributions of 4-H Clubs and their members to voluntary community service.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 194

Whereas the American people have a tradition of philanthropy and volunteerism;

Whereas 4-H Clubs, an organization originally established by the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture and land-grant colleges, provide young people in the United States with the opportunity to actively participate in volunteer services in their communities that can bridge the differences that separate people and help solve social problems;

Whereas there are more than 6,500,000 youth members of 4-H Clubs in the United States;

Whereas 4-H members touch and enhance the lives of others during the annual National 4-H Week and throughout the year by doing good, by giving where there is a need, by rebuilding what has been torn down, by teaching where there is a desire to learn, and by inspiring those who have lost hope;

Whereas 4-H Clubs and their members, as well as other volunteers and Cooperative Extension staff, have joined to promote the week of October 3 through 9, 1999, as an opportunity for national, collaborated voluntary community service; and

Whereas voluntary community service is an investment in the future all Americans must share: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the Congress commends and recognizes 4-H Clubs and their members in the United States for their contributions to voluntary community service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL).

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, every day we hear more about the challenges currently facing our young people in society. However, today I am proud to bring good news about America's youth by specifically recognizing the 7 million young citizens who are involved in 4-H programs through this resolution.

The roots of 4-H began at the turn of the 20th century when progressive educators started to emphasize the need of young people and to introduce nature study as a basis for a better agricultural education. The 4-H program was founded sometime between 1900 and 1910 to provide local educational clubs for rural youth from ages 9 through 19 years. The program was designed to teach better home economics and agricultural techniques and to foster character development and good citizenship. Boys and girls clubs and leagues were established in schools and churches to meet these needs. Farmers saw the practical benefits, and public support and enthusiasm for 4-H, therefore, grew throughout the Nation.

The program is administered by the Cooperative Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, state land grant universities, and county governments. For nearly a hundred years over 45 million Americans, myself and many other Members of this body included, in some 3,150 counties have subscribed to the 4-H philosophy of learning by doing. In all projects, 4-H members strive to develop and improve the four H's: head, heart, hands, and health that not only make themselves better citizens but, through volunteer service, 4-H members make America's cities, towns, and farms better places to live.

To keep up with the wide range of interests of today's young people, the 4-H program has diversified tremendously. Its agricultural heritage is still alive and well, but today's 4-H members also design Web pages, participate in mock legislatures, organize community clean-ups, and deliver speeches. The 4-H Youth Development Program continues to make great contributions toward the development of well-rounded youth. By this resolution we congratulate them and recognize this ongoing contribution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have just one question for you and the gentleman from Georgia and all of my colleagues here this afternoon, and that question is: Are they into it?

"Are they into it" is the current slogan for the 4-H; "Are they into it" is the rallying cry for the 4-H clubs of

America as they approach 100 years of service to communities and neighborhoods from coast to coast. "Are they into it" is the call that over 6 million young people answered last year in 4-H clubs and organizations across the Nation. "Are they into it" is the mantra repeated by over a half a million volunteers who donate an average of \$200 per year to keep the 4-H clubs strong and vital in their communities. "Are they into it" is the question answered by private sector partners of 4-H, Mr. Speaker, who invest almost \$100 million into 4-H youth development programs.

I am glad to say that today this body is into it, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) for bringing this resolution forward today.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and proud to be on the floor supporting this important measure introduced by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL). Many people believe we live in an era of unprecedented cynicism and skepticism. That is why it is important for this Congress to take a little time to recognize the outstanding organization like 4-H which brings young people together to do good for their communities and to grow as principled individuals.

In fact, research indicates that volunteerism among young Americans has actually been on the increase. America's youth want to participate in the betterment of their communities and their country. The 4-H is uniquely established to provide opportunity to young people nationwide to learn valuable life skills, work with others toward common goals, and developing into community leaders.

The 4-H is a dynamic organization whose mission is to foster innovation and shared learning for America's youth, ages 6 to 19. Its vision is to draw upon combined power of youth and adults so that we can learn together in order to address the challenges and opportunities critical to youth in our communities.

4-H stresses three fundamental values: first, Mr. Speaker, we must treat others with mutual trust and respect and open and honest communication; second, we must assume personal leadership and responsibility for our actions; and third, we must celebrate our differences as well as our similarities and always realize that working with youth as partners is the key to our success.

Mr. Speaker, last week I met with several young people from my district, from western Wisconsin, who are in Washington on different trips, two of whom were here for the conference Voices Against Violence, and one was here with the National Young Leadership Conference which uses the 4-H facilities here in Washington for mock government sessions throughout the year.

What I found striking about these young people is their commitment to their communities and, whether con-

sciously or unconsciously, to the values and ideals fostered by the 4-H. Andy Slind of Boyceville, Wisconsin, told me he plans to continue working in his community during the last 2 years of his high school and would work to participate in some form of public service after college.

Mr. Speaker, our young people know they have a stake in their communities and want to help shape their futures. 4-H provides opportunities for such involvement, and it hones the values and skills we all cherish as Americans.

I am grateful for the opportunity to commemorate the 4-H today for personal reasons as well. I am a former 4-H club member myself. When I was a boy growing up in western Wisconsin, I loved and appreciated the time that I spent within my 4-H club.

4-H continues to play a central role in communities like mine. In fact, just on Saturday my local paper carried an article describing a man who was being honored for his dedication to 4-H. Bob Fredrick of Viroqua, Wisconsin, has been a 4-H youth development agent for 40 years. He started in 1957 at the age of 25 and decided to make the youth program his sole career. In honor of Bob's lifelong dedication to Vernon County youth, the community is establishing a special fund for youth programs in his name.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, over 6 million young people were involved in 4-H programs last year. In fact, nationwide 1 in 7 Americans have been involved in 4-H at some point during their lives. In fact, in addition to myself, three of my staffers here in Washington were 4-H members in their youth; and I would venture to guess that many others around Capitol Hill have experience with a 4-H club.

4-H was founded in 1902 and established in my home State of Wisconsin in 1914. There are currently over 2,000 4-H clubs in my State alone and almost 190,000 young people from Wisconsin that belong to 4-H clubs. Wisconsin was proud to host the National 4-H Dairy Conference this last September, which drew over 250 young people from around the United States and Canada to learn about new technologies and techniques in dairy farming. While many people associate 4-H with rural communities and agricultural issues, kids from cities and suburbs from all backgrounds belong to 4-H clubs. Through 4-H they study citizenship and civics, communications and arts, consumer and family issues, Earth and environmental science, technology and personal leadership.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be here today to commemorate 4-H and its contributions to American communities for the past 98 years. By pledging their heads to clearer thinking, their hearts to greater loyalty, their hands to larger service, and their health to better living, our young people, along with the adult volunteers who teach and help them, do work to strengthen their clubs, their communities, their countries and their world.

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

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise also in strong support of the resolution being offered today in honor of the millions of young people who participate in the 4-H program. As my colleagues know, at a time when we are so concerned about youth who act in negative ways, I think it is fitting that we take a moment to honor young people who work to give back to their communities in positive ways through service, education, and leadership. Four-H is a major program in my State, tracing its roots back to the 1890s. In Nebraska more than 325,000 kids participate in the 4-H programs. That is almost 40 percent of the young people in my State.

But 4-H is not only about kids. In Nebraska, nearly 13,000 dedicated parents and group leaders take their time and their energy to work with young people and help kids have fun while they learn. With eight different curriculum areas ranging from the traditional areas such as livestock, livestock, and food preparation to innovative projects in communications arts and environmental stewardship, the 4-H program challenges kids to work together and with adults to learn new skills and develop lifelong interests and contribute to their communities.

The 4-H program offers youth the positive experiences, support, the challenges that they need to be successful and to develop into strong, competent, caring, and responsible citizens. I want to take this moment to especially commend the chapters in Nebraska and all chapters for that matter for their dedication to our communities. These young people and their parents and sponsors deserve our thanks, and they certainly deserve our applause.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I have any more requests for time on this side, so let me just conclude with a couple of personal notes. I do want to sincerely thank the gentleman from Georgia for giving us this opportunity today to honor the 4-H clubs. It brings back a lot of fond memories for myself.

I, as I indicated, participated in 4-H when I was 8, 9, and 10 years old growing up on the north side of La Crosse. It was not a rural area. It was an urban area. We had a wonderful program, though, that brings back memories of those who participated in it, not only the other kids in the neighborhoods that I was a member with, but the adults and the volunteers who participated in it, adults such as Mary Lou and John Rochester who are no longer

with us today; Mrs. Olsen and Mrs. Severson who took over the program to keep it going when the Rochesters could no longer do so; and the countless number of friends, lifelong friends, that I have today because of an organization like 4-H.

Now for those who are familiar with western Wisconsin and La Crosse would know that growing up on the north side of La Crosse was considered growing up on the other side of the railroad tracks. We had some pretty tough neighborhoods back then, and like many youth do today, we were confronted with a lot of choices and a lot of options, some good, some not so good.

At that time in my life I was just starting to get involved in another group called the Kane Street Killers, and we were arch rivals with the North Side Jack Rabbits. I guess according to today's terms they would be considered gang or gang affiliates, and we had rumbles. We would elude police officers with our youthful pranks and childish antics.

But looking back now at my own childhood, I really was at the crossroads of having to decide which way to go, and but for an organization such as 4-H or the Boys and Girls Club of the greater La Crosse area, I think many of us kids who hung out with the Kane Street Killers could have taken decidedly different routes in our lives. It was because of an organization that offered a structured learning environment like 4-H and many of the community activities that we were involved with, annual food drives during the holiday season to collect some food for the food shelters in the area, a community garden where we would grow food and share with senior centers, a softball team that we participated in that gave a lot of us a good outlet for our pent-up energies, those positive activities in our lives kept many of us out of trouble.

□ 1515

I remember participating in the musical "Oklahoma" when I was 10 years old. For me that was probably the most frightening moment of my young life, having to stand in front of people and try to carry a tune. It was not a very pretty sight, but, nevertheless, looking back on it now, it was a learning and growing experience for me. Because of that, I can honestly say here today that many of us were channeled into more constructive, more educational-oriented arenas, rather than pursuing different options on the street on the north side of La Crosse.

Again, let me conclude by thanking the gentleman from Georgia, and also thanking the thousands of individuals, the adults, the parents and uncles and aunts, grandparents, the neighbors from across the country, the volunteers, who are giving part of their busy lives to 4-H and to the kids participating in 4-H in order to provide this type of alternative option in young people's lives. I think it does perform a

very important and vital role in our society as we try to raise our kids in this Nation with the best opportunities possible.

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

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 194, which deals with the 4-H Clubs and their service to the community. I happen to have the honor of representing the National Headquarters of the 4-H Clubs, and I have seen the kind of work that they have done.

We all know the roots of 4-H began at the turn of the century. Educators began introducing nature study as a way of getting young people interested in agriculture. The four-leaf clover that we know so well, that design with the H's, appeared around 1908. They stand for Head, Heart, Hands, and Hustle: Head trained to think, plan and reason; heart trained to be true, kind and sympathetic; hands trained to be useful, helpful and skillful; and the hustle to render ready service to develop health and vitality.

Today, more than 6.5 million youth are involved in 4-H Clubs nationwide. Twenty-seven percent of the young people involved in 4-H are from a minority racial or ethnic group.

These 4-H programs vary from state to state. Some involve after-school activities and tutoring in inner city public housing communities. Others involve teaching youth about the environment, how to develop and implement a project in their community that will help to solve an environmental issue. We see many examples of these projects at an annual agricultural fair that we have in Montgomery County, Maryland, which is typical of what is happening all over the country under the auspices of 4-H direction.

Whether they are fighting poverty in the inner cities, or combating HIV epidemics, 4-H volunteers are making a difference. They want to help others.

Volunteerism is an American tradition. Concern for others, working together to meet the social challenges of American society, embodies the very best of American values.

Every American has the capacity to reach out to others, to enrich his or her community, and to make a difference. In the act of serving, these 4-H volunteers often find that they make a difference in their own lives. Through volunteering, they develop their own knowledge, skills and character, and they build relationships with people they might not have known otherwise.

Again, I reiterate, I am proud of 4-H, I am proud of the 4-H headquarters in Chevy Chase, Maryland, I am proud of the staff at the headquarters. I have been very much involved with many of their activities focused on Citizenship

Washington and other activities where they have brought young people in from all over the country.

There are some people I want to mention. Trina Batte, Janet Hand, Jenna Carter, Loretta Espey, Sylvia Gould, and I could go on and on. These are but a few of the names of the staff members that work at the headquarters. So I am pleased to praise all of the wonderful people who work not only at the headquarters in Chevy Chase, but the volunteers and those people that work for 4-H throughout the country. They do make a difference.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to thank my staff person, Peter Dale, for his work in bringing this resolution to the floor. He has been involved in 4-H, as has his family.

As has been reiterated by others, I have been involved in 4-H. My oldest daughter was a National 4-H Citizenship Winner, and in my local community we have people who are volunteering their time through an adult organization sponsoring scholarships through the 4-H program so young people can get a college education. My State is indeed fortunate to have one of the premier State 4-H educational and recreational facilities, known as Rock Eagle, in the State of Georgia. Many young people pass through that facility each year and are enriched by the experiences that they receive.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would simply urge the favorable adoption of this resolution as a recognition of the outstanding contributions that the 4-H Clubs have made to our communities and to our country. I would urge favorable adoption of the resolution.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 194. For nearly a century, 4-H has been helping the children of this Nation "learn by doing." As the largest youth organization in the United States, 4-H educates children through practical, hands-on methods that emphasize life skills. It is difficult to point to another organization that has had a comparable positive impact on America's youth. Since its inception in the early 1900s, more than 45 million Americans have participated in 4-H. In my home state alone, 4-H is currently helping over 252,000 young people improve their self-confidence and learn important skills such as leadership, citizenship, and decision-making that can be applied over a lifetime. Originally founded as an agricultural youth organization, the 4-H program is no longer limited to rural communities. 4-H clubs are thriving in urban centers across the country, teaching inner city kids the same values and self confidence that have helped so many rural youth. Today, kids from all walks of life can learn to design web pages, participate in mock legislatures, and organize community clean-ups. 4-H continues to work toward the development of youth as individuals and as responsible and productive citizens. I urge you to join me in supporting this resolution.

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

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

motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 194.

The question was taken.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 194.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING PAY ADJUSTMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 915) to authorize a cost of living adjustment in the pay of administrative law judges, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 915

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PAY OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES.

Section 5372(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting "(A)" after "(1)" and by striking all after the first sentence and inserting the following:

"(B) Within level AL-3, there shall be 6 rates of basic pay, designated as AL-3, rates A through F, respectively. Level AL-2 and level AL-1 shall each have 1 rate of basic pay.

"(C) The rate of basic pay for AL-3, rate A, may not be less than 65 percent of the rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule, and the rate of basic pay for AL-1 may not exceed the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule."

(2) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking "upon" each time it appears and inserting "at the beginning of the next pay period following"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) Subject to paragraph (1), effective at the beginning of the first applicable pay period commencing on or after the first day of the month in which an adjustment takes effect under section 5303 in the rates of basic pay under the General Schedule, each rate of basic pay for administrative law judges shall be adjusted by an amount determined by the President to be appropriate."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 915, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 915, sponsored by my esteemed colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS). H.R. 915 is a bipartisan bill to reform the process for setting the pay of the Federal Government's administrative law judges, otherwise known as ALJs. The Federal Government employs over 1,400 administrative law judges. Their work is crucial and very important to the Federal Government's operations. ALJs decide important cases, ranging from the Social Security complaints of senior citizens to complex securities litigation.

In order to recruit and retain qualified administrative law judges, steps must be taken to ensure their pay remains competitive. Regrettably, circumstances are making this difficult. Each grade and step of the current ALJ pay schedule is rigidly set as a fixed percentage of Level IV of the Executive Schedule. As a result, pay increases for ALJs have lagged behind those of their colleagues under the general schedule or in the Senior Executive Service.

This situation creates a disincentive for highly qualified attorneys, both in the Federal Government and in the private sector, to compete and apply for these important positions. The disincentive is particularly acute for private sector attorneys. While they must generally start at the bottom of the ALJ pay scale, government attorneys at least have the option to keep a comparable salary when they become ALJs.

By reforming the pay-setting process, H.R. 915 will make ALJ positions more attractive for attorneys across the board. Although the bill retains the current grade and step structure for ALJs, H.R. 915 provides the President with more flexibility to adjust ALJ pay. Rather than link each grade and step to a specific percentage of Level IV of the Executive Schedule, H.R. 915 simply establishes minimum and maximum rates of pay for ALJs. These are the same as the current minimum of 65 percent of Level IV and the current maximum of 100 percent of Level IV.

H.R. 915 also authorizes the President to adjust ALJ pay rates below the maximum when employees under the general schedule receive an annual pay adjustment. This mirrors the authority the President now has to adjust the pay of the Senior Executive Service.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this chance to offer H.R. 915 for consideration by the House. I encourage the support of all Members.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, Federal administrative law judges, often referred to as the Federal Administrative Trial Judiciary, perform judicial functions within the Executive Branch of Government. In adjudicating cases before them, administrative law judges conduct formal trial-type hearings, make findings of fact and law, apply agency regulations and issue either initial or recommended decisions.

There are over 1,300 ALJs assigned to 31 Federal agencies. The agency employing the largest number of ALJs, over 1,184, is the Social Security Administration, which has its headquarters in my district in Baltimore.

I am pleased that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS), the author of the legislation before us today, was able to work with the Office of Personnel Management to craft a bill that has bipartisan support. H.R. 915, a bill to authorize a cost of living adjustment in the pay of administrative law judges, makes a needed improvement in the ALJ pay system.

Under current law, both Federal judges and ALJs are paid under the Executive Schedule, as are Members of Congress. ALJs are the only executive branch Federal employees whose pay is linked to Members of Congress. From 1993 through 1996, ALJs and Federal judges received no cost of living adjustments because Congress prohibited those subject to the Executive Schedule from receiving a COLA.

When Executive Schedule pay goes unchanged, so does the basic pay for ALJs. Consequently, ALJ pay levels have not kept pace with those of other groups of Federal employees, such as the General Service and the Senior Executive Schedule. Under H.R. 915, the pay adjustment process for ALJs would mirror the process for setting the basic pay rates for the Senior Executive Schedule. The structure of the ALJ pay system would remain unchanged. The bill would retain the minimum and maximum rates for the ALJ pay range, while eliminating the specific linkages to executive pay within that range. The President would be authorized to adjust ALJ pay within that pay range at the same time as SES basic pay rates are adjusted, which is the time of the annual GS pay adjustment. The top ALJ pay rate could still not exceed the statutory maximum, which would remain the rate for the executive Level IV.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and bring the pay of administrative law judges in line with other groups of Federal employees.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this bill. I think we do need to in-

clude the administrative law judges under H.R. 915, and I hope we will be able in the future to look to the Social Security appeals judges also.

I am pleased to also support H.R. 915, which I think is very important. I thank also the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for their support of it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), one who has been at the forefront of protecting the rights of Federal employees and who has been a mentor to me in regard to those kind of issues and many other issues.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the former Speaker pro tem of the Maryland House for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 915, which, as has been stated, is a bill that will provide the President with the authority to provide annual cost of living adjustments to our Nation's more than 1,300 Federal administrative judges, the same authority he now has, frankly, with respect to members of the Senior Executive Service. Currently the pay and step levels for administrative law judges are tied to the Executive Schedule, so they are unable to receive an increase in pay in the years when the Executive Schedule remains unchanged. Since 1991, the basic pay for administrative law judges has increased only three times, in 1992, 1993 and not until 1998, and only one time in the last 5 years, as the figures reflect.

□ 1530

That is in contrast to employees under the General Schedule and the Senior Executive Schedule, who have received a COLA increase in 4 of the last 5 years. This legislation will bring the pay of administrative law judges into line with career employees in the General Schedule and Senior Executive Service.

Mr. Speaker, prior to 1990, administrative law judges fell under the General Schedule and were paid at the GS-15 and 16 rates. In 1990, as part of the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act, a legislation which I had the honor of sponsoring, the judges had their pay linked to the executive schedule.

While this legislation, H.R. 915, will not change the current grade and step structures for administrative law judges, it will tie each grade and step to fixed percentages of the SES.

I support this legislation, and hope this bill will provide increased competition, and draw the highly qualified candidates that these judgeship positions require for the sound administration of the Federal Government and Federal rules and regulations.

I urge my colleagues to join me and the gentlewoman from Illinois and the gentleman from Maryland in supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just take a moment to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this very important legislation. As the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) just stated, one of the things we are most concerned about is making sure that we attract the very best to the administrative law judge system.

Certainly, as much as we might not want to think it, pay is very important. It is something that does attract. We want to make sure that they are treated fairly. They do do an outstanding job over and over again, and are sometimes overlooked because they are on the administrative law judge level. The fact is, they do a very important job.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's comments are very important and relevant. We need to keep focused on that.

Too often we tend to denigrate Federal service at whatever level, from the administrative law judge level to a file clerk. The fact of the matter is they are very important to the fair and proper administration of the people's government. We certainly want to make sure that we have people at these positions who have sound judgment, significant legal ability, and can wisely dispose of the issues that confront them.

I also want to say that I very much appreciate the leadership of my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, who has been the ranking member of this subcommittee, and as such has worked with the chairman in a very positive way in ensuring that we have a sound, wise public employee policy in this country. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time to me, and I thank him for his leadership. As well, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and also I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Let me offer to say, having worked with administrative law judges, and in particular, serving on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, where there is an enormous body of administrative law judges that deal with some of the issues that confront immigrants who are seeking legal admission to the United States, I do know of the great value of the service of the administrative law judges.

I wanted to offer my support for this legislation as a way of equalizing the compensation equal to the amount of work and the amount of service that the ALJs participate in.

My first exposure to ALJs was as a lawyer, but also as a member of the

Houston City Council, because many times constituents, not knowing which governmental agency to call, would call with social security issues. Those issues invariably might be addressed at the level of the ALJs.

I realize what a heavy caseload ALJs have had in a variety of areas. Social security happens to be one. I think that many people do not understand the ALJ tasks. They are not Federal judges in terms of not being judges that are appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate, they come through the administrative civil service process. Yet, they serve a very important responsibility.

When I traveled to visit the detention centers, or at least one of the detention centers in New York, I was able to see the work of ALJs as they held court right in the detention centers, to give due process to those individuals who had been detained who might have an explanation or defense for their being detained as an illegal alien or with some other concerns. It was the ALJ who presided over the proceeding, and was considered the first line of defense, or at least the first line of justice for these individuals.

So I say to the gentleman from Maryland, I simply wanted to add that ALJs play an important role in the life of justice in the United States. Although they are called administrative law judges, and they respond to the administrative process and they come through a civil service process, they are competent, they are qualified, they are trained lawyers, and therefore, they are very much a cornerstone to the justice system in this country.

I am delighted that we are now correcting or at least providing adequate compensation in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of H.R. 915, which authorizes a Cost Of Living Adjustment (COLA), in the pay of Administrative Law Judges. Specifically, H.R. 915 reforms the compensation process for Administrative Law Judges (ALJ) by establishing maximum and minimum salaries for Administrative Law Judges.

Currently, Administrative Law Judges are appointed pursuant to Title 5 of the United States Code, establishing the Administrative Law Judge as an independent decision maker who implements the Administrative Procedure Act.

In an age where a good percentage of this country's legal minds are practicing their craft in the private sector, government must do all it can to attract and keep qualified practitioners of the Judiciary. Under current law, both Federal Judges and Administrative Law Judges are paid under the executive Schedule, as are members of Congress.

From 1993 through 1996, Administrative Law Judges and Federal Judges received no Cost Of Living Adjustment (COLA) because Congress restricted those subject to the Executive Schedule from receiving a COLA. When the Executive Schedule pay remains unchanged, so does the basic pay for Administrative Law Judges. As a result, the pay of Administrative Law Judges has not kept pace with those of other groups of federal employ-

ees, such as the General Schedule and the Senior Executive Schedule.

H.R. 915 seeks to address these concerns by adjusting the pay process for Administrative Law Judges to mirror the process for setting the basic pay rates for the Senior Executive Service. This bill would authorize the President to adjust the pay for Administrative Law Judges within the pay range at the same time that Senior Executive Service basic pay rates are adjusted, which is the time of the annual General Service pay adjustment. The top Administrative Law Judge pay rate will still not exceed the statutory maximum, which would remain the rate for Executive Level IV. As a result, instead of adjusting Administrative Law Judges's rates only when there is an increase in executive pay, the President could adjust any Administrative Law Judge pay rate, which had not reached the statutory maximum.

Mr. Speaker, dear colleagues, this is a well-needed bill that will compensate our judges for a job well done. I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for what she had to say. As I was listening to the gentlewoman, I could not help but remember, in law school one of the things we learn early on is before one gets to court, they have to exhaust their administrative process first, so they do play a very important role. Many cases are resolved before they get to the courts. Our courts would certainly be clogged if they were not resolved.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for her comments. I am sure it means a lot to all of our administrative law judges who might be listening or may read this transcript.

Mr. Speaker, again, I would urge all Members to vote in favor of this very important legislation. I also want to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for her efforts with regard to this, and also the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), the chairman of our subcommittee, and certainly the chairman of the full committee and the ranking member.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 915 is supported by the administration, the Association of Administrative Law Judges, the Federal Administrative Law Judges Conference, the American Bar Association, and the Federal Bar Association.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 915 is good public policy, and will help attract some of the best and brightest legal minds to serve as administrative law judges. I thank the sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for his work on this important issue. I also applaud the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for his leadership in this legislation. I urge all Members to vote for H.R. 915.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 915 and I am proud to have been a co-sponsor of this important legislation. I would like to thank my good friend

and colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. GEKAS, for introducing this important legislation. I would also like to thank the Civil Service Subcommittee and Chairman JOE SCARBOROUGH for acting on this legislation in such a timely manner. It is a fair bill and is sorely needed. With the recent passage of legislation to grant virtually all Federal civilian and military employees a 4.8 percent pay raise, this bill would finally permit a small number of administrative law judges, also career employees, the right to have their pay adjustment determined by the President on an annual basis.

At the present time, ALJs are on the Executive Pay Schedule which includes Members of Congress, Cabinet Secretaries, and Federal District Court Judges. As a result of this classification, ALJs have received only two cost-of-living-adjustments in the past 8 years. Unfortunately, ALJs have been caught in the middle of the controversial political debate surrounding pay raises for Members of Congress and have not received a pay increase. This is despite the fact that their salaries are commensurate with that of the Senior Executive Service (SES), or General Schedule employees. Clearly, it is appropriate to decouple ALJ pay raises from congressional pay raises and not freeze their salaries.

These career employees are among the very few career Federal employees who pay is still tied to congressional salaries. H.R. 915 will place them on the same level as the Senior Executive Service. This change is supported by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and was included in the President's FY 2000 budget request. The President will make the final decision each year as to what, if any pay adjustment these employees will have. This change is critically important to encouraging qualified individuals to serve as ALJs and to begin to adequately compensate those who are currently working as ALJs.

Mr. Speaker, many ALJs live in my congressional district in Northern Virginia. I am glad to see that we are taking action on this legislation before the end of the year. ALJs have had to wait too many years for the appropriate level of compensation. This bill is good public policy and will encourage the best and the brightest to serve their government. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 915 today. Again, I would like to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. GEKAS for introducing this legislation and working tirelessly to shepherd it through the legislative process.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for H.R. 915, a bill that will change the manner in which the approximately 1,300 administrative law judges (ALJs) in Federal agencies receive annual cost of living adjustments. I want to thank Chairman BURTON for his leadership in steering the bill through the Government Reform Committee, along with both the current and former Civil Service Subcommittee Chairmen SCARBOROUGH and MICA for their help in bringing this bill forward, and for their continued efforts to correct the injustice done to ALJ compensation. I would also like to thank OPM for their time and technical expertise in helping to put this bill together.

H.R. 915 is a bipartisan and noncontroversial bill that passed through both the Judiciary Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law and the Civil Service Subcommittee and the full government Reform Committees by unanimous consent on voice votes without objection. The bipartisan cosponsorship of

H.R. 915, as well as the support of the administration, expressed in a May, 1999 hearing in my Judiciary Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, are a testament to the strong support for this legislation.

Administrative law judges serve a vital role as an administrative judiciary to insure agency compliance with the Administrative Procedure Act. In fact, the average citizen is far more likely to appeal to these judges for redress of claims against the government than to the Federal courts.

The ALJ position demands commitment and a high degree of professional legal competence as a senior trial attorney. Therefore, it is important that Federal agencies maintain the ability to attract high quality lawyers to serve as ALJs.

In 1990 in recognition of the ALJ's unique role as independent decision makers, Congress and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) created a judicial pay classification for the ALJs, at 60 percent to 90 percent of level four of the Executive Schedule. The new classification is above the General Schedule 16 classification, and was to compensate ALJs at a level similar to Senior Executive Service (SES) employees.

Unfortunately, according to OPM, ALJ pay has fallen to the level of GS 15 pay and has not maintained the level of SES pay. As a result, OPM, the American Bar Association, and the Federal Bar Association have all expressed concerns that the high quality of ALJ candidates will be diminished if ALJ compensation is not competitive with other senior level Federal employees.

I have sought to correct this erosion in the ALJ pay since the last Congress, when I introduced H.R. 1240 last session to provide ALJs a cost of living adjustment (COLA) when the General Schedule received a COLA. H.R. 1240 passed the full House Judiciary Committee last year by voice vote without any objection, and was included in the draft Civil Service Subcommittee reform package.

OPM proposed some changes to that approach, and I have embodied those changes in the text for H.R. 915 this year, which would treat ALJs the same as SES for COLA purposes. It does not grant an automatic COLA, but instead gives the President the discretion and authority to grant a COLA and the rate.

Additionally, I would like to point out that H.R. 915 would for the first time allow ALJs to have access to the COLA funds already contained in the budgets of the agencies where they sit, requiring no new appropriation of funds. Currently, these already appropriated ALJ COLA funds go to pay additional bonuses for SES personnel.

Enactment of H.R. 915 is a modest step to maintain a competent and independent Federal ALJ corps, and I urge its passage by the House.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 915, legislation to authorize a cost of living adjustment in the pay of administrative law judges. Furthermore, I want to thank the sponsor of this H.R. 915, my friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, GEORGE GEKAS and Civil Service Subcommittee chair, JOE SCARBOROUGH for all of their hard work on this important legislation. H.R. 915 will adjust the basic pay for the more than 1,300 administrative law judges employed by the Federal Government and will authorize to the President the same authority

to provide annual pay adjustments to ALJs who now serve in the Senior Executive Service.

The pay for ALJs has not kept pace over the years with those in other Federal employee positions, making it extremely difficult to attract and retain qualified and experienced attorneys to serve as ALJs.

Throughout my tenure in Congress I have had the opportunity to work with many of our ALJs and have always found their abilities and commitment to public service second to none. The bill before us today will not only reward our ALJs for their tireless dedicated years of public service, but will insure that the Federal Government will continue to maintain an exceptional ALJ roster.

Accordingly, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 915, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1802

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on approving the Journal and on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Approval of the Journal, de novo;
H.R. 754, by the yeas and nays;
H.R. 2303, by the yeas and nays; and
House Concurrent Resolution 194, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending

business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. 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 341, nays 49, answered "present" 1, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 533]

YEAS—341

Abercrombie	Davis (VA)	Holden
Allen	Deal	Holt
Andrews	DeGette	Horn
Archer	Delahunt	Hostettler
Armey	DeLauro	Houghton
Bachus	DeLay	Hoyer
Baker	DeMint	Hulshof
Baldwin	Deutsch	Hunter
Barcia	Diaz-Balart	Hutchinson
Barr	Dicks	Hyde
Barrett (NE)	Dingell	Inslée
Barrett (WI)	Dixon	Isakson
Bartlett	Doggett	Istook
Barton	Doolittle	Jackson (IL)
Bass	Doyle	Jackson-Lee
Bateman	Dreier	(TX)
Bentsen	Duncan	Jenkins
Bereuter	Dunn	John
Berkley	Edwards	Johnson (CT)
Berman	Ehlers	Johnson, Sam
Berry	Ehrlich	Jones (NC)
Biggert	Engel	Jones (OH)
Bilirakis	Eshoo	Kanjorski
Bishop	Etheridge	Kaptur
Blagojevich	Everett	Kelly
Bliley	Ewing	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Farr	Kildee
Blunt	Fattah	Kind (WI)
Boehlert	Fletcher	King (NY)
Bonior	Foley	Kingston
Boswell	Forbes	Klecza
Boucher	Ford	Knollenberg
Boyd	Fossella	Kolbe
Brady (TX)	Fowler	Kuykendall
Brown (FL)	Frank (MA)	LaFalce
Brown (OH)	Franks (NJ)	LaHood
Bryant	Frelinghuysen	Lampson
Burr	Frost	Larson
Burton	Galleghy	Latham
Buyer	Ganske	LaTourette
Callahan	Gejdenson	Lazio
Calvert	Gekas	Leach
Camp	Gephardt	Lee
Campbell	Gilchrest	Levin
Canady	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Cannon	Gilman	Lewis (KY)
Capps	Gonzalez	Linder
Cardin	Goode	Lofgren
Castle	Goodlatte	Lucas (KY)
Chabot	Goodling	Lucas (OK)
Chambliss	Gordon	Luther
Chenoweth-Hage	Goss	Maloney (CT)
Clayton	Graham	Maloney (NY)
Clement	Green (TX)	Manzullo
Coble	Green (WI)	Markley
Coburn	Greenwood	Martinez
Collins	Gutierrez	Matsui
Combest	Hall (OH)	McCarthy (MO)
Condit	Hall (TX)	McCrery
Conyers	Hansen	McGovern
Cooksey	Hastings (WA)	McHugh
Cox	Hayes	McInnis
Coyne	Hayworth	McIntyre
Cubin	Herger	McKeon
Cummings	Hill (IN)	McKinney
Cunningham	Hinchey	Meehan
Danner	Hobson	Meek (FL)
Davis (FL)	Hoefel	Meeks (NY)
Davis (IL)	Hoekstra	Menendez

Metcalf	Riley	Stenholm
Mica	Rivers	Stump
Millender-	Rodriguez	Sununu
McDonald	Roemer	Sweeney
Miller (FL)	Rogan	Talent
Miller, Gary	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Minge	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauscher
Mink	Rothman	Tauzin
Mollohan	Roukema	Terry
Moran (KS)	Roybal-Allard	Thomas
Moran (VA)	Royce	Thornberry
Morella	Ryan (WI)	Thune
Murtha	Ryun (KS)	Thurman
Nadler	Salmon	Tiahrt
Napolitano	Sanchez	Tierney
Nethercutt	Sanders	Toomey
Ney	Sandlin	Trafficant
Northup	Sanford	Turner
Norwood	Sawyer	Udall (CO)
Obey	Saxton	Upton
Oliver	Schakowsky	Velazquez
Ortiz	Scott	Vento
Ose	Sensenbrenner	Vitter
Owens	Serrano	Walden
Oxley	Sessions	Walsh
Packard	Shadegg	Wamp
Pascarell	Shays	Watkins
Paul	Sherman	Watt (NC)
Payne	Sherwood	Watts (OK)
Pease	Shimkus	Waxman
Peterson (PA)	Shows	Weiner
Petri	Shuster	Weldon (FL)
Phelps	Simpson	Weldon (PA)
Pitts	Sisisky	Wexler
Pombo	Skeen	Weygand
Pomeroy	Skelton	Whitfield
Porter	Smith (MI)	Wicker
Portman	Smith (NJ)	Wilson
Price (NC)	Smith (TX)	Wise
Quinn	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Radanovich	Souder	Woolsey
Rahall	Spence	Wynn
Rangel	Spratt	Young (AK)
Regula	Stabenow	Young (FL)
Reyes	Stark	
Reynolds	Stearns	

NAYS—49

Aderholt	Hefley	Pickett
Baird	Hill (MT)	Ramstad
Bilbray	Hilleary	Sabo
Borski	Hilliard	Schaffer
Clay	Hoolley	Slaughter
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Snyder
Costello	Klink	Strickland
Crane	Kucinich	Taylor (MS)
Crowley	LoBiondo	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Dickey	McNulty	Udall (NM)
English	Miller, George	Visclosky
Evans	Moore	Waters
Filner	Oberstar	Weller
Gibbons	Pallone	Wu
Gutknecht	Pastor	
Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)	

"PRESENT"—1

Tancred

NOT VOTING—42

Ackerman	Granger	Moakley
Baldacci	Hinojosa	Myrick
Ballenger	Neal	Jefferson
Becerra	Kasich	Nussle
Boehner	Kilpatrick	Pelosi
Bonilla	Lantos	Pickering
Bono	Largent	Pryce (OH)
Brady (PA)	Lewis (GA)	Rogers
Capuano	Lipinski	Roukema
Carson	Lowe	Rush
Cook	Mascara	Scarborough
Cramer	McCarthy (NY)	Shaw
Dooley	McCollum	Stupak
Emerson	McIntosh	Taylor (NC)
		Towns

□ 1830

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX,

the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on the additional motions to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed earlier proceedings.

MADE IN AMERICAN INFORMATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 754, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 754, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 2, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

YEAS—390

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Frelinghuysen
Aderholt	Coble	Frost
Allen	Coburn	Gallegly
Andrews	Collins	Ganske
Archer	Combest	Gejdenson
Armedy	Condit	Gekas
Bachus	Conyers	Gephardt
Baird	Cooksey	Gibbons
Baker	Costello	Gilchrest
Baldacci	Cox	Gillmor
Baldwin	Coyne	Gilman
Barcia	Crane	Gonzalez
Barr	Crowley	Goode
Barrett (NE)	Cubin	Goodlatte
Barrett (WI)	Cummings	Goodling
Bartlett	Cunningham	Gordon
Barton	Danner	Goss
Bass	Davis (FL)	Graham
Bateman	Davis (IL)	Green (TX)
Bentsen	Davis (VA)	Green (WI)
Bereuter	Deal	Greenwood
Berkley	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Berman	DeGette	Gutknecht
Berry	Delahunt	Hall (OH)
Biggart	DeLauro	Hall (TX)
Bilbray	DeLay	Hansen
Bilirakis	DeMint	Hastings (FL)
Bishop	Deutsch	Hastings (WA)
Blagojevich	Diaz-Balart	Hayworth
Bliley	Dickey	Hefley
Blumenauer	Dicks	Herger
Blunt	Dingell	Hill (IN)
Boehlert	Dixon	Hill (MT)
Boehner	Doggett	Hilleary
Bonior	Doolittle	Hilliard
Borski	Doyle	Hinchey
Boswell	Dreier	Hobson
Boucher	Duncan	Hoefel
Boyd	Dunn	Hoekstra
Brady (TX)	Edwards	Holden
Brown (FL)	Ehlers	Holt
Brown (OH)	Ehrlich	Hoolley
Bryant	Emerson	Horn
Burr	Engel	Hostettler
Burton	English	Houghton
Buyer	Eshoo	Hoyer
Callahan	Etheridge	Hulshof
Calvert	Evans	Hunter
Camp	Everett	Hutchinson
Campbell	Ewing	Hyde
Canady	Farr	Inslee
Cannon	Fattah	Isakson
Capps	Filner	Istook
Cardin	Fletcher	Jackson (IL)
Castle	Foley	Jackson-Lee
Chabot	Forbes	(TX)
Chambliss	Ford	Jenkins
Chenoweth-Hage	Fossella	John
Clay	Fowler	Johnson (CT)
Clayton	Frank (MA)	Johnson, E. B.
Clement	Franks (NJ)	Jones (NC)

Jones (OH)	Napolitano	Simpson
Kanjorski	Nethercutt	Sisisky
Kaptur	Ney	Skeen
Kasich	Northup	Skelton
Kelly	Norwood	Slaughter
Kennedy	Oberstar	Smith (MI)
Kildee	Obey	Smith (NJ)
Kind (WI)	Oliver	Smith (TX)
King (NY)	Ortiz	Smith (WA)
Kingston	Ose	Snyder
Klecza	Owens	Souder
Klink	Oxley	Spence
Knollenberg	Packard	Spratt
Kolbe	Pallone	Stabenow
Kucinich	Pascarell	Stark
Kuykendall	Pastor	Stearns
LaFalce	Payne	Stenholm
LaHood	Pease	Strickland
Lampson	Peterson (MN)	Stump
Larson	Peterson (PA)	Sununu
Latham	Petri	Sweeney
LaTourette	Phelps	Talent
Lazio	Pickett	Tancred
Leach	Pitts	Tanner
Lee	Pombo	Tauscher
Levin	Pomeroy	Tauzin
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Taylor (MS)
Lewis (KY)	Portman	Terry
Linder	Price (NC)	Thomas
LoBiondo	Quinn	Thompson (CA)
Lofgren	Radanovich	Thompson (MS)
Lucas (KY)	Rahall	Thornberry
Lucas (OK)	Ramstad	Thune
Luther	Rangel	Thurman
Maloney (CT)	Regula	Tiahrt
Maloney (NY)	Reyes	Tierney
Manzullo	Reynolds	Toomey
Markey	Riley	Trafficant
Martinez	Rivers	Turner
Matsui	Rodriguez	Udall (CO)
McCarthy (MO)	Roemer	Udall (NM)
McCrery	Rogan	Upton
McDermott	Rohrabacher	Velazquez
McGovern	Ros-Lehtinen	Vento
McHugh	Rothman	Vitter
McInnis	Roybal-Allard	Walden
McIntyre	Royce	Walsh
McKeon	Ryan (WI)	Wamp
McKinney	Ryun (KS)	Waters
McNulty	Sabo	Watkins
Meehan	Salmon	Watt (NC)
Meek (FL)	Sanchez	Watts (OK)
Meeks (NY)	Sanders	Waxman
Menendez	Sandlin	Weiner
Metcalf	Sawyer	Weldon (FL)
Mica	Saxton	Weldon (PA)
Millender-	Schaffer	Weller
McDonald	Schakowsky	Wexler
Miller (FL)	Scott	Weygand
Miller, Gary	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Miller, George	Serrano	Wicker
Minge	Sessions	Wilson
Mink	Shadegg	Wise
Mollohan	Shaw	Wolf
Moore	Shays	Woolsey
Moran (KS)	Sherman	Wu
Moran (VA)	Sherwood	Wynn
Morella	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Murtha	Shows	Young (FL)
Nadler	Shuster	

NAYS—2

Paul

Sanford

NOT VOTING—41

Ackerman	Jefferson	Neal
Ballenger	Johnson, Sam	Nussle
Becerra	Kilpatrick	Pelosi
Bonilla	Lantos	Pickering
Bono	Largent	Pryce (OH)
Brady (PA)	Lewis (GA)	Rogers
Capuano	Lipinski	Roukema
Carson	Lowe	Rush
Cook	Mascara	Scarborough
Cramer	McCarthy (NY)	Stupak
Dooley	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Granger	McIntosh	Towns
Hayes	Moakley	Visclosky
Hinojosa	Myrick	

□ 1839

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish a toll free number under the Department of Commerce to assist consumers in determining if products are American-made."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker on rollcall No. 534, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HISTORY OF THE HOUSE AWARENESS AND PRESERVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2303, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2303, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 7, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 535]

YEAS—388

Abercrombie	Chambliss	Fattah
Aderholt	Chenoweth-Hage	Filner
Allen	Clay	Fletcher
Andrews	Clayton	Foley
Archer	Clement	Forbes
Armey	Clyburn	Ford
Bachus	Coble	Fossella
Baird	Coburn	Fowler
Baker	Collins	Franks (NJ)
Baldacci	Combust	Frelinghuysen
Baldwin	Condit	Frost
Barcia	Conyers	Gallagher
Barr	Cooksey	Ganske
Barrett (NE)	Costello	Gejdenson
Barrett (WI)	Cox	Gekas
Bartlett	Coyne	Gephardt
Barton	Crane	Gibbons
Bass	Crowley	Gilchrest
Bateman	Cubin	Gillmor
Bentsen	Cummings	Gilman
Bereuter	Cunningham	Gonzalez
Berkley	Danner	Goode
Berman	Davis (FL)	Goodlatte
Berry	Davis (IL)	Goodling
Biggert	Davis (VA)	Gordon
Billbray	Deal	Goss
Bilirakis	DeFazio	Graham
Bishop	DeGette	Green (TX)
Blagojevich	DeLay	Green (WI)
Bliley	DeLauro	Greenwood
Blumenauer	DeLay	Gutierrez
Blunt	DeMint	Gutknecht
Boehlert	Deutsch	Hall (OH)
Boehner	Diaz-Balart	Hall (TX)
Bonior	Dickey	Hansen
Borski	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Boswell	Dingell	Hastings (WA)
Boucher	Dixon	Hayes
Boyd	Doggett	Hayworth
Brady (TX)	Doolittle	Hefley
Brown (FL)	Doyle	Herger
Brown (OH)	Dreier	Hill (IN)
Bryant	Duncan	Hill (MT)
Burr	Dunn	Hilleary
Burton	Edwards	Hilliard
Buyer	Ehlers	Hinchey
Callahan	Ehrlich	Hobson
Calvert	Emerson	Hoefel
Camp	Engel	Hoekstra
Canady	Eshoo	Holden
Cannon	Etheridge	Holt
Capps	Evans	Hooley
Cardin	Everett	Horn
Castle	Ewing	Hostettler
Chabot	Farr	Houghton

Hoyer	Miller (FL)	Shaw
Hulshof	Miller, Gary	Shays
Hunter	Miller, George	Sherman
Hutchinson	Minge	Sherwood
Hyde	Mink	Shimkus
Inslee	Mollohan	Shows
Isakson	Moore	Shuster
Istook	Moran (KS)	Simpson
Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)	Sisisky
Jackson-Lee	Morella	Skeen
(TX)	Murtha	Skelton
Jenkins	Nadler	Slaughter
John	Napolitano	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (CT)	Nethercutt	Smith (TX)
Johnson, E. B.	Ney	Smith (WA)
Johnson, Sam	Northup	Snyder
Jones (NC)	Norwood	Souder
Jones (OH)	Oberstar	Spence
Kanjorski	Obey	Spratt
Kaptur	Olver	Stabenow
Kasich	Ortiz	Stark
Kelly	Owens	Stearns
Kennedy	Oxley	Stenholm
Kildee	Packard	Strickland
Kind (WI)	Pallone	Stump
King (NY)	Pascarell	Sununu
Kingston	Pastor	Sweeney
Klecza	Payne	Talent
Klink	Pease	Tancredo
Knollenberg	Peterson (MN)	Tanner
Kolbe	Peterson (PA)	Tauscher
Kucinich	Petri	Tauzin
Kuykendall	Phelps	Taylor (MS)
LaFalce	Pickett	Terry
LaHood	Pitts	Thomas
Lampson	Pombo	Thompson (CA)
Larson	Pomeroy	Thompson (MS)
Latham	Porter	Thornberry
LaTourette	Portman	Thune
Lazio	Price (NC)	Thurman
Leach	Quinn	Tiahrt
Lee	Radanovich	Tierney
Levin	Rahall	Toomey
Lewis (CA)	Ramstad	Traficant
Lewis (KY)	Rangel	Turner
Linder	Regula	Udall (CO)
LoBiondo	Reyes	Udall (NM)
Lofgren	Reynolds	Upton
Lucas (KY)	Riley	Velazquez
Lucas (OK)	Rivers	Vento
Luther	Rodriguez	Vitter
Maloney (CT)	Roemer	Walsh
Maloney (NY)	Rogan	Wamp
Manzullo	Rohrabacher	Waters
Markey	Ros-Lehtinen	Watkins
Martinez	Rothman	Watt (NC)
Matsui	Roukema	Watts (OK)
McCarthy (MO)	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
McCrery	Royce	Weiner
McDermott	Ryan (WI)	Weldon (FL)
McGovern	Ryun (KS)	Weldon (PA)
McHugh	Sabo	Weller
McInnis	Salmon	Wexler
McIntyre	Sanchez	Weygand
McKeon	Sanders	Whitfield
McKinney	Sandlin	Wicker
McNulty	Sawyer	Wilson
Meehan	Saxton	Wise
Meek (FL)	Schaffer	Wolf
Meeks (NY)	Schakowsky	Woolsey
Menendez	Scott	Wu
Metcalfe	Sensenbrenner	Wynn
Mica	Serrano	Young (AK)
Millender-McDonald	Sessions	Young (FL)
	Shadegg	

NAYS—7

Campbell	Ose	Smith (MI)
English	Paul	
Frank (MA)	Sanford	

NOT VOTING—38

Ackerman	Jefferson	Neal
Ballenger	Kilpatrick	Nussle
Becerra	Lantos	Pelosi
Benilla	Largent	Pickering
Bono	Lewis (GA)	Pryce (OH)
Brady (PA)	Lipinski	Rogers
Capuano	Lowey	Rush
Carson	Mascara	Scarborough
Cook	McCarthy (NY)	Stupak
Cramer	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Dooley	McIntosh	Towns
Granger	Moakley	Visclosky
Hinojosa	Myrick	

□ 1848

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF 4-H CLUBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 194.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 194, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 391, nays 0, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

YEAS—391

Abercrombie	Chenoweth-Hage	Foley
Aderholt	Clay	Forbes
Allen	Clayton	Ford
Andrews	Clement	Fossella
Archer	Clyburn	Fowler
Armey	Coble	Frank (MA)
Bachus	Coburn	Franks (NJ)
Baird	Collins	Frelinghuysen
Baker	Combust	Frost
Baldacci	Condit	Gallagher
Baldwin	Conyers	Ganske
Barcia	Costello	Gejdenson
Barr	Cox	Gekas
Barrett (NE)	Coyne	Gephardt
Barrett (WI)	Crane	Gibbons
Bartlett	Crowley	Gilchrest
Barton	Cubin	Gillmor
Bass	Cummings	Gilman
Bateman	Cunningham	Gonzalez
Bentsen	Danner	Goode
Bereuter	Davis (FL)	Goodlatte
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Goodling
Berman	Davis (VA)	Gordon
Berry	Deal	Goss
Biggert	DeFazio	Graham
Billbray	DeGette	Green (TX)
Bilirakis	DeLay	Green (WI)
Bishop	DeLauro	Greenwood
Blagojevich	DeLay	Gutierrez
Bliley	DeMint	Gutknecht
Blumenauer	Deutsch	Hall (OH)
Blunt	Diaz-Balart	Hall (TX)
Boehlert	Dickey	Hansen
Boehner	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Bonior	Dingell	Hastings (WA)
Borski	Dixon	Hayes
Boswell	Doggett	Hayworth
Boucher	Doolittle	Hefley
Boyd	Doyle	Herger
Brady (TX)	Dreier	Hill (IN)
Brown (FL)	Duncan	Hill (MT)
Brown (OH)	Dunn	Hilleary
Bryant	Edwards	Hilliard
Burr	Ehlers	Hinchey
Burton	Ehrlich	Hobson
Buyer	Emerson	Hoefel
Callahan	Engel	Hoekstra
Calvert	English	Holden
Camp	Eshoo	Holt
Canady	Etheridge	Hooley
Cannon	Evans	Horn
Capps	Everett	Hostettler
Cardin	Farr	Houghton
Castle	Fattah	Hoyer
Chabot	Filner	Hulshof
	Fletcher	Hunter
		Hutchinson

Hyde	Mollohan	Shays
Inslee	Moore	Sherman
Isakson	Moran (KS)	Sherwood
Istook	Moran (VA)	Shimkus
Jackson (IL)	Morella	Shows
Jackson-Lee	Murtha	Shuster
(TX)	Nadler	Simpson
Jenkins	Napolitano	Sisisky
John	Nethercutt	Skeen
Johnson (CT)	Ney	Skelton
Johnson, E. B.	Northup	Slaughter
Johnson, Sam	Norwood	Smith (MI)
Jones (NC)	Oberstar	Smith (NJ)
Kanjorski	Obey	Smith (TX)
Kaptur	Olver	Smith (WA)
Kasich	Ortiz	Snyder
Kelly	Ose	Souder
Kennedy	Owens	Spence
Kildee	Oxley	Spratt
Kind (WI)	Packard	Stabenow
King (NY)	Pallone	Stark
Kingston	Pascarell	Stearns
Klecza	Pastor	Stenholm
Klink	Paul	Strickland
Knollenberg	Payne	Stump
Kolbe	Pease	Sununu
Kucinich	Peterson (MN)	Sweeney
Kuykendall	Peterson (PA)	Talent
LaFalce	Petri	Tancred
LaHood	Phelps	Tanner
Lampson	Pickett	Tauscher
Larson	Pitts	Tauzin
Latham	Pombo	Taylor (MS)
LaTourette	Pomeroy	Terry
Lazio	Porter	Thompson (CA)
Leach	Portman	Thompson (MS)
Lee	Price (NC)	Thornberry
Levin	Quinn	Thune
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Thurman
Linder	Rahall	Tiahrt
LoBiondo	Ramstad	Tierney
Lofgren	Rangel	Toomey
Lucas (KY)	Regula	Trafficant
Lucas (OK)	Reyes	Turner
Luther	Reynolds	Udall (CO)
Maloney (CT)	Riley	Udall (NM)
Maloney (NY)	Rivers	Upton
Manzullo	Rodriguez	Velazquez
Markey	Roemer	Vento
Martinez	Rogan	Vitter
Matsui	Rohrabacher	Walden
McCarthy (MO)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh
McCrery	Rothman	Wamp
McDermott	Roukema	Waters
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Watkins
McHugh	Royce	Watt (NC)
McInnis	Ryan (WI)	Watts (OK)
McIntyre	Ryun (KS)	Waxman
McKeon	Sabo	Weiner
McKinney	Salmon	Weldon (FL)
McNulty	Sanchez	Weldon (PA)
Meehan	Sanders	Weller
Meek (FL)	Sandlin	Wexler
Meeks (NY)	Sanford	Weygand
Menendez	Sawyer	Whitfield
Metcalfe	Saxton	Wicker
Mica	Schaffer	Wilson
Millender-	Schakowsky	Wise
McDonald	Scott	Wolf
Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner	Woolsey
Miller, Gary	Serrano	Wu
Miller, George	Sessions	Wynn
Minge	Shadeegg	Young (AK)
Mink	Shaw	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—42

Ackerman	Jefferson	Myrick
Ballenger	Jones (OH)	Neal
Becerra	Kilpatrick	Nussle
Bonilla	Lantos	Pelosi
Bono	Largent	Pickering
Brady (PA)	Lewis (CA)	Pryce (OH)
Capuano	Lewis (GA)	Rogers
Carson	Lipinski	Rush
Cook	Lowey	Scarborough
Cooksey	Mascara	Stupak
Cramer	McCarthy (NY)	Taylor (NC)
Dooley	McCollum	Thomas
Granger	McIntosh	Towns
Hinojosa	Moakley	Visclosky

□ 1855

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to district business, I was unable to be present at several votes that occurred today. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the journal vote, "aye" on H.R. 754, "aye" on H.R. 2303 and "aye" on H. Con. Res. 194.

EXPRESSING SADNESS ON THE DEATHS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN H. CHAFEE, WALTER P. KENNEDY AND PAYNE STEWART

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, today is a sad day for a great many people, not the least of whom are our colleagues in the other body for their loss of their colleague, Senator JOHN CHAFEE, and I would like to take a moment and just express the sympathies of the House of Representatives to our colleagues in the other body and to Senator CHAFEE's family and his constituents for that loss.

Today has become even more grim as we hear of the fatal plane crash that took the life of Payne Stewart, a man who has earned the respect of millions of Americans, and we share with America the grief of that loss.

But, Mr. Speaker, it has just come to my attention that we too in our body have suffered a loss yesterday of one of our long-term Congressional employees from the House of Representatives.

Many Members here will remember Walter Kennedy, who was the retired Republican Sergeant at Arms. Walter Kennedy spent 44 years working here in the House of Representatives. He worked for Congressman Gordon Canfield of New Jersey. He served under Charles Haleck, Gerald Ford, John Rhodes and Bob Michel.

Many of us will remember when we first arrived in town, Walter Kennedy was one of the sage advisers that helped us in many ways along the way, always a friendly voice, always an encouraging word, and always a man who put this body, its traditions, its history and its work above other things.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would just like to express to the family of Walter Kennedy, and even to those of us who served in this body with Walter Kennedy, again, the expression of regret from this body to you for our loss of a fine colleague, a good friend, and a dedicated servant to his country.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Having the majority leader rise and recognize the long service to this House of Walter Kennedy is most appreciated.

On both sides of the aisle we have people who are working professionals

who are willing to give a hand and meet challenges when crises occur, and for years and years around here Walter was one of those people giving advice and counsel, especially to newer Members as we came along. His passing this weekend is a great sadness for his family, I know, but also for all of us who respect him for his work.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join our majority leader in expressing our sympathy to the family of Walter Kennedy. Walter was someone many of us worked with over the years. We had a great deal of affection for Walter and particularly welcomed his sage advice as we first started out in this body, and from time to time he would offer a helping hand whenever there was a problem out on the battlefield.

We will long miss Walter Kennedy. I thank the majority leader for bringing this to our attention this evening.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD I am including the obituary of Walter Kennedy, as well as details on and directions to his funeral.

RETIRED REPUBLICAN SERGEANT-AT-ARMS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Walter P. Kennedy, retired Republican Sergeant-at-Arms, U.S. House of Representatives (1950-1993) and a 43 year resident of Bethesda, MD, died on Sunday, October 24, 1999 in the Coronary Intensive Care Unit of the Washington Hospital Center. He was 78.

Born to Thomas Kennedy and Mary Stella McElvogue on February 23, 1921, he was an immigrant with them from Ireland in 1924. He was raised in Paterson, New Jersey.

During World War II, he served in the Army from February 1943 to November 1945. In 1943, as his unit was preparing to deploy, he became a naturalized citizen. He saw combat in France, Germany and Austria as a medic in the 63rd Engineer Battalion, 44th Infantry Division.

After his discharge from the service, he completed his studies at Seton Hall College, in New Jersey and went on to receive a law degree from Georgetown University in Washington, D.C.

He began a 44 year career in the U.S. Congress in 1950 as the chief administrative assistant for the Hon. Gordon Canfield of New Jersey, retiring in 1993 as the Republican Sergeant-at-Arms for the last couple of decades. In his position with Republican Leadership, he served under Charles Haleck, Gerald Ford, John Rhodes and Bob Michel.

Mr. Kennedy's 44 years of Congressional service is significant inasmuch as it represents more than 25% of all the years Congress has been in existence.

Notably, on the day of his retirement, he was honored by the House of Representatives while it was in session with impromptu speeches by many Members.

Subsequent to his retirement, he logged an additional 6 years on Capital Hill with consulting, political fundraising and public relations through The Kennedy Group Companies of Washington, D.C., for which he was the Chairman and CEO.

Since the death of his father, he had been the patriarch of a big and very close-knit family. He is survived by his wife, Ana Luisa Bou, to whom he was married for more than 53 years, 7 children, Walter P. Kennedy, Jr., Ana L. Kennedy, Thomas F. Kennedy, Dennis

M. Kennedy, Stella M. Kennedy-Dail, Kevin J. Kennedy and Kathleen P. Kennedy McGovern. 4 daughters-in-law and a son-in-law, 12 grandchildren, all who reside in the greater Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. He, himself, was the oldest of four children and he is survived by a brother, three sisters, their spouses and children. He was also the brother for two sister-in-laws, Ernestina Bou and Marie Isabel Pelalas.

He was active with the Boy Scouts and the Catholic Committee on Scouting for more than 40 years. Since 1956 he was an active member of Holy Redeemer Roman Catholic Church in Kensington, Maryland, particularly with the Holy Name Society and the Social Concerns Committee. He was an active member and a Knight of the 4th Degree in the Knights of Columbus.

He was a man of leadership and vision, but also, above all else, a good, honest and kind man. Though never losing focus on the future (which he always maintained as promising), he would consider everyone, yet remain vigilant for the underdog.

He was loved deeply by all and he will be greatly missed.

Viewing for Mr. Kennedy will be on Tuesday, October 26, 1999 from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. and from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. at Francis J. Collins Funeral Home, 500 University Blvd W, Silver Spring, MD. A funeral Mass will be held on Wednesday, October 27, 1999 at 12:30 p.m. at Holy Redeemer Catholic Church, 9705 Summit Avenue, Kensington, MD. Interment will be at the Gate of Heaven Cemetery in Silver Spring, MD following the Mass.

Donations and charitable contributions are urged to the American Diabetes Association on behalf of Mr. Kennedy.

ARRANGEMENTS AND DETAILS (DIRECTIONS BELOW)

A. There will be viewing from 2:00 until 4:00 p.m. and from 7:00 until 9:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 26, 1999 at Francis J. Collins Funeral home (directions below);

B. There will be a Mass at 12:30 p.m. on Wednesday, October 27, 1999 at Holy Redeemer Roman Catholic Church in Kensington, Maryland (directions below);

C. Interment will be at the Gate of Heaven Cemetery following the 12:30 Mass; and,

D. A reception will be held at the Knights of Columbus, Rock Creek Council, 5417 West Cedar Lane, in Bethesda, following interment, until 6:00 p.m.

DIRECTIONS:

Francis J. Collins Funeral Home, 500 University Blvd W, Silver Spring, MD 20901-4625 Phone: (301) 593-9500

From the East on the Capitol Beltway/I-495 (in Montgomery County):

1: Take MD-193 WEST/UNIVERSITY BLVD exit towards WHEATON (US-29 N). 0.2 miles

2: Merge onto MD-193 W. 1.1 miles

3: MD-193 W becomes UNIVERSITY BLVD W. 0.1 miles

From the West on the Capitol Beltway/I-495 (in Montgomery County):

1: Take the US-29 NORTH/COLESVILLE RD exit, exit number 30A, toward COLUMBIA. 0.1 miles (Note: Those coming from downtown Silver Spring, Take the US-29 NORTH/COLESVILLE RD exit, exit number 30A, towards COLUMBIA, crossing over I-495/ Capitol Beltway)

2: Merge onto COLESVILLE RD. 0.3 miles

3: Turn RIGHT onto MD-193 E. AND GET INTO LEFT U-TURN LANE IMMEDIATELY

4: Make U-Turn at light onto WEST-BOUND MD-193 and cross Colesville Rd 0.8 miles

5: MD-193 E becomes UNIVERSITY BLVD W. 0.1 miles

DIRECTIONS:

Holy Redeemer Roman Catholic Church, 9705 Summit Avenue, Kensington, Maryland 20895, (301) 942-2333 (Rectory)

From the Capitol Beltway/I-495 (in Montgomery County):

1: Take the MD-185/CONNECTICUT AVE exit, exit number 33, toward KENSINGTON/CHEVY CHASE.

2: Go North on CONNECTICUT AVE.

3: At the 2nd traffic light, Turn LEFT onto SAUL RD.

4: At the 1st intersection, Turn LEFT onto SUMMIT AVE.

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, I see the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) is here. I would ask the gentleman from Rhode Island if he wants to speak on behalf of his loss for his State.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do.

Mr. ARMEY. Would the gentleman prefer to have his own time to share with himself and colleagues?

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the floor, and ask the Members of Congress to please give their attention and respect to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY). His words will have meaning in this body, as they will have for the Nation.

EXPRESSING SORROW OF THE HOUSE AT THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE JOHN H. CHAFEE, SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 341) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 341

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable John H. Chafee, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed on the part of the House to join a committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, after my opening remarks, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for many today in saying that it does not please me to be standing here before the House.

We are here today because of the passing of a man of uncommon valor,

honor, and integrity. That man is the senior Senator from Rhode Island, JOHN CHAFEE.

It is with great regret and sadness that I offer my condolences to his wife, Virginia, his son, Warwick Mayor Lincoln Chafee, and all the members of the Chafee family. We can only hope that our words today will help to ease the grief that we are experiencing and that they are sure to experience in a very personal, personal way.

While we cannot begin to understand their depth of loss and what they are suffering, we can understand, as many Rhode Islanders will know and as many Americans will know, that the covenant that the people of this Nation have with their government is that much lessened today by the loss of a selfless public servant like Senator CHAFEE.

Mr. Speaker, Senator CHAFEE led the life of an exemplary public servant. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, speaking of the challenges this Nation faced with the economic collapse and war beginning to thunder in Europe, stated "For the trust reposed in me, I will return the courage and the devotion that befit the time. I can do no less." Senator CHAFEE lived this ideal and he lived it until his last days.

He was born in Providence, Rhode Island, the child of one of the State's most storied families. He was still a young student at Yale University when the call went out to mobilize our Nation for war, thrusting America into the furnace of conflict in Europe. The weight of the lives of millions across the globe was placed squarely upon the shoulders of countless young men like Senator CHAFEE, who left his studies at Yale and enlisted in the United States Marine Corps.

Senator CHAFEE willingly walked into the fire of war, serving in the invasion force that blunted the Japanese advance at a tropical island that is now part of our Nation's collective memory, Guadalcanal. Mr. Speaker, his astounding bravery and willingness to shoulder the burden, placing his very life on the line, speaks far more eloquently than words could ever speak about his dedication and his love for this fine country.

Indeed, he was recalled to active duty in 1951, when he once again risked his life for freedom so that countless people around the world would enjoy the same freedom we enjoy here in this country. He commanded a rifle company of 200 American fighting men in the brutal Korean conflict.

I would like to take a moment to read a few lines from *The Coldest War*, by James Brady. Jim Brady, who I am told had dinner with Senator CHAFEE just this past week, served with then Captain CHAFEE in the Korean War. As we all know, the Korean war claimed the lives of 54,000 Americans. This book is a first-person account of their experience.

At the outset, Jim Brady states of his book, "Memoirs are about remembering. I wish I could recall all the

names. If the book has a hero, it is Captain JOHN H. CHAFEE."

Captain CHAFEE was in charge of the Dog Company in the U.S. Marine Corps' First Division. Of Captain CHAFEE, Jim Brady writes, "You learn from men like CHAFEE, a Yalie with a law degree from Harvard who came from money, a handsome, patrician man, physically courageous and tireless. From all that could have come arrogance and snobbery. He possessed neither of these traits. He was only calm and vigorous and efficient, usually cheerfully, decent and humane, a good man, a fine officer."

Mr. Speaker, far too often we use terms like "going to war" and "trench warfare" when talking about legislative battles which go on in Washington, D.C. We should not throw around these terms so lightly, Mr. Speaker, for we have seen in the actions of Captain CHAFEE a true example of patriotism and self-sacrifice, of a willingness to accept a much more daunting challenge than simply a House or Senate floor vote, an election campaign, or a policy or political debate.

The man that Jim Brady described in this book, Captain CHAFEE, was willing to make what is called the ultimate sacrifice, the giving of one's life for one country.

Mr. Speaker, no one could ask for anything more than what Captain CHAFEE was willing to offer. However, even after risking his life by serving in the frozen tracts of Korea, Senator CHAFEE strove to give even more of himself to his community and to his State, contributing to the quality of life in his home in the State of Rhode Island.

Senator CHAFEE graduated from Yale University and eventually went to Harvard Law School, entering the public arena in 1956 when he was elected to the Rhode Island House of Representatives. He served 6 years in this capacity, where he was also elected the Minority Leader. He was elected Governor of Rhode Island in 1962, handily winning reelection for two additional terms.

In a heady appointment for this former marine, Senator CHAFEE was appointed to be President Nixon's Secretary of the Navy, working with a branch of the Armed Forces he dedicated so much of his life to. Senator CHAFEE entered the United States Senate in 1976, and most recently elected to serve a fourth term in 1994.

Senator CHAFEE was well known across the Nation as a moderate in his party, a Senator who would often place pragmatism above partisan politics. He used his frequently commonsense approach to policy to bring together all kinds of legislative coalitions that keep our Nation moving forward in progressive and steady manner.

His range of accomplishments is staggering, touching on everything from health care to gun control. The Coalition to Stop Gun Violence stated

that "Senator CHAFEE was a national leader on gun control," calling him "one of the most effective voices for gun control in the Congress."

However, it was as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee that Senator CHAFEE made a lasting and tangible contribution to all the lives of everyone across this Nation. Senator CHAFEE has been a champion for the environment during his time in the United States Senate. He has worked to improve the air that we breathe with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and the fight against the pollutants that are causing global warming.

He fought to preserve our natural beauty and environmental safeguards that protect the lands we live in by protecting open space and preserving wetlands from irresponsible development and exploitation. He fought for our world's biodiversity, working hard for the Endangered Species Act and successfully trying to keep the most egregious anti-environmental riders from ever seeing the legislative light of day.

While we honor Senator CHAFEE by looking back on his accomplishments, we also should look at two good things he was still working on at the time of his untimely death last evening.

Two legislative proposals of note were S. 662 and S. 664. S. 662 was Senator CHAFEE's latest effort to assist the fight against breast and cervical cancer. This legislation attempted to make screening for these diseases available to low-income women. S. 664 is the Historic Home Ownership Assistance Act, and as anyone from my State of Rhode Island will tell us, preserving our many historic homes is a means by which we preserve our heritage. This legislation seeks to make historic rehabilitation and restoration a priority in the Tax Code.

On both of these legislative fronts, we should all do well to honor not only Senator CHAFEE's accomplishments, but also his work as well.

Mr. Speaker, Senator CHAFEE and I often engaged in what can be termed "lively debates" about issues that we have had differences of opinion on. Senator CHAFEE was indeed a formidable partner in our debates about public policy. However, it is the nature of our government, and I always felt that I had grown as a legislator and as a citizen and even as a person, as a result of our exchanges, to put aside the personal and to underscore the professional in our convictions to our home State.

When I look back at my work with Senator CHAFEE, a quote I heard recently from Thomas Jefferson comes to mind. In his first inaugural address as president of this great Nation, Thomas Jefferson stated that, "Every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle."

In many situations we call ourselves Democrats or Republicans, liberals or

conservatives, left-wing or right-wing. With Senator CHAFEE, however, it was understood that labels were irrelevant. Whatever he did, you could be sure that it was done for the good of Rhode Island and of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, when all is said and done, when the plaudits and the pundits finish speaking about Senator CHAFEE's chairmanships, his committees, his campaigns, his debates, his bills, and his legislative accomplishments, what will remain is what will always have been there. That is, before the chairmanship of committees in the United States Senate, before overseeing our Nation's fleet as Secretary of the Navy, before sitting as Governor of the State of Rhode Island, even before the minority leadership of the State legislative body, there was a 19-year-old known only as JOHN CHAFEE.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to paint a picture. It was the winter of 1942, and this young man, a college student, made a decision to leave the coziness and the tradition-steeped security of the halls of Yale University for the uncertainty of a position as a private in the United States Marine Corps, a move that would almost certainly lead to his exposure to enemy fire in the heat of combat.

To this young man, the future Senator JOHN H. CHAFEE, there was no thought of the marbled corridors of the United States Senate in Washington, of the imposing office that he would have as Secretary of the Navy at the Pentagon, of the impressive view that he would have as Governor of the State of Rhode Island. There was only one thought in Senator CHAFEE's mind. That was of what was right and what was wrong.

This young man made the right decision to fight for the right freedoms for those who were half-way across the world. He brought his honor and his integrity into the Senate, the courage to vote his convictions, and the integrity to defend his beliefs.

There is no difference between that 19-year-old student who chose conflict over complacency during a world war and the United States Senator whom we mourn today. Both saw the challenges and scorned the path of least resistance. Instead of blazing their trail, they blazed their trail on the shining battlefield. Instead of shirking their responsibilities, they lived up to their responsibilities as citizens of this great country of ours, and that should serve as a shining example that will far outlast even those of us who honor him to this day.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will share my time with some of my colleagues, and I thank the Rhode Island delegation for their love and respect for this great Senator and wonderful human being.

I particularly want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND), who is going to allow a number of our colleagues to make

short comments before they get on their way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

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

□ 1915

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I rise in very strong support of this resolution to express our sympathy to the Chafee family. Senator CHAFEE had an outstanding record, as the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) expressed, both in the military and as Secretary of Navy and in the Congress. He was a strong, good friend of the State of Virginia.

I had the opportunity to sit with Senator CHAFEE several months ago at the dedication when they named the CIA after former President George Bush. He expressed at that time that he was leaving and very anxious to go back and live in his home State of Rhode Island.

So I wanted to just present myself here and say to the Chafee family and to the United States Senate, we are very, very sorry.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has suffered a great loss with the death of Senator JOHN CHAFEE. I do not say that lightly, for JOHN CHAFEE was the conscience of the Senate. He was an inspiration for literally hundreds of people who have chosen the path of public service.

George Bernard Shaw once said, "Some men see things, as they are and ask why. I dream things that never were and ask why not." That exemplified the manner in which this great American conducted himself every single day that he was privileged to serve in public office.

He saw the environment being ravaged, pollution rampant, and said we must do something about it. He led the way. He saw poverty and squalor and said someone has to do something about it. He led the way. He championed for improving health care delivery in America. He did so many things so well.

He was not one to seek glory but one who constantly worked tirelessly to obtain results. Just a couple of weeks ago, I was privileged to be at a banquet where this very distinguished United States Senator and great American was honored by the League of Conservation Voters. Ted Roosevelt, IV, was presiding. A number of us, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and others, were there that evening.

I think all of us stood a little bit taller when JOHN CHAFEE was honored. The applause seemed never to end because

we did not want it to end. We wanted that recognition that was being accorded this fine human being to go on and on. The Nation has, indeed, suffered a great loss. So have many of us in this great institution.

He was an inspiration for me personally. He was a mentor, someone I could constantly call to seek advice, to seek guidance. He never steered me wrong. He always wanted to do what was best for the people in a whole wide range of areas, the environment, health care, housing, assisting the disadvantaged.

Few men of his stature pass our way. We all have been privileged to work with a giant in his time, one whose work will last for generations to come, one who has done so much for so many. I will miss JOHN CHAFEE. The Nation will miss him.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has lost a true giant of the 20th century last night with the sudden passing of the senior Senator from the State of Rhode Island, the Honorable JOHN CHAFEE.

JOHN CHAFEE's outstanding dedication to public service began half a century ago when he left Yale University to join the Marines after Pearl Harbor. He was a hero at Guadalcanal, and then he was recalled to active duty when the Korean War broke out and commanded a rifle company on the Korean peninsula during that bloody conflict. He was one of the few members of either chamber of Congress to be a veteran of both World War II and the Korean War.

This young attorney, JOHN CHAFEE, became active in Republican politics in his home State of Rhode Island. He was elected to Rhode Island's State legislature in 1956 as a young man of 34. He eventually served as the minority leader in that body and was elected in 1962 to the first of three successful 2-year terms of governor of his State.

Then in 1968, President-elect Richard Nixon appointed JOHN CHAFEE to be our Nation's Secretary of the Navy, in which position he served meritoriously.

Finally, in 1976, JOHN was elected to the first of four terms in our U.S. Senate. In that position, he served his State and Nation in an admirable manner. He was chairman of the Senate's environment and public works committee. In that position, he was a constant reminder to all of us in both bodies of the need to protect the ecology of our planet. Much of the far-reaching environmental legislation in the last quarter century bears his fingerprints.

JOHN CHAFEE is one of the co-founders of the Theodore Roosevelt Fund, which helped remind his fellow Republicans that the most conservation-minded of all Presidents, Theodore

Roosevelt, was a member of the Grand Old Party.

JOHN CHAFEE, having previously announced his plans to retire in the year 2000, we knew we would be soon missing his outstanding leadership.

I join with my colleagues in extending our condolences and prayers to JOHN's widow, Virginia, to his family, and to the many who admire JOHN CHAFEE's service to our Nation.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for yielding me this time.

United States Senator JOHN CHAFEE. It is hard to believe JOHN's gone. He was a man of extraordinary intellect, of a big warm heart, tremendous patience and tenacity, and a rich sense of human.

Few people have made as much difference in the lives of others as Senator JOHN CHAFEE. When we think of people in the business world, in the academic world, religious leaders, people who dedicate their lives in the social services or in our schools, few have touched so many as deeply as Senator JOHN CHAFEE.

Whether it was in environmental law, in health policy, or in children's services, or in tax and trade law, JOHN was there. He was stalwart. He was principled. He was determined. He understood what it meant to negotiate. He understood why in a democracy as enormously complex as ours one had to come to agreement.

But compromise for JOHN never strayed from certain fundamental principles of the commitments that each of us must hold to one another in a free society that cares for its people.

I have enormous respect for JOHN. I learned from him. I relied on him. The Senate relied on him. New England Republican Members of both the House and Senate relied on him. We will miss him tremendously.

I offer my heartfelt condolences to his wife and his family and hope that the knowledge of his extraordinary gift to this Nation, as well as to their lives, will ease their pain in his loss.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO).

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me the time.

America has lost one of the towering figures in its history in the loss of JOHN CHAFEE. We have heard this evening about the impact that JOHN CHAFEE has had on so many Members of Congress.

If I can, I would like to, for a moment, just touch on how that senior statesman from Rhode Island who in so many ways epitomized the very finest of public service, who is the person that the public ought to be thinking about when they think about the very,

very best that is called to service, what he meant to me.

When I was first elected to Congress, I asked Senator CHAFEE if he would come down to Long Island to participate in a health forum that we had down in Long Island. There was not a single reason, frankly, why somebody of JOHN CHAFEE's stature or experience and the demands on his time as he had would have accepted that invitation from a freshman who really could do nothing at all for him. But he said, without hesitation, yes.

He came down. He was generous with his time. He did not rush back. He was gracious. He displayed the command over the nuances of health policy that so many have applauded him for.

I think it says a lot to me about the man, JOHN CHAFEE, about his character, about his sense of giving, about his leadership, about his investment in another young legislator, perhaps moving up the ranks.

I have now had the pleasure to work with and work alongside JOHN CHAFEE over my four terms in the House as I have seen him master tax policy, environmental policy, and health policy. This is a legislator who knows the nuances of policy, knows the details of policy as well as any staff member that is in the room. He prides himself in that intellect and in that work ethic of understanding the issue. He felt that the public deserved no less. He called to us a higher standard.

Recently, I was fortunate enough to attend a dinner hosted by the League of Conservation Voters that honored JOHN CHAFEE for a lifetime achievement. What I found remarkable about that event was, as Senator CHAFEE rose to accept the reward, this applause by people from both sides of the aisle, from Members of Congress, from advocates, from so-called ordinary citizens, just grew and grew in warmth and in appreciation and respect.

America mourns the loss of JOHN CHAFEE because he was an outstanding leader, an outstanding citizen, an outstanding man who is an example to us all and for which I think he richly and his family richly deserves the accolades of this body and the American public.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today in honor of Senator CHAFEE. Senator CHAFEE is somebody that a lot of my colleagues knew personally and professionally for a long time.

I just happened to have had the privilege over the last few years of working with the Senator on environmental issues. For those of us that have tried to work on bipartisan efforts of environmental issues, Senator CHAFEE was the cornerstone in the Senate to make sure that we did get that kind of cooperation.

I have to say that this body is going to be less without Senator CHAFEE. The Senate actually was an integral part of our working in a bipartisan effort to try to improve environmental law and actually get the outcome.

The Senator was somebody who understood how essential it was that those of us who were working on environmental issues recognize that there is not only a right, but a responsibility to make sure that, at the time we try to save our environment, there is not any need at all to trash our economy.

In fact, I think he said quite clearly that the balance between economic and environmental issues was not only appropriate, it was essential; that a strong economy and a strong environment go hand in hand.

□ 1930

And I think Senator CHAFEE has proven that again and again in his history of working on environmental issues here in the Capitol.

Let me just say, though, that I was privileged to be able to work with this man on certain issues. Our beach bill issues, border pollution issues. He was always at the forefront in wanting to make sure we made our laws here in Washington work in the real world and that the environment would benefit from our intentions.

In fact, I think Senator CHAFEE made a great point in saying that when it comes to environmental issues, caring is not enough, we need to be smart, we need to base it on scientific approaches, and talk about practical outcome. And I think all of us that have worked with him on so many issues understand that maybe coming from a small State like Rhode Island he recognized that lofty ideas must be grounded in reality and that outcome was essential.

A lot of people do not know about the Senator that he was a marine. Some say ex-marine, but those of us that know the marines know there is no such thing as an Ex-marine. One you are a marine, you are always a marine. He was mentioning to me one time that he had done his boot camp at Camp Elliott in San Diego, and he was wondering if he could come out and see the camp and how much it had changed. And, frankly, my office had the privilege of sending him photos of what Camp Elliott looked like when he was there before World War II and what it looks like today. And he was just very, very surprised at what a change had happened to Camp Elliott in San Diego since he had been there.

Well, I think we are all going to remember what changes the Senate and the Capitol have had, and Washington has had since Mr. CHAFEE became Senator CHAFEE and what great changes and positive changes he put through. Be it Democrat or Republican, I would ask us all to remember that Senator CHAFEE always kept his promise to his country. Not just as a Senator, but also as a marine. Semper fi. He was always

faithful. He was always faithful to what this country stands for and what this country needs.

He is someone that is going to be sorely missed, Mr. Speaker, and let us always remember to keep forever faithful to his memory as we work on our legislative proposals throughout the year.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), and wish to thank again the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) for their graciousness in letting a number of Republicans speak on this incredibly wonderful gentleman. And also to say to my colleagues that the Senator clearly was an American first before he was a Republican, and that is what made him so great. We just appreciate his graciousness and thoughtfulness.

Once again, I thank my colleagues from Rhode Island, and I apologize because we had more speakers than I had thought we would, but that was nice.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND) and myself, I submit for the RECORD condolences and remarks by the President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton; the Vice President of the United States, ALBERT GORE; the Secretary of Defense, as well as many others, including many of the organizations whose causes Senator CHAFEE dedicated his public service career to.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WILLIAM S. COHEN ON THE PASSING OF SEN. JOHN H. CHAFEE

"Senator John Chafee was a valued friend, a talented Navy Secretary, Governor and Senator, a valiant Marine, a New England gentleman, and one of the finest people I've ever known. His death is a great loss to the Senate and to this nation.

He leaves an enduring legacy of moderation, decency, concern for the environment, and love for Rhode Island and America. Many years into the future, his life and career will be a standard against which those who aspire to public service will be measured.

Janet and I extend our most heartfelt sympathy to Virginia and the entire Chafee family at this time of loss."

STATEMENT OF SARAH BRADY RE: THE DEATH OF SENATOR JOHN CHAFEE

Jim and I were deeply saddened this morning to hear of the passing of our friend, John Chafee. Senator Chafee was a true gentleman and statesman. His leadership in reducing gun violence in our country will be greatly missed in the United States Senate.

This past June, Handgun Control honored Senator Chafee for his leadership and commitment at our 25th anniversary luncheon. As he accepted his "Celebration of Courage" award, Senator Chafee was characteristically modest. Jim and I were honored to have known him and to have called him our friend. We will miss him.

SENATOR JOHN CHAFEE (R-RI) WAS GUN CONTROL STALWART

Washington, DC—Senator John Chafee (R-RI) died Sunday, silencing one of the most

effective voices for gun control in Congress. Throughout Senator Chafee's distinguished career, he tirelessly argued for gun control and introduced landmark legislation to ban the possession of handguns.

President of the Coalition to Stop Gun Violence Michael Beard lauded Senator Chafee's longstanding commitment to preventing gun violence. "Senator Chafee was a national leader on gun control. In addition to introducing legislation to ban the possession of handguns, Senator Chafee was a tireless advocate for the Brady Law and a ban on assault weapons. Senator Chafee understood that gun violence was an epidemic, but that it was beatable through tough, restrictive measures on firearms. In 1995, Senator Chafee addressed our national meeting of gun violence prevention activists and spoke movingly about how he came to endorse a ban on handguns. He encouraged the activists to keep up the good fight and to always persevere. In a time when partisan bickering has kept Congress at a standstill on important issues, including gun violence prevention, Senator Chafee could always be counted on to rise above petty squabbles and put the needs of the nation first. He will be sorely missed."

The Coalition to Stop Gun Violence is comprised of 44 national organizations and over 100,000 individual members. Michael Beard has been President of the Coalition to Stop Gun Violence since its inception in 1974.

ENVIRONMENTALISTS MOURN PASSING OF SENATOR JOHN CHAFEE

The League of Conservation Voters is deeply saddened by the unexpected loss of a true environmental hero, Senator John Chafee.

"The passing of Senator Chafee leaves a huge hole in the Senate, and an even bigger hole in our hearts," said LCV President Deb Callahan. "Senator Chafee's courageous leadership made him one of the most important allies the environmental community has ever known. His unwavering environmental commitment will be greatly missed."

Throughout his 23-year career as U.S. Senator from Rhode Island, Chafee served as both chairman and ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee. Chafee consistently worked to safeguard America's environmental and public health protections. He demonstrated political courage in both large and small conservation battles that were waged over the years in Congress.

Chafee earned a lifetime environmental score of 70 percent from the League of Conservation Voters. Earlier this month LCV chairman Theodore Roosevelt IV presented Senator Chafee the organization's 1999 Lifetime Achievement Award. Roosevelt noted that Senator Chafee's successful leadership in strengthening the Clean Air and Safe Drinking Water acts and his tireless efforts to preserve open space and conserve America's natural resources made him a true environmental hero.

The League of Conservation Voters is the bipartisan political voice of the national environmental community. LCV is the only national environmental organization dedicated full-time to holding members of Congress accountable for their votes. For each Congress, LCV publishes the National Environmental Scorecard that assigns a percentage rating to each member of Congress based on that year's environmental votes.

SIERRA CLUB MOURNS DEATH OF SENATOR JOHN CHAFEE (R-RI)

Statement of Sierra Club Executive Director Carl Pope:

"The Sierra Club is deeply saddened by the loss of a true environmental giant, Senator

John Chafee. Senator Chafee was at the helm of every major environmental achievement in the past two decades. His leadership steered our nation on a course of environmental conservation and protection. Transcending party lines, Senator Chafee worked to improve our lives by fighting for tough environmental laws, including the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act and Superfund clean-ups.

"When others sought to weaken environmental protections, Senator Chafee courageously stood up and demanded that companies clean up the toxic pollution they created. Thanks to Senator Chafee's vision and hard work, our children have a better chance to enjoy a heritage of breathable air, drinkable water, abundant wildlife and clean coasts.

"Because of Senator Chafee's dedication, our nation is a healthier, more beautiful place to raise our children. Like the lands he fought to protect, Senator Chafee is widely admired and completely irreplaceable."

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S STATEMENT TODAY ON THE DEATH OF JOHN CHAFEE

Before I begin my remarks, I would like to offer my sincere condolences to the family of Senator John Chafee who passed away last night. Rhode Island and America have lost one of the strongest leaders this nation has ever produced. Senator Chafee, who recently announced his retirement from the Senate after 23 years of distinguished service, will be sorely missed. He was a champion of the environment and health care who always put his concern for the American people above partisanship. Known throughout his beloved Rhode Island simply as, "the man you can trust," Senator Chafee was the consummate statesman. For him civility was not simply a matter of personal manners. It was his ideal of how politics should be conducted. I ask all Americans to join me and Hillary in offering our prayers and comfort to his wife, Ginny their five children and 12 grandchildren.

STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Tipper and I were saddened to hear of the passing of Senator John Chafee.

John was one of the friends I most respected and admired in the Senate. And though we came from opposite sides of the political aisle, we saw eye-to-eye on many issues. I will always respect his dedication to serving the people of Rhode Island, his heartfelt commitment to the environment, and his bipartisan approach to the Senate.

I will also remember John as a brave man. For despite the many pressures he faced over the two decades he served in the Senate, he was never a partisan, never an ideologue. He was simply the gentleman from Rhode Island who was never afraid to speak his mind and allow the American people to judge his actions.

Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Virginia, and his children, Zechariah, Lincoln, John, Jr., Georgia, and Quentin.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND), from the Second District of Rhode Island.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, let me first begin by thanking my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) for his very eloquent and heartfelt words about JOHN CHAFEE. It was not only a fitting tribute to a wonderful man but a fitting tribute by a true gentleman from Rhode Island.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the

gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) for all of their kind words, because at a time like this, remembrances are very important to the family members, and I do indeed believe that they will hear all of these and I want to thank them personally.

On behalf of the people of Rhode Island, I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to mark the far too sudden passing of my colleague and my constituent JOHN CHAFEE. The senior Senator from Rhode Island was someone that we will never, ever forget because of the great work that he has done on so many different areas. But first and foremost my thoughts, my prayers, are with the family of JOHN, his wife Virginia, his five children, including Mayor Lincoln Chafee from Warwick and their 12 grandchildren. I know it is often difficult to grasp the enormity and the meaning of the loss of this kind, and I offer my sincere condolences to the Senator's family.

Like many Rhode Islanders, we woke up this morning in total shock when we heard that JOHN CHAFEE had passed last evening of heart failure. Although his public career had spanned over 44 years, the Senator still had many gifts to give, and I am sure over these next 13 to 14 months, if he had finished his tenure in office, he would have provided those to the people of America, and particularly to his beloved people of Rhode Island. I know upon his retirement, which he was looking forward to, he would have served us even in greater ways, far beyond what we would have ever expected from this fine gentleman from Rhode Island.

It is indeed a huge loss for all of us. We were blessed to have a committed public servant such as JOHN as a member of our General Assembly back in 1956, as our governor, as Secretary of the Navy, and for the past 23 years as our Senator. The contributions he made to our State, to our Nation, will never be forgotten. And his legacies, particularly with regard to his work on the environment, health care, and to disadvantaged children, will be forever appreciated.

If there was any proof that his death came too soon, it could perhaps be found in the Senator's own words. Not too long ago, in fact just last year, when a reporter from the Providence Journal asked him, "Senator, what would you like to be remembered for? What would you like to have on your tombstone? What would you like to have as an epitaph?", JOHN CHAFEE laughed and rolled back in his seat and simply said, "Here lies.", and never finished the phrase. Because he knew he had much more work to do. He never felt that he could leave anything undone, and he indeed wanted to be sure that he had that opportunity.

When he announced this past March that he was going to retire, he announced to the State, to much amazement, and to the country as well, "I will not seek another term as U.S. Senator." He said to all of Rhode Island, "I want to come home." JOHN CHAFEE had been a stalwart in Rhode Island politics, but he wanted to go home to his beloved State of Rhode Island; he wanted to share his time with his wife, his family, and his grandchildren.

JOHN was a tireless worker starting back in 1956, when he first ran for the State House of Representatives in Rhode Island from the City of Warwick. Very quickly he emerged as the minority leader in the House of Representatives. And just after 6 years, he ran for Governor of the State of Rhode Island. Winning a very narrow margin of victory in a Republican primary, then going on to win a razor thin victory in 1962 to become the State's Governor.

Quickly, in 1963, as he began his tenure as chief executive, he started working on many of the pressing issues of the State, including their State freeway and transportation systems, but most notably JOHN was known for his work on the environment. I remember very clearly as a landscape architect and as a youngster that JOHN CHAFEE started a program that he dubbed Green Acres. It was one of the first State environmental programs to enhance, to protect, and preserve open spaces and create recreational spaces throughout our State. It was known that JOHN CHAFEE was, first of all, an environmentalist, but, most importantly, he knew how to get such a bill passed in a Democratic General Assembly. He was a craftsman at the very best when it came to the legislature.

JOHN CHAFEE, most notably, led in preservation not only as a member of our General Assembly and as Governor but also as a Senator. As Senator last year, advocating for more open space, he said, "It is our duty as citizens to preserve for the future generations as much of our State's natural beauty, its green open spaces, sandy beaches, and vibrant wetlands as we possibly can."

Countless Rhode Islanders, including myself, can personally attest to the beauty of such wonderful places like Colt State Park and many of our beaches. And it was because of JOHN CHAFEE's perseverance that we have these spaces today. It is because of his leadership in those areas that we have these wonderful open spaces today.

In 1969, President Richard Nixon appointed him Secretary of the Navy and he fought through that difficult period of time during the Vietnam War to be the best he possibly could be as Secretary of the Navy. His distinguished military career, including tours in World War II and Korea, and his ties to Rhode Island and the strong naval heritage that we have, provided an invaluable background for that position. In this position, Senator CHAFEE guided the Navy through the final years of the

conflict in Vietnam, and until he left that position in 1972.

Then he ran unsuccessfully for Senator, but that did not stop him. He came back again, when an open seat became available in 1976, and won that spot and has been there ever since. And during his 23 years in the U.S. Senate, he has worked on a number of issues important to our Nation but, most notably, protecting and preserving the environment. Most of us know JOHN for that.

In an interview last year, JOHN CHAFEE listed the enactment of the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act as his proudest accomplishments. And Senator CHAFEE, for many reasons, has the right to be proud. The passage of the Clean Air Act has been very successful in cleaning the air and improving public health. The air is indeed cleaner and the public health is indeed improved because of JOHN CHAFEE. We still have a long way to go, and a fitting way to pay our tribute and remember JOHN CHAFEE is to continue the great work he began on improving the quality of the air we breathe, and the water that we drink and that we use for fishing and swimming.

With respect to the Clean Water Act, Senator CHAFEE was a true leader, and we should be especially proud. Approximately 25 years ago, only one-third of the Nation's waters were safe for fishing and swimming according to the EPA. And now that has nearly doubled. Today, two-thirds of the Nation's waters are safe for fishing and swimming. This is especially important because of the vast majority of our population living near or on the coast and near those waters.

Clean water is imperative for our State, in terms of its commercial fishing, its tourism, and its agriculture, but also for the entire country. All of these contribute significantly to our economy, not to mention the vast improvements to the quality of life, and we can thank JOHN CHAFEE for that.

In addition to his leadership on preserving the environment, he has been a leader when it came to health care, the quality of health care, access to health care, but also ensuring that child care is available to all working families in Rhode Island and throughout this country. One of the hallmarks was his recognition of the need to compromise and work with people from both sides of the aisle. Working with both sides was not something that was uncommon to JOHN CHAFEE.

I remember back in 1984, when I was first thinking about running for the State House of Representatives in Rhode Island, I was a Democrat all my life, but JOHN CHAFEE called me up and asked me to consider running as a Republican. He said we need environmentalists and people who have an understanding, like you, of what it takes to get things done. I thanked him very kindly and humbly, because it was truly a tribute to have that Senator call this lowly candidate for a State

House office and to be asked to become part of the Republican Party. However, I nodded and told him, "JOHN, I'm a Democrat. Be happy to work with you, but, indeed, we do have differences of opinion. But we can work together." He recognized that, and the 23 years that he served in the Senate, I think, were marked by bipartisanship rather than partisanship.

It is truly an honor to have served with JOHN CHAFEE, to have known him, to have worked with him, and to have helped him in whatever way we could on many of the pieces of legislation he thought was most important. He, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and myself worked very hard in opposing casino gambling. We worked together, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), Senator REED, and myself on improving quality home health care, and we worked on many things that were important to the citizens of Rhode Island.

His congeniality, his demeanor, his ability to forge a compromise are perhaps the most important hallmarks not only of JOHN CHAFEE himself, but his legacy a legislator. He was a true gentleman, a class act, and in the best possible way, the best possible terms, he was a statesman.

We will miss him dearly, Mr. Speaker. Rhode Island will miss him dearly. Our sympathies, our condolences go out to his family. We have lost a giant in Rhode Island politics and in American politics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND) will control the balance of the time.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

□ 1945

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I had to come here simply to say that we in Congress and in the United States of America have really lost a great man. He is a man who believed in what Shakespeare said, "To nature none more bound." He believed in the legacy that we must leave our offspring with regard to nature.

I must say I feel like somebody who is bound to JOHN CHAFEE. He was to me a role model. And I do not even think he knew that. But I looked to him as a man who, as has been mentioned, was bipartisan, who was a man of integrity, a man of coalition building, and a man who exemplified great common sense.

He cared about the people that he represented in Rhode Island. He cared about the people of the United States. He cared about the vulnerable people, the children, those who needed health care. And he cared about the environment which, if endangered and if violated, might not be restored.

So we have heard of the great tributes to him in terms of what he did achieve. But, for me, he was a man that I felt would take legislation and

carefully craft it, carefully work with it so it came out as something that we could all agree on.

He is a man who exemplified, I think, the roughrider instinct of Theodore Roosevelt. Because he really was a tough rider. He had some difficult skirmishes that he had to contend and transcended all of it.

So to the family of Senator JOHN CHAFEE, our condolences. He will live on in love.

To all of our colleagues, those from Rhode Island, those from all parts of the country, we will all miss him very deeply. My hope is and my belief is that his inspiration will live on. And so, although he will be lost, he will be with us always.

So I thank so much the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND) for his great tribute to the man that we all loved.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and all the speakers here this evening for their comments. It is a fitting tribute to a gentleman, a statesman, and we thank them for their comments.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has lost a true giant of the 20th Century last night with the sudden passing of the Senior Senator from the State of Rhode Island, the Honorable JOHN H. CHAFEE.

JOHN CHAFEE'S outstanding dedication to public service began over a half a century ago when he left Yale University to join the Marine Corps after Pearl Harbor. A hero of Guadalcanal, JOHN CHAFEE was recalled to active duty when the Korean War broke out and commanded a rifle company on the Korean peninsula during that bloody conflict. Accordingly, he was one of the few Members of either Chamber of Congress to be a veteran of both World War II and Korea.

As a young attorney, JOHN CHAFEE became active in Republican politics in his home state of Rhode Island. He was elected to Rhode Island's state legislature in 1956 as a young man of 34. He eventually served as the Minority Leader in that body, and was elected in 1962 to the first of three successful two year terms as Governor of his state.

In 1968, President-elect Nixon appointed JOHN CHAFEE to be our nation's Secretary of the Navy in which position he served meritoriously. Finally, in 1976, JOHN was elected to the first of four terms in the U.S. Senate. In that position, he served his state and nation admirably. He was Chairman of the Senate's Environment and Public Works Committee. In that position, he was a constant reminder to all of us of the need to protect the ecology of our planet, and much of the far-reaching environmental legislation of the last quarter century bears his fingerprints. JOHN CHAFEE was one of the co-founders of the Theodore Roosevelt Fund, which helped remind his fellow Republicans that the most conservation-minded of all Presidents—Theodore Roosevelt—was a member of the Grand Old Party.

JOHN CHAFEE, having previously announced his plans to retire in the year 2000, we knew we would be missing his outstanding leadership. I join with my colleagues in extending our condolences and prayers to JOHN'S widow

Virginia and to his family and the many who admired JOHN CHAFEE'S service to his nation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for the better part of four decades, JOHN H. CHAFEE has served the State of Rhode Island with distinction and honor. As State Representative, Governor, Secretary of the Navy and United States Senator, JOHN CHAFEE has set an unprecedented level of service having an impact on both his state and the nation. His absence will leave a void not only in Rhode Island but on the nation as a whole.

When the United States entered World War II, he left Yale to enlist in the Marine Corps, and then served in the original invasion force at Guadalcanal. He was recalled to active duty in 1951, and commanded a rifle company in Korea.

He served six years in the Rhode Island House of Representatives, where he was elected Minority Leader. Running for Governor in 1962, CHAFEE was elected by 398 votes. He was then reelected in 1964 and 1996—both times by the largest margin in the State's history. In January 1969, he was appointed Secretary of the Navy and served in that post for three-and-a-half years.

JOHN CHAFEE'S Senate career began in 1976. He was reelected to a fourth term in 1994, with sixty-five percent of the vote, and is the only Republican to be elected to the U.S. Senate from Rhode Island in the past 68 years.

Chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, the Senator was a leading voice in crafting Clean Air Act of 1990 which strengthened pollution emissions legislation, and a bill to strengthen the Safe Drinking Water Act. Senator CHAFEE is a longtime advocate for wetland conservation and open space preservation, and has been the recipient of every major environmental award.

A senior member of the Finance Committee, Senator CHAFEE has worked successfully to expand health care coverage for women and children, and to improve community services for persons with disabilities. In 1990, Senator CHAFEE spearheaded the Republican Health Care Task Force and became a prominent figure in the national health reform debate. He went on to lead the bipartisan effort to craft a comprehensive health care reform proposal in 1994.

The Senator has received awards and endorsements from such organizations as The National Federation of Independent Business, The American Nurses Association, The League of Conservation Voters, The Sierra Club, Handgun Control Inc., Planned Parenthood, Citizens Against Government Waste, and the National PTA.

Senator JOHN CHAFEE has approached his remarkable career with the single premise to operate through consensus and cooperation wherever possible in order to get the business of the people done. A Republican operating in a heavily Democratic state, Senator CHAFEE understood that partisanship had no place in politics. Today, I express my sincere sympathy to Senator CHAFEE'S family, friends and the great people of Rhode Island. America has lost a unique native son and a hero for us all to remember.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues and all Rhode Islanders in mourning the untimely death of Senator CHAFEE.

The Senator was a principled voice who was able to work with both sides of the aisle

on the issues close to his heart. He left a lasting imprint in our nation's laws—playing a key role in some of the most important legislation passed by Congress over the last three decades, especially in the areas of health care and the environment.

He proved that a sustained dedication to one's ideals through politics can make a real and lasting difference to our communities and our country. His retirement would have left a void in Congress; his untimely death leaves a void in the hearts of all who had the privilege of knowing and working with a true statesman and citizen.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to Virginia Chafee and all the members of her family on the loss of her beloved husband, our esteemed colleague Senator JOHN H. CHAFEE.

Last night our nation lost a great American. JOHN CHAFEE saw combat service in both World War II and the Korean War. He served with distinction in the Rhode Island House of Representatives, as Governor of the State of Rhode Island, and as Secretary of the Navy. For the past 23 years, JOHN CHAFEE has served in the U.S. Senate where he was universally respected for his integrity, civility, and deeply held convictions.

Senator CHAFEE'S contributions to our nation are many. His legacy includes a cleaner environment, better health care, and a model of true bipartisanship from which we can all learn.

I join in giving thanks for his life.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 344.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1987, FAIR ACCESS TO INDEMNITY AND REIMBURSEMENT ACT

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-414) on the resolution (H. Res. 342) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1987) to allow the recovery of attorneys' fees and costs by certain employers and labor organizations who are prevailing parties in proceedings brought against them by the National Labor Relations Board or by the Occupational Safety and Health

Administration, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

AFFORDABLE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS ACT

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I joined the President and Health and Human Services Secretary Shalala today at the White House to call on Congress to approve a prescription drug benefit in Medicare. We also called on private health plans to continue providing coverage for medicine that doctors prescribe.

The problem is twofold. Millions of Americans, young and old, cannot afford the high costs of prescription drugs. And the majority in Congress refuse to lift a finger to reduce these prices and help protect public health.

Unlike other industrialized nations, the U.S. does not regulate drug prices. So drug companies charge us the highest prices of any nation by multiples of two and three and even four times what citizens in other countries pay.

Within the United States, drug companies are charging the highest prices to those with the least bargaining power, the elderly and those without health insurance. Drug companies are diverting also huge sums of money, money that comes from inflated drug prices, into advertising.

From a market perspective, drug companies are doing everything they should be doing. We cannot blame drug companies for maximizing their profits. They make more money than any other industry in America. That is their job. Nor can we blame the President and many of us in Congress for taking steps to protect seniors and the uninsured and to address the ramifications of what drug companies are doing to the disadvantaged. That is our job.

I have introduced an initiative that would bring down prices without taking away the industry's incentive to act like an industry. My bill promotes good old-fashioned American competition.

The Affordable Prescription Drug Act, H.R. 2927, does not use price controls or regulations to bring down prescription drug prices. What my bill does is reduce drug industry power and increase consumer power by subjecting the drug industry to the same competitive forces that other industries bear. It is a means of moderating prices that are too high without inadvertently setting prices too low.

Drawing from intellectual property laws already in place in the U.S. for other products in which access is an issue, pollution control devices as one example, legislation would establish product licensing for essential prescription drugs.

If a drug price is so outrageously high that it bears no semblance to pricing norms for other industries, the Federal Government could require drug manufacturers to license their patent to generic drug companies. The generic companies could sell competing products before the brand name expires, paying the patentholder royalties for that right. The patentholder would still be amply rewarded for being the first on the market, and Americans would benefit from competitively driven prices.

Alternatively, a drug company could lower voluntarily their price, which would preclude the Government from finding cause for product licensing. Either way, Madam Speaker, the price of prescription drugs would go down.

The bill requires drug companies to provide audited, detailed information on drug company expenses. Given that these companies are asking us to accept a status quo that has bankrupt seniors and fueled health care inflation, they have kept us guessing about their true cost for far too long.

We can continue to buy into drug industry threats that R&D will dry up unless we continue to shelter them from competition. That argument, however, Madam Speaker, falls apart when we look at how R&D is funded today.

Long story short, most of research and development dollars are provided by U.S. taxpayers. Get this: fifty percent of all the research and development for drug development in this country are paid for by taxpayers and the National Institutes of Health and other Federal and State agencies; and of the 50 percent that drug companies actually spend, they get tax deductions from Congress for that.

Yet, prescription drug companies reward American taxpayers by charging Americans consumers two times, three times, four times the price for prescription drugs that people in other countries pay.

Madam Speaker, we can do nothing in this body, or we can dare to challenge the drug industry on behalf of seniors and every health care consumer in this country.

I urge my colleagues to support lowering the cost of prescription drugs.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP: LEAD BY EXAMPLE

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, I have introduced today a sense-of-Congress resolution. This sense-of-Congress resolution simply says that if we are going to engage in an across-the-board cut in all the Federal agencies, then Members of Congress should accept a similar cut in their salaries.

I would like to share the contents of my resolution:

"Whereas, Congress may pass an across-the-board funding reduction for Federal agencies to bring closure to the debate on Fiscal Year 2000 funding levels;

Whereas, lawmakers voted themselves a 3.4 percent cost-of-living adjustment this year;

Whereas, salaries of Members of Congress would not be affected by an across-the-board reduction;

Whereas, the rest of the Government's payroll would be affected by the proposed reduction, which would likely result in layoffs and temporary furloughs;

Whereas, it is estimated that the reductions could force layoffs of 39,000 military personnel; and

Whereas, programs at the Department of Education, Department of Labor, and the Department of Health and Human Services, programs such as Meals on Wheels, the National Institutes of Health, Head Start, and the Safe and Drug Free Schools program would be reduced.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that any across-the-board funding reduction for agencies in Fiscal Year 2000 should also include the same reduction for salaries of Members of Congress."

Why have I introduced this resolution? It is because a 1.4 percent reduction, as is being discussed, would lead to approximately 103,000 fewer women, infants, and children from benefiting from the food assistance and nutrition programs offered under the WIC program.

Title I, which provides educational benefits for disadvantaged students, would be cut by \$109 million. Head Start would be cut so that some 6,700 fewer children would be able to benefit from Head Start programs.

The Centers for Disease Control would be cut by approximately \$6.7 million. And a reduction of \$35.7 million would take place in the area of substance abuse and mental health services, thereby denying over 5,000 American citizens access to mental health treatment and drug abuse services.

Vital programs for our farming community would be cut by \$124 million. A 1.4 percent reduction would result in \$3.9 billion being cuts from defense. This cut would require that military services make cuts in recruiting and engage in force separations of up to 39,000 military personnel.

Madam Speaker, I think blanket cuts are unwise and unnecessary. But if the leadership of this House is intent on forcing such cuts indiscriminately on good programs as well as bad, then they ought to be willing to bear some of the burden themselves and take a pay cut.

It is unseemly for this Congress to ask the American people to tighten their belts while not doing the same itself. With this sense-of Congress-resolution, I am simply asking that Members of Congress be consistent. If they really think it is wise to make blind cuts, then they should not be exempting their own salaries.

Quite frankly, I am sick and tired of the leadership up here treating themselves as special people while imposing hardships on ordinary Americans.

As we say in southern Ohio, what is good for the goose is good for the gander.

□ 2000

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

ON PASSING OF SENATOR CHAFEE

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Speaker, I would like to begin by expressing my words of recognition and condolences to the family of Senator CHAFEE. He clearly distinguished the legislative branch of government with service that was bipartisan, common sense, moderate, centrist, and simply was a personal example of integrity and honesty and courage, the like of which some suggest we have too little of around here at this time. In any event, he set the bar very high and it would do well for all of us as we mourn his passing to reflect carefully on his example and embrace it in our own lives to the extent we can. Again, that would be a tall order. Senator CHAFEE in my last visit with him was leading a bipartisan discussion on how we might somehow form a breakthrough in a knotty health policy issue that had divided the parties, divided the Chambers. It was just one example I got to see up close and personal the kind of bipartisan,

nonideological, let-us-solve-the-problem leadership that Senator CHAFEE brought to his work, and clearly the work of the legislative branch was distinguished as a result of his efforts.

Tonight, I am leading a special order about Social Security. In the course of our discussion, I want to provide background about the nature of the program. I also want to discuss the debate that is waging at the moment relative to the budget discussions between the two political parties, and I want to focus on really the missing element of what has captured much of the present discussion, and that is the steps we must take to preserve the solvency of the program, to make certain that it is there not just for us but for our children and our grandchildren as well.

As will be the course in the course of this hour, as commonly happens during these special orders, I have invited several Members of the Democratic Caucus to join me on the floor this evening, and while many will no longer be available in light of the hour, I am very pleased to see the gentleman from Florida here.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding so that I might have an opportunity to address the Nation on this very important issue of Social Security.

Madam Speaker, the district that I represent, which is like many other congressional districts across the Nation, has more than 76,000 people over the age of 65 who receive Social Security. Tens of millions of people across the country rely on this important program for their long-term retirement needs. This makes Social Security one of the most important programs administered by the Federal Government. Everybody in Washington has concluded that finally.

Madam Speaker, I am very troubled by much of the rhetoric that we have been hearing on Social Security over the last few weeks. The rhetoric over Social Security basically has been over what we do with surplus dollars. It really has nothing to do with extending the life of the Social Security trust fund, and that is what we should be talking about.

Now, Madam Speaker, the last time I checked, the law says that the only way we can spend surplus dollars or use the surplus dollars is invest them in treasury notes. And this Congress has made no attempt to change that, nor has that been suggested in any of the rhetoric that has been going on for the last several weeks. All of this fighting and rhetoric over the surplus tends to hide the fact that no action has been taken to extend the life of the Social Security trust fund. According to the Social Security trustees, beginning in the year 2014, the Social Security trust fund will take in less taxes than it pays out in benefits. This means that Social Security will need to redeem the treasury notes it holds starting in the year

2014. By the year 2034, all of those treasury notes will have been paid in full, with interest. Once those notes are repaid, the Social Security trust fund will not have any additional revenue coming in other than the payroll taxes paid in that year to pay the promised benefits, and this will result in a significant decrease in the benefit of about 25 percent. Again, that starts under current projections in the year 2034. This long-term crisis is what Congress should be addressing now, not arguing about the surplus dollars of today. Because the longer we wait, the harder it will be to financially address and solve this very serious long-term crisis.

There have been several plans suggested by both Democrats and Republicans to address this crisis, and my Republican colleagues in the majority up to this point have not considered any of them. At the State of the Union address, President Clinton put forward his plan. The Kolbe-Stenholm plan, a Democrat and Republican, has been introduced. It is a bipartisan plan. The Archer-Shaw plan has been proposed, as well as other plans which Congress should be considering. While no action has been taken on any of these plans this year, at a minimum this congressional leadership and the President should work together to set aside funding to enact Social Security reform, meaningful, substantive Social Security reform. This idea was first proposed in the Blue Dog budget back in the spring as a way to provide the funds necessary to ensure the long-term fiscal viability of the Social Security trust fund. That budget, I might say, enjoyed bipartisan support. Under our plan, the Blue Dog plan, we would set aside \$83 billion over the next 5 years of non-Social Security surplus to help pay for any reform proposal that Congress might adopt. Again, this does not exclude any reform option. All it does is ensure that we can pay for whatever plan that the Congress and the President ultimately agree upon.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to urge the congressional leadership and President Clinton to include these provisions which will fund substantive Social Security reform in any final budget agreement that they reach. After all of the rhetoric has ended, I believe that laying the groundwork for Social Security reform is the best thing that we can do this year to address the crisis facing the trust fund and ensure that Social Security and its benefits are there for our children, grandchildren and great grandchildren.

Mr. POMEROY. Reclaiming my time from the gentleman from Florida, I want to thank him for an excellent discussion which really is reflective of a great deal of work the gentleman has provided and leadership on this issue. I thank him very much for his contribution.

Madam Speaker, as I discussed in the opening, what I want to do over the next few minutes is talk about Social

Security in its full context. I want to do that as a predicate to talk about specifically the very shallow, empty and false rhetoric coming from the majority relative to the stakes regarding Social Security as we discuss the final appropriations bills before this body this session. I then want to get to what I believe is the most important responsibility on all of us, Republican and Democrat alike, and that is lengthening the life of the Social Security trust fund so that it might be there to provide future generations the secure retirement it is presently affording. I want to talk about specifically even in the closing weeks of this session the opportunity that is before us to take this action, to promote the length of Social Security.

Social Security is our Nation's family protection program. It protects all of us. It is really a program of all of us protecting each of us, because it is a program truly that we all have a stake in. It offers us three distinct kinds of protection. First and of course the best known is the retirement income. Retirement income, payable every month, adjusted for inflation, coverage that you cannot outlive no matter how long you may live. You will have just as dependable as the first of the month that Social Security check for support. It has played an enormously important role in the lives of tens of millions of American families.

Just think about the retirement income statistics that follow. It is the primary income for two-thirds of all retirees over age 65; 90 percent of the income for one-third of the retirees. It is all they have got, which underscores how critically important when it comes to safeguarding, protecting and strengthening Social Security, how critical that challenge is. Again, one-third of all Social Security recipients have it for 90 percent or more of all their income.

There are two other benefits I need to mention in addition to the retirement benefit. One is the survivors benefit. This is when the breadwinner dies prematurely, leaving young dependents in the home. They have coverage through the Social Security program. Ninety-eight percent of the children in this country have coverage because of this feature of the Social Security program. When we think of Social Security, we think of an old people's program. Well, it is also a program for America's kids. And make no mistake about that.

Thirdly, it is a disability program, because if someone becomes disabled and unable to work, Social Security will be there. Three out of four workers in the workplace today have no other coverage but for Social Security. It is a vital protection. And without this, if they become banged up, cannot work, that is it, they do not have an income. With Social Security, they have an income. Again, three out of four, it is their only disability insurance policy.

Now, these are kind of black and white, programmatic examples of how

Social Security works, but I want to put this in a very personal context, because Social Security has been very important to my family and to me personally. I was a teenager when my father died. I have received Social Security checks personally. Quite frankly, I do not know how I would have gotten through college without the Social Security program. My mother is now 79 years old. Unlike my grandmother who in her last years moved in with our family because she had not the financial resources to live independently, my mom lives independently and hopefully she will live independently for a good many years to come, because she has that Social Security check coming every month. It really makes a difference in our family between my mom living alone, as she prefers, or living with us as she is always welcome, but it is not her preference.

Finally, I have also, like many of us do, friends that have become disabled in one form or another. I have a friend, a good friend, but he has developed a very disabling bipolar mental illness and simply has been unable to work. Without Social Security, I do not know what he would do. He is now in his late 40's, does not have family to support him, and that Social Security check keeps my friend going. Without it, I shudder to think of what might be the consequences. But it has been vital. So when we talk about retirement income, we talk about survivors income, we talk about disability income, we are talking about literally Social Security achieving a miraculous benefit to the families that it touches every day, and across the country, of course, we are talking about millions and millions of families.

Now that we reflect on the program, think about the good it is doing, let us think about the challenges that face it. It is running a surplus now. In fact very healthy surpluses. But if we look at the obligations upon the program going forward, we see the story starts to change. By 2011, the Social Security program will no longer be in surplus. While that is a good ways out, you may think, well, what is the problem, we need to collect and hold the surpluses for Social Security so that the resources will be there as the baby boomers move into retirement and the draw on the program starts to accelerate. By the year 2021, we are not just paying Social Security benefits based on the FICA tax revenue, the interest of the Social Security trust fund, we at that point start to actually draw down the principal in the trust fund itself. By the year 2034 at present projection, we will wipe out the Social Security trust fund and benefits are scheduled to fall a full 25 percent.

Driving this, of course, is the shift in the demographics of the country: 5.1 workers per retiree in 1960, 3.4 workers per retiree today. In the year 2035, 2 workers per retiree. So we see that the cash flow generating capacity of the workforce changes and the retirement

need, the draw on the program accelerates.

□ 2015

The key to answering the question which party is fighting for Social Security is to look at which party addresses the date at which the program goes bust; 2034 it is scheduled to go bust. Benefits fall 25 percent. Which party is addressing that figure? It is the long-term solvency of the program that is really what is at stake here.

There are three ways to prolong solvency: raise taxes. The taxes are already at 12.4 percent. I believe they are already absolutely as high as can be tolerated, and if we can figure out a way to reduce them without damaging the solvency of the program, I would be all for that.

The other alternative: cut benefits. And you do have people talking about cutting benefits, no longer having some people in this country participate in Social Security, raising the retirement age. Well, the average Social Security check each month is about \$700 a month. You cannot reduce the average Social Security check in this country without doing significant harm to the one-third of the recipients that are depending on that to live.

And raising retirement age. I tell you I do not know about all of the country, but the people I represent back in North Dakota do not think that they ought to have to try and make it on the farm or doing whatever they are doing until age 70 or even higher to receive a Social Security check. They are counting on it as is presently constituted in law.

Well, if you are not going to raise taxes, if you are not going to cut benefits, the way you add to the solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund is to ultimately interject general fund balance into this program to preserve it over the long haul.

That is the backdrop of Social Security, but there is quite a different picture being presented at the present time, and I would talk about that briefly and engage my colleagues in the discussion as well. The House majority has truly launched the most audacious attack that I have seen, charging Democrats with raiding the Social Security revenues. The facts of the matter are it is not true. The fact of the matter is that the charges are hypocritical and untrue.

We are operating under a Republican-passed budget. They are the majority party in this Chamber, and they passed a budget almost on straight party lines. Spending that has occurred within this Chamber has been under the budget resolution, that is, the Republican budget resolution.

The particular spending bills that have been brought forward have been passing with Republican majorities. They are the majority party, they are passing the spending bills, and we have some important third-party validation in terms of what those spending bills

have produced so far. The Congressional Budget Office has reported that Social Security revenues have been drawn on already to the tune of \$14 billion, and I will tell you that that ticker is still running, that amount is still accelerating; and so the very things that the Republicans are charging the Democrats for doing, they have already done even though they have used every appropriations and budget gimmick in the book for a little sleight of hand to try and indicate that that is not the case.

In any event, take that as it will. In any event it does nothing to preserve the solvency of Social Security. For all their rhetoric, they have done nothing. Not one piece of legislation has been considered on this floor this year to advance the solvency of Social Security one day. Let us look at that legislative record.

Here we are very late in the first year of this session. For all the late-bloom rhetoric on Social Security, why in the world have they not brought a plan to the floor to advance the solvency of the trust fund? Nothing by way of activity. Why? Well, I believe it has something to do with their tax cut bill which was earlier considered, passed by the Republican majority, passed by the Senate Republican majority, sent to the President, which fortunately he vetoed because that tax bill would have gobbled up all the general fund revenue that might otherwise have been available to preserve Social Security.

They took the funds for which we can strengthen Social Security, and they shipped them out the door in a great big tax cut benefiting the wealthiest people in this country. Thank goodness the President vetoed that bill and we were able to sustain that veto on the House floor.

What I think is amazing is mere weeks after we stopped them from basically taking the funds that we need to preserve and strengthen Social Security and shipping it out to the wealthiest contributors in the form of their tax cut, just weeks after that they parade around on the floor of the House talking about how they are saving Social Security when they have not strengthened this one bit; they have not added one day to the solvency of the trust fund.

I think one has a responsibility to do more than just critique, however, an important matter like this; and I would just offer the following plan for strengthening, for actually doing something about trust fund solvency.

We are at a point to capture the Social Security surpluses. We must do that. Over time we must capture every dollar coming in and allocate it to the Social Security program. We must do so in a way that draws down the debt held by this country. As you invest those Social Security trust funds, in this case we will actually be redeeming publicly held debt, bringing the debt down from the country.

And then thirdly, because ultimately when you draw that debt down from these Social Security surpluses, you are going to have a windfall in terms of money now going to pay on interest that is no longer needed to go on interest. You take that money, and you invest it in the Social Security Trust Fund. Basically, Social Security earned that money, you can argue; Social Security ought to get that money.

Taking that step would take that trust fund I was talking about and move it from 2034 to 2050. 2050. The program without further change would be able to pay benefits through 2050.

Now I am a classic baby boomer, born in 1952. Year 2050 comes, I am going to be 98 years old, and in fact I do not know that I will be around to see the year 2050 as a good many of us will not be. But the point I want to make is moving into 2050 in the fashion promoted, actually allows us to strengthen and enhance the solvency of the trust fund.

I see that a couple of Members are joining me on the floor, and I want to include them in the discussion. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. It is a pleasure to join you, my good friend from North Dakota.

I think for all of us, when we return to our districts, this is an issue that is of real importance to the people that we represent; and I have to admit that when I have town hall meetings and advertise the topic is going to be Social Security, the audience is generally filled with people who are over the age of 65, and that is somewhat surprising because for many of these people the Social Security system right now is in good shape.

For those who are in our parents' generation, they are probably not going to live beyond the year 2034, so that the assets are there right now for them. But as my friend from North Dakota mentioned, two-thirds of the elderly in this country rely on Social Security as a primary source of their income, and an amazing one-third of the elderly in this country rely on Social Security as the sole source of their income.

It is their lifeline; and, therefore, we have a responsibility to make sure that any changes that are brought up, any proposals that are brought up before this body, do not in any way, in any way, lower the income for these people, these tens of millions of people who rely on Social Security either as the primary source or as the exclusive source of income for their families.

But I am sure, as my friend from North Dakota knows, when we talk to younger people, they are really quite wary. They are not as trustful about the Social Security system, and in fact many of them say the money will not be there when I am going to retire, and the reason they say that, I think, can be summarized in part by what the gentleman from North Dakota said, be-

cause when the system began, you had 5.1 workers for each retiree. We are now at 3.4 workers for each retiree, but in about 25 to 30 years we are only going to have two workers for each retiree. So we have to do something to extend the life of Social Security beyond the year 2034.

That is why I am as shocked and baffled as the gentleman from North Dakota about the arguments that we are hearing in this Chamber today. As the gentleman from North Dakota indicated, there has not been a single piece of legislation that has been considered by this Congress that would extend the life of Social Security. At the same time we hear many of our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle saying, I think, as the gentleman indicated, quite untruthfully, that the Democrats are in some way raiding Social Security surpluses. That is wrong because obviously we are not the ones that are passing the budget.

The people who are passing the budget are the Republicans. They are the ones on a party line vote for most of these measures that are advancing their agenda. So even if we wanted to, it would be virtually impossible for us to do so.

But the fact of the matter is the Congressional Budget Office, which is a nonpartisan office, although the head of the Congressional Budget Office is appointed by the Republicans, has stated that in effect the Republicans themselves have spent some of the surplus on, some of the Social Security surplus to pay for their programs. So if anyone could be accused of taking money from the Social Security system, it is Republicans.

But I think the American people are not interested in whether the Republicans are doing it or the Democrats are doing it. I think they view that as the same old potato/pa-ta-toe tomato/ta-ma-toe politics; and their reaction is let us call the whole thing off, and they will walk away from our political system, which is the worst thing that they can do.

This is far too serious an issue to let partisan politics play a key role in it, and that is why I think what we have to do in this chamber, Democrats and Republicans, is let us put aside this ugly partisan rhetoric, let us put aside these claims, and let us work on the real issue. The real issue is extending the life of Social Security, and until we have a measure on this floor that is a bipartisan, serious proposal, we are going to remain mired in partisan politics, which is the worst thing that we can do.

So I want to applaud the gentleman from North Dakota. I see my good friend from Ohio is here; my friends from Arkansas and Maine are here as well; and I think it is good that we are taking this hour tonight to talk about this because I think maybe we can get others on both sides of the aisle to form a nucleus to move ahead and come up with a proposal that will extend the life of Social Security.

So I yield back to the gentleman from North Dakota and thank him very much for his invitation to be here.

Mr. POMEROY. Reclaiming my time, and I thank very much the gentleman for participating in the discussion tonight. I think you have laid out a couple of very important ideas.

First, the open-mindedness to participate in any kind of bipartisan plan they might move forward that is talking about actually lengthening the life of the trust fund. The President has advanced a plan that lengthens the life of the trust fund. I think we craft the President's long-term plan on the majority's short-term funding plan to get us through this year. You could have the beginnings of a bipartisan deal that ultimately is absolutely true to Social Security because it does something about the length of the trust fund.

Your comments are just so critically important in terms of establishing a benchmark by which the public can really evaluate whether anything is going on with Social Security that means anything or not. The test is does it lengthen the solvency of the program? Does it preserve the life of the trust fund? And that really is the core of the issues you very well outlined.

I thank the gentleman for participating, and I would yield now to the gentleman who has patiently waited to participate as well, the gentleman from Cleveland (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. It is certainly true that Americans are depending on us to guarantee Social Security. There is no question about it, and they are looking for help from both sides of the aisle. I know that in this big debate that has developed over the last few years the role that I have played in it is to suggest that while we want to guarantee Social Security, we need to avoid any effort towards privatization of Social Security.

As you remember, there has been a big hue and cry in Washington over the past few years saying that we can only turn to the private sector to guarantee this tremendous social and economic benefit known as Social Security, and it is lucky that Congress did not privatize Social Security this year.

You remember on October 15 the headlines nationally? Stocks Tumble After Warning By Greenspan, The Dow's Big Drop. An unexpectedly sharp rise in consumer price index fed inflation fears contributing to the Dow's worst drop in a year. The Dow Industrial Average today suffered its worst loss in a year, dipping briefly below the symbolic 10,000 mark it bridged in March as investors recoiled from most of the high-flying stocks that have driven this stage of the bull market.

□ 2030

Now, the falling stock market, and you see this graph right here, what goes up must come down, the falling stock market illustrates the danger we place the American people in if Congress ever agreed to bet Social Security money on the stock market.

While my good friend the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) does this country a service by calling a special order on this topic where we have to say we are going to guarantee Social Security, we also know that investing Social Security in the stock market is a risky proposition that may be fine for people with extra income to gamble, but Americans need a guaranteed income when they are old or disabled. So long as Congress and the President keep Social Security out of the stock market, Social Security has a chance to be sound.

Even as the stock market has been falling, and you might find this interesting, even as the stock market has been falling, Social Security has been getting stronger. The trustees released an analysis that asserted that the Social Security trust fund is now projected to be solvent through the year 2034, without any Congressional action. The previous trustees report set the date of projected insolvency to 2032. Now, think about this. The Social Security trust fund has gained 2 complete years of solvency without privatizing Social Security or investing it in the stock market.

While it is true that Americans are depending on us to guarantee Social Security, I think that Americans also want us to take note of the fact that Social Security got stronger without any Congressional action because the economy is stronger and wages are rising. This should be a lesson for everyone. We do not need the stock market to solve Social Security's projected financial shortfalls. We need to strengthen the economy, we need to raise wages, and Social Security will strengthen itself.

As the stock market falls there is even more good news for Social Security. The President wants to credit the Social Security trust fund with an additional \$2.3 trillion to guarantee surpluses for the trust fund over the next 50 years. No other organization, public or private, has a plan for operation 50 years into the future. Social Security is secure.

What policymakers need to know is that Social Security is secure as long as the Congress and the President back Social Security with a guarantee of the full faith and credit of the United States. Congress can say that the United States of America will pay all promised benefits, just as America stands 100 percent behind its bonds. All Americans win if Congress guarantees Social Security. But if Social Security is invested in the stock market, all Americans will lose guaranteed old age income.

Turning Social Security over to Wall Street will mean that senior citizens, the retirees, would have to check the Dow Jones before they check their mailboxes to see if they have money for shelter, food and medicine.

The falling stock market should remind us that it is better to have a guaranteed monthly check from the

U.S. Treasury. The American people received a big break this year when Congress did not privatize Social Security. We should leave Wall Street gambling to those who can afford to lose.

Americans are depending on us to guarantee Social Security. They need help from people on both sides of the aisle, and I am proud to be here with my colleagues who have a commitment to Social Security and the security of our elderly today and to future Americans.

I thank the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) for his commitment, for his dedication to Social Security, and I look forward to working with the gentleman on those solutions which we know the American people will find their best interests served. So I thank the gentleman. I see our friend the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is here. I am glad we are all working on this issue.

Mr. POMEROY. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Cleveland for his very vigilant efforts in this regard. Clearly if you watch what in particular the Republican Presidential candidates are talking about, in the event any of them would end up in the White House, the privatization programs will be before this Congress that fast. So your working your vigilance will be an important matter ongoing.

Clearly there are those that would like to actually end Social Security as we know it, as a Federal program of all of us protecting each of us, diminish the Federal role and allocate it out into the private sector somehow in a way that would only significantly increase the risk on the individuals, individuals, again, as we have said, two-thirds of which get 70 percent or better of their income from the program, and one-third wholly dependent upon it. So the stakes are very high. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership.

I yield now, Madam Speaker, to the gentleman from Maine, Mr. Allen.

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) for his leadership and his knowledge on this particular issue. It is good to be here tonight to have a chance to bring some common sense and some realistic discussion into a debate that is now going onto the airwaves in this country.

I want to start by trying to really talk about a couple of things that you hear all the time but really are not true. When I talk to young people in my district back in Maine, particularly high school students, I ask them, how many of you think that Social Security will be there for you? And very few, if any, hands go up in the room. They think that, somehow, Social Security is going away. But the truth is that as long as people in this country are working, Social Security will be there. There will always be Social Security revenues coming in, as they do now, that are turned around and going out to pay benefits to people who need them.

The problem is that in 2034, the Social Security authority runs out, the solvency of the system runs out, unless we make some changes, and then there really will not be the authority to pay out funds at that point in time. But even in the worst of all possible worlds, where this Congress did not meet its responsibility to make appropriate changes, benefits would be three-quarters of what they are today. The system does not just disappear and go away. What you would have is a reduced level of benefits.

Social Security will be there, but it will never be a retirement system. It is a social insurance system. It is meant to protect people from the worst kinds of poverty, and, in that regard, it is probably the most successful program in this country's history.

But what we have to do as Members of Congress, as elected officials, is to make sure that the benefits are not reduced, that we figure out a way to cover people so that they will have the security in the future that they have today.

The second topic I want to mention is all this talk about raiding the Social Security surplus. In fact, there are Republican ads out there on air waves in this country accusing Democrats of theft, people coming in in the dark of night to steal hard-earned Social Security dollars.

No one, and I say this about my Republican colleagues as well as Democrats, no one is raiding the Social Security surplus. No one is stealing that money and taking it away so it will not be available for benefits.

What is happening is this: The Treasury is borrowing the Social Security surplus, promising to pay back to the Social Security trust fund interest on the money that is borrowed. If the U.S. Treasury will not pay back its money to the Social Security trust fund, no one will. The Treasury has always done that. Social Security benefits have always been paid to beneficiaries.

What is going on here? What is going on here is politics, the politics of a kind that is really very disturbing, because the benefits that people get from Social Security are not at risk in this debate. The long-term solvency of Social Security is not at risk in this debate. What is going on has really a lot to do with politics, partisan positioning.

The Washington Post the other day had an editorial headlined "Fake Debate." What they were talking about was all this controversy about raiding the Social Security surplus. It is a diversion.

We have a problem, we have a serious problem, but it is a manageable problem, and it has very little to do with raiding. It is all about how we deal with the long-term consequences of this plan.

As I said, Republicans are running TV ads accusing Democrats of theft. Democrats are rightfully saying, "you are saying you are not borrowing the

Social Security surplus, but in fact you have already done that to the tune of \$13 billion, and before we are done here, probably some more will be 'borrowed,'" but it does not put benefits at risk or the long-term health of the system at risk.

It is important. It is important that if we borrow, if we wind up borrowing at all, and, as I say, the Republican appropriations bills have already borrowed \$13 billion, that ought to be kept to a minimum. Why? Because there is one thing we need to do in this country. We need to pay down the national debt. The most important thing we can do for the long-term solvency of Social Security is pay down the national debt, so that this country is stronger economically, better able to pay Social Security benefits when the baby-boomers retire, and that is what we are doing.

From 1980 to the present there are only 3 years when any debt from any of the national debt has been paid down with the Social Security surplus, only 3 years: The year we are going into, we can already project that; the year we are going into, fiscal year 2000 we expect to pay down the national debt by about \$124 billion; the year we are in, the year 1999 is about \$124 billion of paying down the national debt with the Social Security surplus; last year, 1998, paying down the national debt by about \$98 billion.

This is unprecedented in these two decades. We are doing well. We are getting our fiscal house in order. Democrats are leading the way. What we have been able to do is assert some fiscal discipline and do it in a way that will benefit the Social Security system in the long term.

But it is not enough. As the gentleman from North Dakota has pointed out on many occasions, in 2034 this system becomes insolvent, so we need to make changes now that will extend the life of the system beyond that date.

I applaud the President for the plan that he has announced, because it is a way of extending the solvency of the system to 2050. By contrast, the folks on the other side of the aisle have not come up with a proposal that I am aware of that would extend the life of the Social Security system by one day, not one day, and all the charts and all the exhibits and all this talk about raiding the Social Security system has nothing to do at all with extending the life of the system and making sure that it will be there for baby-boomers when they retire, when their needs are the same as seniors today.

That is why it is a little bit discouraging to hear some of the things we have heard, both on TV ads and on the floor of this body over the last few weeks, because, frankly, if we are not dealing with the facts, if we are not being honest with each other, if we are making allegations that are simply untrue, it is the people of this country who lose.

There is no question that we Democrats created Social Security, extended

Social Security, protected Social Security and will fight for Social Security as long as we are here. There is no question about that. What we need to do is make sure that that basic commitment is not undermined by wild allegations that have no basis in fact. That is what I am disturbed to say I am hearing from the other side of the aisle this day.

But I believe, more than anything, that the commitment to Social Security is so strong that we will protect it, that we will protect it for those who receive it now, that we will protect it for the baby-boom generation, and that we will protect it for those kids back in the high school in Maine who do not really believe it will be there for them. We have a responsibility to do that. But this is a manageable problem, and if we maintain our fiscal discipline, if we pay down the national debt, if we adopt a plan that will extend the life of the Social Security system, it will be there well into the 22d century, not just the 21st.

I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for leading this discussion tonight, and I appreciate all the hard work that he has been doing on this work.

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Speaker, I think the gentleman's contribution to this special order has been significant and reflects his time and effort and expertise in the Social Security issue. I also appreciate the tone, which is measured, which is factual, which gives the other side their due when they are entitled to their due.

I have heard on this floor parties suggest that 100 percent of the economic recovery is due to the fact that some Republicans got elected in 1994 and that everything bad that occurred before then was the fault of Democrat Congresses, notwithstanding Republicans in the White House.

You cannot have it both ways. When there is a Republican in the White House, it is entirely the President that gets the credit, and the Democrat Congress gets the blame if something bad happens. Conversely, when it is a Republican Congress and a Democrat in the White House, it is 100 percent the Congress that has saved the day. The people of this country know better.

□ 2045

They know that this economic recovery, which is literally without precedent, occurred because of a very courageous step taken in 1993, offered as the budget plan of the new president, passed by this Congress on a straight party line vote, that began to tackle the deficits.

In the spirit of bipartisanship, I will give the other side some due for holding down spending, along with Democratic participation, because the balanced budget amendments of 1997 was a bipartisan vote. I was proud to vote for that bill.

We have collectively held down spending, but they have been part of

that effort. So under the deficit reduction plan passed by the Democrats, combined with fiscal restraint of both parties in the years since, we have reversed a course that brought our country to the brink of economic ruin.

Just to cite some statistics, debt to GDP, gross domestic product, in 1980 was 26 percent. What happened in the decade and a half that followed, literally in the 12 years that followed, was complete fiscal irresponsibility. Both parties have plenty to shoulder in terms of blame for that, but that brought us in 1997 to where debt to gross domestic product was 47 percent, fully 20 percent higher than in 1980, just 17 years earlier.

We have made some headway, and today it is 40 percent. We are reversing the trends that have brought us so deeply into debt by those terribly out-of-balance budgets.

What the President has proposed is to capture this surplus generated by social security, preserve it for social security, and pay down debt held by the public. That would bring us in the year 2015 to where borrowing costs were 2 cents on every Federal dollar. Presently we pay interest, and it costs 15 cents on every taxpayer dollar, just interest. By the year 2015, according to the President's plan, that would be down to 2 percent, the lowest debt to GDP since 1917, literally without precedent in modern history.

So this business about having resolved to save social security monies, to apply them to the social security trust fund to pay down the national debt, this has a great deal of importance. But the crux of the President's plan is to basically leverage that savings. If we reduce debt at that rate, by the year 2011 we will be saving every year \$107 billion in interest costs.

Interest achieves nothing. Interest costs achieve nothing by way of strengthening the national defense. They do not improve our schools, they do not reduce taxes. They are just a burden that we have to carry, much as an American family carries their mortgage interest burden or their credit card interest burden. If we can retire debt to this tune, we can save each year \$107 billion.

The President's plan is to take this interest savings and pay it into the social security trust fund, because we know we have a shortfall. That is why we are going to run out of money in the year 2034. But rather than raising social security taxes to address that shortfall or cutting benefits to address that shortfall, or making that retirement age go even higher than it already is, the President would take the money we are no longer spending in interest and divert that into the social security trust fund.

That is the kind of infusion we need from the general fund that will ultimately push the solvency of the program out to 2050, so it covers virtually all of the retirement needs of the baby-boomer generation.

I have been very pleased that in the course of this special order, several of our caucus' leading participants in social security have joined me on the floor. I would like to recognize one other who has just joined me, very recently having completed a hard-fought but very important legislative victory on the Patients' Bill of Rights. I am pleased to have the efforts and attention and support of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) now on the issue of social security.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota, for those kind words.

I can remember when I first came to the Congress. In the Blue Dog Caucus, my good friend, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) came because we had had a terrible disaster in North Dakota. We had had a terrible flood. He came to the Blue Dog Caucus and he talked to us about how badly they needed the money to help repair the damage done by the flood. I remember how hard he fought and how hard he worked for the people of North Dakota.

I appreciate what he is doing here this evening. Mr. Speaker, it shows us what a good man my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota is, when he stands here on this floor this evening and gives credit to the Republicans for the work that they have done to help reduce the debt and help reduce deficit spending, and try to make this country better by being fiscally responsible. It shows us what a charitable man he is.

I have seen those ads they are running against my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota. I was amazed the first time I saw them. I do not see how anyone could publicly accuse my good friend, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) of being a thief. It is amazing to me that anyone would rise to that level or sink to that level. But I tell the Members that just to let them know what a good man this is who is working on this particular issue this evening.

Saving social security is not complicated. First, we stop spending the social security trust fund. We preserve and invest it. But we cannot do that by just claiming to do it. Talk is one thing and action is another. The same people that we hear down here accusing the Democrats of spending the social security trust fund are the same people that said that the Census is an emergency. We have known for 200 years we were going to have to take a Census in the year 2000, but they were going to declare an emergency and use that as a budget gimmick, so we can say we are not spending the social security trust fund.

They have done these things dozens of times in this budget year. It is amazing to me that they would want to do that. It is the responsibility of the ma-

jority party to give us a budget that does not do this.

By definition, the minority party cannot pass legislation. Our Republican colleagues keep talking about spending the social security trust fund. They should know, they have been spending it. But they love to say, well, someone else is doing it. It is not my fault, someone else is doing it. It is almost childlike to hear this. Then they take money and run ads accusing someone of being a thief if they voted for any of these appropriations bills. Let us just blame it on someone else. Do not worry about the consequences. Do not worry about extending the life of the social security trust fund.

Just imagine what would have happened if the President had not vetoed that irresponsible tax bill that they tried to pass.

After we stop spending the social security trust funds, the second thing we have to do is pay off the debt, as my colleagues have also talked about here this evening. We take the on-budget surplus and pay off the debt, and we extend the life of the trust fund.

As my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota, and my colleague, the gentleman from Maine, have already mentioned, then we take this interest that is saved and we have some money to work with, and we can extend the lives of these trust funds. We can save social security and Medicare. It is not that we do not know how to do it, it is having the political will to do it.

We also must not forget that we have got to continue to do the things that sustain this economy and let it continue to grow. If our economy goes in the tank, we are going to be in a lot more trouble with the social security trust fund and all other budget issues than we are right now, so we have to remember that we have to continue to expand our trading markets overseas and all the other things: Educate our children, continue to do research and development, and sustain this economy that has made us the greatest Nation in the history of the world.

It is a pleasure to be on the floor this evening and to compliment my good friend, the gentleman from North Dakota, for the great work he does for the people of North Dakota, for the people of this great country, and the high quality that he brings to this Congress and to this House of Representatives.

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentleman. I thank him deeply for the kind observations that he made about me, and more importantly, for the contribution he has made in terms of talking about the vital nature of the social security program and the importance of the debate before us.

I do not think it is the worst thing that ever happened that the parties find themselves now in an at least rhetorical debate in terms of who can best protect social security. This is good competition. This is good competition. May the best party win in terms of protecting it and preserving it and strengthening it on into the future.

We could be in quite a different matter, where all of this surplus is coming in, and rather than looking at the long-range responsibilities for our country, like the families we represent look after their long-term needs when they might have an unexpected windfall, we need to save this and commit it for the long haul, because as we have talked about, social security is a program that is on the books. It is a vital program, but it is going to run out of money in 2034, and benefits are going to fall 25 percent if we do not take the steps now to strengthen it.

So again, this debate, this little competition we are having in terms of who can best strengthen and protect social security, that is a good competition. One of the things that will make it good is whether or not there is actually any delivery behind all the rhetoric.

I see they are bringing out the charts now, so I guarantee Members in the next hour they are going to get an awful lot of rhetoric about Democrats raiding social security, and all the rest of it. I would expect those listening to what might follow to know that the issue is not the rhetoric, the issue is the performance. Ultimately that can only be measured by one thing. That trust fund, the trust fund that is going to go bust in 2030, is it preserved and strengthened? Is that trust fund date pushed back, or is it not?

We have advanced a plan that would measure the interest savings to the Federal Government by paying down the national debt due to these social security revenues. We would then take that savings reflected in general fund dollars and put it into the social security trust fund.

Again, the social security trust fund does not have enough money, so there are three things we can do to strengthen the program long-term. We can raise taxes. I do not think we should do that. We can cut benefits, stop the COLAS, raise the retirement age. I do not think we should do that. Or we can interject additional general funds. That I think we have to do, because the other two alternatives are simply unacceptable.

So let us have that general fund contribution make sense. If we consider the fact that this debt buy-down that saves these interest charges of the Federal Government is directly attributable to social security in the first place, that, Mr. Speaker, is a very good program for shoring up this program over the long haul.

I used to be an insurance commissioner. For 8 years I regulated insurance in North Dakota. That meant that I looked at a lot of phony pitches, put a lot of insurance agents out of business if they were lying about what they were selling, and I fined the heck out of a lot of companies, while I was at it.

I would just say that the efforts underway, the rhetorical efforts of the majority to pose as defenders of social security, would certainly not pass any ethical tests that are presently appli-

cable to the sale of insurance in this country. I have put people out of business for charges that were as false as what they are saying about what the Democrats are doing relative to social security.

Let me just sum up by emphasizing the core points. We are operating under the budget passed by the majority. The appropriations bills have been passed by the majority. The Congressional Budget Office asserts that the majority, who is paying these ads to run in North Dakota and other places accusing Democrats of raiding the social security trust fund somehow, that they have already spent into that trust fund, those revenues, from the cash flow on social security to the tune of \$14 billion and going up.

□ 2100

So let us put aside the smoke and the tired political rhetoric and look for bipartisan ways to lengthen the life of the trust fund. Nothing else cuts it. It is only looking at who is extending the life of the trust fund by which voters in the American public can determine who has been advancing the interest of this final program.

SAVING THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on the left for their interesting perspective. Perhaps the reason we hear such ferocity and denial is because, as former President Reagan used to say, facts are stubborn things.

I am joined this evening on the floor by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a member of the Committee on Appropriations, who represents Savannah and its environs.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), I think maybe it would be a very beneficial thing, maybe, tomorrow night or the next time that we do actually have interaction in a debate, particularly about the spending situation that we are in.

I find it, for example, atrocious that the party of the gentleman from North Dakota last year mischaracterized the statement intentionally of Newt Gingrich about Medicare. I find that absolutely appalling. The distinguished gentleman from North Dakota, to my knowledge, did not do that. I would have talked to him about it if he did.

The other day on the House floor, a 1984 statement of "Candidate Dick Armey" was paraded out here saying "Majority Leader Dick Armey," which he was not the majority leader in 1984. So on a lot of this rhetorical terrorism,

I am with the gentleman from North Dakota and would certainly like to have a one-on-one discussion, a party-to-party discussion.

What I am very concerned about is we have the President who vetoed the Commerce-State-Justice bill tonight because he wants to put more money into the U.N. He vetoed foreign aid because he wants to increase foreign aid. As I listened to the statements of the gentleman from North Dakota tonight, his group statement, as I understand, we seem to have agreement that there is no more money out there except to reduce spending or spend it smarter.

So if we are all in agreement, although I do have a quote here from the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) that I am very concerned about that he said yesterday, not 1984, and not about the health care financing administration or anything like that; but the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) yesterday was making a statement on one of the Sunday talk shows about we should spend a little bit of Social Security. I am concerned about that.

But the point really is that we are in this budget debate. If we all agree, and we did agree last week on the House floor, a vote of 419 to 0, that we would not increase taxes. We did agree we were not even going to take it out of Social Security. There is no more surplus out there. Then we all need to say is, okay, where do we take the money out of if we do go along with the President and wanting to spend more money on foreign aid?

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief response to the thoughts of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON)?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I think an ongoing dialogue, I would be happy to have one on the floor of the House in the context of special orders, would be beneficial. I would like the topics to include the short-term and longer-term framework for the program.

Right now I think it can actually get tripped up in what amounts to kind of blurring accounting-like arguments to the American public. I think we have to discuss the long-term solvency of the program, even as we deal with the appropriations challenge that faces Congress.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Arizona will yield, I agree with that. Some Members who join the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) tonight, for example, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), was saying he is against investment of the funds. Well, that was the President of the United States, not necessarily the position of the Democrat House Members, but that was the President of the United States who was saying that, and only this weekend backed off on that under the rhetorical category we need to clarify where that was coming from.

Another Member, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), said there has not been a bill introduced. I do not know what he would call the Archer-Shaw bill, which one of the other Members who was here tonight actually brought up himself, that that does address, I think, 75 years of Social Security solvency.

Frankly, it is a very intellectual accountant-type approach to this. It is a very complex problem. It is a complex solution. But that might be something that my colleagues choose to talk about, too, that we could throw on the table because I am not necessarily on that bill myself. I do not know that the gentleman from North Carolina signed off on it. But it has a vision, and it has some seriousness to it. It is well worth deciding.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, if I might make a final point, like I say, I think if the parties are in genuine competition in terms of which party best defends and strengthens Social Security, the American people win and win big.

What we need to check each other on, I think, is whether there is legitimacy, factual legitimacy in the claims that we are making as we purport to strengthen Social Security. I would just say the bottom line for me is, do we preserve and lengthen the trust fund or do we not? Really, that has to be a key kept in our discussions even as we go forward in the last week of session.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, one thing that is so important to Social Security is that the actions of this Congress in the next 4 to 5 days as we try to wrap up the appropriations process, if we agree that there is no more money out there in terms of an operating surplus, except from Social Security, and we all agree we do not want to take that money, then we have to go back to the very hard work.

I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I can promise my colleagues there has been a lot of cooperation on both sides of the aisle to try to spend the money wisely. It is extremely difficult to try to fund all the things we mutually agree on, education, health care, senior programs, environmental programs. Then, discouragingly enough, we have this bipartisan agreement signed by both parties, a lot of fanfare in 1997; and yet it cannot be supported on a one-partisan basis. It has got to be bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) yielding to me, and I look forward to continuing this dialogue.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), for spending some time here.

I would, Mr. Speaker, call attention to the statement that appeared on the wires of the Associated Press on Octo-

ber 20, less than 1 week ago, of this year, and I would encourage, Mr. Speaker, those who may be viewing these proceedings through other matters perhaps might want to take a look at the easel in the well of the House.

I will quote from the document right now: "Privately, some Democrats say a final budget deal that uses some of the pension program surpluses would be a political victory for them."

Mr. Speaker, let me simply say that I think, if we, in fact, end up, at the insistence of the President of the United States, raiding the Social Security Trust Fund to spend more and more money, while some in this chamber might consider that a political victory, Mr. Speaker, I must tell my colleagues that would be a defeat for all the American people.

My friends on the left seem to be fixated on a historical argument; and it is simple, Mr. Speaker, to fall into the category of who shot John or who created the program. But I would submit to this chamber, Mr. Speaker, the question before us at this time in this place is not a question of who created Social Security. The question becomes who stands four-square for strengthening and preserving Social Security.

I would recall, just a few months ago, 9 months to be exact, the President of the United States came to this chamber, stood at that podium and offered a budget plan that was very curious, because the President in his remarks, Mr. Speaker, said that he wanted to save 62 percent of the Social Security surplus for Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I may not be the greatest mathematician, but what is left unsaid or what was not explicitly stated in the President's remarks during that State of the Union message was that he felt perfectly fine spending an additional 38 percent of the Social Security surplus on more government programs. Indeed, in that 70-plus-minute address, he outlined some 80 new initiatives in government spending.

That, Mr. Speaker, brings to the floor and brings to the consciousness of the American body politic the fundamental debate. If one believes that one's money is better spent by Washington bureaucrats, if one believes that Washington ought to control more and more of the money one earns, if one believes that Washington and this vast bureaucracy that has grown over the last century is the be-all, end-all to solving one's problems at home, well, then, one perhaps would concur in that analysis.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must tell my colleagues what I have heard time and again is exactly the opposite. Indeed, as Members of the new majority, we came here to change the way Washington works. Once again, facts are stubborn things.

The gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) championed the actions of 1993 and 1994. Need I remind this House, Mr. Speaker, that in the previous majority, there was a one-vote

margin to enact the largest tax increase in American history? Again, facts are stubborn things. Included in that tax increase was an increase in taxation on Social Security recipients.

So even as our friends tonight come to this floor and say they do not believe in raising taxes, recent history and their own rhetoric tonight suggests otherwise.

Indeed, the minority leader and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) appeared yesterday on ABC's This Week. Mr. Speaker, I am aware that a lot of Americans were at church yesterday or enjoying time with their families and may not have seen this public affairs telecast, but let me quote what the House Minority Leader said: "We really ought to spend as little of it," meaning the Social Security surplus. "We really ought to try to spend as little of it as possible."

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) who presumes and boasts that he believes he will become Speaker of the House in the 107th Congress, that is not good enough for the American people.

From day one of my service in this institution, in enumerable town hall meetings across the width and breadth of the 6th Congressional District of Arizona, an area in square mileage almost the size of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, now because of massive growth approaching almost 1 million residents, as next year's census will accurately reflect through a legitimate count of each and every citizen, what I have heard time and again from my constituents is that we need to stop the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund.

The good news is, Mr. Speaker, we have taken steps in that direction. I do not blame the American people for being skeptical. I can understand, indeed, how sometimes, Mr. Speaker, that skepticism gives way to cynicism.

But, again, facts are stubborn things. In the midst of the hue and cry and the Sturm und Drang and the agenda setting function of our friends in the fourth estate, commonly known as the media, perhaps more accurately reflected as the partisan press, came a story in the last 10 days that was, quite frankly, ignored.

I am pleased to have this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, in this chamber to commend the collective attention of this House, my colleagues, and the American people to the findings of the Congressional Budget Office. Because again, facts are stubborn things.

What the Congressional Budget Office discovered in counting receipts and outlays for fiscal year 1999 is that, for the first time since 1960, when President Eisenhower, that great and good man, was ensconced in the executive mansion at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, for the first time since 1960, this Congress balanced the budget, generated a surplus of \$1 billion, and did not touch one red cent of the Social Security funds to go for those expenditures.

Having made that progress, amidst the skepticism and the doubt and the cynicism, dare we retreat? The easiest thing for Washington to do is reflected sadly in the remarks of the minority leader yesterday, the man who would be Speaker, to hear, sadly, his political boasts, is again a predilection toward spending.

□ 2115

Rather than joining with us, to say, Mr. Speaker, no means no, hands off the Social Security trust funds, our friend from Missouri, the minority leader, says, "Well, we really ought to try to spend as little of it as possible."

I thought it ironic to hear my good friend from Arkansas, in extolling the virtue of my other friend from North Dakota, speak of emergency spending on one hand, about the floods that devastated the upper Midwest 2 years ago, and somehow imply that emergency spending for the same type of environmental horrors and acts of nature that have befallen other Americans somehow does not count in the current budgetary scheme of things.

There will always be emergencies. And to those who try to muddy the waters with talk of the Census, I would simply remind this House, Mr. Speaker, that it was this Director of the Census and this administration that wanted to willfully ignore a Supreme Court ruling that stipulated that we ought to actually uphold the Constitution, a unique concept, where the Constitution calls for the actual enumeration of American citizens. And, indeed, the designation of so-called emergency spending came from the fact that we had bureaucratic inertia in action and downright hostility to our supreme tribunal's assessment that the Constitution means what it says. But then again, sadly, that is nothing new.

I am so pleased to be joined on the floor by two very capable colleagues, my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), who joined me here in the 104th Congress in the change in majority status and governing status to our party; and in the well of the House by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), who, in her short time here, elected in a special election in the tragedy of the death of our friend and colleague Steve Schiff, has come to this House and proven an effective and capable public servant with an incredible breadth of experience both in the military and in the pursuit of higher education.

And I would gladly yield to my good friend from New Mexico.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona. I listened with interest to the discussion this evening, and to the comments of my colleague from North Dakota, many of which I agree with, we do need to look at Social Security over the long term. We also need to begin to draw the line in the sand this year, because we have the opportunity to do that for the first time this year.

I wanted to call my colleagues' attention to a chart that was actually prepared by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), because I thought it was a good chart to explain where we are to folks who are interested in watching this nationally. We have had deficit spending in this country for 30 years, until last year. And the reason that we do not have deficit spending now is really a combination of things. One is a very strong economy. But there also must be a will in Washington, and it starts in this House, because all of the spending bills start here, to control Federal Government spending. A commitment to balance the budget in the same way that all of us at home have to balance our own checkbooks. It is that responsible approach to government spending that we are now close to completing here in Washington for the next fiscal year.

I want to commend the President of the United States tonight for signing the defense bill. That defense bill turns the corner in restoring our national security. It includes a 4.8 percent pay raise for those on active duty. It will start the process of recruiting and retaining high quality military personnel. It will mean that we will begin replacing all of those spare parts that have been lost in expeditions overseas. We need to restore our national defense, and the defense appropriations bill begins to do that, and I want to commend the President for having signed it today.

There are other bills that we still have not completed action on, and we will do so and sit down with the President and his advisers and work through each of these bills to make sure that we have a series of spending bills that adds up to no more than \$592 billion, which is the total amount we have in the checking account for the next year. We have set aside another \$115 billion or so that is Social Security money. That is the money we are putting in the IRA this year for our retirement.

Every family knows that if they took the money they were supposed to put in their individual retirement account or that was supposed to be in their pension fund and they spent it this year, it would not be there when they retired. So we are making the commitment this year, because we finally are within shooting distance of being able to meet that commitment; to not touch retirement, we are not going to raise taxes, we are going to balance the budget, and we are going to emphasize education and national security. And within that context, I think we can come up with a very good budget blueprint.

And I thank the gentleman for his time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico who, once again, points out that while there are all sorts of arcane notions and green eyeshades that one can apply to this, there is a very real human equation that comes to balancing the budget. And there is no

mystery, because what goes on around the kitchen table for every American family is the basic essence of what we are trying to come to grips with here in Washington, D.C. And if it is good enough for the American family, it should be good enough for the Washington bureaucrats.

With that, let me yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and the gentlewoman for joining us tonight to talk about our budget priorities.

The gentleman from Arizona knows as well as I do what it was like coming here in the class of 1994. We were looking at, as my colleague will recall, the Congressional Budget Office told us in the spring of that year, when the President submitted his first budget in 1995 for us as Members of Congress, they told us that we could expect to see \$250 billion deficits well into the next century. And that was under the President's proposal.

And basically what we said, as new Members of Congress, was that that was not acceptable; the idea that the Federal Government had to continue to spend more money than it took in, especially in good years. Now, we might understand, maybe we could make an excuse once in a while if there was a serious recession or a depression or a war, but in times of peace and prosperity, we just could not accept the idea that the Federal Government should continue to borrow more than it takes in year after year after year.

And the scary result of this, and this is where it gets down to what the gentleman was talking about in terms of what is going to happen to the kids, it really meant that if we continued to borrow \$250 billion, what the Congressional Budget Office and others said was that if Congress did not get serious about finally balancing the budget, what was going to happen was we were going to virtually guaranty our kids were going to have a lower standard of living. In fact, they told us that by the time our kids that are in junior high and high school today, by the time they reached my age, and I was born in 1951, they were going to be paying a tax rate of between 75 and 80 percent just to pay the interest on the national debt.

Now, think about that. We were literally guaranteeing that our kids were going to have a much lower standard of living, because they would not have been able to buy a car, they would not be able to buy a house, because the tax system was going to take virtually everything they earned just to pay the interest on the national debt. We had reached a point where we had not begun to slow down this spending machine.

And I want to talk a little about what we did as a member of the Committee on the Budget. And, frankly, we as Republicans are not very good sometimes for taking credit for what we have accomplished, but a lot of things

have changed in this city. One of the most important was that there was sort of an assumption around this city that every year Federal spending would go up by 2, or 3, or maybe even 4 times whatever the inflation rate was. I can remember when the Federal budget was growing at 8, 9, 10 percent. Well, we changed that. And what we did is we dramatically slowed the rate of growth in Federal spending.

In fact, I think one of the most amazing statistics is this, and I will repeat it so our colleagues who may be watching in their offices do not miss this point. This year, for the first-time I think in my adult lifetime, not only have we now balanced the budget in fiscal year 1999, without taking money from Social Security, which I think is an amazing accomplishment, because that has not happened since Dwight Eisenhower was President and Elvis was getting out of the Army, 40 years ago, that is the first time that has happened, but an even more amazing statistic is that this year the Federal budget is going to grow at slightly more than 3 percent.

That is an amazing thing. But what is even more amazing is when we realize that the average family budget this year will grow by about 3½ percent. So, again, for the first time I think in my adult lifetime we have created a situation where the average family budget is growing at a faster rate than the Federal budget. And that is part of the reason that the budget is balanced today.

Because I think people on Main Street and Wall Street began to realize that this Congress is serious about reforming welfare, of downsizing some of the Federal programs, of limiting the growth in total Federal spending, of limiting entitlements, and all of a sudden they said, if these guys are serious, real interest rates are coming down, and they did. And they said, if they are really serious and real interest rates come down, it means that more families will be able to afford a house, and a car, and maybe a dishwasher and other things, and the economy will be stronger. And it last has been.

As a result, we have had revenues coming in. In fact, the gentleman may remember, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, when we talked about let us lower the capital gains tax rate by 30 percent. Let us take it from the maximum rate of 28 to 20 percent. Oh, some off friends on the left said that if we did that, that that was a tax cut for the rich and we would deprive the Federal government of all of this revenue. It is a tax cut for the rich, they said, which will blow a hole in the budget. That was their term. Does the gentleman remember that and what happened?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Well, of course, when we reduced the capital gains top rate, we actually saw that far from being in the catchy-chism of the left, a tax cut for the rich, what we did was empowered American citizens to take

that money and invest it in new opportunities, in greater job growth, in new homes, and to use more of their hard-earned money the way they see fit instead of having Washington spend it. And the bottom line is this. In that whole method of scoring that the Federal Government utilizes, in stark contrast to the theoreticians who said it would be a drain on government revenue, we saw reaffirmed the basic principle that when the American people hang on to more of their hard-earned money, tax receipts to the Federal Government actually increase.

More revenue comes to the government because more economic opportunity is empowered to take place. And that is what we have seen in reducing the top rate on capital gains taxes, because it freed up capital that otherwise would have remained dormant or would have gone into the coffers of the Washington bureaucrats.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Well, it comes down to a very simple point, Americans know how to spend their money a lot smarter than we know how to spend it on their behalf. They get a full dollar's worth of value for every dollar they spend. We do not. We know that, and there has been study after study to show that.

But we have made all this progress and a lot of people still do not believe it. I go out to my town hall meetings, and when I start talking about the fact that we finally have balanced the budget without using Social Security, I can almost feel the skepticism in their eyes. At one of my town hall meetings I said, "You know what, I understand why you would not believe this." For 40 years, the American people have, in effect, been misled about what government can do and that borrowing is good and all of that. And they almost now believe that deficit spending at the Federal level is preordained; that it has to happen. So it will take some time before the American people start to really realize we are serious about balancing the budget; that we have balanced the budget without using Social Security, and, like crossing the Rubicon, we are not going to go back. We have made it very clear to our friends on the left here in Congress and to the people down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue that we are not going to go back and raid Social Security. We are not going to balance the budget by raising taxes.

And I might just add, we should make it very clear to the President that we are not going to let him shut down the government either. None of that has to happen. There is more than enough money in this budget. I think at the end of the day we will end up spending about \$754 billion. The Congressional Budget Office has said, if we limit the total Federal spending to \$1754 billion, we will balance the budget without taking a penny of Social Security and we will not have to raise taxes, and we will not have to shut down the government.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And that is a lot of money. \$1.754 trillion, almost \$2 trillion. The amount is astronomical. And the irony is, as my friend from Minnesota knows and, Mr. Speaker, we need to amplify again in this chamber this evening, as we are going through the appropriations process, trying to live within some fairly expansive means, \$1.750 trillion, the President of the United States chose to veto a foreign aid bill because he wants to spend an additional \$4 billion on non-Americans.

□ 2130

Now, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I find it ironic that the current President and the Vice President campaigned in 1992 on the slogan "putting people first." I thought the slogan implied putting the American people first. But, apparently, given trips to a variety of different continents and promises that really spawned cynicism, such as wiring schools on other continents for the Internet, using American tax dollars, let me just say while I am in the neighborhood on this, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly invite the President to the 6th Congressional District of Arizona.

I can take him to any number of rural schools and schools on the reservations for which this administration added not one red penny in terms of impact to aid funds where the Constitution and treaty law stipulates that there is a clear, unequivocal role in the Federal level in educating the Indian children, in educating the children of military dependents, and yet to have those funds cut and still the promise of largess to non-Americans.

The bottom line is and the shock is that the President vetoed the foreign aid bill, saying that he wanted to increase that spending by 30 percent, by \$4 billion. And the question becomes, Mr. Speaker, where can the President get that money? And under the current parameters, there is only one place he can go. You guessed it, the Social Security Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I reject that sad and cynical notion that cannot help but breed the skepticism and cynicism. That money belongs to the American people. They paid it into that trust fund. It should not be spent on tin horn dictators or on utopian designs.

And then tonight, even as we welcome the news, and let us give credit where credit is due, I am so glad the President of the United States signed the defense appropriations, which contains a long overdue pay raise for America's men and women in uniform, 12,000 of whom had to apply for food stamps for their children in a sorry spectacle to make ends meet. I welcome the fact the President signed that bill.

But even as that has happened, there has been a veto or, we understand, the pending veto of the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill. Because,

again, the President apparently thinks American money should not go to the American people or to programs for them. He would rather spend them on utopian designs that threaten our sovereignty in the United Nations.

Let me suggest to this body, Mr. Speaker, and to the President of the United States that America's dues have been paid in full many times over, including in the latest adventure in the Balkans, not paid for when our Commander in Chief put American men and women and pilots in harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, someone has to be the adult here. "No" means "no" to adventurism and overspending. This common sense conservative Congress has held the line in that regard. And we invite the President, who, as we read the pundits and the prognosticators say that he is in search of a legacy, he joined us. It took three times for him to join with us on welfare reform, but we are certainly happy to share credit. Because, after all, in our constitutional Republic, when we pass legislation, we need the President's signature. He joined us on that.

How truly ground breaking it would be, Mr. Speaker, if the President were to accept the invitation of the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who stood at that podium leaving the Speaker's rostrum the day he was sworn in as the Speaker in the 106th Congress and said to the American people, Mr. Speaker, we have reserved H.R. 1 for the President's plan to save Social Security.

I heard my friends on the left in the preceding hour somehow forget about that, apparently. The invitation is still there. And we heard the President make some statements this weekend. As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I know my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), with his background on the Committee on the Budget, we would welcome the President at long last putting into legislative language what it is he, in fact, proposes to do. I am sure that the Committee on Ways and Means and the other appropriate committees of jurisdiction will hold hearings and will examine that. But there is just one other thing that happens that adds to the cynicism that we need to point out.

Aside from some budget messages that are required by law, the last legislative initiative sent to this chamber from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue came before my friend and I were in the Congress. It was a plan to socialize our health care. That is the last policy initiative that has come from this administration in legislative language.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, we invite the President to put his designs on paper in legislative language in H.R. 1. As our Speaker has said, certainly a man of honor, certainly a man of his word, that proposal will receive all due consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to come back to something my colleague talked about in terms of one of the things that frustrated me about some of the comments of our friends on the left. They are saying, well, yes, sure, the Republicans are balancing the budget; but they are going to use some gimmicks.

Well, in truth, I wish we did not have to do that. But let me explain some of the things we are thinking about doing. One is a 1.29 percent cut across the board in only discretionary spending. In other words, it will not affect Social Security, will not affect Medicare, will not affect the entitlement side of the budget, only in discretionary spending, 1.29 percent.

Now, I know some of our friends say that, no, these agencies cannot absorb a 1.29 percent across-the-board cut in their agencies. But let me just tell them this. I represent a lot of farmers. Now, when we tell them that a Federal agency cannot tighten its belt slightly over 1 percent, they do not even laugh because they are tightening their belts to the tune of 20, 30, and even 40 percent. So, I mean, do not tell me that the Federal agencies do not have 1 percent worth of fat in their budgets. That is outrageous. So that is one of the gimmicks they do not like.

Another thing that we are thinking about doing is moving back one pay day, I think from the 30th of the month to the first of the month, to move us into the next fiscal year.

Now, do I wish we were not going to do that? Absolutely. But if the choice is between those two things and stealing from Social Security, that is not even a close call. But let me explain and what makes me so angry about this and what we have been up against in the last several years.

The gentleman mentioned military adventures. This administration has sent troops to more places in this world in the last 7 years than the last five Presidents put together. In fact, the little adventure in the Balkans, in Bosnia and Kosovo have already cost us over \$16 billion.

Now, historians also have to judge whether or not it has been worth it. But let us at least be honest with ourselves and compare that little adventure with what happened in the Gulf. Former President Bush went to all of our allies and said, listen, we have got a problem with Saddam Hussein. It is a big problem. It is a world problem; and if he is allowed to take over Kuwait and the oil fields, he is going to be even a bigger problem for everybody in the world.

So we went to our Japanese allies and said, if you cannot send troops, will you send cash? And they did. And he went to some of our other allies around the world and they all ponied up. And at the end of the day, the war in the Gulf cost us almost nothing. It cost the taxpayers of the United States almost nothing.

Compare that to what has happened in Kosovo. I will never forget we had a

meeting when I first came here with the German foreign minister and the whole thing in Bosnia was starting to boil up, and I remember what the foreign minister told us. He said, at the end of the day, this is a European problem, and it should be solved by the Europeans. And I said, amen.

But it was not long before it was obvious that the Europeans could not solve it. But do you know what at least they could do, because the economy of the European Union is now bigger than the economy of the United States, and yet we are supposed to carry 90 percent of the burden of the war in the Balkans? There is something wrong with that policy. I am not sure if there was even an attempt by this administration to go in and say, listen, we will help to solve the military problem there, we will provide the technology, we will provide the aircraft, we will provide the smart bombs, we will provide what it takes. But it would be nice if you guys would help provide some of the cash. But they did not.

So what happened was the American taxpayers and Congress had to go out and help find the money, \$16 billion.

Well, we have done some juggling and we have taken from here and we have taken from that and we reshuffled the numbers. Because we always kept our eye on the ball. The idea is to reduce the rate of growth in Federal spending to allow the American people to keep more of what they earned and let the economy grow and everything will take care of itself. That is what we have done.

But the President, as my colleague from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) says, has not really been there to help us solve some of these problems. Now, we need his help right now. We have made it very clear that we want to work with the White House, but we said certain things are off the table.

Last week we had a vote on taxes because the President said, at least behind closed doors, well, part of the problem could be solved if we just raised some taxes and some fees and raised cigarette taxes; and there was a proposal from the White House. It said, you know, in the budget message here are some taxes and fees you could raise. So last week the Congressional leaders brought it to a vote. And how many votes did it get?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report the outcome of that vote, again something that, sadly, many of our friends in the media chose not to emphasize in their reportage of the events here on Capitol Hill. And I am grateful for the time tonight.

In answering the question of my friend, the President's plan to increase taxes, as detailed in his budget message, received no votes. The vote was 419 to 0 to reject the President's plan for revenue, which his economic advisor, Gene Sperling, on many national television shows in many messages to this Congress said was part and parcel of the tough choices needed to solve

our budgetary dilemma. And yet not one Member of the minority, even those who spoke so glowingly of the largest tax increase in American history, not one of them voted for that package of new taxes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, so what we have said unanimously everybody in the House said we are not going to raise taxes to balance the budget. That is unanimous. Everybody said that, Republicans, Democrats. And we have one independent. He voted no, as well. All of us said we are not going to raise taxes.

Now, I think there is almost unanimous feeling here in the House, we are not going to raid Social Security. All right, once we have decided that and we have taken those two things off the table, we come back to the last conclusion. At some point we are going to have to make some adjustments, we are going to have to do an across-the-board cut, or we are going to have to do whatever it takes to make certain that we live with \$1754 billion. Okay?

Now, that is where we are. We are not going to raid Social Security. We already decided unanimously we are not going to raise taxes. So, Mr. President, please work with us. If one message should be coming from the Congress down to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, please sit down and work with us. We want to work this out and we are not going to let you shut down the Government.

There is absolutely no need this year for a Government shutdown. Almost half the bills have now have been signed by the President. There are only a couple of them left outstanding that I think where there are serious differences of opinion. And that is part of the process. We should have differences of opinion. The President has some priorities. The Senate has some priorities. I have some priorities. You have some priorities. At the end the day, you work those out. Those can all be worked out. But you have to first agree how big the pie is going to be and how big the parameters of the debate are.

We are not going to raid Social Security. We are not going to raise taxes. We are not going to let the President shut down the Government if we can at all stop it. Everything else is negotiable.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for his comments. I think he has succinctly and forthrightly expressed the sentiment of the majority in the House.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would implore our chief executive to understand that there are different priorities, but one legacy he dare not be tempted by would be the notion of a political stunt to shut down this Government with all the challenges we face. Because in stark contrast to times gone by, certainly one as adroit and skilled in politics knows that going to the well once too often can result in the wrong type of legacy.

I wanted to pick up on a comment my friend made earlier. The gentleman

from Minnesota is quite right, what we are proposing and what we will bring to the floor in short order is an effort to trim the waste, fraud, and abuse that has run rampant throughout our system. We have been stunned by the examples.

My colleagues are familiar with the \$8.5 million in food stamps sent to 26,000 people who had died; 26,000 decedents receiving \$8.5 million in food stamps; the \$75,000 in Social Security insurance payments that went to death-row inmates.

I can recall when I first got here and perhaps my friend in his days and service on the Committee on the Budget, when I first came to Congress in the 104th Congress I was honored to serve on the Committee on Resources. Government always gives a fancy name to different jobs. What we call an accountant in the private sector is called an Inspector General, Washington D.C.

□ 2145

So, the Inspector General from the Interior Department had come down and was seated alongside the director at that time of the National Park Service, and, Mr. Speaker, you will be amazed even today to hear this story because time cannot erase or dilute its irony and its shame. The accountant for the Interior Department, the National Park Service, said the Park Service could not account for over \$70 million in tax money appropriated and spent by the Park Service.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that had happened in the private sector, some folks would have found themselves with new accommodations based on the fact that they would be in violation of criminal law. As it stood at that point in time and sadly still stands, the director of the Park Service at that time was subject to a tongue lashing that appeared on tape-delay fashion on C-Span, and that was it.

Now I tried to work with my colleagues, mindful of the fact that the Committee on Ways and Means has unique interaction with the Committee on the Budget as we look at budget reform to find a way to weed out those culprits administratively wasting and abusing the money of the American people, American tax dollars; and believe me, there is no way that eliminating and reducing by a little over 1 percent can jeopardize programs especially when we make sure, and this is something else that the American people need to hear because of the smear and fear tactics so often we see in this chamber, and sadly elsewhere around this town and in the partisan press, not one penny of those reductions will come from mandatory spending, spending that goes to the truly needy, those who expect it. It will not come out of food stamps, it will not come out of Social Security, it will not come out of veterans' pensions, it will not come out of Medicaid. We will protect those programs for the truly needy. But for the truly greedy, those in this town who

fail to account for the people's money, those in this town who would use that money for their own personal comfort and be less than good stewards of the taxpayers' dollars, Mr. Speaker, they need to be put on notice that there will be a change.

Now, we can expect the hue and cry given the culture of this town and the atmospherics at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, but, Mr. Speaker, I must tell you this. Whether it is a farmer in Minnesota or a rancher in Arizona or an American family around the kitchen table trying to make decisions on its own spending priorities, Americans instinctively know that this bloated bureaucracy can get by on 1 percent less if it means we restore the sanctity and preserve the sanctity proven this fiscal year in keeping our hands off the Social Security Trust Fund.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. You mentioned something about the waste and mismanagement, and you earlier talked about foreign aid.

One of the most outrageous examples that we heard about in the last month or so was that there are reports, and I think fairly well documented reports now, that of the foreign aid and the IMF money that went to Russia we believe as much as 10 billion, that is with a "B," billion dollars, has been looted by the former KGB agents who now run the Mafia in Russia. In fact, much of that money has been laundered through New York banks.

In fact to make it more interesting, just a couple of weeks ago there was several people finally to at least some credit of this Justice Department, or at least some enterprising people working out in New York, that were actually indicted. So during the same week in which we now have growing confirmation that billions of dollars in foreign aid has been expropriated and looted in places like Russia, the President says, Well folks, we need another \$4 billion in foreign aid.

Now I want to come back to the point now. Our leadership has looked at several options of how we close the gap so that we make certain that we do not take a penny from Social Security, which I think everyone in this body wants to live by, and some of them say, Well, we don't like that plan.

The answer simply is, well then let us hear your plan? What is your plan? Here is the question that the members of the working press in this city ought to be asking the people down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue every single day: What is your plan? You do not like the plan of the folks up on Capitol Hill? Fine, exercise a little bit of leadership. You help them and help America. You show us how we can balance the budget because it can be done.

In fact, every American family knows this; and, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you a story.

Every Sunday Americans sit around their kitchen tables and their coffee tables, and you know what they do? They clip coupons from the Sunday newspaper. Every Sunday Americans clip something like 80 million coupons from the Sunday paper, worth an average of 53 cents, and that is how American families balance their budget every week. Is it so much to ask for those families to say to us: listen, if it means cutting the Federal bureaucracy 1.3 percent, you should do it. Or if you want to take money from one department, and shift it and do a few other things, we do not care. But I think what the American people are saying, the ones who have finally realized that, yes, we have balanced the budget without using Social Security, once you finally accomplish that goal, do not go back. You finally have a chance to chart a new course because, and I want to close on this, Mr. Speaker, and then I will yield back to the gentleman from Arizona.

But he also mentioned something very important, because we talk in terms of \$1754 billion, and we talk about balancing the budget, and we talk in terms of numbers and percentages, and we begin to sound like accountants. But at the end of the day this is not just an accounting exercise. It really is a very, very important exercise in democracy; and what it is about, and I mentioned earlier that I was born in 1951. You know the interesting thing is there were more kids born in 1951 than any other year. We are the peak of the baby boomers, and I am fortunate. Both of my parents are still living. They are both on Social Security; they are both on Medicare. And I have three kids, and the oldest two of them now are basically on their own, sort of on their own.

But this is all about generational fairness because on one hand in terms of making certain that every penny of Social Security only goes for Social Security, on one hand what we are doing is we are saying to our parents we are going to make certain that you have a more secure retirement, and I think we need to do that.

But by balancing the budget without using Social Security we are also saying to all the baby boomers and working Americans that we are going to have a stronger economy because we are going to have lower interest rates. In a stronger economy a rising tide lifts all boats, but on the other end of that generational fairness what we are really saying to our kids is we are going to guarantee that you will have a chance at the American dream and a better standard of living.

So it is about securing a brighter future for our kids on one hand, it is about a more prosperous, stronger economic future for the people who are working currently, and it is also about securing a brighter retirement for our parents. So this is not just an accounting exercise, this is about generational fairness; and now that we finally

reached the promised land, we must not turn back, and the message is clear to the American people, to our colleagues and to the people at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

We will not raise taxes. We will not raid Social Security. We will not let the President shut down the government unilaterally. We are going to do everything we can to stop him. But everything else is negotiable.

We want to be reasonable. We want to be flexible. We are willing to work within those parameters. If the President will join us, we can have a budget agreement by the end of this week, we can all go home next week, and frankly the American people will be better off.

Thanks so much for taking this time, and thanks for letting me join you.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Minnesota who offers the common sense perspective of the upper Midwest and just puts in everyday terms what is absolutely so practical and so apparent, and he is quite right. What I call the human equation is at stake here, to make sure the truly needy have a safety net, but also to make sure that money masquerading as a safety net does not become a hammock for the greedy and for those who have been wastrels and less than good stewards of tax dollars from the American people.

I would note this, Mr. Speaker. In other quarters in this town there are those who are especially sensitive to polling numbers, and indeed there are stories of some folks being out in the field nightly polling to determine how they will lead. I happen to think leadership is leading first and then seeing if the message and the course of action is responded to by the American people, and that is why I bring poll numbers to this floor tonight, that I think many in this town, especially in the administration, knowing how sensitive many of its members are to polling questions and polling numbers might be.

This is a Fox News Opinion Dynamics poll of 904 registered voters conducted on October 20 and 21. The question is: Who do you trust to make the best decisions on budget issues? Mr. Speaker, 56 percent of the American people say they trust the Congress on budgetary issues. Twenty-one percent say they trust the President.

I would simply suggest, Mr. Speaker, knowing that there are those especially sensitive to those types of numbers, the reason I quote them here is to reaffirm what my colleague from Minnesota has said. We understand that reasonable people can disagree, but it is highly unreasonable for those in this town to be tempted by the allure of a political stunt to try and shut down the Government hoping that there will be an amen chorus from the partisan press that would somehow sway the American people. That is a gambit that leads to a legacy even more infamous than what already exists.

In a positive vein we congratulate the President for signing the defense

appropriations bill that means that a much needed pay raise for our men and women in uniform will at long last be realized. We would ask the President to reconsider his notion of taking \$4 billion of the Social Security Trust Fund to spend on non-Americans in terms of increased foreign aid, and we would ask the President to re-evaluate his plan to veto the Commerce State Justice bill because he wants more money going to international organizations that at the very least attempt to muddy our sovereignty and our unique rights as a nation state in the free world.

So I would simply say again we have stopped the raid on Social Security. We have crossed, made that incredible stride for the first time since 1960. Though the message has gotten short shrift in the reportage of this town, we dare not retreat. Having stopped the raid, let us not renew it. We would invite the President, Mr. Speaker, and the minority leader who only yesterday on national television said that it was his goal, and let me quote him again; I want to be fair about this. He said, quote: "We really ought to try to spend as little of it as possible."

To change that point of view, join with us; stop the raid on Social Security, accurately protect America's priorities, and let us work as men and women of goodwill to make sure the raid has been stopped once and for all. That is the promise of the new day. That is the pledge we make in a spirit of bipartisanship.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. MASCARA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of medical reasons.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and October 26 until 5:00 p.m. on account of official business.

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 Members (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WEYGAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KINGSTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On October 22, 1999:

H.R. 2670. Making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 341, I move that the House do now adjourn in memory of the late Honorable JOHN H. CHAFEE.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order and pursuant to House Resolution 341, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 26, 1999, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4894. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State Designations [Docket No. 99-008-1] received October 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4895. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting the study of the methods of selection of members of the Armed Forces to serve on courts-martial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4896. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting notification that the President approved a new Unified Command Plan that specifies the missions and responsibilities, including geographic boundaries, of the unified combatant commands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4897. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting Final Regulations—William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4898. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Student Assistance General Provisions (RIN: 1845-AA07) received October 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4899. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-

ting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oklahoma; Recodification of Regulations [OK-8-1-5772a; FRL-6457-7] received October 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4900. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "Designing a Medical Device Surveillance Network"; to the Committee on Commerce.

4901. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 00-01: Determination and Certification for Fiscal Year 2000 concerning Argentina's and Brazil's Ineligibility Under Section 102(a)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2799aa-2; to the Committee on International Relations.

4902. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's 1998 Annual Report on Title XII—Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2220e; to the Committee on International Relations.

4903. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the certification for FY 2000 that no United Nations agency or United Nations affiliated agency grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes and condones or seeks the legalization of pedophilia, or which includes as a subsidiary or member any such organization, pursuant to Public Law 103-236, section 565(b) (108 Stat. 845); to the Committee on International Relations.

4904. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting List of all reports issued by GAO during the month of August 1999, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4905. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Interest and Other Financial Costs [FAC 97-14; FAR Case 98-006; Item XI] (RIN: 9000-AI24) received September 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4906. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Compensation for Senior Executives [FAC 97-14; FAR Case 98-301; Item X] (RIN: 9000-AI32) received September 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4907. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Option Clause Consistency [FAC 97-14; FAR Case 98-606; Item IX] (RIN: 9000-AI26) received September 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4908. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Evaluation of Proposals for Professional Services [FAC 97-14; FAR Case 97-038; Item VIII] received September 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4909. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final

rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Confirming Late Offer Treatment [FAC 97-14; FAR Case 97-030; Item VII] (RIN: 9000-AI25) received September 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4910. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Determination of Price Reasonableness and Commerciality [FAC 97-14; FAR Case 98-300; Item VI] (RIN: 9000-AI45) received September 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4911. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; OMB Circular A-119 [FAC 97-14; FAR Case 98-004; Item V] (RIN: 9000-AI12) received September 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4912. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Javits-Wagner-O'Day Proposed Revisions [FAC 97-14; FAR Case 98-602; Item IV] (RIN: 9000-AI16) received September 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4913. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, transmitting the Office's response sent to the Office of Management and Budget on June 30, 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

4914. A letter from the Chairperson, National Council on Disability, transmitting the report entitled, "Implementation of the National Voter Registration Act by State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies"; to the Committee on House Administration.

4915. 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; Other Rockfish in the Aleutian Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 990304063-9063-01; I.D. 101399D] received October 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4916. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting correspondence with Office of Management and Budget regarding H.R. 2910, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 1113; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4917. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the 1997 annual report of the Board's activities, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 1117; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4918. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the report on continuing disability reviews for the fiscal year 1998, pursuant to Public Law 104-121, section 103(d)(2) (110 Stat. 850); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4919. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting its annual report on the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act and the Andean Trade Preference Act, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1332(g); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4920. A letter from the Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency For International Development, transmitting the Agency's Annual Report to Congress on activities under the Denton Program; jointly

to the Committees on International Relations and Armed Services.

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. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1801. A bill to make technical corrections to various antitrust laws and to references to such laws (Rept. 106-411 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COBLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3028. A bill to amend certain trademark laws to prevent the misappropriation of marks; with an amendment (Rept. 106-412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 2885. A bill to provide uniform safeguards for the confidentiality of information acquired for exclusively statistical purposes, and to improve the efficiency and quality of Federal statistics and Federal statistical programs by permitting limited sharing of records among designated agencies for statistical purposes under strong safeguards; with an amendment (Rept. 106-413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 342. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1987) to allow the recovery of attorneys' fees and costs by certain employers and labor organizations who are prevailing parties in proceedings brought against them by the National Labor Relations Board or by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Rept. 106-414). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X, the Committee on Armed Services discharged. H.R. 1801 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X, the Committee on Commerce discharged. H.R. 2005 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1801. Referral to the Committee on Armed Services extended for a period ending not later than October 25, 1999.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MOORE (for himself, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. LARSON, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MINGE, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 3136. A bill to authorize the Consumer Product Safety Commission to require child-

proof caps for portable gasoline containers; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HORN (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3137. A bill to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to provide for training of individuals a President-elect intends to nominate as department heads or appoint to key positions in the Executive Office of the President; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 3138. A bill to amend the Shipping Act of 1984 to restore the application of the antitrust laws to certain agreements and conduct to which such Act applies; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for himself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 3139. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the excise tax on firearms and to earmark the increase for juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Commerce, 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. NETHERCUTT (for himself, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. NEY, Mr. METCALF, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Ms. DANNER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LEACH, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. JOHN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. DUNN, and Mr. CONDIT):

H.R. 3140. A bill to provide stability in the United States agriculture sector and to promote adequate availability of food and medicine for humanitarian assistance abroad by requiring congressional approval before the imposition of any unilateral agricultural or medical sanction against a foreign country or foreign entity; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Agriculture, 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. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. VENTO):

H.R. 3141. A bill to encourage the safe and responsible use of personal watercraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 3142. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to prevent credit card issuers from taking unfair advantage of full-

time, traditional-aged, college students, to protect parents of traditional college student credit cards holders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 3143. A bill to establish the High Performance Schools Program in the Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WEINER (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LARSON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. REYES, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3144. A bill to provide reliable officers, technology, education, community prosecutors, and training in our neighborhoods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNULTY:

H. Con. Res. 205. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring the heroic efforts of the Air National Guard's 109th Airlift Wing and its rescue of Dr. Jerri Nielsen from the South Pole; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. FORBES):

H. Con. Res. 206. Concurrent resolution expressing grave concern regarding armed conflict in the North Caucasus region of the Russian Federation which has resulted in civilian casualties and internally displaced persons, and urging all sides to pursue dialog for peaceful resolution of the conflict; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. STRICKLAND:

H. Con. Res. 207. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding support for the inclusion of salaries of Members of Congress in any proposed across-the-board reduction in fiscal year 2000 funding for Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. KENNEDY of Rhode Island:

H. Res. 341. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives on the death of Senator John H. Chafee.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 21: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 271: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 460: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 655: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 670: Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 684: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 960: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 961: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 1039: Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1044: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 1093: Mr. CLYBURN.
 H.R. 1168: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 1221: Mr. LARSON.
 H.R. 1285: Mr. MASCARA and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 1349: Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 1505: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. DINGELL.
 H.R. 1509: Mr. HILL of Montana.
 H.R. 1520: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.
 H.R. 1775: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H.R. 1777: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 1816: Mr. BENTSEN.
 H.R. 1838: Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 1842: Mrs. KELLY.
 H.R. 1857: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1899: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. DINGELL.
 H.R. 2001: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
 H.R. 2053: Mrs. MORELLA.
 H.R. 2200: Mr. McNULTY.
 H.R. 2303: Mr. BARR of North Carolina and Mr. DREIER.
 H.R. 2418: Mr. HILLEARY and Mr. NETHERCUTT.
 H.R. 2420: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. RADANOVICH.
 H.R. 2442: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GOSS, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 2498: Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 2569: Mr. BOEHLERT.
 H.R. 2573: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 2619: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 2631: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2634: Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 2655: Mr. SCHAFFER.
 H.R. 2696: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2720: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 2727: Mr. DUNCAN.
 H.R. 2741: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2786: Mr. EHRLICH.
 H.R. 2883: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. BLILEY.
 H.R. 2890: Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 2895: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 2899: Mr. WEINER and Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 2901: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 2928: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. COMBEST.
 H.R. 2936: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 2939: Mr. STARK and Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 2966: Mr. CANNON, Mr. COOK, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MASCARA, and Ms. STABENOW.
 H.R. 2985: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 2995: Mr. CRAMER and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 3034: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 3062: Mr. MASCARA.
 H.R. 3086: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 3091: Mr. POMBO, Mr. NEY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 3128: Mr. COOK.
 H.J. Res. 46: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H. Con. Res. 115: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. BERRY, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. COOKSEY, Ms. CARSON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. FROST.

H. Con. Res. 188: Mrs. MORELLA and Mrs. THURMAN.

H. Con. Res. 190: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H. Con. Res. 197: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COOK, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mrs. WILSON.

H. Res. 37: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Res. 41: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. DIXON.

H. Res. 298: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H. Res. 325: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. DIXON, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LARSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KLINK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HORN, Mr. HILLEARY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. FORD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. QUINN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE **106th** CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1999

No. 146

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:

Gracious Father, our hearts are at half mast with grief over the death of JOHN CHAFEE, our cherished friend, distinguished Senator, patriotic American, and devoted leader. We praise You for this good and kindly man, this discerning and decisive legislator, this example of integrity and vision. We thank You for his stability, his strength, his sagacity. He expressed Your caring and concern for each of his fellow Senators and was a bridge builder, always seeking consensus. All of us in the Senate family came to admire him as a great American.

Now we ask You to comfort his wife and family in this time of grief. Give them courage rooted in the assurance that death is not an ending but a transition in eternal life, the peace that comes from the conviction that he is with You and the hope that flows from Your Spirit, giving the promise that You will never leave nor forsake them. Grant them and all of us who loved and admired JOHN CHAFEE a new dedication to emulate his commitment to be a servant leader. In the name of the Resurrection and the Life. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The honorable PAT ROBERTS, a Senator from the State of Kansas, 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have been asked to make the opening comments on behalf of our distinguished majority leader.

This morning the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 2 p.m. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 434, the African trade bill. As a reminder, cloture on the motion to proceed to the bill was filed on Friday. Therefore, pursuant to rule XXII, that vote will occur tomorrow 1 hour after the Senate convenes unless an agreement is made between the two leaders. Later today, the Senate is expected to proceed to executive session in an effort to debate several nominations currently on the calendar. As previously announced, there will be no rollcall votes during today's session of the Senate.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I understand that there are two bills at the desk due for their second reading.

I ask that they be read consecutively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1770) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the research and development credit and to extend certain other expiring provisions for 30 months, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 1771) to provide stability in the United States agriculture sector and to promote adequate availability of food and medicine for humanitarian assistance abroad by requiring congressional approval before the imposition of any unilateral agricultural or medical sanction against a foreign country or foreign entity.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I object to further proceeding on the bills at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each, with the following exceptions: The Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, is to be recognized to speak until 1 p.m., and the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS, is to be recognized to speak until 2 p.m.

IN HONOR OF SENATOR JOHN CHAFEE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I come to the Senate Chamber this morning to comment about the untimely passing of our distinguished colleague, Senator JOHN CHAFEE.

Senator CHAFEE died last night of heart failure, and I learned about it when I arrived in town this morning, at, I must say, a considerable shock. Senator CHAFEE sat next to me in the Senate. In addition to proximity, we were very close on many, many other lines. Senator CHAFEE leaves behind an extraordinary record as a great humanitarian, a great Senator, and a really great American. His political career is legendary—four terms in the Senate, elected in 1976, 1982, 1988, and again in 1994. Prior to that, he served three terms as the Governor of Rhode Island. His biography on the web site states that Senator JOHN CHAFEE is the only Republican to be elected to the Senate from Rhode Island in the past 68 years.

He brought a unique perspective to the Senate as a protector of the environment and as a firm advocate for expanding health care to every American. During the contentious days in 1993 and 1994 when the Senate was considering

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S13067

the extension of health care, Senator CHAFEE organized a small group of centrists to meet in his office every Thursday morning at 8:30, and came forward with a very solid bill on health care. More recently, Senator CHAFEE was the leader of a group of centrists, both Republicans and Democrats, to come forward with a Patients' Bill of Rights. He had an understanding and a political breadth that led to accolades from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and from the American Civil Liberties Union.

He was the leader of a small group of centrists, also known as moderates, and he brought a degree of civility to this body and this Congress at a time when civility was sorely lacking. JOHN CHAFEE could walk into a room full of controversy and arguments, strike a middle course, and bring Senators and Members on all sides to a position of coalescence and accommodation.

JOHN CHAFEE was a strong family man, very close to his wife Ginny, and was also an active squash player. I tried to lure him to the squash courts early in the morning. He would have nothing of 7 a.m. squash. My wife lives in Philadelphia; JOHN CHAFEE's wife lives in Washington. He insisted on first things first. You could find him in the afternoon frequently playing squash with JOHN WARNER, both coming in for a vote freshly showered.

JOHN CHAFEE brought his son to our centrist meeting recently, who is a mayor of Rhode Island's second biggest city and who is seeking to succeed JOHN CHAFEE in the Senate. I noted last Thursday afternoon that JOHN CHAFEE missed three votes. We were on a bill and had three controversial votes at 5:30, and I worried a little bit about JOHN CHAFEE but had no idea that the situation was as serious as it developed with his passing last night of heart failure.

JOHN CHAFEE leaves a powerful legacy in many lives, a real giant in the Senate, and he will be sorely missed on legislative lines and on compassionate lines because he was such a good friend to all 99 of his fellow Senators.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise with deep and heavy sadness to mourn the passing of a great statesman, my dear friend, JOHN CHAFEE, from Rhode Island.

There will be a lot of eulogies on the floor over the next several days. For the moment, I want to say a few words about a very great man, a very close friend, someone who I think is one of the best Members of the Senate in many, many years.

First, a little bit of history about JOHN CHAFEE. He was born to one of the most prominent New England families. He could have coasted. He could have gone into business. He could have gone into law. No, he did not do that. What did he do? He chose service to his people. It was an extraordinary life of service.

JOHN was a marine. JOHN fought in the historic battle at Guadalcanal. A

few years later, he reenlisted and led troops in combat in Korea.

On a lighter note, as far as I know, Senator CHAFEE was the only Member of the Senate who was also a member of the American College Wrestling Hall of Fame. Move over, Jesse Ventura. We have a wrestler in the Hall of Fame.

JOHN, after serving in the armed services, later turned to public service. He was a Governor of Rhode Island. He was a Secretary of the Navy. Since 1976, he was a Member of the Senate.

When I first joined the Senate about 20 years ago, the last thing in the world I believed was over a period of time he and I would become very close friends. We were sitting as junior Members, very far away from each other, on the Finance Committee and also on the Environment and Public Works Committee. I am from Montana. JOHN is from Rhode Island. In Montana, we even have ranches the size of the State of Rhode Island. We were from very different States with different constituencies. Nevertheless, it was a circumstance of seniority that brought us together. I was very privileged to work with JOHN. We exchanged chairmanships and ranking memberships on the Environment and Public Works Committee. We developed a very close relationship.

He was one of the best persons, in my judgment, in the Senate. On the Finance Committee, he worked to balance the budget. He put fiscal austerity, on behalf of future generations, ahead of ideology. He worked for a system of free trade. Most important, JOHN spoke for those people in the shadows—the poor, the elderly, and children. Especially children with special needs, whether it was Medicaid or welfare reform, JOHN was a very strong advocate. In fact, he was a stronger advocate by far than most Members of the Senate.

On the Environment and Public Works Committee, which he chaired, he did so in the great tradition of other New England Senators: Ed Muskie, Bob Stafford and George Mitchell. Tremendous tradition on that committee.

His accomplishments are legion. We breathe cleaner air because of JOHN CHAFEE. Because of his diligent work on the Clean Water Act, we drink cleaner water because of JOHN CHAFEE. We have a rich legacy, and JOHN CHAFEE left that legacy to our children and grandchildren. In addition, he vigorously pushed through the Oil Pollution Act in the wake of the *Valdez* tragedy; the Safe Drinking Water Act; Endangered Species Act; the National Wildlife Refuge System is in place because of Muskie, Stafford, and, particularly, JOHN CHAFEE; the Coastal Barrier Resources System—all bear JOHN's mark.

Personally, I will remember JOHN CHAFEE as a decent, civil, courteous, commonsense gentleman. His issues and the legislation he worked for were very important. But it is the man who means the most to me and is remem-

bered most by me. He reminds me of my father. He never raised his voice, never lost his temper, was always calm, always cool, often with a little twinkle in his eye, a sense of humor. He had respect for life. He knew what was important and not important. He kept his eye on the ball and wouldn't let conversations drift to gossip or extraneous matters that didn't matter; they prevented Members from accomplishing the objective.

Uncommon common sense. JOHN CHAFEE had a sixth sense for common sense. He knew the basic, balanced, right thing to do.

Senator SPECTER mentioned the organizations he put together, the moderates working on health care. That is only one of the many examples of JOHN CHAFEE trying to get something accomplished for the good of America.

Unquestioned integrity. We say around here that a man's word is his bond. It is true. We always strive toward it because we know it is necessary, not only to get legislation passed but it is one of the most important things in life. We knew when JOHN said something it was true. No one ever questioned what JOHN said.

My father's name was JOHN. Maybe that is part of it. The two of them remind me so much of each other. Both were veterans and knew the importance of America—maybe because they were veterans. JOHN knew from fighting at Guadalcanal, fighting in Korea, fighting for American virtues, American values and what is right in America. Maybe that is what enabled him to keep his perspective and calm.

It has been mentioned he is a family man. I saw it many times. Not too many days ago I was on the floor with JOHN and he said: Gee, I promised Ginny I would be home by 2 o'clock today. His legs were bothering him. Gee, I want to get this bill passed; I will vote on this.

He was torn for the right reasons, torn between family and duty. But he gave honor to both because they were so important to JOHN.

I, too, was stunned when I learned of JOHN's death last night. We will miss him terribly. He was a most wonderful man. His memory will be embedded strongly in all of us. It is a memory I know I will cherish forever and ever. I will always see JOHN's twinkle, his smile, his earnest sense of trying to do the right thing.

On behalf of my wife, Wanda, and my staff, our deepest sympathy and condolences go to Ginny and the family, as well as members of JOHN's staff, some of whom are on the floor. JOHN was very close to his staff. It is a wonderful, tight knit family. Our deepest condolences go out to all of them.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, listening to Senator BAUCUS, I am reminded of a couple of other items about Senator CHAFEE which I think ought to be mentioned. One is that he served as Secretary of the Navy, and, secondly, he served in the Marine Corps during

World War II and was part of the invasion of Guadalcanal, the largest of the Solomon Islands in the Pacific.

He was recalled during the Korean war. I had always wondered about the fairness of the World War II veterans being recalled during the Korean war. I served myself during the Korean war stateside as a special agent in the Office of Special Investigations of the Air Force. At that time, so many of my colleagues avoided military service by going off to law school or graduate school. I had noted at that time that so many veterans were so called. Ted Williams stuck in my mind, a great baseball player, who served during World War II and went off to the Korean war, cutting short his playing time.

I had a discussion with JOHN CHAFEE about that one day. I asked him about his views on being recalled to active service during the Korean war when so many were not serving at all. In his characteristic patriotic way he said, no, there was a job to be done and he was going to do it. He was glad to serve again in Korea, a marine in the toughest kind of work.

That was JOHN CHAFEE; always a great patriot and a great American.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, last week Paul Laxalt and I were talking about some general items, and the name JOHN CHAFEE came up. We had a pleasant visit, Senator Laxalt and I, talking about JOHN CHAFEE, talking about how much we liked him, what a good guy he was, what a good friend of ours he was. In my opinion, the United States has lost one of its true heroes. JOHN CHAFEE died last night. I say this not simply to honor his time in the Senate, where he served with distinction for 23 years; I say it because of the way JOHN CHAFEE lived his life.

From a very young age, he showed the characteristics of leadership he went on to display throughout his whole life. When JOHN was only 11 years old, he saved the life of a young boy who had fallen into a frozen pond where they were playing hockey. Everyone else stood around. Little JOHN CHAFEE went into the water to save this boy's life.

He was a student at Yale during the Second World War. He had completed 3 years of school at Yale when he joined the U.S. Marine Corps to go fight for his country, and fight for his country he did. On his 20th birthday, he participated in the invasion of Guadalcanal—a marine who served with distinction in the Second World War.

The definitive book written about the Korean War is a book called "The Coldest War," written by a man named Brady. The hero of that book is JOHN CHAFEE, a captain in the U.S. Marine Corps during that coldest war. I have spoken on any number of occasions about JOHN CHAFEE, about what a hero he was to me and to the rest of the country. I am happy to do that today

so this RECORD can be spread throughout the Senate for his family, his staff, and many, many friends.

JOHN CHAFEE truly was a hero, as indicated in that book, "The Coldest War." He is a man who served as Secretary of the Navy during the height of the war in Vietnam. He was a very, very effective legislator. He was, as has been indicated by Senator BAUCUS, a very quiet, self-effacing man. He assumed positions of leadership that would have been easy to simply avoid. On the committee on which I served with him for 13 years, Environment and Public Works, he was a leader even before he became chairman of that committee.

Some of the finest work JOHN CHAFEE did is not legislation that has been completed. One example is the Endangered Species Act, a very difficult bill that had to come forward. He was able, 2 years ago, to put together a very important piece of legislation, and got the help of the subcommittee, Governor Kempthorne, then-Senator Kempthorne, so we had two Republicans and we had the ranking member of the full committee, Senator BAUCUS, and I was a ranking member of the subcommittee. We all joined together. None of us wanted to be on that legislation, but we had to be because it was the right thing to do, as the leadership of JOHN CHAFEE indicated. It was legislation that should have passed. We are always going to look back at that piece of legislation, saying if we had done that, the problems with the Endangered Species Act would be behind us.

He served as Governor of the State of Rhode Island, and his service in the Governorship of Rhode Island, even though many years before he came to the Senate, was marked by the same dogged determination to get things done. He did not believe in the status quo. He didn't believe in gridlock. He had determination and spoke up when he felt strongly about issues, and there were a lot of issues he felt strongly about, such as health and the environment.

He was elected Governor of the State of Rhode Island when he was 39 years old. By that time, though, he had already served in two wars, had come back to Yale and completed his degree there, and then got a law degree from Harvard. That is pretty good. Even that was not the end of his service. Before becoming Governor, he served 6 years in the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island.

As Governor of the State of Rhode Island, he helped bring Rhode Island into the modern era. He created the State's community college system, created the Rhode Island Public Transportation Administration, which did many things but is noted for the construction of Interstate 95 and the Newport Bridge, two infrastructure projects that allowed Rhode Island to flourish as it does today.

He fought for fair housing and unemployment laws. He fought to get things

done. He not only fought for them but was able to get them passed. He provided for State-provided health care for the elderly long before Medicare came into being. He developed the Green Acres Program, which was a visionary concept of protecting Rhode Island's natural wonders for future generations, which is a precursor to this antisprawl talk we are now hearing from the White House. They only need to look back 20 or 30 years ago, and JOHN CHAFEE had done the same thing that is being talked about with this urban sprawl problem we now have.

The leadership JOHN CHAFEE showed as Governor of Rhode Island in the mid-1960s led the Republican chief executives to name him their chairman. In 1969, President Nixon called upon this man, JOHN CHAFEE, to take on the challenge—and it was a challenge at the time—to be Secretary of the Navy during the height of the Vietnam war.

I have heard several conversations, they love to joke about it, when JOHN WARNER—who is a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee—when he and JOHN CHAFEE get together to talk about their service, one as Secretary, one as Assistant Secretary, and the difficulties they had during the time the Vietnam war was going forward. He did a great job as Secretary of the Navy.

He then spent several years in the private sector, but in 1976 he was elected in a Democratic State—Rhode Island is perhaps the most Democratic State in the Union, but JOHN CHAFEE did not let that stand in his way—he was elected Governor. I identify with Senator CHAFEE. He was elected Governor by about 400 votes. I have been in a number of close elections myself. Perhaps that is one reason I identified so much with Senator CHAFEE.

He served as Governor as if he were elected by 400,000 votes, and he served in the Senate in the same manner. He was a person in the Senate who quickly established himself as an authority on the Nation's budget.

Of course, as we know, he was a member of the Finance Committee, where he worked hard on tax policy, and was chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, where he worked hard on environmental protection. He was one who always stood for civil rights and human rights.

He was an independent person, and we all know how independent he has been in the Senate. We all need to take a page out of JOHN CHAFEE's book, especially with the rank partisanship that has been taking place in this body for the last several years. JOHN CHAFEE was a person who did not believe in partisanship. He continued to stake out modern, consensus-driven positions that marked his entire career. I admired his ability to go to people on this side of the aisle to develop legislation.

There are those who argue Senator CHAFEE spent many of his years advocating positions that were outside the

mainstream view of the Republican Party in the Senate, especially when he talked about issues of gun control, health care, and the environment. That probably is not the case. I believe JOHN CHAFEE represented the mainstream of America. He was tremendously important and good for the Republican Party, as he was for this country.

At the core of his being, JOHN CHAFEE believed the American people sent us all here to get things done, to compromise. And "compromise" to JOHN CHAFEE was not a bad word. He knew that legislating was the art of compromise and that we had to compromise for the best of the country, not simply bicker with one another.

As I have indicated already, I had the pleasure of serving with Senator CHAFEE for 13 years in the Senate. For the last 5 years, he has been chairman of that committee. I have been so impressed with his willingness to wade into difficult problems. I had so many meetings in his office in the Dirksen Building where he would say: OK, where are we on this? OK, we will get together tomorrow to see where else we can go.

He was a tenacious legislator. He knew legislation was more than standing on the Senate floor giving speeches. I have learned a great deal from him.

I will never forget his work to improve our Nation's air and water quality, improve highways, transit, and all the infrastructure programs. He was so involved in toxic waste. He was a man who believed in Government working for the betterment of each of us.

It was not at all unusual at critical junctures of negotiations on important bills to find him working late at night. He did this from the time he arrived in the Senate, I am told, to the present, and I can vouch for that personally.

Environmental issues are some of the most difficult issues we have to tackle in Washington, often bringing out sharp divisions, sometimes even partisanship. Senator CHAFEE was always looking for ways to cut through the rhetoric and get things done.

While we have not been able to report out a lot of legislation—Superfund, endangered species—it was not his fault. He was frustrated, but he never lost his determination to push forward, and he always did it in good spirits.

Some of the giants of the Senate in the 20th century are people who have served as chairmen of the Environment and Public Works Committee, men such as Robert Stafford of Vermont, Jennings Randolph of West Virginia, and DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, of course, of New York. JOHN CHAFEE clearly deserves to be mentioned in the same breath as all of them. He truly was a great Senator. In fact, it is fair to say when we list the great Senators of the 20th century, it would not be complete without the name of JOHN CHAFEE.

I close by saying I liked JOHN CHAFEE. He was my friend. He was one of the rare people from the other side

of the aisle who, during my election—this last election—asked me: How are you doing? We knew each other well enough—he could not help me financially or give speeches—that he cared about my legislative welfare. He is a man I will never forget. He set an example for me. If I can be the same type of Senator JOHN CHAFEE was, I will certainly be happy.

I extend my condolences to John's wife Virginia, their 5 children and 12 grandchildren, the citizens of Rhode Island, and the hundreds of past and present members of John's staff who worked hard for him and loved him dearly. The Senate and the Nation have lost a great man—JOHN CHAFEE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from Nevada in saying a few words about Senator JOHN CHAFEE. I believe our Nation lost a pillar of the Senate last evening. I found JOHN CHAFEE to be a deeply principled and highly intelligent Senator. Additionally, he was one of the nicest men I have ever had occasion to know in the Senate or anywhere else.

I had the pleasure a couple of years ago of being a dinner guest at the home of JOHN and Virginia CHAFEE in McLean, a warm, hospitable home, a home that had 8, 10 people gathered around the table informally for dinner, where both JOHN CHAFEE and Virginia Chafee presided with a warmth and a hospitality that made it the nicest evening I have ever spent in my 7 years in Washington.

I really liked JOHN CHAFEE, and I had the pleasure of working with him on a number of issues. His record on the environment, on health care, and on gun control is second to none. As chairman of the Senate's Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator CHAFEE was a leading voice in crafting the Clean Air Act of 1990 which strengthened the Nation's emissions standards. Recently, he led successful efforts to enact oil spill prevention and response legislation and a measure to strengthen the Safe Drinking Water Act.

JOHN CHAFEE has won virtually every major environmental award in this country due to his tireless efforts to protect our Nation's resources. Recently, we worked together on an effort to rid California's gasoline of MTBE, and just last Thursday, standing right over there in the Senate Chamber, I said: JOHN, when are you going to be able to pass some legislation out of the committee on MTBE? We remarked how moving on this issue has been made more difficult by the ethanol lobby.

I said: You know, JOHN, we really have to move because, in particular, of the California situation.

He said: I know, I know, and I really want to do something to help.

That is the way he was—a very special person who could see beyond his

own State's parameters and really reach deep into the hearts of many of us who represent States even on the other side of this great Nation.

I will never forget earlier this year when we stood at the White House together to call for meaningful gun legislation. A few years ago, he even angered many conservatives when he pushed for a ban on the manufacture, sale, and possession of handguns. He was a man who believed in his principles, and he brought them with him to the Senate. Regardless of political party, he responded to those principles when the time came for such a response.

The series of events I went through with Senator CHAFEE which showed me the most about him was an earlier effort in a group called the Centrist Coalition. This had to do with developing a balanced Federal budget. It took place around, I guess, 4 years ago. We worked for a couple of years. There were 11 members on the Republican side, 11 on the Democratic side. Senator CHAFEE chaired the Republican portion; Senator BREAUX chaired the Democratic portion.

In meeting after meeting, I saw JOHN CHAFEE's span of knowledge across a whole host of budget items. The Centrist Coalition did, in fact, prepare a budget. We did, and with no hearings, put it on the floor of the Senate. And believe it or not, it got 46 votes. It came close to passing. Many of the major points in that centrist budget actually became part of the leadership understanding with the White House that effectively produced a balanced budget in this Nation. A lot of that diligence and pursuit, over a 2-year period of time, really is a hallmark of the way in which JOHN CHAFEE worked.

As a member of the Finance Committee, Senator CHAFEE worked to successfully expand health care coverage for women and children and to improve community services for people with disabilities.

In 1990, he spearheaded his conference's Health Care Task Force and became a prominent figure in the national health reform debate. He went on to lead a bipartisan effort, as has been spoken of on the floor earlier, to craft a comprehensive health care reform proposal in 1994.

He was also an adamant supporter of a woman's right to choose. He opposed the gag rule, which prohibited doctors at federally funded clinics from discussing family planning and abortion services with their patients.

I think Senator REID, and also the distinguished Senator from Montana, mentioned his service in the Marine Corps in World War II. From talking to JOHN CHAFEE on the floor of the Senate, it was hard to see him as a robust marine at Guadalcanal. But one of the things I have learned in my life is sometimes people you least suspect are the first ones to jump in the river to save a drowning person. I rather suspect that was JOHN CHAFEE, that just

as he was a Senator's Senator, he could be a hero's hero. So he left behind him a very distinguished military reputation, in which I hope his wife and family will always take great pride.

JOHN CHAFEE, to me, was a giant in this body. His civility, his manners, his intelligence, his ethics, his credibility were never in challenge by any member of either of our two great parties. As such, I believe he leaves an indisputable legacy.

I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mrs. FEINSTEIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1774 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have been sitting this morning and listening intently to all the comments that have been made about our very close friend, JOHN CHAFEE. I do not have a prepared statement, but I do have some thoughts I think I want to share.

It happens that this weekend, at the time that this happened, I was on the U.S.S. *Eisenhower*, where they were doing F-18 and F-14 maneuvers and trying to figure out how to get trained for something that is coming up in their deployment to both the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf. So we were talking with some of the military types about JOHN CHAFEE. And about JOHN you hear all these things. I have been listening this morning about how he was such a great guy. But people forget what a hero he was during the Second World War, and then again in the Korean war.

In fact, I got on his committee when I was first elected, coming from the House to the Senate in 1994. There is a tradition that JOHN, every February, would have his new members, along with all the other members of his committee, for dinner. It was a very festive occasion.

I used to look forward to going to that dinner and not saying anything but sitting quietly and listening to the war stories told by JOHN WARNER and JOHN CHAFEE. You could sit there and relive the whole Second World War in a way you will never read about.

When you think of him and the image that he has today, and the image of him that we have been exposed to in the recent years, you do not think of him as being the type of person who would be a war hero. But he was. He was. And every time he told his war stories, it always came back to talking about the love he had for America, what America meant to him, the reason it has to stay strong.

I think it is interesting, because you hear a lot about his political philosophy, and some of the things he stands for are not consistent with standing for a strong national defense, yet he did. He was very unique in that respect.

I listened to the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN. She did such a great job of describing this very gentle person. The Senator said in her comments, I believe three times, that he was a giant, and that she knew JOHN was a giant, and she could look at him and see the things he did that nobody else could do—that he was a giant.

One of the things that is interesting in listening to those who have been saying such eloquent things about JOHN is they are talking about what his stand was on different issues. As a conservative, who disagreed with most of the issues they talked about, I still had a love and reverence and respect for JOHN CHAFEE that is every bit as much or more than some of the others.

I think it is kind of an interesting thing: you look at a guy who does not vote the way you vote on things, and yet every time he would say something about the various issues Senator FEINSTEIN talked about, I would stop and think it over: This is JOHN, so maybe I need to be listening a little bit more. I think he had a greater impact on people who disagreed with him than he did on people who agreed with him.

I appreciate MAX BAUCUS and the things he said. He has served for some time as the ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, a very significant committee and one that is handling things that affect us in our everyday lives. And when he talked about JOHN's unquestionable integrity, I cannot build on that. That is true. That is JOHN. Senator REID also talked about what a giant he was.

I would only add, that of all the characteristics JOHN had, the word that comes to my mind is love. You had to love JOHN CHAFEE. A lot of people don't like me, certainly a lot of them don't love me, but I think of JOHN CHAFEE and say: Who couldn't love JOHN CHAFEE? I feel so rich that I have had the honor of serving with him and being close to him.

This morning when Kay, my wife, and I were talking about JOHN, she recalled her last conversation with Ginny was during our February dinner, the very eloquent dinner he has had every 2 years that he hosted at, I believe, the Metropolitan Club. Kay had been talking to Ginny for a long time. Their subject, Kay told me this morning, was he had already announced 3 days before that dinner that he was going to retire from the Senate after all these years. Ginny was talking about how they were looking forward to their traveling and all the things they were going to do.

Now Ginny is left with 5 beautiful children and 12 grandchildren. I remember how proud JOHN was when he talked about his son, Lincoln, who is running for his seat. So JOHN was a family man. He loved his kids and loved his grandkids. Maybe that is what we all had in common. But this place will not be the same without JOHN CHAFEE. JOHN CHAFEE was the lovable giant.

I yield back, Mr. President, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. 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. THOMAS. Mr. President, several speakers were intending to be here to talk in morning business. With the untimely death of our friend JOHN CHAFEE, I think this time is going to be reserved for Members who wish to talk about the Senator and his life. I would like to do that for a moment.

I have had the opportunity, for my time in the Congress, to serve with JOHN CHAFEE on the committee of which he has been chair. I had the opportunity to become acquainted with certainly one of the most outstanding Senators who has ever been in the Senate. I will not go back over all the things our friends have already said. But each of us, I suppose, has a little different memory, a little different feeling.

JOHN CHAFEE certainly epitomized the meaning of public service, from leaving college and going into the Marine Corps in World War II, to serving again in Korea, to serving his State as a legislator, as Governor, serving the country as Secretary of the Navy, and serving four terms in the Senate, devoting his life to public service and doing it in such a way that he will always be remembered.

Senator CHAFEE was dedicated, of course, to this country. He cherished freedom and risked his life and sacrificed for the freedom you and I enjoy. So it is hard to lose a friend of that kind.

JOHN CHAFEE and I didn't always agree on the issues. He came from quite a different world than I—he was from Rhode Island, and I am from Wyoming—in terms of many of the issues, but we were always able to talk about them.

JOHN CHAFEE came to Wyoming at my request to take a look at endangered species, and he drove out into the wilderness to look. He rode around a ranch. He and a friend of mine got in a pickup, and he looked at a different world than he was accustomed to—because of his service, because of his friendship. So, certainly, no one personifies more that feeling. Nobody was more gentlemanly and more friendly than JOHN CHAFEE.

In terms of service on this floor and in terms of cooperation, we worked through a number of things, such as highway bills, endangered species bills, and EPA things, which are contentious. But JOHN CHAFEE would always listen. JOHN had wisdom to share and was willing to share it.

So I am sure we all feel the tremendous loss of this Senate leader, one of the best in America. I am sure many of

us will come to the floor to share their views and feelings. Senator CHAFEE represented the best of this country in many ways. His leadership, statesmanship, and abilities will be sorely missed, not only in Rhode Island but nationally. We all send our very best and our prayers to his family.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The clerk will call the roll. The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLARD. 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. ALLARD. Mr. President, I come to the floor of the Senate today to recognize the passing of a colleague and a very dear friend, Senator JOHN CHAFEE of Rhode Island, and to express my condolences to his lovely wife Virginia and their family.

I was just elected to the Senate in 1996 and found I had the opportunity to serve on two committees with Senator CHAFEE. He continued to serve as chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, and I also served with him on the Intelligence Committee.

I will take a moment here to recognize my good friend's accomplishments in life and how much I appreciated serving with him in the Senate. He was truly a remarkable individual. He graduated from Yale and then got a law degree from Harvard in 1950. He served in the Marine Corps as well as being Secretary of the Navy. He was a patriot, a hero, serving this country's interests in World War II and Korea.

My wife and I had an opportunity to join him and Virginia at a dinner when I was just elected to the Senate and had just joined his committee. I think it was Senator INHOFE who said he traditionally held dinners for new members of his committee. I got an opportunity to visit with him about some of his experiences, and he was a delight to visit with, as was his wife Virginia. We had a great time that evening.

Senator CHAFEE worked hard on Social Security issues. He was a leader on health care. In fact, he worked in the subcommittees on both of those issues in Finance, and then as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. I found he was extremely fair and encouraging, somebody who could work with Republicans and Democrats.

Even though I disagreed with him, as I found myself at times disagreeing with him because I did represent a Western State with some different views, particularly in regard to water, in committee he always gave me a fair chance. He gave me an opportunity to express my views and to represent the citizens of Colorado. I really did appreciate him for his fairness.

He did a lot to help me be effective in that committee. He made sure, wherever possible, if he could work with me

on environmental issues that were important to Colorado, he did that.

I had an opportunity, which I took, to move from that committee to Armed Services. Even though I did not continue to serve on the Environment and Public Works Committee with him, he continued to be helpful and whenever I had environmental concerns I brought them to his committee. I appreciated his commitment to being a team player and helping everybody in the Senate.

JOHN was a great person; he was a nice person; he was a helpful person. I will continue to remember his dedication.

Just to show how he grew on you, I like to look at his achievements in elected office. He ran for Governor in 1962 and was elected by a mere 398 votes. Then in 1964 and 1966, 2 years and 4 years after he originally ran for Governor, he won both times by the largest margins in that State's history. Not only did he grow on those who knew him personally, but in his public service he grew on those whom he represented. In fact, when he was elected, he became the only Republican to be elected to the Senate from Rhode Island in the past 68 years, and he served 4 terms in that capacity.

He was, indeed, a public servant, somebody who worked hard on environmental issues. At times I found I could agree with him, and I recognized his efforts on conservation and open space preservation. I also recognized his dedication and work on the Intelligence Committee. The Intelligence Committee is one of those committees where much of what we do is not shared with the public. I want the public to know today, Senator JOHN CHAFEE was a valuable resource on that committee, considering his experience in World War II, his experience in Korea, and having been Secretary of Navy.

I will always remember Senator CHAFEE as a friend. I want his family to know my wife Joan and I will miss him.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JEFFORDS. 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. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I am here today with a saddened heart at the passage of probably my best friend in the Senate, and the House.

It is not often we get to be close to someone in this body. Oftentimes, we have friendships, but they are not personal friendships. This was a personal one to me—starting from the time I first knew him in the House. When I came to this body in 1989, I was appointed to his committee, as I took the place of Senator Stafford from

Vermont. And thus, I got to know JOHN immediately and found there was little, if anything, on which we ever disagreed.

His leadership on difficult decisions was without parallel to those I have known in this body. He was one of our greatest heroes in this Nation. I know others have exalted his wartime service at Guadalcanal as a marine.

Also, I remember having met him when he was Secretary of the Navy. I was in the Navy at the time. So my memories go back a long time.

But my friendship was mainly based upon JOHN's tremendous personality and his dedication to work and his ability to get things done. He was a man of courage on the battlefield and in the political arena. I do not know anyone who did not like and respect JOHN CHAFEE.

When I first came to the Senate in 1989, I served on the Environment and Public Works Committee with JOHN as my ranking member. He took me under his wing and helped guide me in the big shoes I had to fill in the wake of Bob Stafford, as I mentioned.

We had many trying problems at that time. We had the reauthorization of the Transportation Act. But the most memorable experiences I had dealt with the Clean Air Act, and not only in the committee but also having been appointed, along with him, by the then-majority leader, George Mitchell of Maine, to be on the Clean Air Task Force.

As one can remember, that was one of the most contentious pieces of legislation with which we have ever dealt. It took the holding of hands and nursing each other along to make sure we could get the votes necessary to pass that very controversial act. That placed me in even greater awe of JOHN's capacity to lead and to be listened to.

I also recall in 1995 and 1996 meeting day in and day out in JOHN's office to develop a centrist health care package. We spent a year as JOHN toiled trying to pull together a middle ground on a health care package. JOHN's work to do that was well recognized. Although it never came to fruition at that time, it did give an alternative to the plan which had come from the White House and did give us all something to work on to try to develop a health care package that would serve this Nation. Although it did not work then, and did not work more recently, it was tried from the center, and it did give to us many thoughts and approaches which have been adopted in the health care package which did pass this body.

JOHN's work to preserve the environment, especially for New England, to me, again, showed he was a leader.

JOHN and I ate lunch together every Wednesday for the last 10 years, along with some others, especially from New England, and also ARLEN SPECTER. But we always discussed the matters of policy on which we would have agreement.

Also, I spent several evenings with JOHN at dinner, when he would say, hey, let's go down to the Metropolitan Club, or elsewhere, and have dinner together. Those were also memorable moments in my life, as we had many things to discuss; but it was as much about ourselves and our families as it was about the great problems of the Nation.

JOHN CHAFEE represented the State of Rhode Island with distinction and represented what was best about this institution. My thoughts and prayers go out to his wife, Ginny, and their 5 children and 12 grandchildren, and also to his wonderful staff, who I have gotten to know over the years, who have most capably served him.

JOHN's memory also goes to the time he came and campaigned for me in my State, and all the other times we had a chance to work together. Most, I remember that if I ever had a question on how to vote or I came in at the last minute and did not know what the issue was—I hate to admit to that—I would first look to see how JOHN voted. I knew, if nothing else, if I voted as he did, I probably would not get in trouble. I suppose we all have moments similar to that that we don't talk about politically, but when you have that kind of an individual whom you can count on to give you the right direction, it is very important here, especially on some of the tough issues we have where those of us who are called moderates have to cast votes at times where we don't get friends on either side of the aisle.

I also want to speak out to JOHN's staff. I know how sad and tremendously burdened they now feel at his passing. But if it was not for his staff and their tremendous capacity, I know JOHN could not have accomplished the things he did as a Senator. They will miss him deeply, but so will I and so will the other Members who got to know him and his staff well over the course of time.

I know all of us are sad today. I am getting to the point where I better quit.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator from the State of Ohio, suggests the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Acting in my capacity as a Senator from Ohio, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from Ohio, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:08 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 2:08 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

IN HONOR OF SENATOR JOHN CHAFEE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today for a few words about Senator JOHN CHAFEE, our wonderful friend who left us early this morning.

I happened to be privileged to know both he and his wife Virginia very well. My heart goes out to her today. I have not been able to contact her because it is pretty difficult. The phone lines are busy, and she is busy. But my wife Nancy and I extend our sympathies and hope we will see her very soon.

As I think about JOHN CHAFEE, I see this mild-mannered person; but then I read about him, and there is a great paradox. If you look at what he did as a patriot, he was a great war hero. He served with the U.S. Marines in Iwo Jima, a very gruesome life experience. Clearly, he had to do some things that aren't so consistent with what we see in a very mild-mannered person.

Believe it or not, after law school at Harvard, he volunteered and went a second time. He went to Korea. Then you would think such a talented man would probably want to be in the front office with generals and admirals. But he was head of a rifle team on the ground. That was JOHN CHAFEE. Yet you could hear him regularly, when he made decisions on foreign affairs issues, talk about our country in a way that you absolutely were sure you knew where his heart, conscience, and mind were. It went way beyond that.

So if anybody were striving to match him, they would have to take a look at the next one, which is his fantastic public service. We all knew him in his last public service career. But many people knew him in the earlier stages, when he was a representative and head of the minority party in the House of Representatives in his State and Governor twice.

I remember vividly when I was elected to the Senate 26 years ago, there were four Senators on the Republican ticket across America who were expected to win. I remember getting a visit in my State then from Richard Nixon, and he had gone to Rhode Island, which was where JOHN CHAFEE was running, who had been Secretary of the Navy and was supposed to be elected; Senator Bartlett of Oklahoma; Senator McClure of Idaho; and myself. He lost.

So he was 2 years younger than I am. It took 2 years for them to realize it, but then they finally elected him. He was here ever since. I can quickly state the legacy I see after all these years, as can others who have been here 10, 15, 20 years. He had such a variety of things he did that I am not sure the two things for which I know him best will be his true legacy; maybe both will be.

Senator CHAFEE followed in the footsteps of great environmental Senators such as Ed Muskie when he became chair, on our side, of the Environment and Public Works Committee. I do believe, even though most of the legislation for clean air, water, and the like had already been accomplished before he went on, at least the policies were in place, as the occupant of the Chair readily knows in his distinguished career. He quickly became known as a real environmentalist who understood and was practical yet stern in his beliefs. When it came to clean air and clean water, pollution in general, and certainly conservation of open space, there was no peer during his years as chairman and even before that.

Everybody will get up and speak, I am sure, about his distinguished efforts on the health care side. He happened to be on the Finance Committee. When you say the Committee on Finance in the Senate, many people don't think of health care, but they have a lot of health care jurisdiction, including Medicare, Medicaid, and all the tax laws as they relate to health care. There was no stronger advocate for getting more people covered in health care than JOHN CHAFEE and no stronger advocate for the health of our children and the need to make sure we were taking every precaution in getting health care to our children and passing laws that would get it there. He was truly a staunch advocate for healthy Americans and Americans having a better chance to be healthy, to get cured when they are sick, and taken care of when they are sick.

I am sure there are other things he has done of which I am not aware. But if we got a chance to look at his record, it would be mentioned. There will be plenty of opportunity. I thought if I found the Senate open, I would drop by and say thank you, Senator CHAFEE, and thank you to his family for all they did for our country and for the Senate; thanks to his wonderful wife for all the sacrifices she and their wonderful family have made.

I hope, again, we will get to see that family during the next 2 or 3 days. I hope the Senate will honor him appropriately. I hope we take time off and go to his funeral. I am not in charge, but I hope we do that. I think we ought to do that, wherever it is. Whatever we are doing, we ought to take time off. That is just what we ought to do for a real Senator and a real friend.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:14 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair; whereupon, at 3 p.m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. COLLINS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

IN HONOR OF SENATOR JOHN CHAFEE

Mr. ROTH. Madam President, today is a sad day for America; today is a sad day for the Senate, for Rhode Island, but especially for JOHN CHAFEE's family.

Senator CHAFEE was, indeed, a remarkable man and a good friend. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family—his wife Ginny and five children—as they pass through this most difficult time.

I believe it can be said without hesitation that few individuals have served America with the distinction that JOHN CHAFEE exhibited in his many years of public service. From his active duty in the Marine Corps—where he saw action in both the Second World War and Korea—to his early years as a member of the Rhode Island House of Representatives, to his years as Governor and his work as Secretary of the Navy, to, of course, his 23 years of service in the Senate, JOHN's patriotism was beyond philosophical; it was pragmatic and it was concrete.

He had a keen sense of duty—a profound sense of responsibility. As a Senator, he knew his constituents, and he served them with such devotion that he was elected in 1976 and returned to Washington four times, despite the fact that he was a Republican in an overwhelmingly Democratic State. Much of his effectiveness was in his ability to find bipartisan cooperation, and to stand fast on issues that were important to the individuals and families he represented. Among these issues was a deep concern for the environment and for quality and affordable health care.

He was a tireless advocate of the underprivileged and a strong proponent of American leadership and economic opportunity. I understand how important these issues were to JOHN—not only because we served for so many years as colleagues and friends on the Senate Finance Committee—but because, like JOHN, I represent a small coastal State in the Northeast, much like you, Madam President. Many of the issues and concerns we faced were the same. In fact, one of the truly great honors I have received as a Senator is to be given the Ansel Adams Award by the Wilderness Society. It is the highest award that prestigious organization gives out, and there are only two Republican Senators who have ever received it. And I must say that it was awarded to JOHN first—2 or 3 years before me.

Madam President, along with you and all our colleagues, I am saddened by his death. But I am grateful for the time we spent together; I am grateful for his leadership and example; and I am grateful for his supportive family. Along with all my colleagues, I express my condolences to them as well as my most profound gratitude for sharing Senator CHAFEE with America.

Madam 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. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I, like countless Americans, am very saddened over the news that JOHN CHAFEE is no longer with us. The news of his death was a shock to me. I was with Senator CHAFEE just last week. I teased Senator CHAFEE about the fact that he was using a wheelchair, and I was accusing him of doing wheelies and racing down the aisles. He spent at least an hour with many of us in the Finance Committee discussing a number of issues, including health care, which was one of the issues in which he was most interested and of which he was a real champion for all Americans. This is a loss for so many, because of his great service to this country.

JOHN CHAFEE spent 23 years in the Senate. He was concluding his fourth term as a U.S. Senator. He had a very exceptional Senate career that encompassed many areas. He was a leader in education, health care, the Environment and Public Works Committee, of which he was chairman, dealing with issues such as clean air and clean water, and reauthorization of many very vital programs.

His service was not only limited to the Senate, however. In addition to his 23 years in the Senate, he served 6 years as Governor of Rhode Island. He also had about 7 years as a marine. He fought in both World War II and in the Korean war. He fought in the Battle of Guadalcanal.

I remember when I was on a trip speaking with leaders in Korea, and I wanted to learn more about the Korean war. They suggested I read a book. I believe the name of the book was "This Kind of War." It is a very thick book. I read it with great interest, and I read about Capt. JOHN CHAFEE, who was a hero during the Korean war. That was something he never mentioned. If you wanted to find out he was a hero, you had to talk to somebody else.

If you go all the way back to his service as a marine officer in World War II and the Korean war, his service in Rhode Island in the State legislature and as Governor, and his 23 years in the Senate, it has been a record of exemplary service. I think it is a total of 44 years of public service, not counting his 7 or 8 years as a marine. In over 50 years of public service, JOHN CHAFEE has dedicated his life to serving his State and his Nation. What great service, what great sacrifice he has made for our country.

I also was pleased to get to know him fairly personally. JOHN and his wife Ginny were married 49 years. What a wonderful, beautiful example. I knew

him also as a wrestler. He was inducted into the National Wrestling Hall of Fame, which is quite an honor. Not many people know that he was captain of the Yale wrestling team and undefeated in his wrestling career prior to the war. That is pretty special; that is not an easy accomplishment. It shows that he had a certain amount of toughness and will.

He was always willing to compromise and always willing to negotiate, but he was tough, he was sincere, he was energetic, he was a tireless campaigner and a tireless worker. He was a very dedicated individual.

JOHN CHAFEE is going to be missed in the Senate. His State will surely miss him to. They have so much for which to be grateful, to have had him as their leader, one of the real valued leaders, both as Governor and Senator, as a captain in the Marines, and as a fantastic colleague, devoted husband for 49 years, father of John, Jr., Lincoln, Zechariah, Quentin, and his daughter Georgia—five wonderful kids who, I know, are very proud of their father.

I know JOHN was very proud of his children. I was with Senator CHAFEE and his son "Linc" last week at a campaign event. You could sense, when Senator CHAFEE was introducing his son, the love and the bond they had between them. It was a wonderful thing to behold.

I have a special comment about Senator CHAFEE and his wife Ginny. I have had the pleasure of knowing them for my 19 years in the Senate. I have been in their home—a wonderful, beautiful, loving couple. I just want Ginny to know that our thoughts are with her and with her children. We want them to know we share their loss and they are very much in our thoughts and our prayers. I want them to know what a great honor it has been for me personally, and I think for all Senators, to have the privilege and pleasure of serving with JOHN CHAFEE in the Senate. He will be missed in Rhode Island, and he will be missed throughout the country.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, in this era of partisanship, harsh sound bites and bitter politics, JOHN CHAFEE wanted to have none of that. He was, in my view, the gold standard as far as public service is concerned. He wasn't full of himself, always humble and low key, always bipartisan.

I especially admired that he was always standing up for people without power and without clout. I think of all the times over the years I had a chance to serve with him—close to 20 years—

that JOHN CHAFEE stood up for children, stood up for the disabled, stood up for folks who are always falling between the cracks in the health care system, people who never had a voice.

Reflecting on his background—a family of means, Ivy League education—one would not think a person with those roots would be there for the kind of causes and the kind of people JOHN CHAFEE was for again and again during these years in public service.

His contributions are going to be documented in many areas but especially in the areas of health care and the environment. We all ought to take some time and reflect on what JOHN CHAFEE contributed to our country. His fingerprints are on every hallmark piece of environmental legislation, going through two decades, in terms of clean air and clean water.

JOHN CHAFEE, in his low-key, dignified way, always made it clear we should push to do better. In debates where various interest groups said, it isn't possible, Mr. Chairman, to get as far as you would like; we can't do it without wrecking the economy, JOHN CHAFEE would always point out time and time again when we pushed ourselves we could make these huge strides in terms of cleaning up the environment.

One of the measures of an individual and an individual's work on Capitol Hill is what his staff thinks of him. I don't know of any staff on either the House or the Senate side who stayed with a Member of Congress longer than JOHN CHAFEE. Those were the most loyal people in Washington. It was because they were working for an individual who they knew was in public service for only honorable reasons.

I hope in the days ahead we think about what JOHN CHAFEE contributed, think about his approach to solving problems, always trying to find the common ground, always trying to bring people together in a bipartisan way for the kind of government people have a right to expect in the 21st century. That is the kind of government Americans believe will help solve the intractable challenges of the day.

I hope when the rhetoric next gets a bit shrill in this body—it happens from time to time—we remember that great Senator who sat just a few feet from the dividing line between Democrats and Republicans in this Chamber, and that all Members remember JOHN CHAFEE's contributions which were so extraordinary in areas including health and the environment but were especially significant because of the way he brought Members together.

Personally, I was involved in half a dozen conferences where tempers got short and late at night everybody was ready to throw in the towel and wrap it up for the day. JOHN CHAFEE would have put in longer hours than anybody and he would keep people at it, trying to almost breed that kind of good will and bipartisanship that were his trademark.

This is a sad day for our country. It is a sad day for the Senate. I hope all Members remember that very special JOHN CHAFEE style in the days ahead. That will be the Senate at its very best.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I listened to the comments by my colleague from Oregon, Senator WYDEN, and he expresses, as do all Members of the Senate, our profound sadness over the death of our friend and our colleague, Senator JOHN CHAFEE from Rhode Island.

Senator CHAFEE was one of a kind. The 100 Members of the Senate, men and women who come from across the country, work hard and fight hard and get involved in a lot of public debate about some very controversial issues. We all have very different styles and different ways of approaching all of these issues, and JOHN's was unique.

Senator CHAFEE was in the Senate for a long while. He had achievements that will last forever. He was quite a remarkable Senator. He was, as the Senator from Oregon indicated, about as bipartisan a Senator as there was in this Chamber. He cared about results. He cared deeply about a wide range of public policy, including children, the environment, and so many other areas.

I used to visit with JOHN a lot about his grandchildren. JOHN CHAFEE's grandchildren played soccer with my children. The way to bring a gleam to Senator CHAFEE's eye was to go over to the area of the Chamber where he sat and talk about his granddaughter Tribbe and her soccer exploits. He so dearly loved those grandchildren and was so proud of them.

Senator CHAFEE was a war hero. He was a graduate of Yale University and Harvard Law School. Most important, he served this country in a very distinguished way. As proud as I have been to be able to serve in the Senate, one of the extraordinary opportunities to serve here is to be able to work with people such as the late Senator JOHN CHAFEE. I add my voice to those of so many other colleagues who come here today to say the Senate has lost truly a great Senator. I know all of us grieve with his family and loved ones and so many Americans across this country today.

Senator CHAFEE worked right through last week. Towards the end of last week, I asked Senator CHAFEE how he was feeling because he obviously was experiencing some difficult health challenges. But as was always the case, last week when I asked him how he was feeling he said, "Oh, fine," because he was not someone ever to complain. They say hard work spotlights the character of people. Some turn up their sleeves, some turn up their nose, and some don't turn up at all.

When people think of Senator JOHN CHAFEE, they will always remember a unique Senator who always turned up

his sleeves and said let's get to work together. The result of that is a legacy of accomplishment in the Senate in so many areas: The children's health insurance grant program; the CARE Independence Act; extending Medicare coverage to poor women, children, and disabled individuals; LIHEAP—so many areas. As the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, he was probably the leading voice in this country in crafting the Clean Air Act of 1990 which strengthened the pollution emission standards; the Safe Drinking Water Act—so many different areas of accomplishment.

But most of us in the Senate who had the privilege of working with him will not remember him so much for his accomplishments as we will his capacity as a human being. He was a colleague and friend. We will miss him dearly. I join with my colleagues today to say that. His daughter Georgia and son-in-law John have been dear friends for many years. I talked to his daughter today. She indicated, again, how proud she was of her father and how strongly she feels about the expression of sentiment today from Members of the Senate about her father and her father's work. We will all miss him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, it is with great sadness that I come to the floor today to speak about JOHN CHAFEE. I first met Senator CHAFEE standing in line to register for Harvard Law School in 1947. We had both returned from World War II and completed college and were freshmen in law school that year.

When you met JOHN CHAFEE in those days, you knew you were meeting a man. He was really an extraordinary man, very capable physically and mentally. I remember kidding him a little bit that he was going to have a tough time in one of our first classes because his uncle was the professor. His uncle, Zechariah Chafee, was one of the great professors of Harvard Law School in those days.

But JOHN CHAFEE finished law school, and then he went back to war. He went to Korea. He really never gave up his commitment as a patriot to this country because he then became the Secretary of the Navy under President Nixon. I think he served with great distinction here as one who had knowledge of what it means to have been in a war and was trying to assure peace.

He served with great distinction, as others have mentioned here today, on various committees of the Senate. It was not my privilege ever to serve with JOHN on one of the committees in the Senate; our paths were different. As a matter of fact, at times we disagreed. But I was chairman of the Senate Republican Campaign Committee the year he got elected.

He had a very distinguished record as Governor of Rhode Island, and he came to us with a unique approach, really, of

a very straight thinking man. He was not bound by partisan politics. He had a Republican philosophy, but he had a commitment to this country that was very deep and one from which I never saw him waiver. I never saw him waiver from something in which he believed. He really didn't care if he was the only person voting the way he decided was the best to vote for his constituents and his country.

I sat here last week and talked to him. He was, as we all know, then in a wheelchair. I was very surprised to see JOHN in a wheelchair, for just 2 weeks ago today we had gathered together here, after the Senate recessed, a group of some 60 of our Harvard classmates, to be with JOHN after he had made his decision not to run for reelection next year. It was sort of a preretirement party, you might say, with the people he had known and still knew very well from throughout the country. It was a great tribute to JOHN, again as a man, because our colleagues came from the west coast, Florida, all over the country, to be with him and Ginny at his first retirement party. Sadly, it was his last because by Friday, when I saw him on the subway, he was again in his wheelchair and was quite despondent about his health at the time. It was sad to see him in that condition, knowing what a vigorous man he was and a great friend.

The Senate has been much better off for having JOHN CHAFEE for so many years because he brought us such an extremely broad scope of opinion from his own experience in life. He was a graduate of Yale, and then he went to Harvard Law School. That didn't happen much in those days, but he decided he would pursue education where his family had a presence. I think his work in the Senate has been extremely significant because of his background in law and his background as a marine. I know those who served with him when he was Secretary of the Navy swore by him as one of the best.

It is sad to see the passing of another one from my generation. When I came here, I think 70 percent of the Senate had served in World War II. I don't know if I am counting right, but I think we are down to about 7 now—about 7 percent. We see in his passing, really, the beginning of the end of an era, of the generation that fought the last great world war. One of these days, I am going to have to write that book of the story that was written by our generation. I have not done that. But if there was any person who ever served in this body who was a great, shining example of that generation, it was JOHN CHAFEE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, this is a sad day for the Senate. I know a number of Senators have spoken in memory of Senator CHAFEE. I must add I really feel a sincere sense of loss today, and I know the Senate feels that collectively because we truly have lost one of our finest Members.

JOHN CHAFEE was a person who was not afraid to say what he thought about any issue that would come before the Senate. He had, to use the cliché, the courage of his convictions. He had the courage to stand up and say what he thought should be said on any issue, without regard for how it would affect the way he would be viewed by Members of the Senate or by the general public, but simply he felt compelled to say what he thought because he thought it was right and should be said and that was why he was here: to express his views, to try to be an influence in the process, to try to shape policies and legislation in a way he thought would be helpful and for the good of the country.

I admired him considerably and respected him enormously. He was a person of unquestioned character and integrity in every sense you can say those words. He was someone we could all look up to because of those traits, and we will miss him very, very much.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, there is a great sadness hanging over the Senate today. I come to the floor to share in our personal thoughts and recollections of a wonderful man. We have all lost a dear friend. JOHN CHAFEE was an extraordinary man, someone respected and loved and admired on both sides of the aisle. I think all of us are stunned and deeply saddened by this loss.

JOHN CHAFEE was one of the most reasonable and, increasingly, one of the most respected and important voices in the Senate. The fact that his voice has been silenced is a loss not only to the people of Rhode Island but to the people of our country.

He was a public servant in the fullest and finest sense. He was a soldier, a State representative, a Governor, a Secretary of the Navy, and a Senator.

There aren't many people who have served or who are serving who dedicated themselves more to public life and to public service and did so with such integrity, such conviction, as did JOHN CHAFEE. Few will leave a more significant legacy.

It has been noted on the floor that JOHN was an accomplished wrestler in high school. Whatever talents he had physically, intellectually JOHN continued to wrestle with ideas throughout his life. Ideas mattered to JOHN CHAFEE. He didn't care whether they were liberal or conservative ideas, Republican or Democratic ideas. He didn't care whether they were his ideas or someone else's. JOHN CHAFEE loved ideas and wrestled with them daily.

There was certainly nothing doctrinaire about him. He was a man of

deep political conviction and unusual political courage. It seems fitting that the last desk he occupied on the Senate floor was once used by another independent and equally principled voice: Senator Margaret Chase Smith.

His achievements in education, in the environment, on health care, on maritime issues, and for the people of Rhode Island will live on long after those of us who served with him are gone. As ranking member and as chairman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, no one was more instrumental in passage of the major environmental legislation of the latter part of this century than was JOHN CHAFEE.

The clean air and water laws, the efforts he made on the construction of important public projects throughout America, were his ideas. They were his accomplishments. But it seems to me that of all of the bridges JOHN CHAFEE helped build, it wasn't a bridge across a river as much as it was the bridge that spanned political divisions that represents his greatest achievement.

JOHN CHAFEE knew how to build bridges. He built them here every day when he came to work. They spanned the divisions based on race and gender and ethnicity and income and generation and every other sort of arbitrary decision we all too often tend to make.

The blue-blooded son of a Rhode Island family, he was a man of uncommon gift and privilege. Yet he had such a common touch. He believed in the concept of noblesse oblige. He believed that to those to whom much is given, much is expected. And he kept that faith, that dictum.

In an interview with the New York Times in June of 1995, JOHN CHAFEE worried aloud about the possible effects of the cuts of Medicaid then being proposed. He said: There are not many lobbyists around here for poor children or poor women. Today, sadly, there is one less lobbyist in the Senate for poor women and children, one less leader, one less friend, one less advocate, one less giant.

It is right that we offer praise and admiration for JOHN CHAFEE today. He more than earned it. But it seems to me the best tribute we can offer our friend is to try to fill the considerable void he leaves now, to try, as he did, to build bridges instead of walls, to try a little harder to respect each other's opinions and see things from each other's perspective, to speak for the people and principles he championed so eloquently for more than 40 years as a public servant from the State of Rhode Island.

JOHN CHAFEE deserves at least that much from us. He was an extraordinary man. He was an extraordinary inspiration. Each of us can be proud to say we knew him and could call him our friend.

Our hearts and our prayers go out to Virginia and to all the Chafee children and grandchildren.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. HAGEL. I thank the Chair.

I wish to follow behind the distinguished minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, in his remarks about a great loss for the Senate and for our country; that is, the loss of the senior Senator from Rhode Island, JOHN CHAFEE. We have all lost a friend. We have lost a man of immense dignity, a man of immense courage.

I have had the privilege of serving in this body for almost 3 years. One of the individuals with whom I became acquainted early was Senator CHAFEE. As our friendship developed, he and I would talk about his service in World War II in the South Pacific, where it happens that my father served at the same time, same places, Guadalcanal, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Australia. My father served in the Army Air Force; JOHN CHAFEE served as a marine. CHAFEE never penalized my father for less service, being in the Army Air Force. If my father were alive today, he would be very proud of the friendship I established with JOHN CHAFEE. In fact, my father died when I was 16 years old. My father was just a day younger than JOHN CHAFEE.

We don't often have an opportunity to get to know our colleagues in intimate ways, in ways that show the younger Senators what has developed this amazing Senator, a Senator's Senator, but as you spend time with your colleagues, you appreciate how they were molded, how they were shaped, and why they had, in the case of JOHN CHAFEE, such an immense capacity to serve—as has been noted this afternoon, the illustrious career of this magnificent individual.

Let me share for a moment a couple of personal stories. When Senator CHAFEE and I were in Kyoto, Japan, in December of 1997, we were on the opposite sides of that issue. He used to say to me: HAGEL, you're a bright boy. One of these days you will understand what I am trying to teach you about the environment.

So after 4 days at Kyoto, I said to Senator CHAFEE: Why don't I take you to China. Senator CHAFEE had been to China a number of times, as I had been. So we went to China for 5 days, and I took him deep inside China where he had never been. We spent some time at fertilizer plants. On one occasion we were out in the field with a farmer in China, and he took a picture of me. Then he had a picture taken of both of us around a two-wheeled garden tiller. He had that picture framed when we came back to the United States, and he inscribed it and sent it to my office. It still hangs in my conference room. It says: To my friend, CHUCK HAGEL, just another typical day out on the Nebraska prairie with a Nebraska tractor. Signed, your friend, JOHN CHAFEE.

I am very proud of that picture, which will hang, as long as I am in the Senate, in my conference room. And whenever I leave this great institution,

I will take that photo with me. I think he was always a little amazed that I was able to get us in to see the Premier of China during that trip. He asked me that night, after we were having dinner, how I did that. I said I used his name. He was quite astonished that his name would have that much appeal to the Chinese but actually the Chinese knew all about Senator CHAFEE.

It is rare that an individual leaves an institution so much better than he found it, as JOHN CHAFEE leaves the Senate; it is rare that an individual leaves the world so much better than he found it, as did JOHN CHAFEE. We shall miss him for his counsel, his wit, his friendship, but we will probably miss him most because he always elevated the debate. He did it with eloquence, elegance, and dignity.

As an old army sergeant, I sign off to a Secretary of the Navy, and I do so with great pride and great humility, knowing that we are all better off because JOHN CHAFEE touched us. We salute you, Secretary CHAFEE.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE, is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I found out this morning, as many other Senators, that Senator CHAFEE passed away. I see the beautiful flowers on his desk. I have been in the Senate now for 9 years, and while I did not know Senator CHAFEE as well as some Senators here, I admired him. I think he was tough in debate. He had positions that he took on issues, but he was substantive. In a way, I think he was a model of what we are about because he was interested in the debate on the issues. He was always a civil, warm, good person.

Sheila and I were talking to support staff today and they were saying what a nice man Senator CHAFEE was. That is what they said, that he was such a nice man. I think Senator JOHN CHAFEE was a kind, decent, caring human being. He was a great Senator with a highly developed sense of public service for Rhode Island and for the country. I know we are going to miss him and the country is going to miss him. I want to extend my love, as a Senator from Minnesota, to Senator CHAFEE's family and to the people of Rhode Island.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina, Mr. THURMOND, is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am deeply saddened to have to note the unexpected passing of our friend and colleague, Senator JOHN CHAFEE of Rhode Island.

I doubt that anyone expected that this week would begin by learning that Senator CHAFEE had been felled by a heart attack last evening. He was a man of relatively young age, great vigor and vitality. He was in his last year of a distinguished Senate career of almost twenty-five years, and I know he was looking forward to returning to

Rhode Island to enjoy life with family and friends in what is a beautiful, coastal state.

Senator CHAFEE was a proud New Englander, and he exhibited many of the fabled characteristics of those who live in the northeastern region of our nation. He was a thoughtful man, as was demonstrated by both his consideration for others, as well as the careful examination he would give to the issues put before him. JOHN CHAFEE marched in lockstep with no one, he was guided by his principles and beliefs and by a firm conviction of what was right and wrong.

Though most of us knew JOHN CHAFEE from his tenure in the United States Senate, he was already a committed public servant long before he was elected to this chamber in 1976. As a United States Marine, he risked his life in two conflicts, World War II and Korea, and like so many of his generation, JOHN sought to make a difference through public service. He held office as a member of the Rhode Island House of Representatives, as Governor of Rhode Island, and as Secretary of the Navy under President Richard M. Nixon. Unquestionably, the experience he gained throughout his career was most beneficial to him as a United States Senator, for he always demonstrated a mastery and depth of issues that was almost unparalleled. Furthermore, JOHN was a gentleman, and no matter how heated the debate, one could always count on him to weigh-in with what was a considered opinion; and, more often than not, was one that reflected that famous common sense approach for which New Englanders are renown.

Through his work, Senator CHAFEE leaves an impressive legacy of legislation, and his contributions to this body and the United States will not soon be forgotten. For his wife Virginia, daughter Georgia, and sons John, Jr., Lincoln, Quentin, and Zechariah, he leaves an even more important and valuable legacy, that of a loving and devoted husband and father. We mourn for the loss the Chafees suffered, we mourn for the loss of our colleague, we mourn for the loss of a good friend and a good man.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, 30 years ago this fall, I met JOHN CHAFEE. President Nixon had just been elected and he had appointed Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird. I aspired to be the Secretary of the Navy. Laird called me to his office and he said, "I want you to meet a very special person." Now, mind you, I had been closely associated with then-Vice President Nixon and worked on his campaign. Senator CHAFEE had been very closely associated to Governor Nelson Rockefeller. There was a little bit of a difference between Vice President Nixon and Nelson Rockefeller. I felt that I should be the Secretary of the Navy because CHAFEE

hadn't been quite the supporter that I had been for these many years. But Laird said to me, "I am going to introduce you to a man that you will respect, work for, and end up loving." I will never forget that. And so late in November, the two of us were informed, and he became Secretary of the Navy and I became his Under Secretary.

We served under Melvin Laird for 3 years of the most difficult period of the war in Vietnam. Unlike myself, with very modest military service in the closing days of World War II and again in Korea, JOHN CHAFEE had been a rifleman at Guadalcanal. Those of us who had been privileged to wear marine green in the generation of the World War II era we knew full well that those who had served on the canal had seen the roughest of the fighting. It was referred to as the "old breed." Those who came in later years were never quite the same as the old breed.

In the many years that I had been with JOHN CHAFEE, very closely associated, I never was able to get out of him all the facts—to this day—about his service in Guadalcanal. One day just a few weeks ago, we were walking down the hall. I can't remember exactly the occasion, but we saw a Marine general who had medals from up on the shoulder all the way down to his waist. I said: JOHN, that is different than the old days, where occasionally a decoration was given in the Corps. It must be different today. He said, "Yes."

I said to him: Did you ever get a decoration besides the Purple Heart? He said: No; didn't deserve it; didn't get it. Mind you, he served on Okinawa, on Guadalcanal, survived, got malaria, went to Australia, recovered, was picked to go to officer candidate school, and served in officer candidate school. He became a platoon leader on Okinawa. He survived the kamikaze attacks going in, and the fighting in that battle was as rough as any of them. The Japanese knew they had their backs against the wall. It was very tenacious, very rough and tenacious.

He told me a few facts about those years. But then just a few years after World War II, surprisingly—4 or 5 years—suddenly we were in another war. We were in Korea. JOHN called up for active duty. I am sure he could have found a way not to have gone because he had served so much in World War II. But he went. When he reported for duty and went to Korea, he became a company commander. In the Marine Corps and in the Army, and the other services, that unquestionably is the toughest of all jobs, with 230-plus men depending on you, with a reinforced company, an infantry company, whatever it may be. But JOHN was there.

I remember not long ago the author of this book, "The Coldest War," came through and visited with JOHN and me. I had been in Korea, but I had been in an air wing as a communications officer. He used to joke with me about how I slept in the tent with a little bit of a

stove, which was true, and he slept in a bunker out in the open. He always used to tease me. But in this book, they captured JOHN CHAFEE. The author discussed his bravery as a company commander and his love for his men—any man who served under JOHN CHAFEE—whether it was in the Marine Corps or, indeed, in this institution.

How privileged I was to sit just in front of my distinguished big brother in this Senate. Any man who served with JOHN CHAFEE inherited a great deal. I say that modestly. But we all profited so much from our personal association with this marvelous man.

I called former Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird and talked to him by phone. He sent me a short memo.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MELVIN R. LAIRD ON SENATOR JOHN H. CHAFEE

Our close and lasting friendship goes back for more than 45 years and will always be remembered. All of John's friends will remember his quick smile, his lack of pretense, his loyalty, his warm compassion, his good common sense judgment, and his special quality as a person. John, in every way, showed he cared about all of us, his Rhode Island constituents, and our country in a most wonderful way.

But his real love was his family. Ginny, most of all, was a very special love. John loved his children—Zechariah (Zach), Quentin, Lincoln, John Jr., and Georgia, and was a special grand dad to his many grandchildren. They will all miss him very much.

There were many unusual associations we had over these past 45 years—going back to Republican National Conventions, his service as Governor, his service as Secretary of the Navy, and his years in the United States Senate. His last interview in office occurred just last Friday with Dale Van Atta, who is working on a book on the Laird-Packard Pentagon Team.

I remember the call I received from John back in 1965 when he was the Governor of Rhode Island criticizing me for my planned attendance at a fund-raiser for my Democratic colleague in the Congress, John Fogarty. The Brick Layers Union had built a special library and so-called "outhouse" in John Fogarty's Rhode Island back yard. The dedication ceremony turned into a fund-raiser for Democrat John Fogarty and it upset John Chafee somewhat that I, as a Republican, was the speaker at the Fogarty building dedication and fund-raiser. I told John of the close working relationship John Fogarty and I had as the ranking members on the House, Education, Welfare and Labor Appropriations Committee. My advice to John was that the best thing he could do as far as his future political career in Rhode Island was concerned, was to be at the dedicatory program. John showed up and he never regretted his attendance.

I remember calling John in December 1968 and asking him to be Secretary of the Navy on the Laird-Packard Team in the Pentagon. There were many candidates suggested for this position—President Nixon had a candidate, as did Senator Dirksen (IL), Senator Hugh Scott (PA), Senator George Murphy (CA), and many others. Under the arrangement I had with President Nixon, it was my choice and I never regretted that choice—John Chafee was terrific!

John was an outstanding Secretary of the Navy. I hated to encourage him to leave the Pentagon and return to Rhode Island to prepare for a Senate bid, but knew that was his heart's desire. The responsibilities of Secretary of the Navy were turned over to his very capable Under Secretary, John Warner. We had a Change of Command ceremony at the Marine Corps base here in Washington and although we had a great replacement (our friend John Warner) there was much sadness in seeing John Chafee return to Rhode Island. We were all so very proud of his accomplishments for the Navy and our country, but sorry to see him leave the Pentagon. His election victories for the United States Senate followed.

His magnificent record in the United States Senate is known by all of you. John's leadership ability to forge a consensus on highly contentious issues of our times is unparalleled in the United States Senate. He will truly be missed.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, Mel Laird was a great public servant, and he still is. He said about JOHN CHAFEE:

Our close and lasting friendship goes back for more than 45 years and will always be remembered. All of John's friends will remember his quick smile, his lack of pretense, his loyalty, his warm compassion, his good commonsense judgment, and his special quality as a person.

John Chafee knew who he was. He never had to boast, he never had to brag, he never stopped to take credit, because this man knew who he was. He had tremendous inner self-confidence and a tremendous ability to be self-effacing.

Laird goes on:

John, in every way, showed he cared about all of us, his Rhode Island constituents, and our country in a most wonderful way. But his real love was his family. Ginny—

I talked to Ginny this morning at the crack of dawn. We exchanged a few words. Then we immediately recalled the happy days together throughout these 30 years—and laughter, for both of us, for a few minutes on the phone. She had the courage, like JOHN, to muster laughter in a moment such as this.

He loved his children—Zechariah, "Zach," Quentin, Lincoln, John Jr., and Georgia, and was a special granddad to his many grandchildren. They will miss him very much.

Yes, JOHN was a hero in every sense of the word. But he was the greatest hero to his family.

Laird goes on:

There were many unusual associations we had over these 45 years—going back to Republican National Conventions, his service as Governor, his service as Secretary of the Navy, and his years in the U.S. Senate. His last interview in office occurred just last Friday with Dale Van Atta, who is working on a book on the Laird-Packard Pentagon Team.

That was the team JOHN and I joined 30 years ago.

For 2 hours I worked with JOHN last Friday setting up a hearing on the Environment and Public Works Committee, where I was privileged to be his deputy, second always in command. I will never be first. Even though he is not here, I will still get his orders. But we were there working last Friday.

Yes, he was a little less spry in his step as he was recovering from his operation. But we have to remember

every day in this great institution that, yes, we have our debates, we have our differences, but the man or the woman to your left or right in this magnificent institution could be gone the next day by the will of God. I always think of that. We have to treasure and value every moment we have with each other in this great institution because it brings us together.

This paragraph in Laird's letter I am amused by:

I remember calling JOHN in December of 1968 and asking him to be Secretary of the Navy on the Laird-Packwood Team in the Pentagon. There were many candidates suggested for this position—President Nixon had a candidate, as did Senator Dirksen, Senator Hugh Scott, Senator George Murphy, and many others. Under the arrangement I had with President Nixon, it was my choice, and I never regretted that choice—John Chafee was terrific.

There are so many. I think in the days to come I will seek the privilege of speaking again of JOHN CHAFEE solely for the purpose of introducing into the RECORD some marvelous statements. I worked with his personal staff today in collecting some of his statements and with the staff of the Environment and Public Works Committee. There are so many lives this great American touched.

He loved his work in the Pentagon for those 3 years because it brought into focus everything he had learned as a young marine on Guadalcanal, as the platoon commander on Okinawa, and as a company commander in Korea.

I remember one day so well. Laird called us up. Laird was short, got on that phone, and issued an order quickly. It was Saturday. Of course, we worked Saturdays. The war was on. Absolutely, we wanted to be there. It was our choice. It was a heavy burden and responsibility. We were losing tens of thousands of casualties every week.

We just finished this engagement in Kosovo casualty-free. In Vietnam, thousands of men and women were killed and wounded week after week. It is so hard to believe now. It is so hard to explain war to the current generation.

But anyway, Laird called up, and he said: You two guys go down to The Mall and give me a report on what is going on.

There was a demonstration down there. CHAFEE and I were dressed in our blue suits as worn by the Navy today. We stripped them down and put on some old khakis. We had some tennis shoes. He and I used to play a little squash in the Pentagon. We put on a couple of old T-shirts. We got into an old car. We had chauffeur-driven cars in those days. Forget them. We got in an old car and drove down to The Mall. I will never forget that sight. There were over 1 million young men and women, in a peaceful way largely, demonstrating against that war in the heart of the Nation's Capital on The Mall between this building and the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial. There they were—1 million.

I could see JOHN was so terribly upset because it brought back the carnage he had seen in his previous military experience when the whole nation, every American, was solidly behind every person in uniform (abroad or at home). The Nation stood in solid support.

We went back to the Pentagon that afternoon, and we sat in Laird's office.

As I reminisced this morning, Laird had only been in office a comparatively short time and there was a lot of thought about how we were going to get America disengaged from that conflict, how we were going to stop the casualties. JOHN CHAFEE from that moment on became a very special counselor to the Secretary of Defense and, indeed, to the President on the need to bring that conflict somehow to a termination with regard to these losses. Over 50,000 young men and women were killed in uniform in that conflict in Vietnam.

Tough? Yes, he was a tough man. He was tough as they come. They used to say at Yale he was a wrestler; you will not get JOHN CHAFEE's shoulders to the mat; you will not get them to the mat. No one ever got them to the mat. I never did. I tried. I don't think in his distinguished career anybody in this great body ever did.

The interesting thing about that man, so full of courage and so full of toughness, I never heard him use a word of profanity, never a curse word. When JOHN would get upset and he was concerned about something, he would say: "Oh, dear." Remember that, colleagues? How many of you heard him say, "Oh, dear"? That was his way of saying, hey, we have a problem, but we are going to solve it. A remarkable man.

We will remember him for his modesty. I searched his web page: 40 years of public service condensed to one page. A modest man, never boasted. He had the self-confidence. I was asked, Who will take his place? Without thinking I simply said: No one. No one will take his place.

God bless you, JOHN, and your family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I thank our wonderful dear friend from Virginia for his very moving and eloquent personal comments about his wonderful friend, a friend of all Members, JOHN CHAFEE, whom we lost today.

Let me begin by expressing my deep sympathies to the CHAFEE family, to Ginny and the children and the grandchildren. I have come to know them over the years, being the neighboring Senator of the wonderful State of Rhode Island. I express to his family, the people of Rhode Island, and to his staff and friends and acquaintances over the years, what a terrible loss the death of JOHN CHAFEE is, to all who care about public service and care about this country.

The words of "scholar," "soldier," "athlete," and "statesman" I use quite

frequently to describe people. But in the case of JOHN CHAFEE, each one of those words has special meaning. He was truly a great scholar as we know from his academic work at Yale and Harvard Law School. He was truly a wonderful soldier, as JOHN WARNER has recounted. If one did not take the time to discover the service JOHN CHAFEE gave to this country in both World War II and Korea, one would not know it if one solely depended upon JOHN CHAFEE to describe it.

JOHN CHAFEE saw service in uniform to his country as not an extraordinary action but one that any good citizen would engage in during a time of serious conflict. Certainly his service in the Marine Corps and the Pacific, and again in Korea, were remarkable periods of our Nation's history. He served our Nation so wonderfully well in that capacity.

He was also a great athlete. Captain of the Yale wrestling team in 1941, he went undefeated. He was also quite a squash player. My brother-in-law, Bernie Buonanno, is from Rhode Island. Bernie and JOHN CHAFEE were regular squash competitors in Providence. I heard great tales about the battles between my brother-in-law and JOHN CHAFEE on the squash courts. I know CARL LEVIN and JOHN WARNER and others play not very far from this Chamber. They have wonderful times there. He was always in great shape, always had a tremendous amount of energy he brought to his work in the Senate.

Last, he was a statesman. That is hardly last. I first got to know JOHN CHAFEE almost 40 years ago. I was a freshman in college in Providence, RI, when JOHN CHAFEE became Governor of the State of Rhode Island. He was elected with an overwhelming margin of 398 votes in that year. He went on in 1964 and 1966 to huge margins. At that time in Rhode Island, Governors only had a 2-year term. During my entire career as a college student, JOHN CHAFEE was the Governor of the small State of Rhode Island. What a wonderful reputation he had as a Governor of that State.

During the latter part of that term, the Vietnam war issue, which JOHN WARNER talked about, began to boil over on campuses. JOHN CHAFEE handled that leadership role as a Governor of his State with great style and with great leadership in terms of understanding the diverse constituency, even of a small State such as Rhode Island.

In 1976, as we know, he came to the Senate. I arrived in 1981 and had the privilege of serving with him for the past 20 years. We didn't serve on committees together. I never had the privilege of being a member of one of the committees of which JOHN CHAFEE was a member. However, he certainly led in so many areas, particularly in environment. There were few who were JOHN CHAFEE's peers when it came to their longstanding concern about being good custodians and guardians of this planet Earth. Certainly throughout his career

on numerous pieces of legislation JOHN CHAFEE was the leader, the voice, that we all looked to when it came to deciding what path to follow as we tried to determine the best course of action, balancing the economic and environmental interests of our Nation.

The Presiding Officer knows this year, as someone who has been deeply interested in child care legislation, I lobbied hard to the Presiding Officer if she would be a cosponsor with me of my child care bill. I will never forget Senator COLLINS saying to me: I will go along with you on your bill on one condition. I am thinking, here it comes; what is the condition, some new provision has to be written in, some new amendment added. And she said: The condition is, if you can get JOHN CHAFEE to support your child care amendment, then I will join in your child care bill.

I talked to JOHN CHAFEE. I said: JOHN, if I can have your support, I can think of at least one or two, maybe four or five other Members of this body who will work with us on this issue. He gave his support to that issue.

This calendar year we have had four votes on child care amendments, and each has carried because JOHN CHAFEE decided to be a working partner on this issue.

That is another example of the kind of quiet leadership JOHN CHAFEE could give to an issue that was important to not only his constituents but to many across the globe and across this country, particularly.

The Presiding Officer, coming from New England, will appreciate this as well. We oftentimes find in antiques stores or flea markets the New England samplers. They are oftentimes framed. Home Sweet Home is the one with which most are familiar. There is another sampler we can find from time to time throughout New England. The sampler says: Leave the Land in Better Shape Than When You Found It. It is an old New England tradition. Our land was not particularly well suited to agricultural interests when that expression was coined; the rocky soil, the difficult winters make it hard to eke out a living. Each generation of New Englanders over the years has tried to clear another field, build another barn or shed, in some way make the land they pass on to the next generation healthier and better suited to serve the next generation.

JOHN CHAFEE was the quintessential New England statesman, in my view. He was not tight when it came to a dollar, but I called him a fiscal conservative when it came to budgetary matters. He was also a person who believed one ought to carefully invest capital in areas that would be critically important to the well-being of any enterprise. And in public life, investing in the environment of our country, investing in the educational needs, the transportation needs, seeing to it that all Americans have a chance to enjoy the wonderful opportunities of our Na-

tion, and the Tax Code, are all wonderful examples of JOHN CHAFEE making wise investments, the wise New England approach to the well-being of our Nation.

So in many ways, JOHN CHAFEE epitomized, I suppose—for me, anyway—what a good Senator from New England ought to be. In many ways, as I think about that old sampler you can find in these bazaars in New England from Maine to Connecticut, "Leave the Land in Better Shape Than when You Found it," JOHN CHAFEE epitomized that simple expression.

Wherever he is at this moment—and I know he is with our good Lord and Savior—he will be looking down knowing—and he should know—that even for that brief amount of time, the few short years, 77 years, he had as a scholar, as a soldier, as an athlete, and as a statesman, JOHN CHAFEE truly left his State and his country and the world in which we live far better than when he found it. For the immense difference he has made, we thank him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I understand the junior Senator from Rhode Island is on the floor and would like to make remarks, too. I ask consent he be allowed to succeed my remarks in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, this morning I was actually in Lexington, KY, with my son and daughter and grandson. I think in a way that made me even more melancholy and mournful about this day and the loss of our good friend JOHN CHAFEE.

I started thinking about JOHN and his life. It made me realize that, day by day, in our regular duties, we go busily about our business and we do not stop, sometimes, to look at the beautiful surroundings, this historic building we are in. We don't stop, sometimes, to thank the staff member who has been particularly helpful to us. Also, sometimes we don't stop to think that we walk with men and women in this institution who have been giants in their lives. JOHN CHAFEE was one of those men. Sometimes we just forgot JOHN CHAFEE had done so much for his country, for his fellow man, for his State, and for his Nation. It was easy to do that because JOHN was not the kind of guy who demanded attention and demanded he be treated with reverence or any extraordinary respect. He was a soft-spoken gentleman, and he was truly a "gentle" man. The word fit him perfectly.

I was just talking to Senator WARNER, his good friend, his successor as the Secretary of the Navy. I never had quite thought about one other thing: JOHN CHAFEE was not one given to temper, not one given to profanity. He was just a dedicated, hard-working, good Senator for his State and for our country. So I believe we truly have lost one

of the best servants we have had in the Senate in my time here, our friend JOHN CHAFEE, the senior Senator from Rhode Island.

I first got to know JOHN CHAFEE some 30 years ago; it is hard to believe, I say to Senator WARNER, who was his deputy over there at the Navy Department. JOHN was the Secretary of the Navy. I had the occasion to meet with him as a staff member because there was a little disagreement between his State and my State about a Seabee base. But he was always so fair in all his dealings; it impressed me then. I didn't realize at the time that he had already been Governor and he had such a distinguished military career. There he was, the Secretary of the Navy.

Then, of course, he went on to be elected to the Senate. Only after I came to the Senate did I realize he truly was a war hero, a marine. He was very proud of it. He defended his country, and he was a highly decorated combat veteran. He served his people so well as Governor of that State, and he also served the people of that State as a Senator since 1976.

I have given a lot of thought about Senator CHAFEE today; also, the fact the last time I saw him and spoke to him personally, last Thursday, he was not feeling particularly well. He wanted to know if there were going to be any more votes. But he was staying right back here, waiting to see if he was going to be needed anymore, attending to his duties, even on Thursday night of last week.

I think it is belated but appropriate that we say a few kind words about Senator CHAFEE and his service. We extend our best to his wife Ginny and to his family.

By the age of 39, JOHN CHAFEE was already a combat veteran in two wars. You will not find it in his official biography, but he earned at least two Purple Hearts, among many other service distinctions. He had left his undergraduate studies at Yale University to first enlist in the Marines. He served in the original invasion forces of the Battle of Guadalcanal during World War II. Following that, he resumed his studies at Yale and went on to earn his law degree at Harvard.

JOHN was recalled to active duty in 1951, and while in Korea he commanded Dog Company, a 200-man rifle unit in the 1st Marine Division. Perhaps Senator WARNER has already recounted all of that, but it is such an impressive part of the man he was.

After 6 years in the Rhode Island General Assembly, including 4 years as his party's leader in the House of Representatives, JOHN was elected Governor of Rhode Island in 1962 by 398 votes—not one to waste any votes, or anything else for that matter. He was reelected in 1964 and 1966 by the largest margins in Rhode Island's history.

The newly-inaugurated President Nixon appointed JOHN CHAFEE to be Secretary of the Navy in 1969, a post he held for 3½ years. He was elected to his

fourth term in 1994 with 65 percent of the vote. He was the first Republican elected to the Senate from Rhode Island in 68 years.

In the Senate, he rose to become chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee where, once again, he worked very aggressively on issues about which he felt strongly. He was a Senator who really did care about the environment. But he tried to make it an issue where we reached across the aisle to each other. He wasn't interested just in making a statement or trying to drive up his ratings with one group or another. He wanted to get results.

I remember he came to me when I had first been elected majority leader in 1996. He said: I believe we can pass this safe drinking water bill. It had been stalled in the Senate and the House, and it was stalled in conference.

I said: John, it's too late. We can't do it.

He said: If we come to agreement, will we get it up for a vote?

I said: If you can get Dirk Kempthorne and the others involved and get Democrats involved, and we can get a bill that will be good for America, to have safe drinking water, why, surely we will do it.

I think it was the last day of the session, but right at the end we got it done because JOHN CHAFEE would not give it up. He wasn't interested in making a statement. He was interested in getting a good bill for his country—Safe Drinking Water—a worthy cause and one of which JOHN CHAFEE was very proud.

Even recently, he was working on efforts that are certainly worthwhile and have been very difficult to bring to closure. The day will come when we will get a new Superfund bill, and when we do, we ought to dedicate it to the memory of JOHN CHAFEE because he has charged that mountain as a good marine, time and time again. We never have quite made it. One of these days we will top the crest, and we will all think about JOHN CHAFEE when we do.

He was an important member of the Finance Committee. He chaired the Social Security and Family Policy Subcommittee. Again, just last week I arrived late at a Finance Committee meeting before we went out to mark up a bill providing assistance for hospitals, nursing homes, and home health care, a bill that would put back some Medicare money as a result of the balanced budget agreement. It was about to come apart. The wheels were coming off. Senators were disagreeing. It looked as if what was going to be a bipartisan package, easily passed out, that had been crafted by the chairman, Senator ROTH, and the ranking member, Senator MOYNIHAN of New York, was going to fall apart right there in that little anteroom before we went into the Finance Committee meeting.

One of the last people to speak was JOHN CHAFEE. He said: Good work has been done on this; it is not everything

we would want—typical of JOHN CHAFEE to say that—but it is a good step. We ought to do it. We ought to go out here right now, take this bill up, and pass it out of the Finance Committee.

Thirty minutes later, by a voice vote, with only two dissenting audible nays, we passed that bill out.

He did his part on the Finance Committee, too. He served as a member of the Select Committee on Intelligence, where he had a real interest in making sure about the intelligence capabilities of our country, to make sure we did not drop our guard in that area, and we started rebuilding our intelligence community after years of problems, going back, I guess, to the 1970s.

He was chairman of the Senate Republican Conference for 6 years, the No. 3 leadership position in the Senate.

In the Senate, we knew JOHN as a genuinely independent New Englander, respected on both sides of the aisle, who worked to bring opposing sides together for the common good. All of us regretted his decision announced earlier this year to leave the Senate, but it was characteristic of JOHN to work to the very end. He leaves behind 5 children, 12 grandchildren, and a legacy of a lifetime of service to Rhode Island and to his Nation.

If the Biblical quote ever applied to any Senator, this quote should apply to JOHN CHAFEE: Well done, thy good and faithful servant.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to join the majority leader and my colleagues in paying tribute to the senior Senator from Rhode Island, JOHN H. CHAFEE. I do so not only on my own behalf but on behalf of the people of Rhode Island, for they have suffered a grievous loss.

First, I extend my condolences to Mrs. Chafee and the Chafee family. Above all else, JOHN CHAFEE was a devoted husband, a devoted father, and a loving and caring father and grandfather. Indeed, his family is a living tribute to his remarkable life.

This is a personal loss to his family, to his friends, to his colleagues, but it is also a personal loss to the people of Rhode Island. For over 40 years, he has played a central role in the life of our State, and Rhode Island is a special place for many, many reasons, but it is a special place in particular because it is a place where everyone knows everyone else, and literally every Rhode Islander knew Senator JOHN H. CHAFEE.

If you had to ask Rhode Islanders what they felt and thought about this man, one word would come quickly to their lips: respect. This respect transcended party politics, social position, every category that we ascribe, sometimes arbitrarily, to people.

This respect was a function of a recognition, first, of his qualities as a man. He was a man of integrity, intel-

ligence, tenacity, and fairness. He was a gentleman. When I arrived in the Senate—and previously as a Member of the other body—he treated me with graciousness and cooperation and help, and I thank him for that from the bottom of my heart.

The respect which Rhode Island holds for this great man is also a function of his selfless service to the Nation. He began that service as a young marine on Guadalcanal. He spent his 20th birthday there. JOHN CHAFEE, the son of privilege, could have found an easier way to serve his country during World War II, but he chose the very hardest way, so typical of the man. He chose to go ashore with the invasion force of Guadalcanal at a time when it was not clear we would prevail. It was only clear we would give everything to win, and JOHN CHAFEE was prepared to do that for his country, for his community, indeed, for decency throughout the world.

Later, after serving in World War II and going back to law school, he was ready to assume the privileges and the rights which such service won him. But another war beckoned, and characteristically, JOHN CHAFEE heard the summons of that trumpet and went to Korea to lead a marine rifle company. Again, he could have found less dangerous assignments but, once again, if American sons were at risk, JOHN CHAFEE would lead them.

After his service in the Marine Corps, he did return home, finished his law school studies, and came back home to Rhode Island. He served as a member of our general assembly with distinction, and in 1962, he was elected Governor of our State, clearly the most Democratic State in the country, but through arduous campaigning and through his personal qualities, he was elected by over 300 votes. Not a landslide, but enough to give him a chance to serve the people of Rhode Island, and serve he did.

Long before it was popular and chic to be an environmentalist, JOHN CHAFEE was an environmentalist. With innovative visionary legislation, he began our State's acquisition of open spaces so our quality of life would not be diminished by economic development. In fact, long before many others, he recognized that a good economy and a good environment not only can go hand in hand but must go hand in hand. This was the early sixties, long before Earth Day, long before the organized environmental movement, but he knew in his heart that quality of life was important to maintain. He knew also that our environmental legacy is a gift from God which we must revere, we must cherish, and we must pass on. And he did so.

He was also a builder because it was this time in our history that route 95 was being developed right through the heart of Rhode Island, and he was there. In fact, he joked that it was a great opportunity for a Governor because every time they completed 2 or 3 miles of interstate, he could hold a

press conference and talk about the progress. But it was something that was close to him, not because of notoriety, but because he saw this as a way to improve the economy of Rhode Island, to link us more closely to the national economy. Indeed, even up to his last days, he was working to improve the infrastructure, particularly the transportation infrastructure of Rhode Island, a mission he began as our Governor more than 30 years ago.

As my colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia, pointed out, he served with great distinction as Secretary of the Navy. After his family, his State of Rhode Island and the Marine Corps were his great loves. These two passions—his State and the naval service—helped mold his life and, indeed, he in turn helped mold these great institutions—our State and the naval service.

He served with distinction at a time when the Navy was being stretched, the tumult of Vietnam was spilling out into our streets, and still we had to fight a superpower adversary in the form of the Soviet Union. He served with characteristic vision, innovation, and distinction.

He was then elected to the Senate, and for four terms he has shown us all what it is to be a Senator. In fact, it is characteristic that Senator JOHN H. CHAFEE literally died on active duty serving his Nation and serving his State as a Senator. He spent his whole life in service to the Nation.

The respect for Senator CHAFEE also emanated from the recognition that he always had an unswerving commitment to principles. He was schooled in the hardest test: Always do the harder right rather than easier wrong.

There are extraordinary numbers of examples to attest to this dedication of principle. I can think of several, but let me just suggest that, again, before so many people took up the cause of gun control, Senator CHAFEE stood solidly to control the violence in the life of America, to reasonably restrict access to weapons, to ensure that the lives of our children are protected.

I can recall being with him at a rally he organized in Providence, RI, where he had Sarah Brady come in. We were literally enveloped by a large group of counterdemonstrators with bullhorns, pressing in on us, trying to literally disrupt this rally to control guns in our society.

But anyone who waded ashore at Guadalcanal and fought in Korea was not easily intimidated. And he was not. He not only stood his ground that day, but he stood his ground every day to try to argue for more sensible rules with respect to handguns. And that is just one example of where he did, in some respect, the unpopular thing because it was the right thing to do.

This respect also emanates from the recognition by my fellow Rhode Islanders that, more than so many others, he always sought to find the common ground that would bring different

groups together, that would result in progress, both in terms of legislation but more importantly progress in terms of the lives of the American people.

He was a pragmatist. He was committed to advancing the well-being of his constituents and the people of this country, and, indeed, the people of the world. He was always looking for practical ways to do that. He was wedded to the strong principles of the Constitution. But he was able to find ways, through the details, to advance those principles, to bring others aboard, to move forward.

When he became impatient, it was an impatience borne of the distractions that we sometimes find ourselves in in this institution and the posturing that we sometimes find ourselves in in this institution—because he was here to do the job of the people of Rhode Island: To improve their lives, to give them more opportunities, to give them more freedom, so they can use it not only for their advancement and the advancement of their children but the advancement of this great country.

He had a special concern for children and those Americans with disabilities. It was a concern that he did not trumpet about, but it was a concern that resonated throughout his entire legislative career.

Today, we have done much to ensure that the poorest children of America have health care through our Medicaid Program. And that was the handiwork of JOHN CHAFEE—not through press releases but through the hard work of legislation, the detailed intricacies of the Internal Revenue Code, and the Social Security laws. He expanded coverage because, while others would be disheartened by failure of comprehensive reform, he dug in and every day advanced the cause of health care, particularly for children in this country.

He always had a special place in his heart and in his service for disabled Americans. I know that because the disabled citizens in Rhode Island revere and treasure this great man for what he has done—again, long before public acclaim or public notoriety. And why did he do it? Because it was the right thing to do.

In March of this year, Senator CHAFEE announced he was leaving the Senate and going home. Last evening, he began that final journey home—home to Rhode Island, a State made infinitely better by his effort and example, a place that mourns but will forever revere his service and take pride in his achievements and inspiration from his life.

In the words of the Poet William Butler Yeats:

The man is gone who guided ye, unwearied,
through the long bitter way.
Ye be the waves that close in our sad nation,
Be full of sudden fears,
The man is gone who from his lonely station
Has moulded the hard years. . . .
Mourn—and then onward, there is no return-
ing
He guides ye from the tomb;

His memory now is a tall pillar, burning
Before us in the gloom!

Senator CHAFEE will allow us to mourn, but insist that we move forward to do the unfinished work, which is the hope and promise of America. And with him as a guide we shall. And he would want it that way.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

DEATH OF THE HONORABLE JOHN H. CHAFEE, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 206, and I ask that the resolution be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 206) relative to the death of the Honorable JOHN H. CHAFEE, of Rhode Island:

S. RES. 206

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable John H. Chafee, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

Resolved, That Senator Chafee's record of public service embodied the best traditions of the Senate: Statesmanship, Comity, Tolerance, and Decency.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 206) was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues to express our profound sorrow at the loss of a dear friend and an outstanding Senator. JOHN CHAFEE was probably the finest gentleman ever to serve in this body. We offer our sincerest regrets, our sympathies, and our prayers to his family.

I stopped by his office today and expressed my sense of loss to his staff. We express, collectively, our deep sorrow to the people of Rhode Island, but, beyond that to the people of the entire Nation who in many different ways, in many different areas, were served so well by JOHN CHAFEE throughout his career.

We have just heard very eloquent remarks from the majority leader and his colleague from Rhode Island, summarizing some of the many things that

JOHN CHAFEE has done. It would take several volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to go through his list of achievements and the things that he has done for the least among us to further the causes in which he felt so strongly.

But I rise today to express gratitude and to celebrate the legacy that he left us. If you had to ask somebody: Who is the most decent person that you know of in politics? chances are, JOHN CHAFEE would be at the top of that list. He was a man, as has been said, who had very strong feelings.

He fought hard for principles, but he fought so with unfailing courtesy, with compassion and kindness and consideration for others who had differing views.

I had the privilege of working with him on a health care task force in 1993 and 1994. I sat in a room and listened to him bring together people of very strongly opposing views. Always, without fail, he guided the discussions away from bitterness, away from harshness, into constructive channels.

I was pleased to work with him on environmental and public works issues. And he was a great leader of a committee that has very contentious issues. He worked together with his leadership. We made progress, sometimes in areas where people thought progress could not be made.

I followed his work on so many issues affecting health care and children from his position in the Finance Committee. He was there to move not just this body but the country forward in assuring that we would meet the needs of children. Whether it was Medicaid for poor children or the foster care bill that he was recently championing, he was always looking out for those in need; but he did so in a manner that is a good lesson for all of us.

When somebody got carried away and attacked him, perhaps a little too strongly, he turned it away with a warm smile and understanding. When views got very heated and the arguments got passionate, he would calm it down with a kind word and steer the discussion and the debate back in a constructive pattern.

When some of us had personal reverses, JOHN CHAFEE was there quietly, as a friend, to lend support, to lend encouragement, and to let us know that we had a friend, somebody who cared for us. If there is one thing I hope this body will remember, it is that record, that unfailing, consistent pattern of being, first and foremost, a concerned human being who was a dear friend.

I hope that legacy can guide this body, that all of us can strive to emulate his service, his compassion, and his caring. As our thoughts and prayers go out to his family, his loved ones, and to all who will miss him, I hope we will remember and hold high those principles which he not only espoused but he lived.

I am from Missouri. One of our slogans is: Show me. JOHN CHAFEE's life

showed us every day, every hour in this body what a fine human being can do to move the process of government forward on a constructive path. I only hope we can hold dear and remember those lessons he taught us.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, with JOHN CHAFEE's passing, the Senate has lost a great leader, Rhode Island has lost a great Senator, and I have lost a great friend.

This afternoon I had the honor of presiding over the Senate and was able to hear firsthand the tremendous outpouring of affection and respect and sadness from my colleagues, as they came to the Senate floor one by one to pay tribute to this remarkable man. Indeed, Senator CHAFEE's legacy exceeds that for which any of us could have wished. He has been a leader in his commitment to children, to improving health care, to preserving our environment.

I wish to talk for just a few moments about what JOHN CHAFEE meant to me personally. From my very first day in the Senate, JOHN CHAFEE took me under his wing. He was always there for me. He encouraged me. He taught me the ropes. He guided me, particularly on contentious issues. He was always a steady voice of reason. He taught me how important it was to reach across the aisle to attempt to achieve a consensus, compromises based on common sense. Indeed, he very quickly enrolled me in one of his favorite projects, and that was the Centrist Coalition, which he chaired, along with our colleague from Louisiana, Senator JOHN BREAUX. Together this group of about 20 Senators would meet periodically to hash out contentious issues, to try to achieve a compromise on budget and other important issues of the day. Always we were guided by JOHN. JOHN had a tremendous ability to pull people together, to bring out the best in everyone.

I also have so many other warm, personal memories of my time with JOHN and his family.

Many of my colleagues may be unaware that JOHN had tremendous ties to my home State of Maine. His family for generations had a home there in Sorrento. His father had lived in Portland, ME, and had owned a business in Saco, ME, in the southern part of the State.

I visited JOHN's home in Sorrento, and he very proudly took me all over the community, telling me of his favorite spots, taking me for a ride in his motorboat. He loved Maine, almost as much as he loved his beloved home State of Rhode Island. He was a New Englander through and through. He brought a sense of integrity and principles to the debates of the day, and he had a sense of pride in his native region of New England. In many ways, he was a Senator for all of New England. I know we always used to joke that he

was the third Senator from the State of Maine.

As I got to know JOHN, his wife Ginny and their children, I became more and more impressed with the tremendous accomplishments of this remarkable individual. But these accomplishments you never heard about from JOHN CHAFEE himself; he was far too modest to ever blow his own horn. Little by little, I learned from his family and his friends of his heroic wartime service, for example, as well as his tremendous legacy as a superb Governor, his service as Secretary of the Navy, and, of course, his service in the Senate.

I remember once talking to his daughter, Georgia. I said: Your father has this tremendous background and people don't know about it because he never toots his own horn. He doesn't tell people of his accomplishments. He is too modest to do so. I remember Georgia saying back to me, yes, truly her father's lifetime could fill up at least one book, but that he would never be the one to write it.

I hope, by our tributes to him today and in the days to come, we will help to write that book so all of America may know what a great man, what a great Senator, what a great friend JOHN CHAFEE was.

I am honored to have known him. The entire world has been enriched by his service.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I first met Senator CHAFEE in December of 1984. We had a small incoming Republican freshman class that year. It was the Senator from Texas, Senator GRAMM, and myself. Senator GRAMM was already a national figure. He had burst onto the stage in his home State of Texas and had served in the House of Representatives for awhile.

I had been in local government. Frankly, I didn't know many people, and it was sort of a lonely first year in many ways.

I met JOHN CHAFEE in the Old Senate Chamber. That is where we had rather spirited elections for leadership in December 1984. The one most people noticed was Bob Dole being elected Republican leader to replace Howard Baker. But also on that day, Senator CHAFEE was elected chairman of the Republican conference, as I recall, by one vote. I think JOHN getting elected chairman of the Republican conference by one vote kind of summed up the odds he was frequently up against, not only in our conference, where he was one of the most moderate Members and frequently at variance with the majority of the conference, but he was a survivor because people recognized his personal qualities.

I don't know a great deal about Rhode Island, but I am told only 8 percent of the people of Rhode Island consider themselves Republicans. Someone earlier today described it as the most

Democratic State in America. I suspect that is true. And yet we had here a man with such enormous personal qualities that he was elected Governor multiple times and served in the Senate from 1976 until his death. Clearly, there was something special about JOHN CHAFEE that people came to recognize and understand.

Most of the causes JOHN pursued were, shall I say, not particularly good for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. He always thought it would be a good idea to raise cigarette taxes. Well, as you can imagine, the State has an enormous number of tobacco growers. That was rarely something I was enthusiastic about. Also, at least part of our State of Kentucky is in the Tennessee Valley Authority. JOHN always thought the TVA was something that ought to be terminated, and I must say over a period of years, having watched TVA operate, I am more and more open to JOHN's views on the matter, although I haven't gone quite that far.

Other speakers have said it, but I think the hallmark of JOHN CHAFEE was the fact you knew no matter what he said and did, it was based upon a great sense of objectiveness. He operated with enormous personal integrity and clearly was one of the most popular Members of the Senate. He always had an open mind. He was willing to revisit an issue.

For example, just last week, in a rather contentious debate that we frequently have around here on campaign finance reform, JOHN, whose views were fundamentally different from mine on the subject, actually ended up agreeing with me on one of the proposals we had before us. It was a tribute to his willingness to revisit an issue, or at least part of an issue, where he had a long-standing commitment. But he took a look at a particular version that we had before us and reached a different conclusion.

At the beginning of this Congress—we have our desks here on the floor on a seniority basis—I had finally been around here long enough where I moved over in the area where a lot of senior Members are. JOHN was right here, two desks over. I think it was really during the impeachment hearing, when we were all here so much of the time and I felt I got to know JOHN even better. We were frequently talking, both in the cloakroom and out here on the floor, during that very difficult time.

It is hard for me to imagine a finer human being than JOHN CHAFEE, who was an effective Senator, an outstanding Senator, and really a fine human being. So we celebrate his remarkable life, which others have spoken about—from his courage under fire in World War II and again in Korea, to his exemplary service to the Nation in the U.S. Senate. So I say to you, Ginny, and to all the family, we share your grief. We will miss JOHN more than words can express. Not only have you lost a husband, but the Senate has

lost a great Member, and America has lost one of its finest statesmen.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina, Mr. HELMS, is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this is a sad afternoon for all of us. Senator CHAFEE and I had been seatmates for nearly a decade. I can testify that never once during those years did he comport himself in the slightest manner to diminish his image—which was widely held—as a perfect gentleman and a dedicated American. His whole life was such.

He was a man whose dedication to his wife and family was demonstrable in everything he did and said. Often were the times that we exchanged tidbits of news about his family and mine; we talked a lot about those whom we love.

I was one of the many Senators who, with some frequency, did not agree with some of JOHN's votes. And you know, it is a funny thing, Mr. President, he disagreed with me the same number of times but always pleasantly. I never doubted that he was genuine, honest, and sincere in all that he did and said as a Senator and as a human being.

I never once heard him speak a harsh word about anyone, and I never was aware of his losing his temper. He may have, but I never saw it.

Mr. President, JOHN CHAFEE was a thoroughly decent and unfailing gentleman who was respectful of the opinions and judgments of others but unyielding in his own opinions. That is the way it is supposed to be around here.

Did I like JOHN CHAFEE? You bet. Did I respect his quiet independence? Of course. Like the good U.S. Marine that he was in World War II, he was demonstrably willing to give his life for his country and to serve his country in other capacities, such as Secretary of the Navy.

I shall miss his sitting next to me; I shall always remember our agreement to nudge each other when the rhetoric in this Chamber caused heads to begin to nod, which frequently happens when some long-winded speaker takes up a lot of time, which I am not going to do at this time.

JOHN CHAFEE was a friend whom I shall forever miss, and Dot Helms and I extend our deepest sympathy to JOHN's dear wife, Virginia, whom I admire greatly, to his five children, and all of his splendid family which he loved so dearly.

One final personal note. I know how the staffs feel; he had two of them—his personal staff and the committee staff. I know exactly how they feel this afternoon. I extend my sympathy to them as well because I have been there and I have done that. I served as an administrative assistant to a distinguished U.S. Senator in the early '50s, and he died unexpectedly; he had a heart attack. I remember the helplessness that all of us felt. Coming here to make

these remarks, I rode over on the underground trolley that connects the Dirksen building with the Capitol. In the car with me was one of Senator CHAFEE's staff members. He was sad, and I told him that I knew exactly how he felt. It is not a good day. But it is so good that all of us, the staff members, his friends and family, were able to know and be with JOHN CHAFEE.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the "Thoughts from Senator CHAFEE's Staff" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection. The material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUGHTS FROM SENATOR CHAFEE'S STAFF

Working for Senator Chafee was not a job, it was an honor, and a great one at that. Each and every one of us—on the personal staff in Washington . . . the Environment Committee staff . . . and in the Senator's Rhode Island office—felt privileged to be advancing his legislative priorities, his values, his vision of government and public service.

In the many wonderful tributes that have been paid to Senator Chafee, his concern over issues such as the environment, health care, civil rights, and gun violence have been highlighted. He also cared deeply about our nation's economic future, and its impact on generations to come. Senator Chafee cared about these issues because of their implications for people generally, but, more specifically, for the most vulnerable members of our society—children, the disabled, the frail elderly, and the low-income. His guiding motivation was the importance of human dignity, and the belief that government could make a positive difference in people's lives.

His sense of public spirit was infectious, and we have all learned a great deal from him. But more important than any lesson in civics is the example he set for all of us about how to conduct our lives: listen to both sides; do what's right; and even if you don't prevail, be of good cheer; and always look for the good in people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY, is recognized.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in expressing our great sorrow for the loss of JOHN CHAFEE. He was a really remarkable, special soul, a very gentle person, who nevertheless had a will of steel. He was, in many ways, sort of an archetypal New Englander, for those of us who come from that part of the country. There was a great quality of independence, a great ability to march to the beat of his own drummer. He did that. I think that in very special ways he was one of the bridges in the U.S. Senate.

I first crossed paths with JOHN CHAFEE back during the Vietnam war. I am proud that his signature is on my medals. We talked a lot about that after I came back. He had the great capacity to reach out across the aisle. I recall this summer, as a matter of fact, how he came up to me one evening and said, "I am a bachelor; Virginia is not here." My wife, Teresa, wasn't here at the time. He said, "Let's go to dinner." So we went down to the Metropolitan Club, where I heard some other colleagues say he often went to dinner. We just sat and talked a lot about life,

about war, about his experiences; and all the divisions of the Senate sort of melted away because of his gesture. But it was not strange for JOHN to do that. Those of us who worked with him over the years here know that he was always reaching across the aisle trying to build a bridge, trying to pull people together.

I remember when we were in the throes of a fight over the clean air amendment in 1990. There were great meetings in the room back here with George Mitchell. JOHN CHAFEE, Senator Mitchell, and a few others with great calming voices, were reaching out trying to pull people together and find a path of common sense. That is really one of the great legacies, the commitment that produced that amendment and also produced a whole host of advances with respect to the environment.

I traveled with JOHN to Rio. We were part of the delegation for the Rio conference when we had that huge summit.

I traveled with him again to Kyoto. I remember one very peaceful moment when we snuck away to a beautiful Japanese garden. He was busy looking at the architecture, experiencing the remarkable peace of that place, and laughing at the fact that he had stolen away from a conference for a few moments to do so.

JOHN was one of the great calming influences in this body, a man of extraordinary common sense, a person who always tried to stand for principle—not for party, not for ideology, but for what was best for the State, best for the country, and best, in his judgment, for families and for the future.

He was passionate about Rhode Island, and passionate about the country. And in the end, I think his legacy will be measured not only by the legislation that he worked on, not only by his remarkable efforts to help us get a health care bill in 1993 and 1994, but meetings which I will forever remember in his hideaway where he brought people together trying to forge a centrist plan, which, ultimately, I might add, helped pave the way for Kennedy-Kassebaum and for other things that we have contemplated.

But he understood what his course was. He had a great sense of who he was, of what this place meant to him, and what all of us could achieve. He always placed those aspirations on the table as directly and as honestly as anybody I know in the Senate.

JOHN was also a warrior—a great warrior. Underneath the remarkable, docile, and temperamental person that we grew to know, there was really this other person who knew how to fight for country and for things that were bigger than him. He did so at Guadalcanal, he did so in Korea, and he did so in a remarkable way.

I will always remember Col. Terry Ball—he became a general, and he is now retired, just recently, about a week or two ago—telling me of the re-

markable journey he took with JOHN, a journey he talked to JOHN about before he took it, to go back and visit in the South Pacific those great places that he was part of with the Marine Corps.

I remember reading William Manchester's book, "Return to Darkness." In many ways, that was the journey JOHN went on when he went back there to revisit those places where he had served with such distinction but where he also knew such a profound loss.

This past summer, we shared another great moment together. We had the privilege of joining the Secretary of the Navy on the USS *Constitution* at Boston Harbor for a dinner. He was there with his family—the greater part of his family. It was a dinner in honor of JOHN and his service. A number of us went up there to share that evening.

I must say the sparkle in his eye at being aboard the ship with the flags raised, the colors presented, with his presentation of a walking cane from the *Constitution* itself, the sparkle in his eye that evening is something I will always remember.

I will never forget his passion for the Armed Forces, and particularly, of course, for his beloved Marines.

The Marines have their motto *semper parati*, "forever faithful." It is clear that motto was the guiding light of JOHN's life—forever faithful to his family, to his love, Virginia, to his children, his grandchildren, to the Senate, to his State, and to the principles which guided them.

He is really Mr. President, with all respect for all of our colleagues, the kind of person in this great institution who is worth emulating. I hope there will be others such as him in the future.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, while traveling to Washington today from my home in Colorado, I learned the sad news that our colleague, Senator JOHN CHAFEE, passed away last evening from heart failure. It is with deep sadness that I pay tribute today to this statesman, a great American, and my friend.

JOHN CHAFEE was born in Providence, Rhode Island, and graduated from Yale University and Harvard Law School. He left Yale to enlist in the Marine Corps when the United States entered World War II, and then served in the original invasion forces at Guadalcanal. He was recalled to active duty in 1951, and commanded a rifle company in Korea.

JOHN served for six years in the Rhode Island House of Representatives, was elected as Rhode Island's governor in 1962, and was reelected in 1964 and 1966.

In January 1969, JOHN CHAFEE was appointed Secretary of the Navy, and he began his career in the United States Senate in 1976. He was reelected to a fourth term in 1994, with 65 percent of the vote, and was the only Republican to be elected to the U.S. Senate from Rhode Island in the past 68 years.

JOHN CHAFEE has been a leader in the Senate and indeed the nation to improve the quality of our environment. As an effective Chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, JOHN built a strong legislative record for clean air, clean water, conservation of wetlands, and preservation of open space.

He also will be long remembered for his tireless efforts as a senior member of the Finance Committee to expand health care coverage for women and children and to improve community services for persons with disabilities.

I extend my condolences to JOHN's wife Virginia, their five children and twelve grandchildren.

I will miss my friend and colleague, Senator JOHN CHAFEE of Rhode Island.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today in mourning the loss of our colleague, JOHN CHAFEE. JOHN was a good and honorable man who served his state and his country with distinction. A devoted public servant and Member of this body for 23 years, Senator CHAFEE's influence extended beyond the aisles and transcended partisan rhetoric. His accomplishments as a lawmaker and his unquestionable influence among his peers stand as a testament to his ability.

Senator CHAFEE will long be admired and remembered for his devotion to this country both as a soldier and public servant. His distinguished service in the military, including serving in the Marines at Guadalcanal and commanding a rifle company in Korea, were indicative of the man who would never shy away from duty or responsibility. His record as a legislator, governor, and senator in Rhode Island indicate the amount of trust the people of Rhode Island put in JOHN.

Although political views may vary from person to person, it is easy to put these differences aside and to recognize men of strong character and integrity. These are qualities which were abundant in JOHN, and his steadying influence in the United States Senate will be truly missed. My thoughts and prayers extend to his family and all those whose lives Senator CHAFEE touched.

THE LATE FREDERICK "RICK" HART

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the most unpleasant tasks we carry out is to come to the Senate Floor in order to mark the passage of friends who have died. Today, it is my sad duty to share my memories of a man who was not only a valued friend, but one of the nation's treasures, Mr. Frederick "Rick" Hart, who passed away unexpectedly in August.

All recognize that Washington is the capital of the United States, and almost all also recognize it as a beautiful city, with impressive, inspiring and humbling architecture and monuments. People from all over the world travel to the District of Columbia to see and visit places such as the Capitol,

the White House, the Vietnam War Memorial, and the National Cathedral. Through their explorations of Washington, millions of people have been exposed to, and moved by, the art work of Rick Hart.

Rick Hart was one of the world's most talented and appreciated sculptors who created many impressive pieces during his career, but it is two pieces in particular with which visitors to Washington are most familiar. Though they may have never known that these two pieces were created by Rick Hart, countless individuals have been taken by the "Creation" at the National Cathedral and "Three Soldiers" at the Vietnam War Memorial.

It is appropriate that one of Rick's most famous sculptures is to be found at the National Cathedral, for it was there that he began his career as an apprentice stone carver, working on the gargoyles that adorn the gothic structure. From the beginning of his involvement in art, it was obvious that Rick was a man of tremendous talent and creativity. This was proven unquestionably when at age thirty-one his design for a sculpture to adorn the west facade of the Cathedral was picked after an international call for submissions.

One decade after his design for the National Cathedral was accepted, his emotion evoking sculpture of "Three Soldiers" was dedicated in November of 1984 as a supplement to the Vietnam War Memorial. It certainly must have been a challenge for this artist to go from creating a work that helped to express the glory of creation and God with a work that stands as a reminder to those who served and died in Vietnam. Not surprisingly, Rick rose to the challenge and sculpted what has become one of the most recognized and respected military sculptures in the world, and one that helps to pay appropriate homage to all those who participated in that conflict.

All that Rick accomplished in his life is that much more impressive given his humble and hard beginnings. Born in Atlanta, Georgia, Rick lost his mother at an early age and was reared in rural South Carolina for much of his young life, until he and his father moved to Washington. Rick was a bright man with both his hands and his mind, and his exceedingly high Scholastic Aptitude Test scores allowed his entrance in college at the young age of sixteen. Just as many who have been born and raised in the South have done, Rick chose to return "home", and he enrolled in the University of South Carolina as a philosophy student. Rick's higher education also include studies at the Corcoran and American University, where ironically, he was scheduled to give the commencement address at next year's graduation and to be awarded an honorary degree.

My chief of Staff, R.J. "Duke" Short, his wife Dee, and our good friend Harry Sacks have been friends of Rick for many years, and it was they who intro-

duced me to Rick back in 1995. Rick generously and graciously volunteered to create a bust of me which has been donated to the United States Senate and is on display not far from this Chamber, in Senate-238, also known as "The Strom Thurmond Room." In order to script by bust, Rick and I spent a considerable amount of time together. Rick was a warm, outgoing, and humble man and it was obvious that creating works of art was a passion for him.

Though still very young, only in his fifties, Rick suffered a serious health setback last year when he was felled with a stroke. Strong and vital, Rick was making an impressive recovery when he was admitted to Johns Hopkins Hospital in August to be treated for pneumonia. Tragically, doctors discovered that his body has been overtaken by cancer and he had quite literally only days to live. His death was sudden, unexpected, and tragic, and has left all of us pondering how someone so vital could be taken at such a young age. His passing saddens all who knew him and his death leaves a tremendous void in the American art community. My condolences and sympathies are with his wife Lindy and sons Alexander and Lain. While their husband and father may no longer be here, Frederick "Rick" Hart has achieved a kind of immortality through his great works of art.

SUPERFUND RECYCLING EQUITY ACT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, over the past three decades, concern for our environment and natural resources has grown—as has the desire to recycle and reuse. You may be surprised to learn that one major environmental statue actually creates an impediment to recycling. Superfund has created this impediment, although unintended by the law's authors.

Because of the harm that is being done to the recycling effort by the unintended consequence of law, the distinguished minority leader, Mr. DASCHLE, and I introduced the Superfund Recycling Equity Act, S. 1528. This bill removes Superfund's recycling impediments and increases America's recycling rates.

We had one and only one purpose in introducing the Superfund Recycling Equity Act—to remove from the liability loop those who collect and ship recyclables to a third party site. The bill is not intended to plow new Superfund ground, nor is it intended to revamp existing Superfund law. That task is appropriately left to comprehensive reform, a goal that I hope is achievable.

While the bill proposes to amend Superfund, Mr. President, it is really a recycling bill. Recycling is not disposal and shipping for recycling is not arranging for disposal—it is a relatively simple clarification, but one that is necessary to maintain a successful re-

cycling effort nationwide. Without this clarification, America will continue to fall short of its recycling goal.

S. 1528 was negotiated in 1993 between representatives of the industry that recycles traditional materials—paper, glass, plastic, metals, textiles and rubber—and representatives of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Justice, and the national environmental community. Similar language has been included in virtually every comprehensive Superfund bill since 1994. With nearly 50 Senate cosponsors, support for the bill has been both extensive and bipartisan.

Since Senator DASCHLE and I introduced S. 1528, some have argued that we should not "piecemeal" Superfund. They argue that every part of Superfund should be held together tightly, until a comprehensive approach to reauthorization is found. And given the broad-based support for the recycling piece across both parties, some think it should be held as a "sweetener" for some of the more difficult issues. Superfund's long history suggests, however, that the recycling provisions—as sweet as they are—have done little, if anything, to help move a comprehensive Superfund bill forward. Rather, "sweeteners" like brownfields and municipal liability are what keep all parties at the table.

Holding the recyclers hostage to a comprehensive bill has not helped reform Superfund, and continuing to hold them hostage will not ensure action in the future. What it does ensure is that recycling continues to be impeded and fails to attain our nation's goals.

This recycling fix is minuscule compared to the overwhelming stakeholder needs regarding Superfund in general, but so significant for the recycling industry itself. It is easy to see why this bill has achieved such widespread bipartisan support among our colleagues.

S. 1528 addresses only one Superfund issue—the unintended consequence of law that holds recyclers responsible for the actions of those who purchase their goods. The goal of this bill is to remove the liability facing recyclers, not to establish who should be responsible for those shares if the unintended liability is removed.

Senator DASCHLE and I have heard from various parties who want to add minor provisions outside the scope of the bill. Although many have presented interesting and often compelling arguments, I will continue to ask that any party wishing to enlarge the narrow focus of S. 1528 show support on both sides of the aisle, as well as from the administration and the environmental community.

Much time, energy and expertise went into crafting an agreement where few thought it was possible. That agreement has been maintained through four separate Congresses where all sorts of attempts to modify it have failed. Congress should accept this delicately crafted product.

S. 1528 shows Congress' commitment to protect and increase recycling.

S. 1528 repeats what we all know and support—that continued and expanded recycling is a national goal.

S. 1528 removes impediments to achieving this goal, impediments Congress never intended to occur.

The nearly 50 Senators who have already co-sponsored this bill recognize the need to amend Superfund for the very important purpose of increasing recycling in the public interest. Let's act this year.

MODERNIZATION OF THE ABM TREATY

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I rise today on a substantive issue which has caused me considerable concern recently. It has to do with the issue of our national missile defense and the fact we passed legislation earlier this year on that subject, and we now hear the administration discussing its options under the National Missile Defense Act. We hear responses from around the world about the intent we have that is now in our law to deploy a limited national defense system. I want to speak on that subject for a minute or two.

When we passed the National Missile Defense Act, we all realized, and the President did, too, when he signed it, that the ABM Treaty, the antiballistic missile defense treaty, that exists between the United States and Russia, prohibits the deployment of a national missile defense system and that the treaty would have to be amended if it was to remain in force.

Some statements being made on the subject now by our own administration, as well as by Russian officials, cause me considerable concern. For example, the Secretary of State recently said that the administration was examining "the possibility of adjusting [the ABM Treaty] slightly in order to have a National Missile Defense."

Since article I of the treaty expressly prohibits a national missile defense, the Secretary's suggestion that only a slight adjustment is required in the treaty language is a huge understatement, and it is likely to mislead the Russians and others as well.

The National Missile Defense Act acknowledges our policy of pursuing arms control arrangements, but it requires the deployment of a limited national missile defense which contradicts the initial premise of the ABM Treaty.

A number of Russian Government officials have said they will not negotiate changes in the ABM Treaty. A Russian foreign ministry spokesman has been quoted as saying it is "absolutely unacceptable to make any changes in the key provisions of the treaty and the Russian side does not intend to depart from this position."

A Russian defense ministry official has said: "There can be no compromise on this issue."

Additionally, it has been reported that Russian and Chinese Government

representatives have introduced a resolution in the U.N. General Assembly demanding the United States forego deployment of a missile defense system and strictly comply with the treaty's prohibition on territorial defense.

It is entirely inappropriate for the U.N. to consider seriously a resolution that would presume to dictate to the United States what we should or should not do in defense of our own national security. Ballistic missile threats are real and have caused our Government to adopt a policy that requires a deployed national missile defense.

It is my fervent hope our own Government will acknowledge clearly that the National Missile Defense Act means what it says and stop encouraging misunderstanding by the Russians, the Chinese, or anyone else of our intentions to defend ourselves against ballistic missile attack. We also hope the point will be made that we are not trying to undermine or threaten Russia's missile deterrent.

Our relationship with Russia has improved considerably in recent years. I hope this new era of mutual respect and understanding will continue to be strengthened. We are getting into an unfortunate situation, however, where candor and honest exchange of information and intentions are taking a back seat to half-truths and bluster. The latter course will lead to misunderstanding and possibly disaster. At no time in the history of the relationship have honesty and unequivocal dialog been more important between Russia and the United States. The ABM Treaty is out of date and must be changed to reflect today's realities. The sooner everyone acknowledges this fact and gets busy negotiating the changes that are required, the better off we will all be.

CHARLES BATTAGLIA

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I would like to comment about a distinguished American who is retiring from service in the U.S. Senate. Charles Battaglia has been associated with me in the Senate for the past 14 years. He came to help me as an assistant when I served on the Intelligence Committee and stayed with me to become staff director of the Intelligence Committee during the 104th Congress when I chaired that committee, and then, in the 105th Congress, moved over with me to be the staff director when I chaired the Veterans Affairs Committee through the first session of the 106th Congress.

Mr. Battaglia has a distinguished record. Following graduation from Boston College, he served 25 years in the U.S. Navy, serving in the offices of the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Navy, and the Naval War College. In 1978, Mr. Battaglia was selected by the Director of Central Intelligence, Adm. Stansfield Turner, to be his special assistant at CIA. He received his MBA

from Bryant University, and in 1991 completed the Kennedy School of Government's international security program, was a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, and has an extraordinarily distinguished military record in the Navy, in the intelligence community and CIA, as an assistant on the Intelligence Committee, and later as staff director there.

He has earned retirement status. I might say we are making some effort to bring him back on a contract part-time basis to help with our inquiry into alleged espionage and other matters on oversight at the Department of Justice.

He has had an extraordinary record and become a personal friend of mine in the intervening 14 years. He has done great service for the military and as a member of the Senate family.

I yield the floor.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, October 22, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,674,164,714,443.85 (Five trillion, six hundred seventy-four billion, one hundred sixty-four million, seven hundred fourteen thousand, four hundred forty-three dollars and eighty-five cents).

One year ago, October 22, 1998, the Federal debt stood at \$5,548,924,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred forty-eight billion, nine hundred twenty-four million).

Fifteen years ago, October 22, 1984, the Federal debt stood at \$1,591,515,000,000 (One trillion, five hundred ninety-one billion, five hundred fifteen million).

Twenty-five years ago, October 22, 1974, the Federal debt stood at \$479,517,000,000 (Four hundred seventy-nine billion, five hundred seventeen million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,194,647,714,443.85 (Five trillion, one hundred ninety-four billion, six hundred forty-seven million, seven hundred fourteen thousand, four hundred forty-three dollars and eighty-five cents) during the past 25 years.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it request the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2. An act to send dollars to the classroom and for certain other purposes.

H.R. 2300. An act to allow to a State combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of all its students.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2. An act to send dollars to the classroom and for certain other purposes; to the

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 2300. An act to allow a State to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of all its students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time and placed on the calendar:

S. 1770. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the research and development credit and to extend certain other expiring provisions for 30 months, and for other purposes.

S. 1771. A bill to provide stability in the United States agriculture sector and to promote adequate availability of food and medicine for humanitarian assistance abroad by requiring congressional approval before the imposition of any unilateral agricultural or medical sanction against a foreign country or foreign entity.

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-5754. A communication from the President and CEO, National Safety Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the audit of the financial transactions of the Council and related entities for fiscal years 1998 and 1999; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5755. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status of open dumps on Indian lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-5756. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5757. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to NATO operations in and around Kosovo; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5758. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of a retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5759. A communication from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Overseas Use of the Purchase Card" (DFARS Case 99-D002), received October 21, 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5760. A communication from the Director, Information Security Oversight Office, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant Executive Order 12958, a report entitled "1998 Report to the President"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-5761. A communication from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to its commercial activities inventory; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-5762. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's report under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-5763. A communication from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People who are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to additions to the Procurement List, received October 21, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-5764. A communication from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Clean Air Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-5765. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to its commercial activities inventory; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-5766. A communication from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Flood Insurance Compliance"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5767. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notice of Eligibility and Selection Criteria-National Awards Program for Model Professional Development", received October 19, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5768. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program" (RIN1845-AA10), received October 19, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5769. A communication from the Deputy Executive Secretary, Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network; Final Rule" (RIN0906-AA32), received October 21, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5770. A communication from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Rule: Amendments to the Regulations for Cotton Warehouses-Electronic Warehouse Receipts, and Other Provisions" (RIN0560-AE60), received October 20, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5771. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State Designations" (Docket #99-008-1), received October 21, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5772. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas" (Docket #99-033-2), received October 19, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5773. A communication from the Chief, Programs and Legislative Division, Office of Legislative Liaison, Department of Defense, transmitting, a report relative a cost comparison study conducted at Niagara Falls International Airport-Air Reserve Station; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5774. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Efficiency Program for Commercial and Industrial Equipment; Test Procedures, Labeling, and Certification Requirements for Electric Motors" (RIN1904-AA82), received October 21, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-5775. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulations Governing Off-the-Record Communications" (Docket No. RM98-1-000), received October 20, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-5776. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to refunds of offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-5777. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Glacier Bay National Park, Alaska; Commercial Fishing" (RIN1024-AB99), received October 20, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-5778. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mississippi Regulatory Program" (SPATS No. MS-015-FOR), received October 20, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-5779. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indiana Regulatory Program" (SPATS No. IN-140-FOR), received October 20, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-5780. A communication from the Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Superfund for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5781. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Disaster Assistance; Redesign of Public Assistance Program Administration; 64 FR 55158; 10/12/99", received October 21, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5782. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Respiratory Protection and Controls To Restrict Internal Exposures" (RIN3150-AF81), received October 20, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5783. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Approval of Revisions to the North Carolina State Implementation Plan" (FRL #6463-6), received October 21, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5784. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Control of VOC Emissions from Solvent Metal Cleaning Operations" (FRL #6459-9), received October 21, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5785. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Approval of National Low Emission Vehicle Program" (FRL #6461-9), received October 21, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5786. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Publicly Owned Treatment Works" (FRL #6462-7), received October 21, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5787. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna: Adjustment of General Category Daily Retention Limit on Previously Designated Restricted Fishing Days" (I.D. 091599A), received October 21, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5788. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Closure of Pollock Fishery in Statistical Area 620 of the Gulf of Alaska", received October 21, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5789. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sharpchin and Northern Rockfish in the Aleutian Islands Sub Area of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area", received October 13, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5790. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Other Rockfish in the Aleutian Islands Sub Area of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area", received October 21, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1754. A bill entitled the "Denying Safe Havens to International and War Criminals Act of 1999."

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, an referred as indicated:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 1774. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to regulate certain 50 caliber sniper weapons in the same manner as machine guns and other firearms; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. HELMS):

S. 1775. A bill to amend section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act to 1961 to modify the matters taken into account in assessing the cooperation of foreign countries with the counterdrug efforts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. GRAMS):

S. 1776. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to revise the energy policies of the United States in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, advance global climate science, promote technology development, and increase citizen awareness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

S. 1777. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for the voluntary reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and to advance global climate science and technology development; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1778. A bill to provide for equal exchanges of land around the Cascade Reservoir; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CLELAND:

S. 1779. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel M/V SANDPIPER; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 1780. A bill for the relief of Raul Morales-Torna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 1781. A bill to amend the Act that established the Keweenaw National Historical Park to require the Secretary of the Interior to consider nominees of various local interests in appointing members of the Keweenaw National Historic Park Advisory Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRIST:

S. 1782. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity credit to small business employees working or living in areas of poverty; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

S. 1783. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a prospective payment system for inpatient longstay hospital services under the medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 1784. A bill entitled the "Saint Helena Island National Scenic Area Act"; 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. LOTT (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. REED, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. BYRD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. HELMS, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DODD, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BREAUX, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. REID, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BOND, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. GORTON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. MACK, Mr. KERREY, Mr. ROBB, Mr. BURNS, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GREGG, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. THOMPSON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. KYL, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. FRIST, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CLELAND, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. HAGEL, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. BAYH, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. EDWARDS):

S. Res. 206. A resolution relative to the death of the Honorable JOHN H. CHAFEE, of Rhode Island; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 1774. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to regulate certain 50 caliber sniper weapons in the same manner as machine guns and other firearms; to the Committee on Finance.

MILITARY SNIPER WEAPON REGULATION ACT OF 1999

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of myself and Senator LAUTENBERG to introduce the Military Sniper Weapon Regulation Act of 1999. This bill will reclassify powerful .50 caliber military sniper rifles under the National Firearms act, thus making it much more difficult for terrorists, doomsday cults, and criminals to obtain these guns for illegitimate use.

Let me just talk a little bit about what a .50 caliber gun is, and then I will describe why I believe it is vital to tighten the rules surrounding their use and purchase.

These .50 caliber firearms are weapons of such range and destructive capability that it seems unthinkable for them to fall into civilian hands. These

.50 caliber guns, manufactured by a small handful of companies and individuals, are deadly, military style assault rifles. The M82A1, one common example of these guns, was manufactured with one purpose in mind—the efficient destruction of enemy armaments and personnel. These guns, weighing 28 pounds and capable of piercing light armor at more than 4 miles, enable a single shooter to destroy enemy jeeps, tanks, personnel carriers, bunkers, fuel stations, and even communication centers. As a result, their use by military organizations worldwide has been rapidly spreading during the course of this decade.

But with the increasing military use of the gun, we have also seen increased use of the weapon by violent criminals and terrorists around the world.

The weapons are deadly accurate up to 2,000 yards. This means that a shooter using a .50 caliber weapon can reliably hit a target more than a mile away. In fact, according to a training manual for military and police snipers published in 1993, a bullet from this gun “even at one and a half miles crashes into a target with more energy than Dirty Harry’s famous .44 magnum at point-blank” range.

And the gun is “effective” up to 7,500 yards. In other words, although it may be hard to aim at that distance, the gun will have its desired destructive effect at that distance—more than 4 miles from the target.

The weapon can penetrate several inches of steel, concrete, or even light armor.

Many ranges used for target practice do not even have enough safety features to accommodate these guns—it is just too powerful.

This gun was used extensively in the gulf war by American troops. Ideal for long range destruction of personnel, light armor or communications, there is no question that this gun is an effective wartime tool.

Recent advances in weapons technology, however, allow this gun to be used by civilians against armored limousines, bunkers, individuals, and even aircraft—in fact, one advertisement for the gun apparently promoted the weapon as able to “wreck several million dollars’ worth of jet aircraft with one or two dollars’ worth of cartridge.”

One new version of the .50 caliber weapon is a modified machine gun capable of accepting ammunition belts, and yet is still allowed for civilian use by BATF.

This gun is so powerful that one dealer told undercover GAO investigators “You’d better buy one soon. It’s only a matter of time before someone lets go a round on a range that travels so far, it hits a school bus full of kids. The government will definitely ban .50 calibers. This gun is just too powerful.”

Mr. President, a recent study by the General Accounting Office revealed some eye-opening facts about how and where this gun is used, and how easily it is obtained.

The GAO reports that many of these guns wind up in the hands of domestic and international terrorists, religious cults, outlaw motorcycle gangs, drug traffickers, and violent criminals.

One doomsday cult headquartered in Montana purchased 10 of these guns and stockpiled them in an underground bunker, along with thousands of rounds of ammunition and other guns.

At least one .50 caliber gun was recovered by Mexican authorities after a shoot-out with an international drug cartel in that country. The gun was originally purchased in Wyoming, so it is clear that the guns are making their way into the hands of criminals worldwide.

According to a recent news story, another .50 caliber sniper rifle, smuggled out of the United States, was used by the Irish Republican Army to kill a large number of British soldiers.

And ammunition for these guns is also readily available, even over the Internet. Bullets for these guns include “armor piercing incendiary” ammunition that explodes on impact, and even “armor piercing tracing” ammunition reminiscent of the ammunition that lit up the skies over Baghdad during the Persian Gulf war.

Several ammunition dealers were willing to sell armor piercing ammunition to an undercover GAO investigator even after the investigator said he wanted the ammunition to pierce an armored limousine or maybe to “take down” a helicopter.

In fact, our own military helps to provide thousands of rounds of .50 caliber ammunition, by essentially giving away tons of spent cartridges, many of which are then refurbished and sold on the civilian market.

The bill I offer today will begin the process of making these guns harder to get and easier to track.

Current law classifies .50 caliber guns as “long guns,” subject to the least government regulation for any firearm. Sawed-off shotguns, machine guns, and even handguns are more highly regulated than this military sniper rifle.

In fact, many states allow possession of .50 caliber guns by those as young as 14 years old, and there is no regulation on second-hand sales.

Essentially, this bill would re-classify .50 caliber guns under the National Firearms Act, which imposes far stricter standards on powerful and destructive weapons.

For instance:

NFA guns may only be purchased from a licensed dealer, and not second-hand. This will prevent the sale of these guns at gun shows and in other venues that make it hard for law enforcement to track the weapons.

Second, purchasers of NFA guns must fill out license transfer applications and provide fingerprints to be processed by the FBI in detailed criminal background checks. By reclassifying the .50 caliber, Congress will be making a determination that sellers should be more careful about to whom

they give these powerful, military guns.

ATF reports that this background check process takes about 60 days, so prospective gun buyers will face some delay. However, legitimate purchasers of this \$7,000 gun can certainly wait that long.

Clearly, Mr. President, placing a few more restrictions on who can get these guns and how is simply common sense. This bill will not ban the sale, use or possession of .50 caliber weapons. The .50 caliber shooting club will not face extinction, and “legitimate” purchasers of these guns will not lose their access—even though that, too, might be a reasonable step, since I cannot imagine a legitimate use of this gun.

The bill will simply place stricter requirements on the way in which these guns can be sold, and to whom. The measure is meant to offer a reasoned solution to making it harder for terrorists, assassins, and other criminals to obtain these powerful weapons. If we are to continue to allow private citizens to own and use guns of this caliber, range, and destructive power, we should at the very least take greater care in making sure that these guns do not fall into the wrong hands.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. HELMS):

S. 1775. A bill to amend section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act to 1961 to modify the matters taken into account in assessing the cooperation of foreign countries with the counter drug efforts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

• Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am introducing today for Senator HELMS and myself legislation to help the Administration better understand the importance of representing the US national interest. I am sending to the desk a bill on additional considerations for assessment of cooperation of foreign countries with United States counter-drug efforts. The purpose of this bill is to help the Administration get its act together when it comes to the certification process on illegal drugs. Recent statements by the Drug Czar and other Administration officials on certification, along with their actions in regard to such countries as Syria and Iran, show that they may have misplaced US national interests when it comes to drug policy. I want to help them find it again.

Over a decade ago, Congress passed measures in the Foreign Assistance Act that require US Administrations to certify whether other countries are taking serious steps to deal with major illegal drug production or trafficking in their territories. The view behind this legislation was to force an accounting, at least once a year, of what the US and other countries were doing to address a major foreign policy concern that, in the view of Congress, governments here and abroad would just

as soon have ignored. Administrations do not like accounting for themselves. Not many foreign countries welcome it either. They would prefer that legislatures and the public give them the money and approval they want with no questions asked. It's less troubling than having to explain actions, account for shortfalls, or demonstrate that the money being provided is achieving anything. Congress, however, thinks differently. It should and it must, in my view.

Today, the Clinton Administration, like its predecessors, is trying both to ignore certification as a genuine responsibility and to undo it where it can. It has made efforts to get Congress to scuttle the requirement. It has poor-mouthed the idea internationally while denying it has done so. It has resorted to lawerly gimmicks and low tricks to drop from certification some of the worst countries imaginable. And lately it has been trying to broaden, as it says, the evaluation and accountability process in the Western Hemisphere to make it fairer by participating with the Organization of American States in the creation of what is called the Multinational Evaluation Mechanism (MEM). This is a subterfuge for trying to get rid of the process by calling it something else. Given this Administration's poor performance on international drug control, I am not surprised at an effort to disguise shortcomings in some artful bureaucratic way. I am not surprised, but I am disappointed.

As part of the effort to discredit certification, the Administration has resorted to distortions and misrepresentations about what it involves and has enlisted a set of arguments that, while sounding plausible, are really little more than the old magician's trick of "watch the birdie" while hoping that you will not notice what he is really doing with his other hand. Well, we deserve better than sleight-of-hand on an issue as important as this one. I thought it might be useful to provide an antidote to these shenanigans with a few home truths.

There are many arguments advanced against certification, and I have addressed many of these in earlier statements on this floor, but the best one argues that while certification may once have been useful—time unspecified—it has served its purpose and is counter-productive because it hampers further cooperation with other countries that resent being subject to a unilateral, U.S. judgment of their performance. Mexico is often advanced as an example. This view is fine if you are working from the idea—which seems to be so much of the philosophy behind our present foreign policy—that we should be guided by everyone in the world's interests before our own or in spite of our own.

Now, I have no doubt that other countries resent being evaluated. In my experience, they resent being evaluated by any individual country or col-

lectively. This is not new, whether we are talking drugs or policies on intellectual properties or nuclear proliferation. And I am sure that this resentment over being judged can complicate negotiations. Both these points, however, are irrelevant to the circumstances under consideration. As a matter of our national interest, we are obliged to make judgments about the actions of other countries whether they like it or not. Let me try to make this point clearer in a different context.

The United States is currently embroiled in a controversy with the European Union over rules governing the importation of bananas. I am not going to comment on the merits of the particulars of the case, apart from noting that the United States, the present Administration, has determined—has judged—that EU restrictions, quotas, and preferences on the importation of bananas are unfair and prejudicial. This, folks, is an evaluation. And it is one deeply resented in Europe, as an infringement of the rights of not just one country but of an association of many countries, which happen to be our major allies. Nevertheless, the Administration is prepared to pursue the case in the teeth of this resentment to force a change it wants. And in doing this it is prepared to invoke sanctions to achieve its goals.

Similarly, the Administration is prepared to condemn a gaggle of other countries for permitting the pirating of various intellectual properties, such as books, videos, and copyrighted products. It is prepared to pursue sanctions to achieve a remedy. I can extend this list to judgments about states that support terrorism or are engaged in systematic human rights abuses. This Administration involved this country in a major military engagement—the ultimate sanction—to stop what it regarded as gross violations of human rights. I have no doubt that Slobodan Milosevic and his cronies deeply resented U.S. judgments about the fitness of his actions and even more objected to the steps we took to change his behavior. I do not detect that this resentment at being judged or the knowledge that there were objections to the actions then taken based on that judgment carried any weight in the decisions made by this Administration to bomb and strafe military and civilian targets in the former Yugoslavia.

What these examples show is that even this Administration understands, when it wants to, that there are matters of such import requiring judgments about the actions of other countries and involving responses based on those judgments that resentment or objections by others do not signify when it comes to deciding what we should do to protect interests we regard as important. Now, certification only requires that we make the involvement of other countries in the production and transit of illegal drugs—which kill more Americans

every year that all the terrorists have in the last ten years or more than Mr. Milosevic did at any time—a matter of judgment and possible action of a degree at least as important as bananas. I happen to believe that judgments about drugs coming to the U.S. are at least as much in our interest as judgments about bananas going to Europe.

I am puzzled by the Administration's reluctance to apply meaningful standards of judgment to the actions of other countries when it comes to drug policy. I am further puzzled by its willingness to be so moved by the resentment of other countries when it comes to judgments about drug policies and programs. The requirements in the law are not written in some mysterious dialect nor apply unfamiliar concepts. The idea is not so alien to our experience or even to this Administration's own actions as to be beyond comprehension. Yet, the Administration seems to have its own sources of bemusement when it comes to taking this issue seriously.

In essence, what the law requires is that the Administration determine first whether countries are major producing or transit areas for illegal drugs. You would not think this terribly difficult or controversial, or too intrusive on the feelings of others. It then asks for the Administration to determine whether these countries are acting in good faith to enforce their own domestic laws against these practices; are acting in conformity with any bilateral agreements with the United States to address these activities; or are doing what is reasonable and responsible to do in light of international law that governs the conduct of all countries on this issue. I am hard pressed to see how this infringes on the sovereignty of other countries or what in it is so outrageous as to occasion abandonment of the effort.

The law then requires that if, in the judgment of the Administration, any given country is not acting in good faith, it may then be subject to sanctions. The law does not require that the efforts of another country be successful in order to be certified. It does not require that judgments be without consideration of other national interests. It does ask, on this very important question, that the Administration supply to Congress and the American people at least once a year its considered opinion of whether other countries where a truly pernicious practice is being engaged in that affects directly the lives of U.S. citizens each and every day are, as a matter of fact, doing all that is reasonable to stop this practice. It then requires that if these countries are receiving U.S. assistance—that is, money from U.S. taxpayers—that this money be cut off—unless it is humanitarian aid or this self-same counter-drug assistance.

While I understand perfectly why an aid recipient might squawk, I do not know what act of imagination it requires to manufacture outrage on behalf of other countries threatened with

losing this assistance because in our judgment they are doing less than their best to cooperate with us. But that outrage is trotted out as an argument against certification. That aside, the most onerous part of the certification decision, and what other countries truly object to, is what world opinion makes of a U.S. judgment that a particular country is not cooperating with U.S. and international efforts to stop drug production or trafficking. What the Administration would have us do is forgo this judgment lest it hurt the feels of other countries. And yet, it is this judgment or the threat of it that has, in fact, been the primary impetus to encourage the very cooperation that the Administration says we do not need the certification process to achieve.

What the Administration would really like to do is to stop accounting to Congress and the public for its international drug policy. It knows that this is a non-starter. So it has proposed instead to bury this accountability in an elaborate ruse in cooperation with the OAS to neuter the process. In doing this, it has helped to devise through the OAS a list of over 80 evaluation items to help in developing a so-called multinational evaluative mechanism. There are, of course, no teeth in the evaluation process, and each of the member states involved has an effective veto over any adverse judgments of their respective efforts. In this regard, I am reminded of the inhabitants of Garrison Keiller's Lake Wobegon, where all the children are above average. The details behind the evaluation are to be kept confidential, which is okay since no one has much faith in the ability of most of the countries party to the evaluation to actually collect and evaluate the information in the first place. The countries involved lack the necessary reporting mechanisms, the budgets to sustain them, or the staffs to ensure ongoing, consistent information. This farrago is then supposed, gradually, to substitute for certification, somehow being fairer and more likely to ensure cooperation.

Ironically, the premise underlying this process is the same as that informing certification, that is, that a judgment about performance does need to be made. The difference here is that somehow a multilateral judgment would be better, and it wouldn't be offensive since it would be collaborative. In my view, it won't be offensive because it won't be effective. You can make what you want to of a process that is supposed to involve judgments about the effectiveness of actions that are designed not to offend anyone being judged. But I am not reassured. And if this is the face of cooperation, then we are in for some rude shocks in our international relations.

Having said this, I am prepared to help the Administration in its efforts. In order to give the Multinational Evaluation Mechanism some chance of effective implementation, I am, along

with Senator HELMS, today introducing legislation that would require that in future certification decisions the Administration incorporate the MEM as part of its deliberations in determining whether to certify other countries or not. Taking the Administration at its word that the mechanism is not an attempt to replace certification, but rather an effort to complement it, I offer this bill to enhance the process.●

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. GRAMS):

S. 1776. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to revise the energy policies of the United States in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, advance global climate science, promote technology development, and increase citizen awareness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE CLIMATE CHANGE ENERGY POLICY
RESPONSE ACT

S. 1777. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for the voluntary reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and to advance global climate science and technology development; to the Committee on Finance.

THE CLIMATE CHANGE TAX AMENDMENTS OF 1999

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, few issues present stakes as high for our country as global climate change. Worst case scenarios involving elevated temperatures and sea levels are disturbing to many people. On the other hand, capping energy use at levels lower than those in the growth-oriented nineties could chill our economy faster than it would cool down the climate.

Responsible governance includes environmental stewardship. However, the ultimate obligation of any government official anywhere is to win freedom for the governed who do not now have it, and to protect freedom for those who are already free.

By freedom, I mean the opportunity to achieve one's true potential, whether as an individual, a community, or a nation. And isn't it marvelous how freedom spawns discovery and innovation? And, in turn, how discovery and innovation solve problems and create opportunities?

Mr. President, we need consensus on climate change. But there is no magic dust that we can sprinkle on ourselves to make us all embrace the same scientific and economic conclusions on this issue. Our only chance lies in good, hard work toward that end.

Where should we begin? Knowledge leads to understanding, and understanding to consensus. Mr. President, at the moment we have some critical gaps in our knowledge of climate phenomena.

We know not nearly enough about the Earth's capacity to assimilate carbon dioxide. We know not nearly enough about natural variability of the climate over years, much less over centuries and millennia. Our ability to

measure and predict changes is not developed. Adequate measurement and modeling machinery is not even invented yet. Scientists at the National Research Council published a report in September, 1999, that confirm these observations. In the preface of that Report, they state:

It would be a misinterpretation of U.S. administration policy and agreements at the Kyoto conference to conclude that the causes and characteristics of global change are sufficiently clear that scientific inquiry in this area should be limited to mitigation measures.

* * * * *

A great deal more needs to be understood . . . about global environmental change before we concentrate on "mitigation" science. We do not understand the climate system well enough to clarify the causes and likelihoods of rapid or abrupt climate changes.

Likewise, Mr. President, we need to understand the economic implications of the leading policy alternatives. One year ago the U.S. Department of Energy published a sobering analysis of potential economic impacts of implementing the Kyoto agreement. But shouldn't we hear from other agencies as well? What would the Department of Labor have to say? How about Agriculture and Transportation? Let's look before we leap.

A third area we must explore is technology. What do we really know today about how energy will be produced in this country in 20 years? What do we know about how—and how much—it will be consumed? Can we develop policies to encourage real improvement in energy efficiency without trying to pick the market winners and losers?

Mr. President, we are now living in the Information Renaissance. But many in government behave as though we are still in the Dark Ages. If some of us in Congress have difficulty gaining access to government-controlled information in this area—and all too often we have—can you imagine the obstacles to private citizens?

Let's get all the information—science, technology, economics—together. Let's make it freely and widely available. All Americans have a right to know what their Government knows—and what their Government is doing—about climate change.

Knowledge in the science, economics, and technology of climate change will yield to understanding. We should all be open to unexpected discovery, whether in pleasant surprises or confirmation of today's predictions.

While we are waiting to close our knowledge gaps, why not go ahead with some steps that reduce greenhouse gas emissions while accomplishing other benefits along the way? Every minute wasted in traffic tie-ups is that much more carbon dioxide man releases into the atmosphere. If we apply technology to solving traffic problems and the greenhouse gas theory fizzles out, at least our efforts will have saved time for busy travelers and commuters.

Let's find ways to encourage individual citizens, farms and small businesses, communities and States, to take some no-regrets action to lower greenhouse gas emissions. But let's not offer the false hope that their efforts will be rewarded in some kind of negotiable credits issued in an international currency of carbon caps or fuel rations.

Mr. President, the two companion bills that several colleagues and I are introducing today set out to do all these things with regard to the global climate change issue. My legislation does not pretend to answer all the questions. Rather, it lays out a framework for reaching consensus that begins by developing knowledge; and from knowledge understanding; and from understanding consensus.

Mr. President, let's get started. I welcome my colleagues to join me as co-sponsors.

I ask unanimous consent that the text and a section-by-section analysis of each measure be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1776

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Climate Change Energy Policy Response Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—ENERGY POLICY COORDINATION

Sec. 101. Responsibility of Department of Energy.

TITLE II—ADVANCEMENT OF CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE

Sec. 201. Coordination, prioritization, and evaluation of climate change science research.

TITLE III—COMPREHENSIVE POLICY REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

Sec. 301. Domestic and international assessment of policies for addressing the effects of greenhouse gas emissions.

TITLE IV—PUBLIC RIGHT TO KNOW

Sec. 401. Annual report to public.

TITLE V—ACCELERATED DEVELOPMENT AND DEPLOYMENT OF RESPONSE TECHNOLOGY

Sec. 501. Review of federally funded energy technology research and development.

Sec. 502. Study of regulatory barriers to rapid deployment of emission reduction technology.

TITLE VI—INTERNATIONAL DEPLOYMENT OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY TO MITIGATE CLIMATE CHANGE

Sec. 601. International deployment of energy technology to mitigate climate change.

TITLE VII—OPTIMAL OPERATING EFFICIENCY OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

Sec. 701. Traffic congestion relief research.

TITLE VIII—VOLUNTARY INITIATIVES

Sec. 801. Improved and streamlined reporting and certification of voluntary measures.

Sec. 802. Public awareness campaign regarding benefits of certification of voluntary emission reductions.

Sec. 803. State authority to encourage voluntary energy initiatives.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) to responsibly address climate change issues requires examination of energy policies and practices;

(2) global climate change issues have profound scientific, technological, economic, and public policy facets that must be addressed in a comprehensive, integrated fashion;

(3) current scientific research, experimentation, and data collection are not adequately focused on answering key questions within the United States or internationally;

(4)(A) the lack of a coordinated climate modeling strategy in the United States is hampering progress in high-end climate modeling activities;

(B) the United States lacks the capabilities to perform the requisite climate change modeling simulations and experiments in order to be able to apply existing United States intellectual expertise to important science and policy questions related to climate change; and

(C) those deficiencies, among others, limit the ability of the United States to—

(i) predict future climate characteristics and assess the results of climate change;

(ii) formulate policies that are consistent with national objectives; and

(iii) advance most effectively an understanding of the underlying scientific issues pertaining to climate change and variability;

(5) there has been a lack of progress made by Federal agencies responsible for climate observation systems, individually and collectively, in developing and maintaining a credible, integrated climate observing system, consequently limiting the ability of the United States to document and understand climate change adequately;

(6)(A) developing and deploying technologies can speed the transition to a lower level of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States and throughout the world;

(B) the pace of technological change in the marketplace is difficult to predict accurately; while breakthroughs in such developments are often incremental, capital turnover, consumer acceptance, technological compatibility, economics, and other factors can alter the pace of such change; and

(C) such technologies need to be environmentally sound, safe, cost-effective, and consumer-friendly;

(7)(A) public access to scientific, economic, and public policy information regarding climate change is severely limited;

(B) the public's right to know and to be fully informed of all aspects of climate change is not being satisfied; and

(C) open and balanced discussion leading to public support for the best environmentally and economically sound approaches to climate change policy resolution is urgently needed;

(8) sufficient scientific questions and public interest exist to warrant tangible encouragement and acknowledgment of responsible actions by private entities to reduce, avoid, or offset greenhouse gas emissions, even though many scientific, technological, economic, and public policy questions have not yet been resolved;

(9) voluntary measures should be encouraged through incentives rather than in anticipation of future domestic or international regulatory mandates; and

(10) greenhouse gas emission improvements can be achieved through voluntary measures even as we answer yet unresolved key questions about global and regional climates.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XVI of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 is amended by inserting before section 1601 (42 U.S.C. 13381) the following:

"SEC. 1600. DEFINITIONS.

"In this title:

"(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration.

"(2) EMISSION REDUCTION.—The term 'emission reduction' includes—

"(A) avoidance of the emission of a greenhouse gas;

"(B) a limitation on the emission of a greenhouse gas;

"(C) sequestration of carbon; and

"(D) mitigation for the emission of a greenhouse gas.

"(3) ENERGY TECHNOLOGY.—The term 'energy technology' means—

"(A) a technology relating to—

"(i) the generation or production (including exploration and discovery) of an energy source; or

"(ii) the transmission, distribution, conservation, or use of energy that could reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and

"(B) a technology relating to carbon sequestration, including carbon sequestration through crops, soils, forests, oceans, and wetlands.

"(4) GREENHOUSE GAS.—The term 'greenhouse gas' means a gaseous constituent of the atmosphere, natural or anthropogenic, that absorbs and re-emits infrared radiation."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 2776) is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 1601 the following:

"Sec. 1600. Definitions."

TITLE I—ENERGY POLICY COORDINATION

SEC. 101. RESPONSIBILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1603 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13383) is amended—

(1) by inserting striking "Within 6 months" and inserting the following:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Within 6 months"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) ROLE OF SECRETARY.—The Secretary, consistent with other Federal law, shall—

"(1) coordinate all energy-related activities involving climate change issues, including scientific research, energy technology and development, and evaluation of effects and implications on energy use, sources, and related activities of various global climate change policies described in this title;

"(2) select policies to be assessed under this section and conduct the assessments; and

"(3) ensure that—

"(A) the collection and dissemination of all information developed and disseminated (including data and modeling results) relating to climate change issues described in this title is timely, balanced, accurate, and sound; and

"(B) the information described in subparagraph (A) is made available to the public.

"(c) STAFF.—

"(1) STAFF DIRECTOR.—The Secretary of Energy shall designate an appropriate officer of the Department of Energy to function as staff director for the Secretary for functions assigned to the Secretary under this title.

"(2) STAFF SUPPORT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy may request from the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary

of State, and Secretary of Transportation such additional staff support as the Secretary may require to carry out functions under this title.

“(B) PERSONNEL ON DETAIL.—Staff provided under subparagraph (A) shall serve on detail to the Secretary with the approval of the respective agency heads.

“(C) NO STAFFING INCREASE.—This subsection and the other amendments made to this title by the Climate Change Energy Policy Response Act shall not serve to authorize an increase in staffing authority for the Secretary or any such agency head.

“(e) CONSULTATION WITH NAS, NAE, NRC, AND EPA.—The Secretary shall consult, as appropriate, with—

“(1) the National Academy of Sciences and National Academy of Engineering;

“(2) the National Research Council; and

“(3) the Environmental Protection Agency.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The section heading for section 1603 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 is amended by striking “**DIRECTOR OF**” and inserting “**COORDINATION OF**”.

(2) The item in the table of contents for the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13381 et seq.) is amended by striking “Director of” and inserting “Coordination of”.

TITLE II—ADVANCEMENT OF CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE

SEC. 201. COORDINATION, PRIORITIZATION, AND EVALUATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XVI of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13381 et seq.) is amended by striking section 1604 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 1604. COORDINATION, PRIORITIZATION, AND EVALUATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE RESEARCH.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, with the advice and assistance of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering, shall coordinate, prioritize, and evaluate the Federally funded research conducted by or through Federal agencies that, in whole or in part, involves climate change science.

“(b) RECOMMENDATIONS TO CARRY OUT RESEARCH.—The Secretary shall annually request from the National Research Council recommendations of measures to effectively carry out all scientific research performed under this title, including strengthening of peer review processes and grantmaking procedures.

“(c) PLAN FOR COORDINATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Climate Change Energy Policy Response Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress recommendations for legislative and administrative measures to effectively carry out research and public information programs under this title.

“(2) SUBJECTS.—Recommendations under paragraph (1) shall include recommendations to improve peer review processes and grantmaking procedures.

“(d) OBJECTIVES OF FEDERAL CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE RESEARCH.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—All climate change science research performed under this title—

“(A) in the aggregate, shall adequately address the objectives stated in paragraph (2); and

“(B) individually, shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate a focus on those objectives, as appropriate.

“(2) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives referred to in paragraph (1) are the objectives of—

“(A) understanding the Earth’s capacity to assimilate natural and manmade greenhouse gas emissions;

“(B) evaluating the natural variability of the climate, including such phenomena as El Niño;

“(C)(i) developing, and assessing the capabilities of, climate models; and

“(ii) facilitating future climate assessments and our understanding and predictions of climate through formulation of a national statement of goals and objectives, followed by appropriate development of a national climate modeling strategy that—

“(I) includes the provision of adequate computational resources to enhance supercomputing capabilities and the provision of adequate human resources; and

“(II) is integrated and coordinated across the relevant agencies;

“(D) ensuring the integrity of all observational data used to validate models;

“(E) stabilizing the existing climate observational capability;

“(F) identifying critical climate variables that are inadequately measured or not measured at all;

“(G) building climate observing requirements into existing, ongoing operational programs;

“(H) revamping climate research programs and appropriate climate-critical parts of operational observing programs so as to produce truly useful long-term climate data;

“(I) establishing a funded activity for the development, implementation, and operation of climate-specific observational programs;

“(J) assessing the capability and potential of the United States and North American carbon sequestration, including carbon sequestration through crops, forests, soils, oceans, and wetlands; and

“(K) developing and deploying the technology to monitor all relevant national and global data.

“(e) REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and the President a report on the activities carried out under this section.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall contain any scientific conclusions, interim status reports, and recommendations for subsequent research and testing that the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(3) DRAFT REPORT.—A report under paragraph (1) shall be made available in draft form not later than August 1 of each year to appropriate nongovernmental organizations with applicable scientific expertise for review before final publication.

“(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall be made public, including through the National Resource Center on Climate Change established under section 1612.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN CLIMATE CHANGE RESEARCH.—For each of fiscal years 2001 through 2004, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as are necessary for—

“(1) research to assess the ability of natural carbon sinks to adjust to natural variations in climate and greenhouse gas emissions including crops, grassland, forests, soils, and oceans;

“(2) research on natural climate variability;

“(3) research to develop and assess the capabilities of climate models;

“(4) research to ensure the integrity of data used to validate climate models;

“(5) research to develop carbon sinks in the United States, primarily crop and forestry research; and

“(6) research to develop and deploy monitoring technology.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 2776) is amended by striking the item

relating to section 1604 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 1604. Coordination, prioritization, and evaluation of climate change science research.”.

TITLE III—COMPREHENSIVE POLICY REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

SEC. 301. DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF POLICIES FOR ADDRESSING THE EFFECTS OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XVI of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13381 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1604 the following:

“SEC. 1604A. ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVE ENERGY-RELATED POLICIES FOR ADDRESSING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

“(a) EVALUATION AND COMPREHENSIVE REPORT.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF ECONOMIC INDICATOR.—In this subsection, the term ‘economic indicator’ means—

“(A) the rate of inflation;

“(B) the rate of change in the gross domestic product;

“(C) the unemployment rate;

“(D) interest rates; and

“(E) the price and supply availability of fossil fuels (by category and source).

“(2) REPORTS BY SECRETARY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Climate Change Energy Policy Response Act and bi-annually thereafter, the Secretary, after consultation with each department referred to in paragraphs (3) through (10) and the United States Trade Representative, shall submit to Congress and to the President a report containing a critical analysis and assessment of energy-related policies for responding to potential global climate change (including a comparative assessment of the policies).

“(B) DESIGNATED POLICIES.—The Secretary shall select at least 3 energy-related policies for assessment under subparagraph (A).

“(C) SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM ASSESSMENTS.—The assessments shall be for the short term (within 5 years following the date of the report) and the long term (within 50 years following the date of the report).

“(3) ENERGY SUPPLY AND DEMAND.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall analyze and assess the energy supply, demand, and price implications for each energy-related policy referred to in paragraph (2)(A).

“(B) ACCOUNTING FOR VARIOUS SCENARIOS.—Each assessment described in subparagraph (A) shall address any energy implications under various scenarios, including changes in economic indicators.

“(C) INITIAL DRAFT.—The Energy Information Administration shall—

“(i) prepare the initial draft of each report required under this paragraph; and

“(ii) make a copy of the initial draft available to the public.

“(4) AGRICULTURE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—After opportunity for consultation with the Department of Agriculture, each report by the Secretary shall analyze and assess the agricultural production cost and market implications of each energy-related policy referred to in paragraph (2)(A), including the overall impact of the policy on rural economies.

“(B) ACCOUNTING FOR VARIOUS SCENARIOS.—Each assessment described in subparagraph (A) shall address any agricultural implications under various scenarios, changes in economic indicators, and in livestock and commodity prices.

“(5) HEALTH.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—After opportunity for consultation with the Department of Health

and Human Services, each report by the Secretary shall analyze and assess the health implications of each energy-related policy referred to in paragraph (2)(A).

“(B) ACCOUNTING FOR VARIOUS SCENARIOS.—Each assessment described in subparagraph (A) shall address any health implications under various scenarios, including changes in economic indicators.

“(6) LABOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—After opportunity for consultation with the Department of Labor, each report by the Secretary shall analyze and assess the implications of each policy referred to in paragraph (2)(A) on—

“(i) workers, including wages, job opportunities, and the comparative attractiveness, if any, of locating operations of United States companies abroad; and

“(ii) consumers, in terms of projected impacts, if any, on the Consumer Price Index.

“(B) ACCOUNTING FOR VARIOUS SCENARIOS.—Each assessment described in subparagraph (A) shall account for implications under various scenarios, including changes in economic indicators.

“(7) TRANSPORTATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—After opportunity for consultation with the Department of Transportation, each report by the Secretary shall analyze and assess the impacts, if any, of each policy described in paragraph (2)(A) on all modes of transportation, and the resulting economic effects of such cost changes on consumers, labor, agricultural enterprises, and businesses (including specifically domestic consumers and businesses that are dependent on transportation).

“(B) ACCOUNTING FOR VARIOUS SCENARIOS.—Each assessment described in subparagraph (A) shall address any transportation implications under various scenarios, including, in the case of motor vehicles, technological changes in vehicle design and traffic constraint mitigation.

“(C) CONSIDERATIONS.—Each assessment described in subparagraph (A) shall consider such factors as—

“(i) vehicle miles traveled;

“(ii) the availability of adequate and reliable public transportation within and between cities, States, and regions;

“(iii) the commercial use of trucks and other highway motor vehicles for transporting goods and passengers and delivering services;

“(iv) the geographic size and population of the United States relative to those of other developed countries;

“(v) safety;

“(vi) environmental laws;

“(vii) fuel prices;

“(viii) energy conservation; and

“(ix) changes in economic indicators.

“(8) HOUSING AND URBAN PLANNING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—After opportunity for consultation with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, each report by the Secretary shall analyze and assess the implications of each policy described in paragraph (2)(A) on housing costs and urban planning.

“(B) ACCOUNTING FOR VARIOUS SCENARIOS.—Each assessment described in subparagraph (A) shall address any housing and urban planning implications under various scenarios, including variations in mortgage and construction interest rates and changes in economic indicators.

“(9) INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—After opportunity for consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the United States Trade Representative, each report by the Secretary shall analyze and assess the implications of each policy described in paragraph (2)(A) on United States exports and imports and trade competitiveness.

“(B) ACCOUNTING FOR VARIOUS SCENARIOS.—Each assessment described in subparagraph (A) shall address any international commerce implications under different scenarios, including changes in economic indicators.

“(10) ACTIONS BY OTHER NATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report by the Secretary shall analyze and assess the actions taken, or likely to be taken, and the net aggregate effect of such actions, by each United Nations member country to avoid, reduce, or adapt to potential global climate change.

“(B) CONSULTATION.—Each report shall be prepared in accordance with otherwise applicable laws (including regulations) after opportunity for consultation with the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and the Department of State.

“(C) ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each assessment described in subparagraph (A) shall analyze the political and economic factors present in each country that form the basis for the assessment.

“(ii) MATTERS TO BE ADDRESSED.—Each assessment shall specifically address—

“(I) the status of the commitment of each country to any international agreements, treaties, or protocols related to potential global climate change; and

“(II) the projected ability of each country to commit to, and the likelihood of each country's committing to, specific quantifiable targets to reduce, within specified timeframes, greenhouse gas emissions under a legally binding international agreement.

“(11) REPORTING FLEXIBILITY.—For biannual reports under this subsection, the Secretary may—

“(A) submit individual reports with respect to each paragraph under this subsection; or

“(B) submit a combination of 1 or more biannual reports, but only if submitting a combination of reports would facilitate public understanding in a timely manner.

“(b) COMPREHENSIVE POLICY REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 months after the date of enactment of the Climate Change Energy Policy Response Act, and biannually thereafter, the President, with the advice and assistance of the Secretary, shall submit to Congress a report analyzing and integrating the combined findings of the reports required under subsection (a).

“(2) CONTENTS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include recommendations of any changes in law, international agreements, or public policy that the President considers to be in the best interests of the United States.

“(c) NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES; NATIONAL ACADEMY OF ENGINEERING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Climate Change Energy Policy Response Act, the Secretary shall request that, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of that Act and biannually thereafter, the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering (acting through the National Research Council) submit to Congress and to the Secretary (for inclusion in the review and report under subsection (c)) a report containing a comparative assessment of each policy assessed under subsection (b), including the known scientific effect of each mechanism on global climate change and the effect of each mechanism on the technology development and selection.

“(2) SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM ASSESSMENTS.—An assessment under paragraph (1) shall be for the short term (the following 5-year period) and for the long term (the following 50-year period).

“(d) REPORT ON ACTIONS UNDER EPA JURISDICTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Climate Change Energy Policy Response Act, and biannually thereafter, based on consultations with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and the President a report describing the energy supply and demand implications of all activities carried out by the Agency that have a coincidental effect on actions by the private sector that affect greenhouse gas emissions.

“(2) PUBLIC CONSULTATION.—In preparing a report under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with—

“(A) persons in the private sector that are regulated by the Administrator; and

“(B) persons in the public sector.

“(e) SUSPENSION OF REPORTS.—After a second report is made under this section, the Secretary may suspend any reporting requirement under subsection (a) for a period of not more than 4 years if the Secretary determines that additional responses to that requirement would not be likely to provide information that substantially supplements the earlier reports.”

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 2776) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1604 the following:

“Sec. 1604A. Assessment of alternative policies for addressing greenhouse gas emissions.”

TITLE IV—PUBLIC RIGHT TO KNOW

SEC. 401. ANNUAL REPORT TO PUBLIC.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XVI of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13381 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1610. ANNUAL REPORT TO PUBLIC.

“(a) REPORT.—The Secretary, at the time the President submits to Congress the budget of the United States Government under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, shall publish a detailed report that includes, to the maximum extent practicable—

“(1) a description of all current fiscal year and prior fiscal year Federal spending on climate change, categorized by research, regulation, education, and other activities;

“(2) an estimate of the prior year and current amount of any Federal tax credits or other Federal tax deductions claimed by taxpayers directly attributable to emission reduction activities;

“(3) a compendium of all proposed Federal spending related to climate change categorized by research, regulation, education, and other activities;

“(4) tables detailing all spending recommendations on climate change submitted by Federal agencies to the Office of Management and Budget, compared with the final recommendations of the President;

“(5) an alphabetical index of all climate change grantees, cross-referenced by name of institution and persons carrying out the grant project;

“(6) an index of all climate change grant proposals not funded by Federal agencies; and

“(7) a list of all persons, and their institutional affiliations, participating in peer review of climate change grant proposals submitted to Federal agencies.

“(b) AVAILABILITY OF REPORTS.—A report under subsection (a) shall be—

“(1) printed on recycled paper;

“(2) made available to the public; and

“(3) posted on the Internet.

“SEC. 1611. PUBLIC COMMENT.

“In the case of any report under this title that is to be published, the Secretary shall—

“(1) provide to the public notice and opportunity to comment on the contents or quality of the report before it is published; and

“(2) receive, catalogue, and make readily available to the public all written public comments on reports covered by this section, except that lengthy compilations of public comments may be published in electronic format only.

“SEC. 1612. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER ON CLIMATE CHANGE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the National Academy of Sciences, shall maintain a National Resource Center on Climate Change (referred to in this section as the ‘Center’).

“(b) FUNCTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Center shall preserve and make available to the public all reports, studies, or other information relating to climate change provided for in this title, provided for in the Climate Change Energy Policy Response Act, or otherwise available to the Federal Government.

“(2) REFERENCE ITEMS.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, reference items may be made available in electronic format only.

“(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAW.—Nothing in this section alters or amends otherwise applicable law restricting public access to information, including laws protecting national defense secrets, intellectual property rights, and privacy rights.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 2776) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1609 the following:

“Sec. 1610. Annual report to public.

“Sec. 1611. Public comment.

“Sec. 1612. National Resource Center on Climate Change.”.

TITLE V—ACCELERATED DEVELOPMENT AND DEPLOYMENT OF RESPONSE TECHNOLOGY

SEC. 501. REVIEW OF FEDERALLY FUNDED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XVI of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13381 et seq.) (as amended by section 401(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1613. REVIEW OF FEDERALLY FUNDED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

“(a) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY REVIEW OF FEDERALLY FUNDED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) review annually any federally funded research and development activities carried out on energy technology; and

“(B) issue a public report by October 15 of each year on the results of the review for consideration and use in the preparation of the budget of the United States Government submitted under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, for the following fiscal year.

“(2) ASSESSMENT OF TECHNOLOGY READINESS.—As part of the review of an energy technology, the Secretary shall—

“(A) assess the status (including the potential commercialization) of the technology and any barriers to the deployment of the energy technology; and

“(B) consider—

“(i) the length of time it will take for deployment and use of the energy technology so as to have a meaningful impact on emission reductions;

“(ii) the cost of deploying the energy technology;

“(iii) the safety of the energy technology; and

“(iv) other relevant factors.

(b) ENERGY TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CLEARINGHOUSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish, in the National Resource Center on

Climate Change established under section 1614 or by such other means as the Secretary considers appropriate, an information clearinghouse to facilitate the transfer and dissemination of the results of federally funded research and development activities being carried out on energy technology.

“(2) NO EFFECT ON RESTRICTIONS OR SAFEGUARDS.—Paragraph (1) has no effect on any restrictions or safeguards established for national security or the protection of personal property rights (including trade secrets and confidential business information).

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR JOINT FEDERAL/PRIVATE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2004 such sums as are necessary for programs for the demonstration of innovative energy sequestration technologies described in section 1600(3)(B) to be conducted jointly by the Federal Government and private nonprofit or for-profit entities.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 2776) (as amended by section 401(b)) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1612 the following:

“Sec. 1613. Review of federally funded energy technology research and development.”.

SEC. 502. STUDY OF REGULATORY BARRIERS TO RAPID DEPLOYMENT OF EMISSION REDUCTION TECHNOLOGY.

Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States (in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the United States Trade Representative) shall—

(1) identify and evaluate regulatory barriers to the more rapid deployment of technology domestically and internationally for greenhouse gas emission reductions (within the meaning of section 1600 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, as added by section 3);

(2) recommend to Congress changes in law that would permit more rapid deployment of such technologies; and

(3) make such other recommendations as the Comptroller General of the United States considers to be appropriate.

TITLE VI—INTERNATIONAL DEPLOYMENT OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY TO MITIGATE CLIMATE CHANGE

SEC. 601. INTERNATIONAL DEPLOYMENT OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY TO MITIGATE CLIMATE CHANGE.

Section 1608 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13386) is amended by striking subsection (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) INTERNATIONAL DEPLOYMENT OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY TO MITIGATE CLIMATE CHANGE.—

“(I) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) ENERGY EFFICIENCY.—The term ‘energy efficiency’ means the ratio of the design average annual energy output of a unit of an energy production facility (determined without regard to any cogeneration of steam) to the design average annual heat input of the unit (based on the highest heating value of the fuel used by the unit).

“(B) INTERNATIONAL ENERGY DEPLOYMENT PROJECT.—The term ‘international energy deployment project’ means a project to construct a unit of an energy production facility outside the United States—

“(i) the output of which will be consumed outside the United States; and

“(ii) the deployment of which will result in greenhouse gas reduction when compared to the technology that would otherwise be implemented through an increase in energy efficiency of—

“(I) 5 percentage points or more, in the case of a unit placed in service before January 1, 2010;

“(II) 7 percentage points or more, in the case of a unit placed in service after December 31, 2009, and before January 1, 2020; or

“(III) 10 percentage points or more, in the case of a unit placed in service after December 31, 2019, and before January 1, 2030.

“(C) QUALIFYING INTERNATIONAL ENERGY DEPLOYMENT PROJECT.—The term ‘qualifying international energy deployment project’ means an international energy deployment that—

“(i) is submitted by a United States firm to the Secretary in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary by regulation;

“(ii) uses technology that has been successfully developed or deployed in the United States;

“(iii) meets the criteria of subsection (k);

“(iv) is approved by the Secretary, with notice of the approval being published in the Federal Register; and

“(v) complies with such terms and conditions as the Secretary establishes by regulation.

“(D) UNITED STATES.—The term ‘United States’, when used in a geographical sense, means the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and territories and possessions of the United States.

“(2) PILOT PROGRAM FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Climate Change Energy Policy Response Act, the Secretary shall by regulation provide for a pilot program for financial assistance for qualifying international energy deployment projects.

“(B) LIMITATION.—The pilot program shall provide financial assistance, subject to the availability of appropriations, for not more than 6 qualifying international energy deployment projects.

“(C) SELECTION CRITERIA.—After consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the United States Trade Representative, the Secretary shall select projects for participation in the program based solely on the criteria under this title and without regard to the country in which the project is located.

“(D) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A United States firm that undertakes a qualifying international energy deployment project selected to participate in the pilot program shall be eligible to receive a loan or a loan guarantee from the Secretary.

“(ii) TIMING.—The Secretary may enter into a commitment to make a loan or loan guarantee before the United States firm decides on a binding contract for the construction of a qualifying international energy deployment project.

“(iii) RATE OF INTEREST.—The rate of interest of any loan made under clause (i) shall be equal to the rate for Treasury obligations then issued for periods of comparable maturities.

“(iv) AMOUNT.—The amount of a loan or loan guarantee under clause (i) shall not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of the qualified international energy deployment project.

“(E) COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS.—A qualifying international energy deployment project funded under this section shall not be eligible as a qualifying clean coal technology under section 415 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7651n).

“(F) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of the Climate Change Energy Policy Response Act, the Secretary shall submit to the President a report on the results of the pilot projects.

“(G) RECOMMENDATION.—Not later than 60 days after receiving the report under subparagraph (F), the President shall submit to Congress a recommendation, based on the results of the pilot projects as reported by the Secretary of Energy, concerning whether the financial assistance program under this section should be continued, expanded, reduced, or eliminated.

“(H) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection such sums as are necessary for fiscal years 2001 through 2004.”.

TITLE VII—OPTIMAL OPERATING EFFICIENCY OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

SEC. 701. TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF RESEARCH.

Section 502 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF RESEARCH.—

“(I) STUDIES.—

“(A) REGIONAL APPROACHES FOR REDUCING TRAFFIC CONGESTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study, and prepare a report comparing the effectiveness of various regional approaches for reducing traffic congestion.

“(ii) REQUIRED ASSESSMENTS.—At a minimum, the study shall assess the impact on traffic congestion of—

“(I) expansion of highway capacity;

“(II) improvement of traffic operations (including improved incident management associated with traffic accidents and vehicle breakdowns); and

“(III) programs for demand management.

“(B) HIGHWAY DESIGN CONCEPTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall fund a study analyzing, and preparation of a report concerning, highway design concepts for projects to relieve congestion in urban areas without acquisition of additional rights-of-way.

“(ii) ENTITY TO CARRY OUT STUDY.—The study may be carried out and the report prepared—

“(I) by the Department of Transportation;

“(II) by another entity, through an arrangement with the Secretary; or

“(III) by a combination of the entities described in subclauses (I) and (II).

“(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the studies required under paragraph (1) shall be 100 percent.

“(3) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2002, \$1,000,000 of the sum deducted by the Secretary under section 104(a) shall be made available to carry out the studies required under paragraph (1).

“(B) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Funds made available under subparagraph (A) shall be allocated among the 2 studies at the discretion of the Secretary, except that each study shall be allocated funds sufficient to allow for completion of the study.”.

TITLE VIII—VOLUNTARY INITIATIVES

SEC. 801. IMPROVED AND STREAMLINED REPORTING AND CERTIFICATION OF VOLUNTARY MEASURES.

(a) REVISED GUIDELINES UNDER ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 1992.—Section 1605(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13385(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) REVISED GUIDELINES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Climate

Change Energy Policy Response Act, the Secretary shall revise the guidelines, after notice and opportunity for public comment, to reflect the amendments to this title made by that Act. Thereafter, the Secretary shall review and revise the guidelines every 5 years, after notice and opportunity for public comment.

“(B) CONTENTS.—The revised guidelines shall—

“(i) provide for a random or other verification process using the authorities available to the Secretary under other provisions of law;

“(ii) include a range of reference cases for reporting project-based activities in all appropriate sectors of the economy (including forestry and electric power generation); and

“(iii) address the issues, such as comparability, that are associated with permitting the option of reporting on an entity basis or on an activity or project basis.

“(C) RETENTION OF VOLUNTARY REPORTING.—Any review under this paragraph shall give appropriate weight to—

“(i) the purpose of encouraging voluntary emission reductions by the private sector; and

“(ii) the voluntary nature of reporting under this section.

“(D) VALIDITY OF CERTIFICATION.—Except to the extent that an emission reduction certified in a report under this subsection, not later than 1 year after the date of the report, is adjusted under the verification process under subparagraph (B) or review process under subsection (d)(2), the emission reduction shall be valid for purposes of this and any other provision of law if the report meets the guidelines as in effect on the date on which the report is made.”.

(b) ASSURANCE OF ACCURATE REPORTING.—Section 1605(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13385(b)) (as amended by subsection (a)) is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) REPORTING PROCEDURES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with paragraph (5), the Administrator shall—

“(i) develop forms for voluntary reporting under the guidelines established under paragraph (1); and

“(ii) make the forms available to entities wishing to report such information.

“(B) CERTIFICATION OF REPORTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A person reporting under this subsection shall certify the accuracy of the information reported.

“(ii) REPORTS BY A CORPORATION.—In the case of information reported by a corporation, the report—

“(I) shall be signed by an officer of the corporation; and

“(II) shall be subject to section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.”.

(c) AVOIDANCE OF DUPLICATE REPORTING.—Section 1605(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13385(b)) (as amended by subsection (a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(4) AVOIDANCE OF DUPLICATE REPORTING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The guidelines under this subsection shall ensure against multiple certification of the same emission reductions.

“(B) FIRST TO SEEK CERTIFICATION.—In a case in which—

“(i) more than 1 person is directly involved in the creation or implementation of an emission reduction measure;

“(ii) there is no—

“(I) written contractual arrangement between the persons that specifies which person is entitled to report the emission reduction; or

“(II) reference case or other provision of the guidelines that addresses the question which person is entitled to report the emission reduction in the circumstance of the case; and

“(iii) the Administrator determines that 2 or more of the persons have equally valid claims to the same emission reduction;

the first of the persons to certify the emission reduction in a report under this subsection shall be the only person entitled to report the emission reduction.”.

(d) SIMPLIFICATION OF REPORTING.—Section 1605(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13385(b)) (as amended by subsection (c)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) SIMPLIFICATION OF REPORTING.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Climate Change Energy Policy Response Act, the Administrator shall by regulation, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, as appropriate, review and revise the reporting forms and procedures to facilitate greater participation by small businesses, farms, and other organizations that did not extensively participate in voluntary emission reductions and reporting under this subsection during the first 6 years after the date of enactment of this Act.”.

(e) BEST PRACTICES FOR ESTIMATING EMISSION REDUCTIONS.—Section 1605 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13385) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) BEST PRACTICES FOR ESTIMATING EMISSION REDUCTIONS.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT BY THE SECRETARY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, after notice and opportunity for public comment, the Secretary, with the assistance of the Administrator, shall establish the most reasonably effective practices for estimating emission reductions under subsection (b).

“(2) REVIEW OF PRIOR CERTIFICATIONS.—Emission reductions certified before the date of enactment of this subsection shall be subject to review by the Secretary and adjustment, in appropriate cases, to account for any change in a practice under this subsection.

“(3) CONFORMITY OF PRIOR REPORTED EMISSION REDUCTIONS WITH BEST PRACTICES.—In any review under this subsection, the Secretary shall obtain the assistance of the Administrator in assessing whether and to what extent any prior reported emission reduction is in conformity with best practices established under paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 802. PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN REGARDING BENEFITS OF CERTIFICATION OF VOLUNTARY EMISSION REDUCTIONS.

Section 1605 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13385) (as amended by section 801(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PUBLIC AWARENESS PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall create and implement a public awareness program to educate all appropriate persons (especially farmers and small businesses) in all regions of the United States of—

“(A) the direct benefits of engaging in voluntary emission reduction measures and having the emission reductions certified under this section and available for use under other incentive programs; and

“(B) the forms and procedures for having emission reductions certified under this section.

“(2) SPECIAL AGRICULTURAL AND SMALL BUSINESS OUTREACH.—The Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to farmers, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, with respect to small businesses,

shall assist the Secretary in creating and implementing the public awareness program under paragraph (1)."

SEC. 803. STATE AUTHORITY TO ENCOURAGE VOLUNTARY ENERGY INITIATIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XVI of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 is amended by striking section 1606 (106 Stat. 3003) and inserting the following:

"SEC. 1606. STATE AUTHORITY TO ENCOURAGE VOLUNTARY ENERGY INITIATIVES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law regarding the production, transmission, distribution, sale, or use of energy or of energy services, a State is not prohibited or restricted from continuing to engage in any action, or from implementing any State law (including a regulation) in effect on the date of enactment of the Climate Change Energy Policy Response Act, if the appropriate State authority finds that the action or law is appropriate for mitigating the financial risks to producers, transmitters, distributors, sellers, buyers, or users of energy or energy services that engage in voluntary steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

"(b) COORDINATION WITH LATER ENACTED LAW.—This section shall remain in effect notwithstanding any Federal law, including any Federal law enacted after the date of enactment of this section, unless the later law specifically refers to this section and expressly states that this section is superseded."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 2776) is amended by striking the item relating to section 1606 and inserting the following:

"Sec. 1606. State authority to encourage voluntary energy initiatives."

THE CLIMATE CHANGE ENERGY POLICY RESPONSE ACT OF 1999—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to revise the energy policies of the U.S. in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, advance global climate science, promote technology development, and increase citizen awareness, and for other purposes.

SECTION 1.—SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SECTION 2.—FINDINGS.

SECTION 3.—DEFINITIONS.

TITLE I—ENERGY POLICY COORDINATION

SEC. 101

Directs the Secretary of Energy to: coordinate federal activities involving climate change issues including scientific research; energy technology and development, and economic analysis of various climate change policy alternatives;

select climate change policy alternatives for critical analysis;

ensure that collection and dissemination of all government developed or funded information relating to climate change is timely, balanced, understandable, accurate, sound, and made available to the public; and

consult with the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, the National Research Council, and the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Secretary of Energy is to name staff to carry out this legislation. Consulting agencies may detail additional staff to DOE. The Act authorizes no additional staffing positions in any government agency.

TITLE II—ADVANCEMENT OF CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE

SEC. 201—COORDINATION, PRIORITIZATION, AND EVALUATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE RESEARCH

This section directs the Secretary of Energy to:

(with the National Academies of Science and Engineering) coordinate, prioritize, and evaluate federally funded scientific research on climate change conducted by or through federal agencies;

request the National Research Council to annually recommend measures to effectively carry out all scientific research covered by this legislation; and

submit to Congress legislative recommendations to more effectively carry out research and public information programs under this legislation, including recommendations to improve peer review processes and grant-making procedures

This section also provides that the objectives for federal climate change science research are to:

understand the Earth's capacity to assimilate natural and manmade greenhouse gas emissions;

evaluate the natural variability of the climate, including such phenomena as El Niño;

develop, and assess the capabilities of, climate models; and develop a national climate modeling strategy with adequate computational and human resources that are integrated and coordinated across the relevant agencies;

ensure the integrity of all observational data used to validate models and stabilize the existing climate observational capability;

identify critical climate variables that are inadequately measured or not measured at all;

build climate observing requirements into existing ongoing operational programs;

revamp climate research programs and appropriate climate-critical parts of operational observing programs so as to produce useful long-term data;

establish a funded activity for the development, implementation, and operation of climate-specific observational programs;

assess the capability and potential of the United States and North American carbon sequestration, including through crops, forests, soils, oceans, and wetlands; and

development deploy the technology to monitor all relevant national and global data.

Requires DOE to submit to Congress and the President a report on all science activities carried out under this title. The reports are to contain any scientific conclusions, interim status reports, and recommendations for subsequent research and testing that DOE considers appropriate. A draft report must be made available by DOE to appropriate nongovernmental organizations for their review no later than August 1 of each year. All reports under this section must be made available to the public through the National Resource Center on Climate Change.

For each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, such sums as are necessary are authorized to be appropriated for research:

to assess the ability of natural carbon sinks to adjust to natural variations in climate and greenhouse gas emissions including, crops, grassland, forests, soils, and oceans;

on natural climate variability; to develop and assess the capabilities of climate models;

to ensure the integrity of data used to validate climate models;

to develop carbon sinks in the United States (primarily crop and forestry research); and

to develop and deploy monitoring technology

TITLE III—POLICY REVIEW AND COORDINATION

SEC. 301—DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF POLICIES FOR ADDRESSING THE EFFECTS OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

This section provides that within two years after the bill becomes law (and biannually thereafter) DOE, after consultation

with each of seven federal agencies, is to prepare an economic analysis of climate change policy alternatives. The Secretary of Energy is to select three or more such policy alternatives for critical analysis only. Each analysis is to look at short term (five years) and long-term (fifty years) implications, and account for changes in various factors, including economic indicators.

Each agency to be consulted is to contribute expertise as appropriate on each policy alternative analysis in the following areas:

energy supply and demand, and energy price implications;

agricultural production cost and market implications, including overall impact on rural economies (discrete scenarios including variations in commodity and livestock prices);

health implications, if any;

implications for (1) workers, including wages and job opportunities and potential for U.S. firms locating operations abroad; and (2) for consumers in terms of predicted changes to the Consumer Price Index;

implications on all modes of transportation and the effects of the resulting cost changes on consumers, labor, agriculture and businesses;

housing costs and urban planning (under different mortgage and construction interest rate scenarios).

implications for U.S. exports and imports and trade competitiveness.

Status of activities and commitments in other countries

In addition to the foregoing seven economic analyses, DOE is to consult with the Department of State, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Administration to assess actions taken, or likely to be taken, by each United Nations member country to avoid, reduce, or adapt to climate change. Each such assessment is to analyze political and economic factors present in each country that may impact the assessment. The status of the country's commitment to international agreements relating to climate change, and the projected ability and likelihood of each country committing to binding international agreements with targets or timetables, are to be assessed.

Integration of policy alternative analyses

Within 30 months after enactment, and biannually thereafter, the President, with the advice and assistance of the Secretary of Energy, is to submit to Congress a report analyzing and integrating the combined findings of the report. The conclusion is to contain recommendations of any changes in law, international agreements, or public policy that the President considers to be in the best interest of the United States.

Scientific effect of policy alternatives

The Secretary of Energy is to request the National Academies of Science and Engineering to assess the known scientific effect of each policy alternative chosen for analysis under this Title and its effect on technology development and selection.

Environmental Protection Agency activities with climate change implications

DOE is to report on the activities of EPA that coincidentally affect actions by the private sector that, in turn, affect greenhouse gas emissions. DOE is to consult with the public and private sectors in preparing this report.

Reporting flexibility

The Secretary of Energy may suspend one or more of the agency reporting requirements after two reports if it finds that such

reports will not likely provide information that substantially supplements earlier reports.

TITLE IV—PUBLIC RIGHTS-TO-KNOW

SEC. 401—ANNUAL REPORT TO THE PUBLIC

DOE is to publish an annual report on U.S. investment in climate change activities that includes:

- a description of current, prior year, and proposed spending on climate change categorized by research, regulation, education, and other activities;

- estimate of current and prior year tax credits and deductions claimed by U.S. taxpayers attributable to greenhouse gas emissions reductions;

- tables of spending proposals on climate change submitted by federal agencies to OMB, compared with President's final recommendations to Congress;

- an index of all climate change grantees, cross-referenced by name of institutions and persons carrying out the projects;

- an index of all grant proposals not funded by federal agencies; and

- a list of all persons and their affiliations participating in peer review of climate change grant proposals.

Each such report is to be printed on recycled paper, made public, and posted on the Internet.

Public comment

DOE is to provide for notice and opportunity for public comment on the report. Such comments are to be catalogued and made readily available to the public in electronic format.

National Resource Center on Climate Change

DOE, in consultation with the National Academy of Science, is to establish a National Resource Center on Climate Change. The Center is to preserve and make publicly available all reports, information, studies or other information available to the federal government on climate change. Reference items may be made available in electronic format only. Public availability of information is subject to laws protecting national defense secrets, intellectual property rights, and privacy rights.

TITLE V—ACCELERATED DEVELOPMENT AND DEPLOYMENT OF RESPONSE TECHNOLOGY

SEC. 501—REVIEW OF FEDERALLY FUNDED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Requires DOE by October 15 of each year to review any federally funded energy technology research and development activities. The review will assess the status of the energy technology, including lead-time required until deployment, cost, safety, potential barriers to deployment, and other relevant factors.

Requires DOE to establish a technology information clearinghouse to disseminate the results of federally funded energy technology research and development activities. The clearinghouse is to be set up within the National Research Center on Climate Change, but is not to affect national security secrets or personal property rights.

SEC. 502—STUDY OF REGULATORY BARRIERS TO RAPID DEPLOYMENT OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION REDUCTION TECHNOLOGY

This section requires GAO, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the U.S. Trade Representative, to identify and evaluate regulatory or other barriers to more rapid deployment of technology to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The scope is both domestic and international. Requires GAO to recommend to Congress any necessary changes in law.

TITLE VI—INTERNATIONAL DEPLOYMENT OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY TO MITIGATE CLIMATE CHANGE

SEC. 601—INTERNATIONAL DEPLOYMENT OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY TO MITIGATE CLIMATE CHANGE

Pilot program for financial assistance

Requires the Secretary of Energy to create a pilot program to provide financial assistance, subject to available appropriations, for not more than six (6) qualifying, international, energy deployment projects. To qualify, the projects must be built, operated, and used outside the United States and must increase energy efficiency compared to the technology that would otherwise be implemented. The Secretary of Energy, after consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce and the U.S. Trade Representative, may make the selection based solely on the criteria set forth in Sec. 601.

Financial assistance (for qualifying international energy deployment projects)

A U.S. firm undertaking an international energy deployment project which qualifies under the preceding section is eligible for financial assistance in the form of a loan or a loan guarantee. The loan amount would not exceed 75% of total project cost, and the interest rate would equal that for Treasury obligation then issued for periods of comparable maturities.

Equity investment insurance (for firms selected to participate in pilot project)

Under this section a U.S. firm that enters a binding contract for a qualifying international energy deployment project would, if approved by DOE to be part of the pilot project, be eligible for insurance on investment the firm has in the project.

Coordination with other programs

Provides that a qualifying international energy deployment project, funded under this title, would not be eligible as a qualifying clean coal technology under Section 415 of the Clean Air Act.

Report and recommendations

No later than four (4) years after the date of enactment, DOE must submit a report to the President on the results of the pilot projects. After reviewing the report the President is to recommend to Congress that the financial assistance program be continued, expanded, reduced or eliminated.

Authorization of appropriations

Authorizes appropriations (such sums as are necessary) to fund the programs under this title for fiscal years 2001-2004.

TITLE VII—OPTIMAL OPERATING EFFICIENCY OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

SEC. 701—TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF RESEARCH

Amends Section 502 of title 23, United States Code. Requires DOE to enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study comparing the effectiveness of various regional approaches for reducing traffic congestion. At a minimum the study is to assess the impact on traffic of: (1) expansion of highway capacity; (2) improvement of traffic operations; and (3) programs for demand management.

Relieving urban congestion without additional right-of-way

Requires DOE to fund a study and prepare a report analyzing highway design concepts for projects to relieve congestion in urban areas without acquisition of additional rights-of-way. For fiscal years 2000 through 2002, \$1,000,000 of the [sum deducted by the Secretary under Section 104(a)] would be available for these studies.

TITLE VIII—VOLUNTARY INITIATIVES:

SEC. 801—IMPROVED AND STREAMLINED REPORTING AND CERTIFICATION OF VOLUNTARY MEASURES

Amends the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to improve and streamline reporting and certification of voluntary measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Revised reporting guidelines

Requires DOE (with one year of enactment and every five years thereafter), to revise reporting guidelines to reflect changes made by this legislation. Establishes criteria for review of the reporting guidelines. Requires that any review pursuant to this section give appropriate weight to (1) the purpose of encouraging voluntary greenhouse gas emission reductions; and (2) the voluntary nature of reporting under this section. Validates reported emissions reductions so long as (1) the report meets then applicable guidelines and (2) reported reductions are not adjusted by Energy Information Administration (EIA).

Forms for accurate reporting

Requires DOE to develop forms for voluntary reporting and to make the forms available to entities wishing to report. Provides that entities reporting emissions reductions certify the accuracy of the report. Information reported by a corporation must be signed by one of its officers. Ensures against multiple certification of the same greenhouse gas emissions reductions: If more than one party has a valid claim to the same reduction, the first person to seek certification of a greenhouse gas emission reduction shall be granted the certification.

Greater participation by small businesses and farms

Requires the Administrator of EIA, in conjunction with the Secretary of Agriculture and Administrator of the SBA, to review and revise the guidelines to facilitate greater participation by small businesses, farms, and other organizations that did not previously participate in voluntary reductions and reporting.

Best practices for estimating reductions

Requires the Administrator of EIA to establish the most reasonably effective practices for estimating greenhouse gas emission reductions under §1605(b). Provides that emission reductions certified prior to the effective date of this section be reviewed, and modified if necessary, to account for any changes implemented by this section.

SEC. 802—PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN OF VOLUNTARY EMISSION REDUCTIONS CERTIFICATION

Requires EIA to create a public awareness campaign: (1) on the benefits of engaging in voluntary greenhouse gas reduction measures and having the reductions certified and available for use under other incentive programs; and (2) explaining forms and procedures for having reductions certified. USDA and SBA are to implement comparable programs for the agricultural and small business communities.

SEC. 803—STATE AUTHORITY TO ENCOURAGE VOLUNTARY ENERGY INITIATIVES

This section provides that a state is not restricted from continuing to engage in any action, or from implementing any State law, that is in effect at the time this legislation is enacted, if the State determines that the action or law is appropriate for mitigating the financial risks to producers, transmitters, distributors, sellers, buyers, or users of energy or energy services who engage in voluntary steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This provision remains in effect unless specifically and expressly superseded in subsequent legislation.

S. 1777

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 "Climate Change Tax Amendments of 1999".

SEC. 2. PERMANENT TAX CREDIT FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT REGARDING GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 41(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to termination) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN RESEARCH.—Paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply in the case of any qualified research expenses if the research—

"(A) has as 1 of its purposes the reducing or sequestering of greenhouse gases, and

"(B) has been reported to the Department of Energy under section 1605(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) applies with respect to amounts paid or incurred after the date of enactment of this Act, except that such amendment shall not take effect unless the Climate Change Energy Policy Response Act is enacted into law.

SEC. 3. TAX CREDIT FOR REDUCED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FACILITIES.

(a) ALLOWANCE OF REDUCED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FACILITIES CREDIT.—Section 46 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to amount of credit) is amended by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting ", and", and by adding at the end the following:

"(4) the reduced greenhouse gas emissions facilities credit."

(b) AMOUNT OF CREDIT.—Subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to rules for computing investment credit) is amended by inserting after section 48 the following:

"SEC. 48A. CREDIT FOR REDUCED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FACILITIES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 46, the reduced greenhouse gas emissions facilities credit for any taxable year is the applicable percentage of the qualified investment in a reduced greenhouse gas emissions facility for such taxable year.

"(b) REDUCED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FACILITY.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'reduced greenhouse gas emissions facility' means a facility of the taxpayer—

"(1)(A) the construction, reconstruction, or erection of which is completed by the taxpayer, or

"(B) which is acquired by the taxpayer if the original use of such facility commences with the taxpayer,

"(2) the operation of which—

"(A) replaces the operation of a facility of the taxpayer,

"(B) reduces greenhouse gas emissions on a per unit of output basis as compared to such emissions of the replaced facility, and

"(C) uses the same type of fuel (or combination of the same type of fuel and biomass fuel) as was used in the replaced facility,

"(3) with respect to which depreciation (or amortization in lieu of depreciation) is allowable, and

"(4) which meets the performance and quality standards (if any) which—

"(A) have been jointly prescribed by the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy by regulations,

"(B) are consistent with regulations prescribed under section 1605(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, and

"(C) are in effect at the time of the acquisition of the facility.

"(c) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of subsection (a), the applicable percentage is one-half of the percentage reduction in greenhouse gas emissions described in subsection (b)(2) and reported and certified under section 1605(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

"(d) QUALIFIED INVESTMENT.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'qualified investment' means, with respect to any taxable year, the basis of a reduced greenhouse gas emissions facility placed in service by the taxpayer during such taxable year, but only with respect to that portion of the investment attributable to providing production capacity not greater than the production capacity of the facility being replaced.

"(e) QUALIFIED PROGRESS EXPENDITURES.—

"(1) INCREASE IN QUALIFIED INVESTMENT.—In the case of a taxpayer who has made an election under paragraph (5), the amount of the qualified investment of such taxpayer for the taxable year (determined under subsection (d) without regard to this subsection) shall be increased by an amount equal to the aggregate of each qualified progress expenditure for the taxable year with respect to progress expenditure property.

"(2) PROGRESS EXPENDITURE PROPERTY DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'progress expenditure property' means any property being constructed by or for the taxpayer and which it is reasonable to believe will qualify as a reduced greenhouse gas emissions facility which is being constructed by or for the taxpayer when it is placed in service.

"(3) QUALIFIED PROGRESS EXPENDITURES DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) SELF-CONSTRUCTED PROPERTY.—In the case of any self-constructed property, the term 'qualified progress expenditures' means the amount which, for purposes of this subpart, is properly chargeable (during such taxable year) to capital account with respect to such property.

"(B) NON-SELF-CONSTRUCTED PROPERTY.—In the case of non-self-constructed property, the term 'qualified progress expenditures' means the amount paid during the taxable year to another person for the construction of such property.

"(4) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) SELF-CONSTRUCTED PROPERTY.—The term 'self-constructed property' means property for which it is reasonable to believe that more than half of the construction expenditures will be made directly by the taxpayer.

"(B) NON-SELF-CONSTRUCTED PROPERTY.—The term 'non-self-constructed property' means property which is not self-constructed property.

"(C) CONSTRUCTION, ETC.—The term 'construction' includes reconstruction and erection, and the term 'constructed' includes reconstructed and erected.

"(D) ONLY CONSTRUCTION OF REDUCED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FACILITY TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—Construction shall be taken into account only if, for purposes of this subpart, expenditures therefor are properly chargeable to capital account with respect to the property.

"(5) ELECTION.—An election under this subsection may be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe. Such an election shall apply to the taxable year for which made and to all subsequent taxable years. Such an election, once made, may not be revoked except with the consent of the Secretary."

(c) RECAPTURE.—Section 50(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to other special rules) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(6) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO REDUCED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FACILITY.—For purposes of applying this subsection in the case of any credit allowable by reason of section 48A, the following shall apply:

"(A) GENERAL RULE.—In lieu of the amount of the increase in tax under paragraph (1), the increase in tax shall be an amount equal to the investment tax credit allowed under section 38 for all prior taxable years with respect to a reduced greenhouse gas emissions facility (as defined by section 48A(b)) multiplied by a fraction whose numerator is the number of years remaining to fully depreciate under this title the reduced greenhouse gas emissions facility disposed of, and whose denominator is the total number of years over which such facility would otherwise have been subject to depreciation. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the year of disposition of the reduced greenhouse gas emissions facility property shall be treated as a year of remaining depreciation.

"(B) PROPERTY CEASES TO QUALIFY FOR PROGRESS EXPENDITURES.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraph (2) shall apply in the case of qualified progress expenditures for a reduced greenhouse gas emissions facility under section 48A, except that the amount of the increase in tax under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph shall be substituted in lieu of the amount described in such paragraph (2).

"(C) APPLICATION OF PARAGRAPH.—This paragraph shall be applied separately with respect to the credit allowed under section 38 regarding a reduced greenhouse gas emissions facility."

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 49(a)(1)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "and" at the end of clause (ii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting ", and", and by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) the portion of the basis of any reduced greenhouse gas emissions facility attributable to any qualified investment (as defined by section 48A(d))."

(2) Section 50(a)(4) of such Code is amended by striking "and (5)" and inserting ", (5), and (6)".

(3) The table of sections for subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 48 the following:

"Sec. 48A. Credit for reduced greenhouse gas emissions facilities."

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act, under rules similar to the rules of section 48(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990).

(f) STUDY OF ADDITIONAL INCENTIVES FOR VOLUNTARY REDUCTION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Energy shall jointly study possible additional incentives for, and removal of barriers to, voluntary, non-recoupable expenditures for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. For purposes of this subsection, an expenditure shall be considered voluntary and non-recoupable if the expenditure is not recoupable—

(A) from revenues generated from the investment, determined under generally accepted accounting standards (or under the applicable rate-of-return regulation, in the case of a taxpayer subject to such regulation),

(B) from any tax or other financial incentive program established under Federal, State, or local law, or

(C) pursuant to any credit-trading or other mechanism established under any international agreement or protocol that is in force.

(2) REPORT.—Within 6 months of the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Energy shall jointly report to Congress on the results of the study described in paragraph (1), along with any recommendations for legislative action.

(g) SCOPE AND IMPACT.—

(1) POLICY.—In order to achieve the broadest response for reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and to ensure that the incentives established by or pursuant to this Act do not advantage one segment of an industry to the disadvantage of another, it is the sense of Congress that incentives for greenhouse gas reductions should be available for individuals, organizations, and entities, including both for-profit and non-profit institutions.

(2) LEVEL PLAYING FIELD STUDY AND REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Energy shall jointly study possible additional measures that would provide non-profit entities (such as municipal utilities and energy cooperatives) with economic incentives for greenhouse gas emission reductions comparable to those incentives provided to taxpayers under the amendments made to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by this Act.

(B) REPORT.—Within 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Energy shall jointly report to Congress on the results of the study described in subparagraph (A), along with any recommendations for legislative action.

THE CLIMATE CHANGE TAX AMENDMENTS OF 1999—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for the voluntary reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and to advance global climate science and technology development.

Section 1 designates the short title as the "Climate Change Tax Amendments of 1999."

Section 2 extends on a permanent basis the tax credit for research and development in the case of R & D involving climate change.

In order for a research expense to qualify for the credit, it must: have as one of its purposes the reducing or sequestering of greenhouse gases; and have been reported to DOE under Sec. 1605(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

This tax credit applies with respect to amounts incurred after this Act becomes law, and only if the Climate Change Energy Policy Response Act also becomes law.

Section 3 provides for investment tax credits for greenhouse-gas-emission reduction facilities.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FACILITY CREDIT

The amount of the credit would be calculated based upon the amount of greenhouse gas emission reductions reported and certified under section 1605(b) of the Energy Policy Act. The credit would be equal to one-half of the applicable percentage of the qualified investment in a "reduced greenhouse gas emissions facility."

For example, if a taxpayer replaces a coal-fired generator with a more efficient one that reduced greenhouse gas emissions by 18 percent, compared to the retired unit, the taxpayer would be entitled to a tax credit of 9 percent of qualified investment in that "reduced greenhouse gas emissions facility". Such facility is defined as a facility of the taxpayer: the construction, reconstruction, or erection of which is completed by the taxpayer; or the facility may be acquired by the

taxpayer if the original use of the facility commences with the taxpayer; which replaces an existing facility of the taxpayer; which reduces greenhouse gas emissions (on a per unit of output basis) as compared to the facility it replaces; which uses the same type of fuel as the facility it replaces; the depreciation (or amortization in lieu of depreciation) of which is allowable; which meets performance and quality standards (if any) jointly prescribed by the Secretaries of Treasury and Energy; and are consistent with regulations prescribed under Sec. 1605(b) of the Energy Policy Act (relating to voluntary reporting of greenhouse gas emission reductions).

Only that portion of the investment attributable to providing production capacity not greater than the production capacity of the facility being replaced qualifies for the credit.

While unit efficiencies could be achieved if the credit were allowed for replacing a unit with another that burned a different fuel, such incentive for fuel shifting does not directly stimulate efficiency technology development for each fuel type. The objective is to improve efficiencies "within a fuel"; not to encourage fuel shifting "between fuels."

QUALIFIED PROGRESS EXPENDITURE CREDIT

With respect to qualified progress expenditures, the amount of the qualified investment for the taxable year shall be increased by the aggregate of each qualified progress expenditure for the taxable year with respect to progress expenditure property. Progress expenditure property is defined as any property being constructed by or for the taxpayer and which it is reasonable to believe will qualify as a reduced greenhouse gas emission facility.

ELECTION

A taxpayer may elect to take the tax credit in such a manner (i.e. as an investment credit, or as qualified progress expenditure) as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe. The election will apply to the taxable year for which it was made and to all subsequent taxable years. Such an election, once made, may not be revoked except with the consent of the Secretary.

RECAPTURE WHERE FACILITY IS PREMATURELY DISPOSED OF

If the facility is disposed of before the end of the facility's depreciation period (or "useful life" for tax purposes) the taxpayer will be assessed an increase in tax equal to the greenhouse gas emissions facility investment tax credit allowed for all prior taxable years multiplied by a fraction whose numerator is the number of years remaining to fully depreciate the facility to be disposed of, and whose denominator is the total number of years over which the facility would otherwise have been subject to depreciation.

Similar rules apply in the case in which the taxpayer elected credit for progress expenditures and the property thereafter ceases to qualify for such credit.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Amendments made to the Internal Revenue Code apply to property placed in service after the date of enactment of this Act.

STUDY OF ADDITIONAL INCENTIVES FOR VOLUNTARY REDUCTION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Transportation are directed to study, and report upon to Congress along with any recommendations for legislative action, possible additional incentives for and removal of barriers to voluntary non-recoupable expenditures on the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. An expenditure qualifies if it is voluntary and not recoupable—from reve-

nues generated from the investment; determined under generally accepted accounting standards; under the applicable rate-of-return regulation (in the case of a taxpayer subject to such regulation); from any tax or other financial incentive program established under federal, State, or local law; and pursuant to any credit-trading or other mechanism established under any international agreement or protocol that is in force.

By Mr. CLELAND:

S. 1779. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel M/V *Sandpiper*; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

CERTIFICATE OF DOCUMENTATION FOR THE VESSEL "SANDPIPER"

• Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill today to direct that the sailing vessel *Sandpiper*, Official Number 1079439, be accorded coastwise trading privileges and be issued a certificate of documentation under section 12103 of title 46, U.S. Code.

The hull and interior of the *Sandpiper* were constructed in Taiwan in 1998 by Ta-Yang Yacht Building Company, Ltd. She is a 48 foot Cutter Rig presently used as a recreational vessel. Since construction, the vessel has been rigged and outfitted in the United States. It is estimated that 60% of the cost of the vessel has been spent on the mast, rigging, sails, electronics, navigational instruments, safety equipment, interior furnishings, and various other deck fittings. These items were acquired in Annapolis, Maryland and refitting was completed in April, 1999.

The vessel is owned by Mr. and Mrs. David Maner of Augusta, Georgia. The Maners would like to utilize their vessel in the coastwise trade of the United States. However, because the vessel's hull was constructed in Taiwan, it did not meet the requirements for coastwise license endorsement in the United States. Such documentation is mandatory to enable the owner to use the vessel for its intended purpose.

The owners of the *Sandpiper* are seeking a waiver of the existing law because they wish to use the vessel for charters. The desired intentions for the vessel's use will not adversely affect the coastwise trade in U.S. waters. If the Maners are granted this waiver, it is their intention to comply fully with U.S. documentation and safety requirements. The purpose of the legislation I am introducing is to allow the *Sandpiper* to engage in the coastwise trade of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The bill follows:

S. 1779

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CERTIFICATE OF DOCUMENTATION.

Notwithstanding section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. App. 883), section 8 of the Act of June 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 81, chapter 421; 46 U.S.C. App. 289), and section 12106 of title 46, United States Code, the

Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel SANDPIPER, United States official number 1079439.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 88

At the request of Mr. ROBB, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 88, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to exempt disabled individuals from being required to enroll with a managed care entity under the medicaid program.

S. 631

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) was added as a cosponsor of S. 631, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate the time limitation on benefits for immunosuppressive drugs under the Medicare Program, to provide continued entitlement for such drugs for certain individuals after Medicare benefits end, and to extend certain Medicare secondary payer requirements.

S. 961

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 961, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farm And Rural Development Act to improve shared appreciation arrangements.

S. 1109

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1109, a bill to conserve global bear populations by prohibiting the importation, exportation, and interstate trade of bear viscera and items, products, or substances containing, or labeled or advertised as containing, bear viscera, and for other purposes.

S. 1144

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1144, a bill to provide increased flexibility in use of highway funding, and for other purposes.

S. 1277

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 1277, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a new prospective payment system for Federally-qualified health centers and rural health clinics.

S. 1303

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of

S. 1303, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to the treatment of forestry activities.

S. 1464

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1464, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish certain requirements regarding the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

S. 1473

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1473, a bill to amend section 2007 of the Social Security Act to provide grant funding for additional Empowerment Zones, Enterprise Communities, and Strategic Planning Communities, and for other purposes.

S. 1488

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1488, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for recommendations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services regarding the placement of automatic external defibrillators in Federal buildings in order to improve survival rates of individuals who experience cardiac arrest in such buildings, and to establish protections from civil liability arising from the emergency use of the devices.

S. 1494

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1494, a bill to ensure that small businesses throughout the United States participate fully in the unfolding electronic commerce revolution through the establishment of an electronic commerce extension program at the National Institutes of Standards and technology.

S. 1528

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCH-

INSON), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1528, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to clarify liability under that act for certain recycling transactions.

S. 1537

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1537, a bill to reauthorize and amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980.

S. 1547

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1547, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to preserve low-power television stations that provide community broadcasting, and for other purposes.

S. 1619

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1619, a bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to provide for periodic revision of retaliation lists or other remedial action implemented under section 306 of such Act.

S. 1623

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1623, a bill to select a National Health Museum site.

S. 1667

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1667, a bill to impose a moratorium on the export of bulk fresh water from the Great Lakes.

S. 1678

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana

(Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1678, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the provisions of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

S. 1701

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1701, a bill to reform civil asset forfeiture, and for other purposes.

S. 1717

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1717, a bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of pregnancy-related assistance for targeted low-income pregnant women.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 60

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 60, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of the U.S.S. *Wisconsin* and all those who served aboard her.

SENATE RESOLUTION 196

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 196, a resolution commending the submarine force of the United States Navy on the 100th anniversary of the force.

SENATE RESOLUTION 206—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE JOHN H. CHAFEE, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. REED, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. BYRD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. HELMS, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DODD, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BREAUX, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. REID, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BOND, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. GORTON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. MACK, Mr. KERREY, Mr. ROBB, Mr. BURNS, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GREGG, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. THOMPSON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. KYL, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr.

FRIST, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CLELAND, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. HAGEL, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. BAYH, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. EDWARDS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 206

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable John H. Chafee, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

Resolved, That Senator Chafee's record of public service embodied the best traditions of the Senate: Statesmanship, Comity, Tolerance, and Decency.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to be family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

ASHCROFT (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2328

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. ASHCROFT (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ROBB, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. HELMS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INOUE, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BOND, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. 1. CHIEF AGRICULTURAL NEGOTIATOR.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF A POSITION.—There is established the position of Chief Agricultural Negotiator in the Office of the United States Trade Representative. The Chief Agricultural Negotiator shall be appointed by the President, with the rank of Ambassador, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) FUNCTIONS.—The primary function of the Chief Agricultural Negotiator shall be to conduct trade negotiations and to enforce trade agreements relating to U.S. agricultural products and services. The Chief Agricultural Negotiator shall be a vigorous advocate on behalf of U.S. agricultural interests. The Chief Agricultural Negotiator shall perform such other functions as the United States Trade Representative may direct.

(c) COMPENSATION.—The Chief Agricultural Negotiator shall be paid at the highest rate of basic pay payable to a member of the Senior Executive Service.

THE MILLENNIUM DIGITAL COMMERCE ACT

ABRAHAM AND OTHERS AMENDMENT NO. 2329

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. LOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill (S. 761) to regulate interstate commerce by electronic means by permitting and encouraging the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Millennium Digital Commerce Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings: (1) the growth of electronic commerce and electronic government transactions represent a powerful force for economic growth, consumer choice, improved civic participation and wealth creation.

(2) The promotion of growth in private sector electronic commerce through Federal legislation is in the national interest because that market is globally important to the United States.

(3) A consistent legal foundation, across multiple jurisdictions, for electronic commerce will promote the growth of such transactions, and that such a foundation should be based upon a simple, technology neutral, non-regulatory, and market-based approach.

(4) The Nation and the world stand at the beginning of a large scale transition to an information society which will require innovative legal and policy approaches, and therefore, States can serve the national interest by continuing their proven role as laboratories of innovation for quickly evolving areas of public policy, provided that States also adopt a consistent, reasonable national baseline to eliminate obsolete barriers to electronic commerce such as undue paper and pen requirements, and further, that any such innovation should not unduly burden inter-jurisdictional commerce.

(5) To the extent State laws or regulations do not provide a consistent, reasonable national baseline or in fact create an undue burden to interstate commerce in the important burgeoning area of electronic commerce, the national interest is best served by Federal preemption to the extent necessary to provide such consistent, reasonable national baseline eliminate said burden, but that absent such lack of consistent, reasonable national baseline or such undue burdens, the best legal system for electronic commerce will result from continuing experimentation by individual jurisdictions.

(6) With due regard to the fundamental need for a consistent national baseline, each jurisdiction that enacts such laws should have the right to determine the need for any exceptions to protect consumers and maintain consistency with existing related bodies of law within a particular jurisdiction.

(7) Industry has developed several electronic signature technologies for use in electronic transactions, and the public policies of the United States should serve to promote a dynamic marketplace within which these technologies can compete. Consistent with this Act, States should permit the use and development of any authentication technologies that are appropriate as practicable as between private parties and in use with State agencies.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to permit and encourage the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces rather than proscriptive governmental mandates and regulations;

(2) to promote public confidence in the validity, integrity and reliability of electronic commerce and online government under Federal law;

(3) to facilitate and promote electronic commerce by clarifying the legal status of electronic records and electronic signatures in the context of writing and signing requirements imposed by law;

(4) to facilitate the ability of private parties engaged in interstate transactions to agree among themselves on the terms and conditions on which they use and accept electronic signatures and electronic records; and

(5) to promote the development of a consistent national legal infrastructure necessary to support of electronic commerce at the Federal and State levels within existing areas of jurisdiction.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **AGREEMENT.**—The term ‘agreement’ means the bargain of the parties in fact as found in their language or inferred from other circumstances and from rules, regulations, and procedures given the effect of agreements under laws otherwise applicable to a particular transaction.

(2) **ELECTRONIC.**—The term “electronic” means relating to technology having electrical, digital, magnetic, wireless, optical, electromagnetic, or similar capabilities.

(3) **ELECTRONIC AGENT.**—The term “electronic agent” means a computer program or an electronic or other automated means used to initiate an action or respond to electronic records or performances in whole or in part without review by an individual at the time of the action or response.

(4) **ELECTRONIC RECORD.**—The term “electronic record” means a record created, generated, sent, communicated, received, or stored by electronic means.

(5) **ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE.**—The term “electronic signature” means an electronic sound, symbol, or process attached to or logically associated with an electronic record and executed or adopted by a person with the intent to sign the electronic record.

(6) **GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY.**—The term “governmental agency” means an executive, legislative, or judicial agency, department, board, commission, authority, institution, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or of a State or of any country, municipality, or other political subdivision of a State.

(7) **RECORD.**—The term “record” means information that is inscribed on a tangible medium or that is stored in an electronic or other medium and is retrievable in perceivable form.

(8) **TRANSACTION.**—The term “transaction” means an action or set of actions relating to the conduct of commerce, including the business of insurance, between 2 or more persons, neither of which is the United States Government, a State, or an agency, department, board, commission, authority, institution, or instrumentality of the United States Government or of a State.

(9) **UNIFORM ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS ACT.**—The term “Uniform Electronic Transactions Act” means the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act as provided to State legislatures by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Law.

SEC. 5. INTERSTATE CONTRACT CERTAINTY.

(a) **APPLICATION OF SECTION.**—This section applies only to transactions between parties

each of which has agreed to conduct such transaction by electronic means. By agreeing to conduct a transaction by electronic means a party does not necessarily agree to conduct other transactions by electronic means.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—In any commercial transaction affecting interstate commerce:

(1) A record or signature may not be denied legal effect or enforceability solely because it is in electronic form.

(2) A contract or agreement may not be denied legal effect or enforceability solely because an electronic record was used in its formation.

(3) If a law requires a record to be in writing, an electronic record satisfies the law.

(4) If a law requires a signature, an electronic signature satisfies the law.

(c) **ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE.**—In a legal proceeding, evidence of an electronic record of signature may not be excluded solely because it is in electronic form.

(d) **TERMS AND CONDITION OF AGREEMENTS.**—The parties to a transaction may agree on the terms and conditions on which they will use and accept electronic signatures and electronic records, including the methods therefore, in commercial transactions affecting interstate commerce. Nothing in this subsection requires that any party enter into such a transaction.

(e) **RETENTION.**—

(1) If a law requires that certain records be retained, that requirement is met by retaining an electronic record of the information in the record which—

(A) accurately reflects the information set forth in the record after it was first generated in its final form as an electronic record or otherwise; and

(B) remains accessible for later reference.

(2) A requirement to retain records in accordance with paragraph (1) does not apply to any information whose sole purpose is to enable the record to be sent, communicated, or received.

(3) A person satisfies the requirements of paragraph (1) by using the services of any other person if the requirements of paragraph (1) are met.

(4) If a law requires a record to be provided or retained in its original form, or provides consequences if the record is not provided or presented or retained in its original form, that law is satisfied by an electronic record provided or retained in accordance with paragraph (1).

(5) If a law requires retention of a check, that requirement is satisfied by retention of an electronic record of the information on the front and back of the check in accordance with paragraph (1).

(6) A record retained as an electronic record in accordance with paragraph (1) satisfies a law requiring a person to retain records for evidentiary, audit, or like purposes, unless a law enacted after the effective date of this subsection specifically prohibits the use of an electronic record for a specified purpose.

(7) This subsection does not preclude a governmental agency of the United States or any State from specifying additional requirements for the retention of records, written or electronic, subject to the agency’s jurisdiction.

(f) **TRANSFERABLE RECORDS.**—

(1) In this section, “transferable record” means an electronic record that—

(A) would be a note under Article 3 of the Uniform Commercial Code or a document under Article 7 of the Uniform Commercial Code if the electronic record were in writing;

(B) the issuer of the electronic record expressly has agreed is a transferable record; and

(C) relates to a transaction involving real or personal property.

(2) A person has control of a transferable record if a system employed for evidencing the transfer of interests in the transferable record reliably establishes that person as the person to which the transferable record was issued or transferred.

(3) A system satisfies paragraph (2), and a person is deemed to have control of a transferable record, if the transferable record is created, stored, and assigned in such a manner that—

(A) a single authoritative copy of the transferable record exists which is unique, identifiable, and, except as otherwise provided in paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), unalterable;

(B) the authoritative copy identifies the person asserting control as—

(i) the person to which the transferable record was issued; or

(ii) if the authoritative copy indicates that the transferable record has been transferred, the person to which the transferable record was most recently transferred;

(iii) the authoritative copy is communicated to and maintained by the person asserting control or its designated custodian;

(iv) copies or revisions that add or change an identified assignee of the authoritative copy can be made only with the consent of the person asserting control;

(v) each copy of the authoritative copy and any copy of a copy is readily identifiable as a copy that is not the authoritative copy; and

(vi) any revision of the authoritative copy is readily identifiable as authorized or unauthorized.

(4) Except as otherwise agreed, a person having control of a transferable record is the holder, as defined in section 1-201(20) of the Uniform Commercial Code, of the transferable record and has the same rights and defenses as a holder of an equivalent record or writing under the Uniform Commercial Code, including, if the applicable statutory requirements under section 3-302(a), 7-501, or 9-308 of the Uniform Commercial Code are satisfied, the rights and defenses of a holder in due course, a holder to which a negotiable document of title has been duly negotiated, or a purchaser, respectively. Delivery, possession, and endorsement are not required to obtain or exercise any of the rights under this subsection.

(5) Except as otherwise agreed, an obligor under a transferable record has the same rights and defenses as an equivalent obligor under equivalent records or writings under the Uniform Commercial Code.

(6) If requested by a person against which enforcement is sought, the person seeking to enforce the transferable record shall provide reasonable proof that the person is in control of the transferable record. Proof may include access to the authoritative copy of the transferable record and related business records sufficient to review the terms of the transferable record and to establish the identity of the person having control of the transferable record.

(g) **ELECTRONIC AGENTS.**—A contract relating to a commercial transaction affecting interstate commerce may not be denied legal effect solely because its formation involved—

(1) the interaction of electronic agents of the parties; or

(2) the interaction of an electronic agent of a party and an individual who acts on that individual’s own behalf or for another person.

(h) **SPECIFIC EXCLUSIONS.**—The provisions of this section shall not apply to a statute, regulation, or other rule of law governing any of the following:

(1) The Uniform Commercial Code, as in effect in a state, other than sections 1-107 and 1-206, Article 2, and Article 2A.

(2) The creation or execution of wills, codicils, or testamentary trusts.

(3) Premarital agreements, marriage, adoption, divorce or other matters of family law.

(4) Court orders or notices, or documents used in court proceedings.

(5) Documents of title which are filed of record with a governmental unit until such time that a state or subdivision thereof chooses to accept filings electronically.

(6) Residential landlord-tenant relationships.

(7) The Uniform Health-Care Decisions Act.

(i) **INSURANCE.**—It is the specific intent of the Congress that the benefits of this title apply to the business of insurance. This section applies to any Federal and State law and regulation governing the business of insurance that requires manual signatures or communications to be printed or in writing, document delivery, and retention.

(j) **APPLICATION IN UETA STATES.**—This section does not preempt the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act as in effect in a State, if that Act, as in effect in that State, is not inconsistent, in any significant manner, with the provisions of this Act.

SECTION 6. PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE USE OF ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS.

To the extent practicable, the Federal Government shall observe the following principles in an international context to enable commercial electronic transaction:

(1) Remove paper-based obstacles to electronic transactions by adopting relevant principles from the Model Law on Electronic Commerce adopted in 1996 by the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law.

(2) Permit parties to a transaction to determine the appropriate authentication technologies and implementation models for their transactions, with assurance that those technologies and implementation models will be recognized and enforced.

(3) Permit parties to a transaction to have the opportunity to prove in court or other proceedings that their authentication approaches and their transactions are valid.

(4) Take a non-discriminatory approach to electronic signatures and authentication methods from other jurisdictions.

SECTION 7. STUDY OF LEGAL AND REGULATORY BARRIERS TO ELECTRONIC COMMERCE.

(a) **BARRIERS.**—Each Federal agency shall, not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, provide a report to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Secretary of Commerce identifying any provision of law administered by such agency, or any regulations issued by such agency and in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, that may impose a barrier to electronic transactions, or otherwise to the conduct of commerce online or by electronic means. Such barriers include, but are not limited to, barriers imposed by a law or regulation directly or indirectly requiring that signatures, or records of transactions, be accomplished or retained in other than electronic form. In its report, each agency that shall identify the barriers among those identified whose removal would require legislative action, and shall indicate agency plans to undertake regulatory action to remove such barriers among those identified as are caused by regulations issued by the agency.

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall, within 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and after the consultation required by subsection (c) of this section, report to the Congress concerning—

(1) legislation needed to remove barriers to electronic transactions or otherwise to the

conduct of commerce online or by electronic means; and

(2) actions being taken by the Executive Branch and individual Federal agencies to remove such barriers as are caused by agency regulations or policies.

(c) **CONSULTATION.**—In preparing the report required by this section, the Secretary of Commerce shall consult with the General Services Administration, the National Archives and Records Administration, and the Attorney General concerning matters involving the authenticity of records, their storage and retention, and their usability for law enforcement purposes.

(d) **INCLUDE FINDINGS IF NO RECOMMENDATIONS.**—If the report required by this section omits recommendations for actions needed to fully remove identified barriers to electronic transactions or to online or electronic commerce, it shall include a finding or findings, including substantial reasons therefor, that such removal is impracticable or would be inconsistent with the implementation or enforcement of applicable laws.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce that a full committee oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The oversight hearing will take place Tuesday, October 26, 1999, 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 the interpretation and implementation plans of Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, Subparts A, B, C, and D, Redefinition to Include Waters Subject to Subsistence Priority; Final Rule. Only the administration will present testimony.

Those who wish to submit written testimony should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. Presentation of oral testimony is by committee invitation only. For information, please contact Jo Meuse or Brian Malnak at (202) 224-6730.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate for a hearing entitled "Internet Cramming: The Latest High-Tech Fraud on Small Businesses." The hearing will be held on Monday, October 25, 1999, beginning at 1 p.m. in room 652 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS BUREAU McDONALD

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of

Thomas Bureau McDonald who died as a result of a tragic car accident on October 9, 1999 in Albuquerque, New Mexico at the age of 35. His parents, family, and friends have lost a very special person. New Mexico has lost a young and dedicated public servant whose passion was working with college students, strengthening and expanding higher education, and stressing the importance of attending college.

Tom was a rising star among those interested in public service in New Mexico. He will be missed for his cheerful personality, his keen sense of humor, his political savvy, and his devotion to empowering students at the university and state level when it came to their education. Tom was never concerned with how much he could accomplish or who he could influence but, rather how he could live his life so when he was no longer serving in his appointed or elected capacities his ideas, dreams, and goals would be a reality. That reality was for children and their families living throughout New Mexico to have the opportunities in place to attend college to better themselves and to better their community. In life there are individuals who are concerned about being remembered for what they have done or still can do; Tom's only concern was being remembered for who he was—an outspoken leader on higher education and its students, a good son to his parents, a loving grandson to his grandmothers, and a trustworthy and loyal individual to his friends.

Tom attended the University of New Mexico and graduated from Western New Mexico University in Silver City, New Mexico where I grew up as a child. During his years at Western, Tom was elected by his peers not just once but twice to serve as their student body president (1990–1992). It was during this time that he eloquently presented a plan to the Board of Regents to build a new \$3.5 million Student Union Building utilizing only student fees. Tom was fortunate to go back a few years ago to the dedication of this new building. While at the dedication ceremony he realized that what started as a vision, a risk, a challenge, turned into structure of unity where students, administrators, and community members could learn, work and just be together.

Mr. President, from 1990 to 1992 Tom was appointed to two one year terms as the student member on the Governor's Commission on Higher Education by former Governor Bruce King. During his tenure, Tom transformed the way members of the Commission viewed student participation and input on higher education. Through his optimism, determination, and presence he created an identity for students around the state who were concerned about the quality of their education. That identity which Tom helped form not only exists before the Commission today, but before the State Legislature and Office of the Governor.

From 1992 to 1993 Tom was elected by student representatives from New

Mexico's two-year and four-year institutions as executive director of the Associated Students of New Mexico (ASNM). ASNM is a non-profit student organization that represents the interests of 100,000 students members enrolled in two-year and four-year institutions of higher learning before the New Mexico Commission on Higher Education, State Legislature and Office of the Governor. This organization has brought forth some of New Mexico's current and former state legislators, county commissioners, and public servants. Two of my current Washington DC staffers and one of my state staffers are former executive directors of this association. While serving as executive director, Tom always encouraged those he met to reach for their goals, pursue their dreams, and turn any rejection into motivation. He believed that what one does now to enhance their life will impact others in the future. He lived what he preached and what he did to enhance his life has left a lasting impact for students and their education throughout New Mexico.

Tom received his Masters of Criminal Justice from New Mexico State University in 1996. He was also appointed by Governor Gary Johnson to serve a two-year term from 1994-1996 as the first voting student regent in the history of New Mexico State University. One year later in 1997, he was appointed by Governor Johnson to serve a full six-year term on the New Mexico Commission on Higher Education where he served until the time of his death.

Mr. President, I would like to extend my condolences to his parents Clyde and Eileen and the entire McDonald family. I ask that my colleagues in the Senate join me in honoring the achievements and contributions in the life of this young and outstanding New Mexican.●

MENTOR A CHILD WEEK

● Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize the efforts of those working to make a difference in the lives of today's youth. The last week in October is "Mentor a Child Week" in my home State of Oklahoma. I encourage all of us to participate.

Big Brothers, Big Sisters is an organization whose mission is to make a positive difference in the lives of children and youth. Focusing on the challenges single parents face, this organization provides professionally supportive one-to-one relationships with a positive and caring adult volunteer, and assists these children in achieving their greatest potential as they grow to become responsible citizens in the community.

Children with mentors are 46 percent less likely to use illegal drugs, 27 percent less likely to use alcohol, and 52 percent less likely to skip school. Youth with mentors have better relationships with their peers and family members.

I encourage all citizens, parents, governmental agencies, public and private institutions, businesses and schools to support efforts that will promote the mentoring of children and youth throughout our community.●

WOMEN'S BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER

● Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the Women's Business Development Center in their efforts to help female entrepreneurs establish their niche in the corporate world. The WBDC helps train and provide technical assistance to entrepreneurial women. These are the same women who own your neighborhood dry cleaner, run your child care center, and assist with your taxes.

Mr. President, I would like to call special attention to the women who have dedicated their time expanding child-care availability in Illinois. The WBDC sponsors the Child Care Business Initiative (CCBI) in cooperation with the Hull House Association that will provide information, resources, and guidance to women seeking entry into this important and growing industry. Over 250 women have utilized CCBI to gain critical business skills and key industry information about child care.

The Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs estimates that over 1,000 child care centers would need to be created to meet the projected demand for child care in Illinois alone. In light of the fact that only 20% of the 162,000 children who are in working families receive full-day, licensed child care, the role that the CCBI plays in helping women establish day care centers may have a significant impact on the availability and accessibility of child care in Illinois.

Again, I would like to take this time to commend the WBDC for creating and expanding opportunities for ambitious, women entrepreneurs.●

SENATOR LEAHY'S 10,000TH VOTE

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise to recognize one of my colleagues, Senator PAT LEAHY, who has cast his 10,000th vote. I congratulate him on his tenure in the Senate.

Senator LEAHY and I have worked together in the past on many agricultural issues and legislation as members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. Most notably we worked closely together on two farm bills, both in 1990 when Senator LEAHY served as chairman of the committee and in 1996 when I served as chairman. Senator LEAHY joined with me in reviewing the organization of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and developing legislation to streamline its operations. We both share an interest in conservation issues and have worked together to provide opportunities for farmers to preserve and protect their natural resources.

We have both recognized the importance of a bipartisan approach on

major legislation originating in the committee. I value the partnership that we formed to move important agricultural legislation through the committee and through the Senate.

My colleague, Senator PAT LEAHY, deserves commendation for his service and tenure in the Senate. I am proud to serve with him and look forward to working together in the future on issues of mutual interest.●

IN RECOGNITION OF TPL, INC.

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased today to recognize TPL, Inc. in Albuquerque, NM who is a 1999 Tibbetts Award recipient and will be honored by the U.S. Small Business Administration at a congressional reception on Tuesday, October 26, 1999 here in Washington DC.

The Fourth Annual Tibbetts Award is presented by the Small Business Administration to firms that have attained high levels of success in research and development under the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program and to organizations and individuals who have supported technological innovation. Moreover, those groups are judged on the economic impact of their technological innovations and overall business achievements.

I feel that it is fitting that I recognize the 1999 Tibbetts Award recipient TPL, Inc. and its CEO Mr. H.M. (Hap) Stoller for their hard work that has led them to receive this prestigious national award. TPL, Inc. is a leading contractor for the Army and Navy in the demilitarization of conventional munitions as well as the development of economically viable processes for the commercial reuse of recovered energetic materials. TPL, under sponsorship of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency in the Military Capacitor Program, has developed the state-of-the-art in high energy density dielectric materials for capacitive devices and has begun their manufacture for advance weapons system programs. The technologies underlying these accomplishments were initiated under the SBIR Program.

TPL was recently awarded a \$38.4 million sub-contract from General Dynamics Ordnance Systems as part of their five-year, \$145 million operational demilitarization contract from the U.S. Army's Industrial Operations Command. TPL will be totally responsible for three out of nine families of conventional munitions contained in the largest demilitarization program ever funded by the Army. Concurrently, through the Tri-Services Demilitarization Technology Office, the Navy is supporting three Phase III efforts to transition energetic materials resource recovery and reuse processes to pilot plant facilities, such processes designed to lower the cost of demilitarization activities as well as protect the environment by allowing demilitarization material reuse. These contracts reinforce TPL's position as an

innovator in demilitarization processes, an activity that is essential in the rapidly changing international system. Additionally, the work associated with these contracts will be performed at Fort Wingate, New Mexico, bringing critically needed jobs to one of the more disadvantaged parts of the State.

Mr. President, as you can see TPL, Inc. reflects the very best in SBIR achievement and has established itself as a strong national leader in technological innovation. In addition, TPL, Inc. was recognized in 1997 as one of the fastest growing technology companies in the State of New Mexico and in 1995, and again in 1996, was recognized as one of the fastest growing, privately held companies in the United States. Again, let me congratulate TPL, Inc. and its staff of their hard work, dedication, and commitment. They are a tremendous asset to their community and New Mexico, and we are extremely proud of their accomplishment.●

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1999

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, October 26. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin 30 minutes of debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 434, the African trade bill, to be equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

I further ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote regarding the motion to proceed to the trade bill occur at 10 a.m. on Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hour of 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday so that the weekly parties can meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will immediately resume debate on the motion to proceed to the African trade

bill at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday. In accordance with rule XXII, the Senate will proceed to a cloture vote on the motion to proceed at 10 a.m. It is hoped that cloture will be invoked and that a time agreement can be reached so that the Senate may begin debate on the bill and that Senators may begin to offer their amendments. The Senate may also consider any legislative or Executive Calendar items cleared for action, as well as any appropriations conference reports that may become available.

PERMISSION FOR FLOWERS IN THE CHAMBER

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the flowers be permitted in the Senate Chamber during the week of October 25 to honor the life of our former colleague, JOHN CHAFEE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the provisions of S. Res. 206 as a further mark of respect to the memory of our former colleague and Senator, JOHN CHAFEE, following the remarks by Senator ROBB from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBB. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Carolina for permitting me to speak after which this Senate will adjourn in memory of our friend and colleague, JOHN CHAFEE.

IN HONOR OF SENATOR JOHN CHAFEE

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I just returned. I was down-State when I heard the news of JOHN CHAFEE's passing. I felt compelled to come to the floor for just a very brief minute and say that, in my judgment, JOHN CHAFEE was as decent a human being as any individual I have encountered in public service.

He was a personal friend during the time he was here in Washington. We happened to attend the same church in northern Virginia. We happened to have worn the same uniform of the U.S. Marine Corps in service to our

country. But most of the time I spent with JOHN CHAFEE was right here in the Capitol frequently in his hideaway. I spent more time in that particular hideaway than I did in my own office, or any other Senator's hideaway in the Capitol, meeting with a bipartisan group of Senators from both sides of the aisle trying to make the system work.

JOHN CHAFEE was an extraordinary human being in many ways. But he understood the need for bipartisanship if this institution were to accomplish the goals which the American people expect us to accomplish. And it was always at the call of JOHN CHAFEE that we would gather and try to see if we couldn't find some common ground upon which the Senate could at least offer an alternative to the occasional gridlock into which we have occasionally found ourselves forced by the process or other agendas.

It was never with any rancor that he disagreed with anyone, whether it be someone on his own side of the aisle or someone on this side of the aisle. He was always a voice of reason, always a voice of bipartisanship, always someone wanting to make the system work and committed to the goals for which he was elected to this particular institution by the people of Rhode Island.

Mr. President, I have no prepared remarks. I could not pass up this opportunity to express my own profound sense of loss of someone who was far more special, I suspect, to this institution than many of those who do not or have not had the privilege of serving in it may realize, and whose loss we may feel in ways that many of its Members have not fully come to grips with at this particular point.

JOHN CHAFEE was one of those extraordinary individuals with whom I was very proud to serve and call a friend.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBB. In honor of the memory and with our own sense of loss to the family, friends, and staff of JOHN CHAFEE, I now move, in accordance with the previous order and pursuant to Senate Resolution 206, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Honorable JOHN H. CHAFEE, late a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 6:01 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, October 26, 1999, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EQUITY, EDUCATION, AND THE WORKFORCE

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, since its inception in 1974, the Women's Education Act has had a tremendous impact on gender equity issues throughout our nation. While women have progressively made gains in the classroom, they are still not properly represented in most Fortune 500 companies. According to a report by Congressional Research Service, women in today's labor market typically earn between 73 cents and 76 cents for every dollar earned by men. In addition, while the government has attempted to address the wage gap differential through various forms of legislation, it appears that women are still disproportionately hired for lower tier jobs with limited access and proper training for middle and upper management positions. In a nation where women now represent more than 46% of the workforce, (up from 33% in 1960) we must continue to close the wage gap by supporting the reauthorization of WEEA.

As we move into the new millennium, this nation and a number of its multi-national corporations are attempting to recruit workers from outside the United States to fill key Information Technology (IT) positions. This trend could be halted if more elementary and secondary schools would mentor and convince young women to take more math and science classes with a stronger emphasis on critical thinking and logical reasoning skills. Moreover, according to the American Association of University Women (AAUW) 65% of all jobs in the year 2000 and beyond will require technological skills, yet women are still being encouraged to take data entry courses. These kinds of statistics are alarming considering that still only 17% of students who take advanced computer science tests are young women. As Americans, it is our responsibility to ensure that women throughout our nation are given every opportunity to strive for academic excellence. Gender equity in the workforce cannot be achieved if we don't continue to cultivate young minds by supporting female interests in jobs that have traditionally gone to males.

Lastly, the impact WEEA has had in the private and public sector is quite evident. More women than ever are being encouraged to take challenging course work while attempting to shatter corporate America's glass ceiling. However, programs such as WEEA are now under attack from political pundits who believe women have caught up and even surpassed men. Clearly, nothing could be farther from the truth. The truth is that while women have made significant gains in corporate America they still trail men in the areas of science and technology. Although gender equity issues are now at the forefront of American politics, programs such as WEEA provide critical research that continues to identify important need

areas. The WEEA Equity Resource Center, which serves as a depository for issues and programs deemed sensitive to the needs of women, provides companies, universities and athletic programs with information on recent policy briefs and studies which impact how women are treated in the workplace. For this reason, I encourage my colleagues to support the reauthorization of WEEA as we send a clear message across this nation that women are our most indispensable resource.

TRIBUTE TO RONALD PRESCOTT

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we rise to pay tribute to our good friend, Ron Prescott, the recipient this year of the Distinguished Educator Award from the Charter School of Education at California State University, Los Angeles. It is simply impossible to overstate the contribution that Ron has made to public education during the past 38 years. From his early post as a teacher in three inner-city schools to his current position as deputy superintendent for the Los Angeles Unified School District, Ron has devoted his life to improving our public schools and boosting educational opportunities for the young people of his community, State, and Nation.

Ron launched his career in the 1960's as a teacher at two east Los Angeles schools and a third in south Los Angeles. His classes were filled with minority students to whom Ron committed his time, talents, and resources with enormous dedication. In addition to classroom teaching, Ron served as lead teacher for specially funded programs, master teacher and was the sponsor of a student intergroup program. Even after he left the classroom, Ron spent 3 years working as consultant on intergroup relations.

From the early 1970's, Ron has held a number of key administrative posts with the Los Angeles Unified School District. From 1978-81, Ron served as deputy area administrator, providing support services for 55,000 students from 85 different cultural groups. From 1982-84, Ron was administrator for Student Adjustment Services. In this post, he was responsible for direct expulsion proceedings, foreign-student admissions, and liaison services and attendance accounting. In Ron's current position, deputy superintendent in the Office of Government Relations and Public Affairs, he oversees grants assistance, policy research and development, and Parent Community Services, among other duties and responsibilities.

Ron has also worked with numerous outside organizations in the area of public education. In 1973, he founded the Tuesday Night Group, a Sacramento-based education coalition that

remains active. He is also a current board member of Policy Analysis in California Education, and has served a term as president of EdSource (education policy research council).

This is but a sampling of Ron's distinguished career in education. He has been honored by the California Legislature, Phi Delta Kappa, the Padres y Maestros de Aztlan, and the YMCA for his leadership in education and his service to youth. It is an honor to recognize his accomplishments today and to ask our colleagues to join us in saluting Ron Prescott, who has worked tirelessly throughout his career to make a better world for our children. His selflessness and sense of community are a shining example for us all.

IN RECOGNITION OF ALLEN I. POLSBY, OUTGOING ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL FOR LEGIS- LATION AND REGULATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, in one of the many transitions that are taking place at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Allen I. Polsby, a mainstay of the Office of General Counsel as Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, has moved to new duties. Al Polsby grew up in my district, on a farm in Norwichtown, and attended Samuel Huntington Elementary School in the 1940's. Many members of his family, starting in the 1890's, have been prominent in the civic, commercial, educational, medical, and religious affairs of New London County. He has maintained his personal ties to the area through, for example, his membership on the board of directors of the New England Hebrew Farmers Society of Chesterfield, of which his great-grandfather was an original incorporator. But he has made his professional contributions nationally, as a lawyer and Federal civil servant.

For the past 25 years and more, Mr. Polsby has had a hand in the technical, legal aspects of virtually every appropriations measure that has affected HUD and funding for assisted housing and community development nationally. On the basis of his technical mastery, legal erudition, and a singular fair-mindedness that permitted him to generate and keep the trust of every political and technical participant in the appropriations process during his tenure, his views have also often resulted in affecting how the policies of appropriations were made.

The best example of Mr. Polsby's impact on policy is in the now-accepted practices relating to the permitted uses of various classes of unexpended funds carried over from one fiscal year to the next. The legal theories on which these practices have been based, and which have in turn been one of the impetuses for the

• 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.

custom of reprogramming notifications, have to a large extent been created and developed by Mr. Polsby. Historically, based on these legal theories, many billions of dollars, particularly for assisted housing, have been made available that would not otherwise have been used.

On a technical level, one needs only to compare an appropriation law of 25 years ago with a current one to see Mr. Polsby's impact, along with that of many other people, on the modernization of the appropriations laws. Among the features of current appropriations laws, not found 25 years ago, that Mr. Polsby contributed are serially numbered administrative provisions, and cross-citations for appropriations laws, which are in general not codified, to the U.S. Statutes at Large. These and many other basic technical innovations were a result of Mr. Polsby's application of a personal standard to the drafts of appropriations bill texts. The standard is in this question: Can an able lawyer far from a Federal Depository Library, such as in Norwichtown, decipher the text? Any time the answer to this question was "no," another innovation has soon followed.

Mr. Polsby has carried responsibility for many other legislative duties, in addition to appropriations. These have included the drafting of such bills as the Federal Housing Corporation Charter Act, largely in H.R. 2975, 105th Cong., 1st Sess., which is a conceptual and technical landmark despite the fact that it was not enacted. He is also the draftsman of the America's Private Investment Companies Act bill, H.R. 2764 and S. 1565, 106th Cong., 1st Sess., which is part of the Clinton administration's New Markets Initiative. Mr. Polsby has also been one of the participants in the drafting of almost all HUD legislation during the past 20 years, and more recently, as Associate General Counsel, has supervised the legislation and regulations functions within the Office of General Counsel at HUD.

In transition to new duties, Mr. Polsby served briefly, for the second time in his career, as acting General Counsel of HUD. He became HUD's Associate General Counsel for Appeals in September.

After a few years in private practice, Allen I. Polsby started his civil service career in 1963 as a trial lawyer at the Civil Aeronautics Board. While there, he tried several formal cases and argued appeals to the 5-member Board, but his most lasting impact has come from an informal matter before the Board. The matter was whether to approve a senior citizens discount fare tariff. Eighty years of consistent precedent made by Federal transportation regulatory agencies, including the CAB, supported disapproval. Mr. Polsby proposed a reinterpretation of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 that supplied a sound legal basis for approving the discount fares tariff. The CAB approved the fares on that basis, and other regulatory agencies soon followed in approving senior citizen discounts under their jurisdictions.

Mr. Polsby first came to HUD in 1966, and served his apprenticeship as a legislative draftsman under the tutelage of the established master, Hilbert Fefferman. Mr. Polsby also worked in the office of program counsel for the Model Cities Program and the Government National Mortgage Association, and in many other capacities at HUD over the years.

Allen I. Polsby is a graduate of Brown University and the George Washington University

Law School. He is married to Gail K. Polsby, a private psychotherapist and long-time faculty member at the Washington School of Psychiatry. The now live in Bethesda, MD. Their two children are adults—Dan, a lawyer named for his long-deceased grandfather, and Abigail, a professional wilderness guide.

Mr. Speaker, Allen Polsby has had significant opportunities in his career to contribute to the development of public and legal policy. He has made the most of these opportunities to improve housing policy and develop innovative legal doctrine. I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

ABILITIES EMPLOYMENT MONTH

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is characteristic of the people of my district to look for and find humor in adversity; to prompt a smile from those who grieve, or to laugh in the midst of misfortune. We have learned, over many generations, through a long history of natural and man-made disasters, that laughter indeed is the best medicine. Now, as the rest of the nation observes the month of October as National Disabilities Month, we in Guam continue to look on the bright side, as is our nature, and have proclaimed this month "Abilities Employment Month," with the theme "Think Abilities . . . Employ Abilities."

The Guam Developmental Disabilities Council, the University of Guam's University Affiliated Programs on Developmental Disabilities, the Department of Integrated Services for Individuals with Disabilities' Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the non-profit organizations which provide services to persons with disabilities are working together to sponsor and coordinate an impressive schedule of events and activities to promote awareness, understanding and the need as well as the benefits of employing the abilities of our families, friends and neighbors who are disabled in some way. The Governor of Guam issued a proclamation stating that, "Guam cannot afford, either morally or financially, to lose the contributions of persons with disabilities in the workplace or in our community at large." The proclamation further states, "October is set aside to help our community recognize the tremendous value and potential that people with disabilities have to commit and dedicate ourselves to their full empowerment, integration employment. . . ."

To this end, numerous activities are planned. These include Pre-employment Workshops, which focus on pre-employment skills, personal hygiene, resume preparation, application and interview skills and interpersonal relationships in the workplace; Consumer Employment Workshops, to promote consumer knowledge of employment opportunities, accessing employment services and entrepreneurship; Employer Power Workshops to increase job opportunities and expand employer placement skills with emphasis on sensitivity, provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), successful job accommodations and performing job analyses. Additionally, Guam System for Assistive Technology will hold an open house; there will be

a legislative forum with policymakers on employment issues; a job fair at Guam's One-Stop Employment Center; and "A Day in the Life" sensitivity activity in which able people experience what it is like to have a disability.

An island-wide call for nominations of persons and organizations who exemplified superior performance in the workplace was conducted. The winners were recognized at an Awards Ceremony with Guam's Lieutenant Governor presenting the awards. It gives me great pleasure at this time to recognize, congratulate and commend the winners as well. For superior performance in the workplace as a Public Sector Employee, Ms. Catherine P. Leon Guerrero of the Department of Revenue and Taxation; for superior performance in the workplace as a Private Sector Employee, Mr. Joel E. Oyardo of Atkins Kroll, Inc.; and for superior performance in the workplace as an Employee of a Non-Profit Organization, Mr. Elipido Agaran of Goodwill Industries. The Department of Revenue & Taxation took the Outstanding Public Sector Employer Award; Citizens Security Bank won the Outstanding Private Sector Employer Award and the Outstanding Non-profit Organization Employer Award was given to Goodwill Industries of Guam. Also to be commended are the planners of this year's "Think Abilities . . . Employ-Abilities" Month: the Guam Developmental Disabilities Council, the University of Guam's University Affiliated Programs on Developmental Disabilities, the Department of Integrated Services for Individuals with Disabilities, Goodwill Guam and Guma' Mami. Maulek che'cho' miyu para todo I maninutet na taotao Guam, Si Yu'os ma'ase hamyo todos.

MAKE A DIFFERENCE DAY

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor today to recognize all Americans, and especially those at Carrollton Elementary School, participating in "Make A Difference Day," October 23rd.

Make A Difference Day is America's most encompassing national day of helping others; a celebration of neighbor helping neighbor; friend helping friend; young helping old; old helping young; teacher helping student; employer helping employee; stranger helping stranger. With the generous support of many private sponsors, nearly two million people now set aside the fourth Saturday in October for assisting others in their communities.

At Carrollton Elementary School, in the 7th district of Georgia, Principal Kathy Howell and Associate Principal Anita Buice have spearheaded an excellent, day-long campaign enabling parents and students to improve their school; including projects such as constructing educational materials and planting flowers in the schoolyard.

I would like to commend Principal Howell, Associate Principal Buice, and the students and parents of Carrollton Elementary School for their outstanding efforts; and I know they will work for a better community, not just on Make A Difference Day, but every day of their lives. Grassroots volunteer efforts such as

this, will continue to strength America's communities, and thereby keep America strong well into the 21st Century.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID VITTER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 522, I was late arriving on the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

CAMERA AND BASKETBALL HOOPS HELP BRIDGE CULTURAL GAP BETWEEN WEST VIRGINIANS AND PALESTINIANS

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to submit for the RECORD an article which appeared in the Beckley, WV, Register-Herald, on October 17, 1999.

As you will note from reading this article, 10 men from Beckley and 2 from Huntington, WV, representing the Memorial Baptist Church and the Fellowship of Christian Athletes recently visited Gaza and the West Bank in the Middle East, where they used some very common skills to build friendships with Palestinians.

The Reverend Paul Blizzard, who lead the group on the mission to Gaza and the West Bank, said that his visit was to show their love for the Palestinian people and to extend a helping hand in any way they could. And they did so in a most astonishing but effective manner—with a camera and basketball hoops. Aided by Bernard Bostick, coach at the Beckley-Stratton Junior High School, and Mike White, area director of the fellowship of Christian athletes, the West Virginians worked with basketball camps to help the youths develop their sports emphasis.

While the language barrier was present—West Virginians don't speak Arabic as a rule, and few Palestinians speak English—they found hand signals often worked just as well as words—and learned all over again that kids are kids and people are people no matter where they are when it comes to sports.

The camera was wielded by Rod Carney who owns the Grace Book Store in Beckley, and John Brown, a computer specialist with the Mine Safety and Health Administration in Mount Hope, WV, who took pictures of the basketball games and of families. Mr. Carney noted that "family is very important in Palestine, and they don't have any way of getting pictures made of themselves. Many families have been separated and it means a lot to them to have family portraits made or to even have individual pictures of family members." The film will be developed in Huntington and the photos sent to the Baptist workers in the West Bank for distribution among the families.

Reverend Blizzard noted that "there is so much bad press and misleading information about Palestinians. We see all the rock-throwing and terrorism and are led to believe those acts characterize the people there. It just is

not true. The Palestinian people are the most hospitable, loving people you would ever want to meet."

One of the highlights of the trip was the personal meeting with President Yasir Arafat during the visit. There was a prayer, and an exchange of gifts, with President Arafat giving the group a Nativity set with the inscription Bethlehem 2000 as a gift from Gaza, and the West Virginia group gave the President a gift of the world-famous West Virginia Glass, a Bible and a West Virginia Lapel Pin from Governor Cecil Underwood. President Arafat told the group they would be welcome again anytime they desire to visit Palestine.

It was my pleasure to personally convey Rev. Blizzard's request to me to help arrange for a personal meeting with President Arafat. I was able to hand the request to President Arafat in person during his recent visit to Washington.

It is Christian efforts such as those carried out by Rev. Blizzard and his group from the Beckley and Huntington Baptist Church and the Fellowship of Christian Athletes that can help us put an end to the mindless stereotyping of Palestinians and others of Arab descent as bomb-throwing terrorists. I know Rev. Blizzard will continue his missionary work in Palestine in the years to come.

As the Representative of Rev. Blizzard and the other 11 members of his group who made the trip, I am very proud to insert the newspaper article describing his experience in Palestine in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

TEN MEN FROM BECKLEY, TWO FROM HUNTINGTON, USED SKILLS TO BUILD FRIENDSHIPS WITH PALESTINIANS

(By Bev Davis)

A Beckley group used a basketball, a camera to build friendships in another part of the world.

The Rev. Paul Blizzard, pastor of Memorial Baptist Church in Beckley, used contacts from previous trips to the Middle East to arrange a 12-day visit to Gaza and the West Bank, where 10 men from Beckley and two from Huntington used some special skills to build friendships with Palestinians there.

"There is so much bad press and misleading information about Palestinians. We see all of the rock-throwing and terrorism and are led to believe those acts characterize the people there. It just is not true. The Palestinians we met are the most hospitable, loving people you would ever want to meet," Blizzard said.

The American team took gifts of food, shoes, sports equipment and T-shirts.

"We gave over 100 pairs of shoes to a doctor who will distribute them in a Bedouin camp in Gaza. The people are very poor there. The shoes will enable the doctor to get people to come to the clinic for vaccinations and other medical services," Blizzard said.

The group also organized a three-fold plan to provide several services to their Palestinian hosts.

Bernard Bostick, a coach at Beckley-Stratton Junior High School, and Mike White, area director of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, prepared themselves to work in basketball camps, teaching new skills and helping the Palestinians develop their sports emphasis.

"We met with a group of kids who didn't speak much English, and we didn't know Arabic, but when the balls started to bounce, there was one language," White said. "We used hand signals to explain techniques, and the expressions on the faces of the players told us immediately they were pleased with

new moves they learned from Bernie. Kids are kids, and people are people, no matter where they are. We had a wonderful opportunity to get to know these groups, and it was hard to leave."

A Baptist group arranged for Rod Carney, owner of Grace Book Store in Beckley and John Brown, a computer specialist with the Mine Safety and Health Administration in Mount Hope, to take pictures of people living in the West Bank.

"Family is very important there, and they don't have any way of getting pictures made. A lot of families have been separated, and it means a lot to them to have family portraits made or to even have individual pictures of family members," Carney said.

He shot 16 rolls of film and sent them to Huntington, where a photo shop will develop the photographs at no charge and send them back for Baptist workers in the West Bank to distribute to the families there.

"We were in homes of people who had very little, and yet they always welcomed us warmly and offered us food and beverages. We knew sometimes they were offering us all they had. We were all deeply touched by their hospitality," Carney said.

"When people asked us why we came, we told them we believe God wanted us to go there to show our love for the Palestinian people and to extend a hand to help them in any way we could," Brown said.

Huntington Audiologist Tom Waybright accompanied the group and did volunteer work in a school for the hearing-impaired.

"This was a unique opportunity to learn more about the people and to provide a service for them," Blizzard said. "Everywhere we went, people were so appreciative and they just treated us like family."

One unexpected highlight was the opportunity to meet with Palestinian National Authority President Yasser Arafat and exchange greetings and gifts with him, Blizzard added.

"Through the efforts of Abu Tariq, the president's personal representative, our whole group was invited into the national headquarters to meet him. We talked with him and prayed with him. We gave him gifts from Gov. Cecil Underwood's office—lapel pins in the shape of the state of West Virginia and a piece of glass from our state. The president gave us a Nativity set with the inscription 'Bethlehem 2000'. One of our men gave him a Bible. It was quite an experience for all of us," Blizzard said.

"It was reported the next day that Arafat enjoyed our visit very much and he sent word that we are welcome again," Blizzard said.

Several of the men said they would like to go back.

"We have made wonderful friends in the Middle East and are eager to see them again. We have come to love the Palestinian people, and we look forward to our return there," Blizzard said.

TRIBUTE TO ARTURO RODRIGUEZ

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my close friend, Arturo Rodriguez, who has been the president of the United Farm Workers since 1993. Arturo assumed the presidency of the UFW following the death of the organization's founder, Cesar Chavez. Although no one could ever replace Cesar

Chavez, just as no one could ever replace Martin Luther King, those of us who care deeply about the UFW and the plight of farmworkers have been tremendously impressed by Arturo's leadership and accomplishments these past 6 years.

Under Arturo's direction, the UFW won 16 straight secret-ballot elections—most by big margins—and signed 21 new contracts with growers. He also organized some highly publicized, well-attended marches on behalf of the UFW. The marchers always include many teenagers too young to have personal memories of Cesar Chavez, but eager to continue the work of the UFW.

When he was a teenager living in San Antonio, TX, in the mid 1960's, Arturo first heard from his parish priest about Cesar Chavez and the burgeoning UFW. Inspired by the struggle, Arturo became an active supporter of the farmworkers. At the University of Michigan in 1971, for example, Arturo organized support for UFW boycotts.

In 1973, Arturo met Cesar Chavez, which changed his life in two ways. For one, he joined the UFW, working for two decades to plot and implement strategy. The second was a bonus: Arturo met and fell in love with Linda Chavez, Cesar's daughter. The couple were married in 1974 at La Paz, the UFW's headquarters near Bakersfield, CA. Today Arturo and Linda live at La Paz with their three children.

Prior to becoming its president, Arturo worked on many key issues for the UFW. In 1975, Arturo helped organize union representation elections in the Salinas Valley, including the UFW campaign at Molera Packing Co.—the artichoke ranch where the first election under the California Agricultural Labor Relations Act took place. Two years later, he organized union elections in Imperial Valley vegetable fields and Ventura County citrus orchards.

From May through September 1992, Arturo coordinated UFW help for grape workers walking off their jobs in the largest Coachella and San Joaquin Valley vineyard demonstrations in 20 years. He became president in May 1993, a few weeks after the death of Cesar Chavez.

Arturo has renewed UFW's presence both in the fields and in the halls of government. In Sacramento and in Washington, he joins our struggle to prevent the restoration of the discredited and disgraced bracero program.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Arturo Rodriguez, whose lifelong commitment to civil rights and economic justice inspires us all. I am proud to be his friend and to fight by his side against further exploitation of America's farmworkers.

UNVEILING OF STAMPS HONORING THE UNITED STATES SUBMARINE FORCE ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate members of the United States Submarine Force as the U.S. Postal Service unveils a series of stamps which pay tribute to

the Force for "A Century of Service to America." Earlier today, I was privileged to join the Postal Service, the U.S. Navy and veterans from across eastern Connecticut in introducing these stamps, which commemorate the Centennial of the Submarine Force. In this series, we can witness the stunning progress we have made from the Navy's first submarine—the U.S.S. *Holland*—to the *Ohio* and *Los Angeles* Class submarines of the late Twentieth century. However, these stamps honor much more than technological prowess. They remind us of the selfless service of tens of thousands of veterans who patrolled the depths of the world's oceans guaranteeing victory over tyranny and security for all Americans.

"A Century of Service to America" is a fitting theme for the Submarine Force. "A Century" recognizes the magnitude of the anniversary. Nearly a century ago, the Navy took ownership of its first submarine, the U.S.S. *Holland*. Since then, 648 submarines have entered the force—nearly half of which have been built in Groton, Connecticut, also known as the "Submarine Capital of the World." Our submarines have become technological marvels, the crown jewels of our nation's fleet. Consider how far we've come: the mighty *Ohio* class submarines are nearly as wide as the *Holland* was long! Today, our best and brightest are working to get the next generations of submarines, the *Seawolf* and *Virginia* Class subs, into the fleet. These will be the quietest and the most advanced submarines ever launched giving their crews an almost limitless range of new capabilities.

"Service" is a tribute to our submariners who risked their lives, everyone who supported their efforts, and the men and women who designed and built five generations of submarines. Over the past one hundred years, 400,000 men and women have either served aboard submarines or provided mission support. Over 3,500 veterans of the Submarine Force have made the supreme sacrifice for their country. Veterans of the Submarine Force during World War II paid the highest price in lives lost. Admiral Chester A. Nimitz, a submariner himself before he led the U.S. Navy in the Pacific during the Second World War, said: "It is to the everlasting honor and glory of our submarine personnel that they never failed us in our days of great peril."

In southeastern Connecticut, we also know that the men and women of Electric Boat serve their country. They design and build some of the most sophisticated machines the world has ever known. Members of the Submarine Force have been so successful in safeguarding our nation in part because of the craftsmanship and hard work of generations of EB employees.

Finally, we focus on what the Submarine Force means to America. It turned the tide in the Pacific during the Second World War accounting for fifty five percent of all enemy shipping destroyed while comprising only two percent of all Naval forces. During the Cold War, the "Forty-One for Freedom" *Polaris/Poseidon* and succeeding *Trident* submarines ensured that our nation would never be the target of nuclear aggression. Daring intelligence missions provided a clear picture of the capabilities and the goals of the Soviets and other nations which threatened our national interests. As Secretary of Defense Cohen said in urging the Postal Service to honor this anniversary, "the peaceful end to

45 years of confrontation is the modern legacy of the Submarine Force."

Mr. Speaker, America owes a great debt to the members of the Submarine Force—past and present. A series of stamps is a small gesture of a thankful nation to honor their service, their sacrifice, and their role in guaranteeing that successive generations of Americans have been able to enjoy the freedoms that make this country the greatest nation on earth.

EXCEL PROGRAM FOR GOVERNMENT OF GUAM EMPLOYEES

HON. ROBERT A UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the governor of Guam, Carl T.C. Gutierrez, acknowledges the hard work of government of Guam employees. The governor's employee recognition program, better known as the Excel Program, is the highest and most competitive employee awards bestowed by the governor. This program showcases the outstanding employees and programs within the government of Guam.

Over 60 governmental agencies and departments participate in this program. Awardees are chosen within each department's nominees for 55 occupational groups. These groups range from clerical to labor and trades to professional and technical positions. The various awards reflect individual and group performance, valor, sports, community service, cost savings, and integrity.

My sincerest congratulations go to this year's awardees. I urge them to keep up the good work. I am pleased to submit for the RECORD the names of this year's outstanding employees.

INSPIRATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT AWARD

Small Dept./Agency: Lucina Leon Guerrero, Vocational Rehabilitation Worker, DISID

Medium Dept./Agency: Lt. Kenneth R. Paulino, Customs and Quarantine Officer Supervisor, Customs and Quarantine Agency

Large Dept./Agency: Eulalia Harui-Walsh, Social Worker II, Guam Memorial Hospital Authority

SILENT ONES

Small Dept./Agency: Mary J. Sebastian, Administrative Services Officer, Military Affairs

Medium Dept./Agency: Gerard V. Aflague, Customs and Quarantine Officer III, Customs and Quarantine Agency

Large Dept./Agency: Susie B. Reyes-Wells, Administrative Assistant, Guam Memorial Hospital Authority

Community Service—Annie P. Roberto, Program Coordinator III, DPHSS

Female Athlete of the Year—Arleen M. Sahagon, Electric Meter Reader Supervisor, Guam Power Authority

Male Athlete of the Year—Kenneth Rios, Control Operator, Guam Power Authority
Sports Team of the Year—Guam Customs Golf Team, Customs and Quarantine Agency
Livesaving—Lillian S.N. Opona, Employment Program Administrator, Department of Labor

Integrity—Diogenes L. Tamondong, International Auditor, Guam Power Authority

MANAGER OF THE YEAR

Small Dept./Agency: Bernard Punzalan, Administrator and Operations Manager, Guam Economic Development Authority

Medium Dept./Agency: Lillian S.N. Opena, Employment Program Administrator, Department of Labor

Large Dept. Agency: Daniel P. Astroga, Personnel Services Administrator, Department of Administration

COST SAVINGS/INNOVATIVE IDEA OF THE YEAR

Small Dept./Agency: Vera L.F. Dela Crus, Word Processing Secretary II, Military Affairs

Medium Dept./Agency: Mary A. Kolski, Chemical Dependency Treatment Specialist III, Department of Corrections

Large Dept./Agency: Bradley A. Hokanson, Program Coordinator IV, Guam Police Department

PROJECT/PROGRAM OF THE YEAR

Small Dept./Agency: Guam Big Summer Festival Street Party, Guam Visitors Bureau

Medium Dept./Agency: Youth & Family Outreach Program, GHURA

Large Dept./Agency: Liheng Famagu'on, Department of Education

UNIT OF THE YEAR

Small Dept./Agency: Division of Support Services, DISID

Medium Dept./Agency: Guam-Hawaii Medical Referral Office, Governor's Office

Large Dept./Agency: Building Construction & Facility Maintenance, DPW

DEPARTMENT OF THE YEAR

Small Dept./Agency: Guam Economic Development Agency

Medium Dept./Agency: Department of Youth Affairs

Large Dept./Agency: Department of Public Works

Recognition of Former Outstanding Employee—Ana Artero, Library Technician II, Department of Education

EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR

General Clerical: Cheryl B. Peralta, Clerk III, DPHSS

Typing & Secretarial: Jessica Q. Chong, Word Processing Secretary II, Customs & Quarantine Agency

Keypunch & Computer Operations: Johns A. P. Borja, Teleprocessing Network Coordinator, GTA

Office Management & Miscellaneous Administrative: Mercy Santiago, Administrative Assistant, Guam Economic Development Authority

Real Estate Registration and Taxation: Francisco T. Cepeda, Land Agent II, DPW

Purchasing, Surplus Property, Supply & Related: Velma L. Camacho, Buyer I, UOG

General Administration & Management Systems Analysis: Deborah Chu, Research Officer, Guam Economic Development Authority

Program Administration: Bernard Lastimoza, Program Coordinator I, GHURA

Accounting & Fiscal: Mary A. Mantanona, Accounting Technician II, AHRD

Personnel Administration, Equal Employment & Public Information: Grace O. Garces, Public Information Officer, Guam EPA

Computer Programming & Analysis: Patricia C. Dulla, Programmer/Analyst I, GPA

Community & Social Services: Rosemarie D. Nanpie, Social Worker III, Department of Mental Health & Substance Abuse

Counseling Psychology & Related: Mary Korski, Chemical Dependency Treatment Specialist III, DOC

Employment & Service Related: June R. San Nicolas, Employment Development Worker II, AHRD

Library Science & Related: Roque Iriarte, Library Technician II, UOG

Public Safety: Joseph R. Meno, Police Officer II, GPD

Security & Correction: Tommy King Corrections Officer I, DOC

Technical & Professional Engineering: Roselle Guarin, Engineer I, Guam EPA

Planning: Edwin G. Aranza, Planner II, Guam EPA

Wildlife, Biology, Agricultural Science & Related: Victor P. Camacho, Biologist I, Department of Commerce

Laboratory Services: Victoria Cinco, Hospital Laboratory Technician III, Guam Memorial Authority

Crime Scene & Related Technical: Monica P. Ada, Criminalist I, GPD

Nursing & Dental Hygiene: Jennifer Rosario, Staff Nurse II, Guam Memorial Hospital Authority

Custodial: Andres S. Bautista, Maintenance Custodian, DPW

Equipment Operation & Related: Francis G. Salas, Equipment Operator Leader, GPA

Mechanical and Metal Trades: John S. Angoco, Auto Mechanic II, DPW

Building Trades: Joe Antonio, Maintenance, DYA

Power System Electrical: Jose S.N. Cruz, Substation Electrician II, GPA

Plant Operations: Gregorio T. Quitano, Plant Maintenance Mechanic II, GPA

Electronics and Related Technical: Shane Hernandez, Electronic Technician II, Guam Memorial Hospital Authority.

SUPERVISOR OF THE YEAR

Keypunch & Computer Operations: Christian Quitugua, Computer Operations Supervisor, Guam Memorial Hospital Authority

Office Management & Miscellaneous Administrative: R. Gregory Sablan, Loan Officer, Guam Economic Development Authority

Real Estate Registration & Taxation: Sharon C. Rodriguez, Acting Deputy Civil Registrar, Department of Land Management

General Administration & Management Systems Analysis: Cecilia D. Javier, Administrative Officer, Department of Public Works

Program Administration: Robert R. Kelley, Program Coordinator IV, Department of Public Health & Social Services

Accounting & Fiscal: Reynaldo I. Dayson, General Accounting Supervisor, Guam Power Authority

Youth Services & Related: Alber Buendicho, Youth Service Supervisor, Department of Youth Affairs

Public Safety: Bonnie A. C. Suba, Police Sergeant I, Guam Police Department

Security & Correction: June D. P. Aguon, Correction Supervisor II, Department of Corrections

Technical & Professional Engineering: Perlita L. Sugang, Engineer II (Acting Engineer Supervisor), Department of Public Works

Planning: Jordan Kaye, Chief Planner, Guam Environmental Protection Agency

Laboratory Services: Glendalyn Pangelinan, Hospital Laboratory Technician III, Guam Memorial Hospital Authority

Crime Scene & Related Technical: Rose M. A. Fejeran, Criminalist III, Guam Police Department

Nursing & Dental Hygiene: Melinda Treluas, Community Health Nurse Supervisor I, Department of Public Health & Social Services

Labor, Grounds & Maintenance: Eleanor F. Borja, Solid Waste Management Assistant Superintendent, Department of Public Works

Equipment Operation & Related: Benny C. Salas, Cargo Checker Supervisor, Port Authority of Guam

Mechanical and Metal Trades: Vicente C. San Nicolas, Heavy Equipment Supervisor, Department of Public Works

Building Trades: Silvester T. Mendiola, Painter Supervisor, DPW

Power System Electrical: Norman P. Mesa, Line Electrician Supervisor, Guam Power Authority

Plant Operations: Bartolome Abuan, Plant Shift Supervisor, Guam Power Authority

Merit Cup Leader Award: The best of the best among the outstanding Supervisors & Managers of the Year:

Daniel P. Astorgen, Personnel Services Administrator, Department of Administration

Merit Cup Employee Award: The best of the best among the outstanding Employees of the Year:

Joseph R. Meno, Police Officer II, Guam Police Department

HIGH PERFORMANCE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1999

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the High Performance Schools Act of 1999, a bill intended to help school districts build schools that provide better learning environments for children, while also saving on energy costs and protecting the environment.

I am pleased that my colleague GEORGE MILLER is joining me as an original cosponsor of this bill.

Many of you know about my interest in energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies. These technologies further our national goals of broad-based economic growth, environmental protection, national security, and economic competitiveness.

In recent years, we've seen a wide array of successes in developing these technologies. In particular, much research has focused on improving energy efficiency and increasing the use of renewable energy in building in a "whole building" approach to design and construction. By incorporating advanced energy efficiency technologies, daylighting, and renewable energy, "whole buildings" provide benefits in the way of energy savings, environmental protection, and economic efficiency. As buildings account for roughly a third of our annual energy consumption and a commensurate share of greenhouse gas emissions, this research focus seems well justified.

The bill I am introducing today—the "High Performance Schools Act of 1999"—takes the concept of "whole buildings" and puts it into the context of our schools. My bill would establish a program in the Department of Education to help school districts produce "high performance" school buildings. It would provide block grants to state offices to education and energy, via state Governors, that they would then provide to school districts for building design and technical assistance. These grants would be available to school districts that are faced with rising elementary and secondary school enrollments, that can't afford to make major investments in construction or renovation, and that commit to work with the state agencies to produce school facilities that incorporate a "high performance" building approach.

The time is ripe for improving the way we build our schools. This country is currently experiencing a dramatic increase in student enrollment due to the "baby boom echo," the children of the baby boom generation. During the 20 years from 1989 to 2009, this Nation is

being asked to educate an additional 8.3 million children. At the same time, over 70 percent of our Nation's schools were built before 1960 and are now in need of major repairs.

Visiting schools in the 2nd Congressional District in Colorado, I have seen firsthand the spaces in which our children are learning and growing. Many districts can't afford sorely needed remodeling or construction of new schools, while others are scrambling to address severe overcrowding issues. And we aren't alone: School enrollment in Colorado increased by 70,000 students in the last five years. While new schools open at or above capacity, enrollment is projected to grow in Colorado by 120,000 in the next decade.

Clearly, there's an urgent need for school construction—in Colorado and in every state across the country. Thousands of communities nationwide red even now in the process of building new schools and renovating existing ones. But in drawing up construction plans, schools often focus on short-term construction costs instead of long-term, life-cycle savings. My bill would help ensure that school districts have the tools and assistance they need to make good building decisions.

High performance schools are a win for energy savings and a win for the environment, but best of all, they are also a win for student performance. A growing number of studies link student achievement and behavior to the physical building conditions. A study from Mississippi State University, for example, showed that in schools in North Carolina, Texas and Nevada, variables such as natural light and climate control played a role in improved test scores, higher moral and fewer discipline problems.

We wouldn't dream of just putting typewriters in these new schools—we would install today's computer technology. Nor should we build yesterday's "energy inefficient," non-sustainable, and less effective schools. Our kids are our country's future, and they should have the best school facilities, especially if they will cost less and benefit us all in other ways.

In short, we have an enormous opportunity to build a new generation of sustainable schools, schools that incorporate the best of today's designs and technologies and as a result provide better learning environments for our children, cost less to operate, and help protect our local and global environment. The High Performance Schools Act would start us on the road to achieving these goals. I look forward to working with Mr. MILLER and other Members of the House to move forward with this important initiative.

RED RIBBON WEEK

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor today to recognize youth throughout the nation, and especially in the seventh district of Georgia, who will be celebrating "Red Ribbon Week," from October 23rd to 31st.

In 1985, the first Red Ribbon Week was held shortly after the tragic murder of Drug Enforcement Agent Enrique "Kiki" Camarena. Now, small towns and large cities across

America take part in Red Ribbon Week, a seven-day observance promoting drug-free communities. The message during this week is simple, "just say no to drugs." The vibrant red ribbons tied around flagpoles, street signs and school yard fences remind us together we can do something about drugs and drug abuse in our communities.

Sponsored by the National Family Partnership and observed by numerous other public service organizations, Red Ribbon Week has grown from its humble beginnings in memory of Camarena's tragic death, into a national movement against drugs and drug abuse. In communities everywhere the week is observed through rallies, lectures, essay contests and other awareness activities.

In a period such as this, where pro-drug referenda are being voted on and some public officials are calling out in favor of drug legalization, it is truly outstanding that our young people are uniting to show they still know what is right: staying away from drugs. I commend all of the young people participating in Red Ribbon Week, as well as other anti-drug activities, for taking an interest in improving their lives and their communities, now and for the future. If we are to ever win the War on Drugs, grassroots efforts such as this are surely where we must start . . . and stay.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID VITTER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 523, I was late arriving on the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

OPPOSITION TO THE NORWOOD-DINGELL INSURANCE REGULATION LEGISLATION

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the Norwood-Dingell health insurance regulation legislation. I have listened to my colleagues and constituents to learn all I could before casting my vote. Although I am convinced that something needs to be done to redress a health insurance system that is out of balance, I have several concerns that could not be allayed.

Norwood-Dingell properly expands the ability of patients to recover damages from health care plans in court. The current bar to recovery of any damages against a health plan is inappropriate. Those plans that act negligently or are found guilty of medical malpractice should be held accountable as any medical professional would be. Norwood-Dingell, however, would open the gates to these types of suits too broadly.

Had the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Representative HOUGHTON, the gentleman from New York, been adopted by the House, I would have voted for Norwood-Dingell on final passage. That common sense amendment would have ensured that

employers and directors would not have to worry about liability except in very rare cases. Under the vague language of Norwood-Dingell, however, there is uncertainty. Uncertainty is always a breeding ground for lawsuits, and the result would be their employers willing to provide health care to working families. Had Mr. HOUGHTON's substitute passed, the bill would have had all the protection and access provisions of the Norwood-Dingell bill, but lawsuits would have been limited in a reasonable way.

I also support the same common sense limits on suits against doctors and other professionals that have forced malpractice insurance to skyrocket, doctors to practice "defensive medicine" and raise everyone's costs, forcing even insurance companies to raise prices and reduce quality of care. Doctors should not have any greater liability than insurance companies and they also need help redressing the balance of power that is now tilted too heavily towards insurance companies, which is why I am a cosponsor of legislation such as H.R. 1304, a bill that would allow doctors to come together when dealing with health insurers.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, we need to do more to protect patients and give doctors the freedom to treat their patients using their sound medical judgment as the yardstick rather than an insurance company's bottom line. Still, there are now more Americans without health insurance than there were just a few short years ago and we need to make sure that we don't raise health care costs more than necessary. I would note that the Congressional Budget Office has not done a cost estimate of this bill as required by the Unfunded Mandates Act and that none of us really know how much costs will increase and how many of our constituents will lose their health coverage. Before passing a bill that will affect nearly every American, I think we owe it to them to find out.

TRIBUTE TO MR. FRANK E. MATTHEWS, JR.

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Frank E. Matthews for his tremendous work for the River Cities Combined Federal Campaign, his many years with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, as well as the leadership and generosity that he has shown toward the City of Huntington and the State of West Virginia as a whole.

At the Huntington District Corps of Engineers, Frank serves as executive officer to the district engineer—a position that he has held for 19 years. He adds much needed continuity and leadership to this constantly changing field.

Despite his many responsibilities to the Army Corps, Frank still makes time for worthy causes such as the River Cities Combined Federal Campaign, where he has served as coordinator since 1966. Frank has been described as the glue that holds the River Cities' CFC campaign together. Always modest, Frank refuses to take credit for the campaign's success—preferring to attribute the success to his coworkers' generosity. However, his internal auditing system is one of the many ideas

that has turned the annual fund-raising drive into such a success. It gives the fundraiser credibility while assuring donors that their money is spent appropriately. The auditing system allows Frank to track funded agencies and ensure that money is spent properly. Anyone at anytime can look at the report to see where the money is going. Initiatives such as the auditing system explain how the River Cities' campaign has grown and blossomed into a highly successful fund-raising drive under Frank's leadership. Just last year, Corps of Engineers employees donated \$32,000 to the River Cities' CFC campaign, or almost 40 percent, to the campaign's overall total of \$82,608.

In addition to his official responsibilities, Frank is very active in his hometown community of Huntington, West Virginia and his list of activities reads like a Who's Who of area organizations. He is a member of the American Legion Post 16, the Elks and Rotary Clubs, the Huntington Museum of Art, the Marshall University Alumni Association, the Southside Neighborhood Association, and is a past commandant of the 340 Marine Corps League. He has also served on the board of directors of the Region II Mental Health Association, the Boy Scouts of America Tri-State Area Council, and the Huntington Jaycees.

I have had the privilege of knowing Frank for many years. I consider him a dear friend and am honored to have worked with him on behalf of West Virginia. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Frank's wife, Jewell, his three married daughters, Maureen, Samantha, and Juliet, as well as his son, Matt, for sharing Frank with all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Frank on all of his hard work for West Virginia and the United States. He is truly a model of generosity and the epitome of a public servant.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on October 21st, I was unavoidably detained from casting rollcall votes 522, 523, 524, and 525.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote 522, "aye" on rollcall vote 523, "no" on rollcall vote 524, and "aye" on rollcall vote 525.

TRIBUTE TO B.T. COLLINS

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to B.T. Collins. The date of November 6, 1999 will see the dedication of the B.T. Collins Army Reserve Training Center, currently under construction at the old Sacramento Army Depot. Because of this great honor, I ask all of my

colleagues to join me in acknowledgment of this event.

This twenty million-dollar facility will provide training for 1,200–1,400 soldiers each month. These men and women will receive training in field medical surgical hospital techniques, field mess preparations, high tech communications, and other basic or advanced military occupational specialty training.

The lobby of this new training center will house the B.T. Collins Museum. This will provide a permanent home for many of the historical photographs, letters, uniforms, and other paraphernalia that B.T. Collins had collected throughout his Army and political careers. His sisters and friends will donate much of the collection. They will also work closely with the military and the builders to insure that the museum will reflect B.T. Collins' love of country, family and community service.

On this extraordinary day, perhaps the most notable event will be the dedication of a bust of B.T. Collins to be placed at the entrance of this important facility. The artist, Garr Ugalde has been commissioned to create the bust, and he has presented a preliminary wax model of his work that amazingly captures B.T. Collins in his green beret. This bust will be donated by his family and friends.

B.T. Collins' friends and family made a promise that they would not allow his memory, patriotism, ideals, and contribution to his country to be forgotten. This memorial is one way to make good on that promise. It is their sincere hope that this museum will inspire soldiers to emulate the ideals that B.T. Collins espoused.

Mr. Speaker, as the friends and family of B.T. Collins gather to celebrate this landmark event, I am honored to pay tribute to one of Sacramento's most outstanding citizens. B.T. Collins' contributions to his community, state, and country are commendable. I am sincerely pleased that this museum and monument to this great man will preserve his memory for generations. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in wishing B.T. Collins and his family continued success in all their endeavors.

CONGRATULATIONS ON THE FIRST ANNUAL NATIONAL RAISE THE ROOF DAY

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Clinton signed the HUD–VA appropriations bill into law providing housing assistance to many impoverished Americans. Unfortunately, while this bill is an improvement over the initial House passed spending levels, it does not go far enough to address the needs of homeless individuals, tenants living in expiring Section 8 properties or distressed public housing, and impoverished communities. To ensure that our government has the political will to invest adequately in housing assistance, we need to raise public consciousness about the unmet housing and community development needs and educate the public about the existing and proven programmatic and policy solutions that address these needs.

One recent step to educate, organize, and mobilize Americans in this direction took place last Saturday, October 16th, when more than 10,000 volunteers in 150 cities joined together for the first ever National Raise the Roof Day. Under Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Andrew Cuomo's leadership, they spent the day repairing and building homes. But they were also building something much bigger—a national awareness of one of the most pressing problems facing our nation, the need for safe, decent and affordable housing.

I would like to commend everyone who participated in this landmark event. In Washington, D.C. Mayor Anthony Williams, actress Sarah Jessica Parker, home improvement expert Bob Vila, and community volunteers joined Secretary Cuomo to repair homes in the Columbia Heights community. In my home state of California, more than 1,800 volunteers repaired or built new homes for families in fifteen cities and counties. Similar events took place throughout the nation—led by the nation's mayors, national non-profits, local community and faith based organizations, businesses, and impoverished Americans—themselves in need of affordable housing.

Secretary Cuomo convened this Raise the Roof Day for three simple but important reasons. First, while we live at a time of record economic strength, a record number of people are facing an affordable housing or home ownership crisis. There are still a record 5.3 million households with worst case housing needs, and two million units in need of major repairs. Despite a record home ownership rate, home ownership for minorities and in cities still lags behind.

Raise the Roof Day also showed us that there is something that we can do about this crisis. We are not helpless. We are not powerless, either as a nation, or as a community in confronting this challenge. Don't listen to those who say that nothing works. There are many programs that are making a difference. HUD's FHA is expanding home ownership with a record 1.3 million loans insured this year. HOPE VI grants are replacing the worst public housing with livable communities. Americans can take action to organize and mobilize for adequate investments in affordable housing.

And last year, in partnership with Congress, HUD won its best budget in a decade. And this year we've done it again—a significant budget increase for HUD, that includes 60,000 new affordable housing vouchers, more money for the homeless, and increases in funds for Fair Housing and public housing.

Finally, Raise the Roof Day celebrates the spirit of voluntarism—the spirit of community—that we need as a nation to tackle our toughest challenges. Government must provide the funds and the resources, but that's only part of the solution. It's when people come together to help their neighbors that we can really make a difference. That's how this country was built, and that's how we must take on this challenge as well.

Mr. Speaker, Raise the Roof Day was a rousing success. Americans need to become more involved in these events. This is an issue where we can really make a difference—and a cause that truly deserves our time and our energy. I look forward to similar events in the future.

TRIBUTE TO WALTER L. JOHNSON—FRIEND OF BAY AREA WORKING MEN AND WOMEN

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the extraordinary contributions of my dear friend, Walter L. Johnson, the Secretary-Treasurer of the San Francisco Labor Council (AFL-CIO) and one of our nation's most devoted advocates for worker rights and progressive causes. A patriot, a crusader, and a man of genuine compassion and decency, Walter deserves the gratitude and appreciation of all of us who care about economic justice, civil rights, worker safety, and affordable health care.

Walter Johnson's life of community service began seventy-five years ago in the small town of Amenia, North Dakota. While still a teenager, he joined the United States Army and fought in World War II. At the conclusion of his military service, Walter moved to the Bay Area, where he met and married his wonderful wife Jane. They are the parents of three wonderful children. He also contributed his significant energies to his union—Local 1100 of the United Food & Commercial Workers Union (UFCW). Walter's talents as an organizer quickly became apparent to his colleagues in the UFCW, who selected him for a series of important positions in Local 1100—Business Agent in 1957, President in 1958 and Executive Officer in 1965.

Walter later was chosen to lead the San Mateo County Labor Council. It was while he served in this position that I first worked closely with him on issues of concern to working men and women in our area. Throughout these years and the decades that have followed, he developed a reputation as a fighter for the rights of working people and an articulate spokesman on critical issues affecting the Bay Area. On the basis of his outstanding record, Walter Johnson was elected Secretary-Treasurer of the San Francisco Labor Council on May 13, 1985, a position he still holds. There he has continued to fight for the causes to which he has devoted his life.

Mr. Speaker, whenever an injustice has been committed against any one of the Labor Council's 75,000 members, Walter Johnson can be found leading the crusade to right this wrong. When irresponsible corporations breach contracts or hire strikebreakers or operate sweatshops or discriminate against minorities or ignore worker safety laws, it is Walter who rallies San Francisco's working men and women to stand up against these injustices. It makes no difference whether the violated include truck drivers, bike messengers, hotel employees, teachers, or workers in any other profession—Walter is there, leading a picket line or rallying public opinion behind a just cause.

Walter Johnson's commitment to our nation's fundamental values extend well beyond defending the interests of the membership of the San Francisco Labor Council. He has worked, along with other leaders of the California Labor Federation (AFL-CIO), to educate citizens about matters that affect our diverse society in so many different areas: child labor, health care for young people and the under-

privileged, quality child care, human rights and the proliferation of sweatshops abroad, and the civil rights of women, minorities, and immigrants. Walter's principled activism has touched many lives, and I am grateful for it.

Walter's dedication to community service has benefitted the people of San Francisco in just every way imaginable. He has served on the Board of Directors of the United Way of the Bay Area, the Bay Area Economic Forum, the Nature Conservancy, the San Francisco Bay Area Girl Scouts Council, the Council for Civic Unity, the Shelter Network (which provides housing and assistance for the homeless), and a wealth of other civic, cultural, charitable, and educational institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in paying well-deserved tribute to Walter Johnson and in recognizing the exceptional contributions of this outstanding man, who has devoted his life to fighting for the interests and values of San Francisco's working men and women.

TRIBUTE TO THE ARMED GUARD

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a group of individuals whose dedicated service deserves recognition. It gives me great joy to offer my appreciation to the brave men of the Naval Armed Guard Service who protected the flow of supplies on the high seas during World Wars I and II.

Created as a branch of the United States Navy during World War I to maintain and operate weapons aboard merchant ships targeted by enemy vessels, the men of the Armed Guard served with unflappable courage as they ensured the safe passage of vital supplies to Europe. Over 144,900 men served in the Armed Guard on more than 6,000 ships. Nearly 2,000 of these brave men lost their lives in defense of freedom.

Crossing the ocean was a perilous, often horrific journey during both World Wars. Enemy submarines were not particular when targeting military or merchant vessels. The character and heroism of the men of the Armed Guard helped to make those voyages a little safer. Their job was not an easy one. Their lives on the sea consisted of hours of quiet punctuated by moments of terror that required strong nerves and courage.

It is said that it takes ten individuals to support one infantryman. The enemy knew that the key to an allied victory was the supply routes, and consequently attacked our merchant fleet mercilessly. It is obvious to me that without the valor exhibited by the Armed Guard, victory in both wars would have been indefinitely delayed.

This country owes a debt of gratitude to these brave men.

A TRIBUTE TO LUIS J. BOTIFOLL

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend Dr. Luis J.

Botifoll for being honored by The Association of Cuban Journalist's Board of Governors with its National Award for his years of work and dedication to expanding and protecting the rights of a free and open press.

Dr. Luis J. Botifoll, who once served as the Director of the Havana based newspaper "El Mundo," is being honored not only for his years of service to the Cuban people, but also for the leadership he has shown the world's free press in the face of the dictatorial regime of Fidel Castro.

Through the use of his eloquent articles and essays, Dr. Botifoll was able to bring a voice to a people who were denied the right to free press, by the dictatorship of Fidel Castro.

In recognition of his many achievements, I would like to applaud the hard-work and energy of Dr. Luis J. Botifoll. His dedication to the sanctity of free speech deserves all of our recognition and respect.

STATEMENT HONORING MR. BATISTA VIEIRA AND MRS. DOLORES VIEIRA

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to congratulate Mr. Batista Vieira and Mrs. Dolores Vieira on the 25th anniversary of their involvement with the Broadcast Radio Industry, a quarter-century tenure that has been marked by tremendous dedication and service to the Portuguese community in California. Because of their work, the Portuguese language, culture, traditions, and values have remained alive for the people of California in ways that would have been otherwise impossible.

For the last twenty-five years, Mr. and Mrs. Batista's "Portuguese Radio" has helped the "Portuguese of the Diaspora" living in my district and surrounding areas in Northern California to remain in close contact with the customs and lives of their friends and families in Portugal. "The Portuguese Radio" has impressed itself upon the daily lives of so many Portuguese immigrants because of the connection it brings to the nation many of these individuals still consider their cultural homeland; the sounds of Portugal broadcast over Portuguese Radio fill the homes and businesses of these people for countless hours of the day with sounds of the land they once knew, tying their old traditions and ways of life to the land that has newly become their adopted home.

Northern California, and particularly Santa Clara County, is a land of tremendous ethnic and cultural diversity, serving as it does as a home to immigrants from all areas of the globe. The cultural richness of this area is truly a result of the efforts of individuals such as Mr. and Mrs. Vieira who have worked through the Broadcast Radio Industry to preserve the beautiful traditions of Portugal in living form. The people of Northern California owe them a profound debt of gratitude.

IN RECOGNITION OF DALE DAVIS

HON. BOB RILEY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dale Davis of Delta, Alabama. Mr. Davis died of leukemia in July of this year, but his life is being celebrated on this date, October 25, 1999, at a meeting of the Clay County Hospital Board on which he served.

Dale Davis lived all of his life in Alabama. As an adult, he worked as a well driller. However, the real measure of a man is the influence he has on others. Dale Davis' "measure" came from his faith in God and his community involvement (most notably his service on the Clay County, Alabama, Hospital Board) as well as his devotion to his wife and two children. He was well thought of by all who knew him as evidenced by this special recognition.

Dale Davis' death at such a young age was tragic, but all who knew him rejoice in his life and offer our prayers and best wishes to his wife, son and daughter.

TRIBUTE TO PAUL PATRICK
COUGHLIN

HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to remember a very dear friend and to mark the six month anniversary of his passing, April 23, 1999.

Paul Patrick Coughlin was an outstanding gentleman whose loyalty, warmth, and kindness touched the lives of many, many people in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Paul was a leader, tried and true. But Paul led with compassion. He lived every day of his life committed to improving his community, and to fostering opportunities not only for his own children and grandchildren, but for his neighbors through his tireless public service.

Paul served as a Selectman in his beloved town of Dedham, as a Trustee of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy, as Chairman of the Dedham Democratic Town Committee, as a Veteran's Agent in the Town of Dedham, as Assistant Sergeant at Arms in the Massachusetts Legislature, as a Deputy Sheriff in Norfolk County, as an Assistant Clerk of Courts in West Roxbury District Court, and as a loyal union member of the Communication Workers of America.

I miss Paul dearly, as does his family and the many, many friends who have been fortunate to have known him. Although his is no longer with us in person, his kindness, his spirit, and his good works will be remembered forever.

TICKET TO WORK AND WORK INCENTIVES IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. JERRY MORAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1999

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, unfortunately, to oppose this legislation. I wholeheartedly support the original intent of this bill, and I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1180. Improving the current system to provide real choices for people with disabilities is essential. The Work Incentives Improvement Act would address the barriers to employment by improving job training and rehabilitation services and providing the health insurance which is so critical.

Unfortunately, the bill we are considering today is not H.R. 1180. The bill today includes troubling language from a substitute bill, which could cost Kansas and other states' school districts, million of dollars. Section 407 of this bill would limit Medicaid funding for school districts and their education of disabled children.

Section 407 precludes or significantly restricts the use of bundled rates. The bundling system allows schools to minimize paperwork by billing for a package of medical services, rather than for each individual service provided to each child. In May of this year, HCFA sent a letter to all State Medicaid directors prohibiting bundled rates for school based services for special education health costs. At that time, there were seven states that had HCFA-approved bundled rate systems, including Kansas. Since this announcement, I have heard from nearly every school superintendent in my district. They are extremely concerned about this rule. The administrative burden this will impose on schools will be enormous. The end result of Section 407 of this bill will be to legislate this HCFA rule. Without proper committee hearings and discussion of this issue, it is upsetting that we are forced to vote on it now. If this provision is passed, I believe we could be punishing states that are efficient and accountable. We will once again be turning our backs on our students.

When the Individuals with Disabilities Education was first passed, Congress promised that the federal government would pay 40% of the costs to schools. The federal government has never lived up to this promise and currently only pays out about 10% of the costs. Then Congress and the Administration told schools that they could seek reimbursements by Medicaid for school-based medical services for students with disabilities. HCFA told schools that it would even work with states to come up with a system of reimbursement that would not be so administratively burdensome to schools. So states and schools agree and are enthusiastic about getting more federal funds for special education costs. Yet, now both HCFA and Congress turn around and change their minds.

In order to bill Medicaid for these services, schools will now have to record each service provided. The administrative burden for small schools will keep schools from seeking this reimbursement. The time and cost will be so high that schools in my district will not be able to afford to seek a reimbursement.

So this provision is putting schools between a rock and a hard place. They do not have the

resources to seek reimbursements for Medicaid, yet then their school budgets will be devastated because they cannot access these federal funds. We are bankrupting our small schools and—who pays in the end—our students. The budgets of small schools are already being drained by costs associated with special education services. Funds they should have access to for books, retaining teachers, and school modernization.

This bill will now go to a conference between the House and Senate. I hope that conferees will take this time to listen to the concerns of school superintendents and state Medicaid directors. We need their advice and input as we form this legislation. I ask that we study this issue further before we legislate a rule that could hurt our schools.

TRIBUTE TO DR. DAVID PLATT
RALL

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about some distressing recent developments in the wake of the tragic death on September 28 of environmental medicine pioneer Dr. David Platt Rall.

Dr. Rall tragically died late last month from injuries sustained in a car accident while vacationing in France. His wife, Gloria Monteiro Rall, was badly injured in the accident, but is recovering. I know the thoughts and prayers of many of us go out to her and Dr. Rall's entire family.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Rall was a giant in the world of science. His credentials are long, but the highlights include running the federal National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) and the National Toxicology Program (NTP) simultaneously, Assistant Surgeon General in the U.S. Public Health Services, scientific counselor to the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, chair of the World Health Organization's Program on Chemical Safety, foreign secretary of the National Academy of Sciences' Institute of Medicine, board member of the Alliance to End Childhood Lead Poisoning and the Environmental Defense Fund. He had conducted breakthrough cancer research early in his career at the National Cancer Institute and he was husband, father and a grandfather.

Kenneth Olden, the current director of both NIEHS and NTP, calls Dr. Rall, "a pioneer, who established the credibility of our two federal environmental health organizations and set the paces. We are standing on his broad shoulders."

This man accomplished far more than many of us will manage to do in our lives. And, all of this work was devoted to advancing the cause of human health—and millions of people are the better for it.

It is a sad sign of our times, Mr. Speaker, when the death of such an individual becomes an invitation for cheap political attack to those who found his brilliance and accomplishments threatening.

One such person is chemical industry lobbyist and Cato Institute Adjunct Scholar Steven Milloy, who turned Dr. Rall's tragic death into what can only be seen as a callous, self-promotional opportunity.

Mr. Milloy runs a web site that features a cartoon of himself in devil costume, complete with horns, and tail. He calls himself the "Junkman," and junk certainly seems to be his main product. His self-appointed job is to denigrate the research of public interest groups and serious, accomplished academics.

But the Junkman reached a new low when on October 2, he posted a mocking "Obituary of the Day," on Dr. Rall's death, saying, and I quote, "Scratch one junk scientist".

The Cato Institute was alerted to this language by an outraged public interest group. President Edward H. Crane responded with—what seemed at the time—class and dignity, saying Milloy had an "inexcusable lapse in judgment and civility" with his "appallingly offensive comments."

In the face of that unequivocal rebuke, what did Mr. Milloy do? He refused to apologize, then posted even more vitriol the following day. His web site on October 12 said, "As far as David Rall is concerned, he was a bad guy when he was alive . . ." and that, "Death did not improve his track record."

Mr. Speaker, if this language isn't outrageous enough, the response of the Cato Institute to this second round of remarks was worse. When 11 heads of public health, consumer and environmental groups wrote Mr. Crane to sever his ties to Mr. Milloy, Mr. Crane chose not to respond. When Dr. Rall's surviving brother and two environmental group heads wanted to meet with Mr. Crane, Mr. Crane flatly refused. His rationale? The offensive web material had come down and he thought the matter was "closed."

The matter, Mr. Speaker, is far from closed. There are still no apologies to the Rall family, and Cato has taken no position on this second round of highly offensive comments. Never mind that the "junkman's" junk is out in the press now, posted on the Internet for friends and loved ones of Dr. Rall to read—along with the rest of the world.

The Cato Institute, with its silence and inaction tells media, the public and this Congress that Cato accepts this behavior and will reward the "Junkman" with a continued institutional home—no matter how badly it denigrates someone else, no matter how great the person who is being denigrated.

I call on the Cato Institute to show the same class and dignity they showed when first alerted to this situation and take additional, stronger action. Doing so would send an important message that while someone is free to say what he or she wants—however offensive—there are consequences for such actions. This is an especially libertarian view that I am sure the Cato Institute can understand.

IN HONOR OF PRESIDENT JULIUS NYERERE

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, as the world mourns the death of President Julius Nyerere, I wish to send the deepest condolences to the people of Tanzania.

For many years, the world has come to know President Julius Nyerere as a pioneer for change. He was committed to his people

and was a leader whose only ambition was to build a strong nation and a solid future for Africa. That is why he was a great statesman and a favored son of millions of Africans.

President Nyerere fought for his nation's independence and was elected to lead Tanganyika in 1961. In 1964, President Nyerere peacefully united Tanganyika with the island of Zanzibar, forming the Republic of Tanzania. He served as the leader of that nation for nearly twenty-five years. A proud father of a post-colonial nation, he worked to translate that pride and success to all of Africa.

All righteous people admired him, for he was a fearless pursuer of justice. He stood tall and spoke up against African strongmen and brutal dictators like Uganda's Idi Amin and the minority rule in South Africa.

President Nyerere voluntarily stepped down in 1985. A world leader, he built a solid foundation for his nation so that it can peacefully grow and flourish. He returned to his modest farm, but remained a powerful voice for peace and a relentless ambassador for the needs of Africans and the African continent.

He died at the age of 77 while trying to meditate an end to the war in Burundi. At the time of his death, President Nyerere was engaged in his favorite activity—finding a way to lead Africa on a journey of lasting prosperity and peace. For all he has given to his nation, his beloved continent and its people, and the world, I am certain that his legend will live on forever. Having had the good fortune to work with the 9th Congressional District African and Caribbean Advisory Committee, I know that his influence has been broadly felt and am hopeful that his spirit will guide us in the future.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT M. BEREN

HON. KEN BENTSEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Robert M. Beren, a benefactor whose generosity in Houston was recently recognized by the renaming of The Hebrew Academy at 5435 S. Braeswood. The school is now named Robert M. Beren Academy, in recognition of Mr. Beren's generous philanthropic contributions.

An oil and gas producer from Wichita, Kansas, Mr. Beren's ties to Houston run deep. His Houston grandchildren, Irene Beren Jefferson, Elizabeth Beren Jefferson, and Alexander Beren Jefferson benefit from the education at what will henceforward be known as Robert M. Beren Academy. His eldest daughter, Nancy T. Beren, and her husband, Larry S. Jefferson, M.D., are both extremely active in the Houston community. Following in her father's footsteps, Ms. Beren contributes her time and energy to projects and organizations that benefit children and families. It is especially fitting that Ms. Beren recently served for 2 years as President of Robert M. Beren Academy and that Dr. Jefferson currently serves on its Board of Education.

Robert M. Beren's penchant for giving revolves around two principles: his philosophy of reinforcing a strong Jewish background and his belief in an excellent secular education. By

supporting Houston's only modern orthodox Jewish day school, Mr. Beren promotes both of these ideals.

Mr. Beren's own educational history illustrates his love of academic challenge. After graduating from Marietta High School in Marietta, Ohio, he went on to graduate cum laude from Harvard College with a B.A. in Economics. He then graduated with high distinction from Harvard's Graduate School of Business Administration. In addition to pursuing his personal studies, Robert Beren distinguished himself by serving our country as a soldier in the U.S. Army during World War II. His keen business sense and organizational talents have served him well as President and Chairman of BEREXCO, INC., a successful oil company he oversees in Wichita, Kansas.

Robert Beren is extremely proud of his 13 grandchildren and his four children: Nancy T. Beren, Amy Beren Bressman, Julie Beren Platt, and Adam E. Beren. He has set a shining example, not only for his own family, but also for all of those who strive to give back and benefit others. The endless hours and vast resources that Mr. Beren has bestowed on religious institutions, civic organizations, and institutions of higher learning reveal where his heart lies. He is currently Vice-Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Yeshiva University; a Member of the Board of Overseers Committee for Harvard College; President of the Robert M. Beren Foundation, Inc.; Sole Trustee of the Israel Henry Beren Charitable Trust; and Board member of the Ohr Stone Institutions of Israel, the Hebrew Congregation, and the Mid-Kansas Jewish Appeal. In the past, he has given freely of his time to the Wichita Public School System, the Wichita Area Chamber of Commerce, the United Way, and the Anti-Defamation League, always with the ideal in mind of enhancing his community for the common good.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Beren on a lifetime of outstanding contributions to his community. I especially thank him for making the new school building for Houston's Robert M. Beren Academy a reality. With Mr. Beren's help, the school will continue to instill in its students the knowledge and ideals associated with their Jewish heritage while providing an excellent secular education to carry with them throughout their lives.

TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH "BIZ" STEINBERG

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Elizabeth "Biz" Steinberg, executive director of the Economic Opportunity Commission of San Luis Obispo Inc. in my district in California. Last Friday, October 22, Biz received the Excellence in Leadership Award from the California Association of Nonprofits in Oakland, California. She was chosen from a field of 37 leaders.

I am obviously not alone in being terribly proud of Biz Steinberg. In the congratulatory letter sent to her in honor of this award, the CAN executive director said: "The selection committee was overwhelmed by your consistent display of excellence and commitment

both to your organization and the community. The work you are doing in San Luis Obispo is heroic and truly an inspiration to the nonprofit sector."

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, Biz is a hero to many of us. Her unflagging grace and tireless effort on behalf of the community she serves with daily passion inspires all who know her. For the past 15 years, Biz has headed the EOC in San Luis Obispo County. When Congress founded the EOC in 1965 during the War against Poverty, I am sure that Biz's is the kind of leadership that members of Congress envisioned: one of determination and cooperation and courage.

IN HONOR OF THE THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMISSION ON CATHOLIC COMMUNITY ACTION

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the thirtieth anniversary of the Catholic Diocese of Cleveland's Commission on Catholic Community Action.

The Commission on Catholic Community Action was established in 1969 with a mission to protect and promote human dignity and advance justice for all. Successful in their mission, the CCCA has played a pivotal role in the rebirth of Cleveland. Focusing on urban redevelopment, the CCCA has organized, promoted, and made a difference in neighborhood issues such as job training, economic empowerment, environmental justice, and peacemaking.

With an outlook to reduce poverty and discrimination, the CCCA has sponsored and co-sponsored numerous seminars, speeches, and awards banquets. Keynote speakers at these events have educated the public on issues such as the Holocaust and prejudice reduction. Generating community awareness throughout Cleveland, the CCCA has provided participants with a new appreciation for celebrating multicultural diversity within the city.

Through hard work and determination, the CCCA has truly improved life opportunities for urban residents of Cleveland. Upholding this tradition of giving and caring, the CCCA has made Cleveland's urban residents culturally and economically stronger. Congratulations to the Commission on Catholic Community Action for thirty years of service and on continuing their mission into the new millennium.

My fellow colleagues, join me in honoring the Catholic Diocese of Cleveland's Commission on Catholic Community Action as they celebrate their thirtieth anniversary.

STUDENT RESULTS ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2) to send more

dollars to the classroom and for certain other purposes:

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Mink-Woolsey-Sanchez-Morella amendment to restore current gender equity provisions from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to H.R. 2, the Student Results Act. We must ensure that girls succeed in school.

Since the passage of Title IX a quarter-century ago, America's schools have been expected to provide the same opportunities for girls as well as boys. While a great deal of progress has been made, a gender gap still exists in America's schools.

Studies show that more than half of all female students take no high school math beyond Algebra 2. In a global economy, where science and technology advances are paramount, this closes doors on future studies, scholarships and careers for these female students.

This amendment will retain gender equity provisions in current law, including the Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA). The amendment encourages the training of teachers to treat boys and girls fairly in the classroom. It targets dropout prevention programs for at-risk youth, as well as pregnant and parenting teenagers. It also allows the training of teachers to encourage girls to pursue careers and higher education degrees in mathematics, science, engineering and technology.

The amendment is supported by over 70 organizations, including the Girl Scouts of America; the National Education Association; the American Association of University Women; and the National Parent Teacher Association. The National Women's Law Center, which also supports this amendment, writes:

[The] Elimination of the Women's Educational Equity Act signifies the dissolution of the only federal program that specifically targets and tackles the barriers to educational opportunities for women and girls.

They give an example of a 1999 WEEA program that created and implemented an on-line course for teachers called "Engaging Middle School Girls in Math and Science." This program helps to ensure that stereotypes and biases do not eliminate educational opportunities for girls.

However, this is just one of many programs and services provided by WEEA. Generally, WEEA represents the federal commitment ensuring that girls' future choices and success are determined not by their gender, but by their own interests, aspirations, and abilities. It is a comprehensive resource for teachers, administrators, and parents seeking proven methods to ensure equity in their school systems and communities.

Let's do the smart thing. Let's do the right thing. Support the Mink/Woolsey/Sanchez/Morella amendment. We must give all students, girls and boys alike, the chance to learn, excel and achieve.

HONORING THE REDEDICATION OF THE YOUNG ISRAEL SHOMRAI EMUNAH OF GREATER WASHINGTON

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Young Israel Shomrai Emunah of Greater Washington. On October 31st, the members of this congregation will join together to rededicate the facility that has served as their home for the past quarter-century. In addition, the congregation, located in Silver Spring, MD, will celebrate the renovation of its sanctuary and expansion of its building.

Since its creation, the Young Israel has helped to provide its members with a spiritual anchor and a firm foundation upon which to build a Torah observant community. The synagogue truly lives up to its name Shomrai Emunah—"guardian of the faith."

The synagogue, loosely established in 1951, was first located in Riggs Park, in northeast Washington, DC. Its first permanent home was established in 1957. However, a few years later, the community moved to Silver Spring and eventually built two facilities, the first located on University Boulevard. As the community grew, the leadership of the synagogue sought larger quarters, resulting in the construction of a spacious facility on Arcola Avenue. The new facility was completed in 1974.

As we all know, mortar and bricks do not make a community. Rather, the individuals in each community influence its success. Through the foresight of its founding members and the meticulous guidance of the Young Israel's esteemed spiritual leader, Rabbi Gedaliah Anemer, the synagogue boasts a membership of more than 500 families. The synagogue provides a variety of programs to serve its members. The community furnishes classes throughout the year, including an active adult education program. Seniors programs, a nursery school, the youth department, and a vibrant Sisterhood are all supported by the Young Israel.

Mr. Speaker, a synagogue is referred to as a "House of Prayer," a "House of Study," and a "House of Assembly." The Young Israel Shomrai Emunah fulfills all of these definitions. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the entire membership of the Young Israel; Rabbi Gedaliah Anemer; the President of the synagogue, Arnold Sherman; the chairman and co-chairman of the renovation committee, Sheldon Klein and Dr. Howard Schulman; and the board of directors. May they proceed from strength to strength.

TO HONOR DIETRA LEAKE FORD

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the work and exceptional contributions of the late Dietra Leake Ford to the small business community and the entire Federal Government. Ms. Ford passed away on October 21, 1999.

Dietra Ford was a valuable leader in the advocacy of small, minority, and women-owned businesses; she accomplished much in her position as Associate Administrator for Enterprise Development at the General Services Administration. Under her leadership, the Office of enterprise Development won the 1997 North Star Award for excellence and leadership in economic development programs that serve women business owners. This July 1st she had just completed three years at GSA, and in that time contract numbers had tripled with women-owned businesses and doubled with minority businesses.

Ms. Ford was a highly esteemed leader and advocate for small business, not only at the General Services Administration, but also nationwide throughout the federal government and private sector. A powerful crusader for the interests of minority and women entrepreneurs, Ms. Ford served as a liaison with the White House Office of women's Initiatives, the Interagency Committee on Women's Business Enterprise, the Small Business Administration, the Office of Management and Budget, other Federal agencies, and Members of Congress.

Prior to going to GSA Dietra Ford had over 15 years of senior executive experience in both the legislative and the executive branches of the Federal Government. She served in the Clinton Administration as Executive Director of the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board from 1993 to 1996. In 1992 she was named as one of the ten cluster coordinators for the Transition Office of the President-Elec. From 1975 to 1993, she was a senior legislative associate for the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the District of Columbia.

Ms. Ford was active in many civic organizations. She served as a member of the Board of Directors of Sibley Memorial Hospital in Washington, DC. She also was a former director for the United Methodist Church General Board of Global Ministries and traveled and represented this board at numerous international forums.

Ms. Ford held a bachelor's degree from Howard University and a master's degree from Boston University, where she was HUD Urban Studies Fellow.

Dietra Ford has left to the small business community, GSA, and the Federal Government at large an impressive legacy of innovative programs and creative initiatives. She is mourned by her many colleagues and will be sorely missed.

RECOGNIZING JULIA MARIE FLOWERS

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the birth of Julia Marie Flowers. Julia is the third child of Major Craig Flowers and his lovely wife Beth, the 16th grandchild of Denzil and Barbara Garrison, the 5th grandchild of Lt. Col. Jim and Nancy Flowers and the younger sister to Kathleen and

Annie. Julia arrived in Bartlesville, Oklahoma, on Wednesday, October 20th at 12:30 p.m., weighing in at a healthy 7 pounds 7 ounces and an impressive 20½ inches. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in offering our heartiest congratulations to the Flowers family and share their happiness with the arrival of darling Julia.

RUSSIAN ASSAULT ON CHECHNYA

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in the name of combating terrorism, Russia has again launched a war against Chechnya. It is employing indiscriminate use of force against civilians, and another humanitarian tragedy is unfolding.

In August and September of this year, Islamic extremists based in Chechnya— independent of the government of Chechnya— twice staged armed incursions into the neighboring Russian Federation Republic of Dagestan. In response, the Russian Government has sent its army to reoccupy Chechnya, a region that had won de facto independence from the rest of Russia as a result of a bloody war from 1994–96 invaded.

Now the United States Government recognizes, as a standard of international law, the territorial integrity of the Russian Federation, and Moscow has the legal right to bring to justice those responsible for committing crimes in the incursion into Dagestan. One should also sympathize with the victims of the recent unsolved bombings that killed almost 300 persons in Russia. But neither this terrorism nor the incursions into Dagestan, as reprehensible as they were, justify the use of indiscriminate force against the civilian population of Chechnya and causing the carnage that we are seeing now.

Last week, Russian rockets struck the Chechen capital of Grozny, hitting a marketplace and killing scores of civilians. This was preceded by air raids and artillery shelling of non-combatant villages, homes and farms in the northern part of Chechnya. The Russian Federation Migration Service states that more than 170,000 internally displaced persons have fled Chechnya, mostly to the neighboring region of Ingushetia.

Mr. Speaker, I, along with Mr. WOLF and Mr. FORBES, am introducing today a concurrent resolution calling upon the Government of the Russian Federation to cease unprovoked military attacks on the civilian population of Chechnya and to seek a negotiated solution to the conflict, using the auspices of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, which helped broker an agreement to end the 1994–96 war. The United States Government should take a stronger stand in support of these goals, as the European Union has done.

Not that the government of Chechnya has been entirely blameless. Since achieving de facto independence from Russia in 1996, Chechnya has degenerated into a morass of lawlessness and violence, with a government powerless to establish law and order. The

economy, which was devastated by the war, has been sustained heavily by criminal activity. Moreover, rampant kidnappings of Russians and foreigners for ransom have caused Chechnya to lose much sympathy and support in Russia and the West.

Russia is entirely justified in using appropriate methods to combat terrorism, but not in launching a war against innocent civilians. Russia is a participating State of the OSCE, and has agreed to certain standards regarding the protection of civilians when addressing internal security matters. Yes, Chechnya is recognized by the international community as a part of Russia, but this is not merely an "internal matter." The 1991 Moscow Document of the OSCE clearly states that commitments undertaken in the field of the human dimension of the OSCE are matters of direct and legitimate concern to all participating States and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the State concerned.

Moreover, Moscow's current policy is likely to lengthen and widen the conflict, perhaps into Russia and beyond, and it may well jeopardize democracy in Russia if Russian leaders attempt to use "emergency" measures as part of its war policy.

Our resolution also calls upon the Chechen government to make every appropriate effort to deny bases or other support to radical elements committed to violent actions in the North Caucasus. Furthermore, the resolution urges our own government to emphasize to all parties the necessity of resolving the conflict peacefully, under OSCE auspices, and to express the willingness to extend appropriate assistance toward such resolution, including humanitarian assistance, as needed.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that this resolution is not "anti-Russian" or "pro-Chechen." Many observers who wish to see a prosperous and democratic Russia have been deeply disturbed by the present campaign in Chechnya. The chairperson of the Moscow Helsinki Group, Ludmila Alexeyeva, has stated that: "Under the pretext of fighting terrorism, a real war is being waged against Chechnya, with tragic consequences for the civilian population. In several cities in Russia, under the same pretext, the authorities are conducting a genuine campaign of ethnic cleansing. These events are no less dangerous for European security than the Kosova crisis caused by the Milosevic regime last spring. In and around Chechnya we are witnessing a humanitarian catastrophe which is alarming, insofar as the international community is paying very little attention."

In a recent statement, Deputy Secretary of State Talbott called upon Russia to use restraint, "taking action against real terrorists, but not using indiscriminate force that endangers innocents, or resuming the disastrous 1994–96 war in Chechnya." President Clinton should back these good words with stronger steps. If Russia does not act with restraint and pursue dialogue, then Chechnya should become the main issue at the OSCE Summit in Istanbul on November 18 and 19.

I hope that the Congress would go on record as supporting these calls, and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this resolution.

SUPPORT FOR THE PAIN RELIEF
PROMOTION ACT**HON. JAMES A. BARCIA**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague from Oregon, Mr. BLUMENAUER, recently presented remarks on the floor to defend Oregon's assisted suicide policy and to criticize the proposed Pain Relief Promotion Act, H.R. 2260.

First of all, I think it is important to clarify the fact that H.R. 2260, the Pain Relief Promotion Act, does not limit states' ability to legislate assisted suicide. It simply clarifies that assisted suicide may not take place with federally controlled substances. This allows states to pass their own laws while clarifying the boundaries of federal involvement regarding assisted suicide. This bill also does not establish any new authority to penalize assisted suicide. My colleague has every right to speak in favor of the policy his constituents have chosen. But by the same token, representatives of the other 49 states that have chosen not to follow such a policy have a right to ask: Why should we be voiceless participants in Oregon's experiment with assisted suicide?

Mr. BLUMENAUER has expressed grave concern over the provision in the bill that makes it illegal to intentionally prescribe federally controlled drugs with the intent to cause a patient's death. Under this provision, he says, law enforcement personnel will be judging, for the first time, whether a doctor's "intent" is to cause a patient's death. I would like to take the time right now to respond to this objection.

Currently, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) routinely makes these judgments. They have always had the right to revoke controlled substance permits based on abuse by health care workers. Whenever a prescription is written for a federally controlled substance, a DEA prescription is printed using a federal DEA registration number which is then attached to the actual bottle of pills. In this way, the DEA can keep record of and check whether or not federally controlled drugs are being used for "legitimate medical purposes." There are numerous instances in which physicians have had their DEA registrations suspended or revoked because they used these drugs in ways that led to patients' deaths by drug overdose. Clearly then, the DEA has the authority, right and experience to do what it has always been doing—monitor the use of federally controlled substances. Even more extensive federal involvement, though, has been prompted by Oregon's assisted suicide law. It is my colleague's own state legislature, in fact, that has escalated federal involvement by enacting a law that freely uses federally controlled substances for assisted suicides. In so doing, Oregon has practically demanded, perhaps unintentionally, that the federal government review and clarify its policy regarding what constitutes a "legitimate medical purpose." The federal government obviously has a right to say how federally controlled substances can be used. And so it is the aim of H.R. 2260 to address this question by clarifying the federal government's policy on the use of federally controlled substances in relation to assisted suicides.

Department of Justice policy currently forces the federal government to implicitly endorse

assisted suicide by directing the DEA to allow federally controlled substances to be used in any manner which a state's assisted suicide law may prescribe. Every time a lethal overdose of barbiturates is prescribed to assist an Oregon citizen's suicide, the federal authority of the DEA is invoked to authorize the prescription. Since the Controlled Substances Act requires that such prescriptions be used for a "legitimate medical purpose," the federal government implicitly endorses the use of federally controlled substances in each case of assisted suicide as a "legitimate medical purpose" under current Justice Department Policy. It is only appropriate then, that we clarify how federally controlled substances can be used instead of letting an individual state that is heroically experimenting with democracy dictate how these federally controlled substances will be used. After all, they are federally controlled substances and they require federal control.

H.R. 2260 clarifies that assisted suicide will not be performed with the federal government's blessing. It also ensures that enforcement of the Controlled Substances Act will distinguish between intentional killing and the unintended hastening of death that may rarely occur as a side-effect of aggressive pain control. (This particular distinction, by the way, is found explicitly in almost all state laws against assisted suicide enacted in recent years; it was upheld as a reasonable and workable legal standard by the U.S. Supreme Court in its *Vacco v. Quill* decision two years ago.) Finally, H.R. 2260 provides the funds needed to begin to seriously advance our understanding of pain management.

Beginning with the premise that aggressive pain control is to be encouraged as a legitimate part of modern medical practice, the legislation backs up this declaration through \$5 million per year for the training of health professionals in palliative care, and for the education of law enforcement personnel so that they will be sensitive to the legitimate needs of modern pain management when they perform their necessary task of preventing misuse. Because this legislation sends such a clear and positive message about pain management to physicians and patients, it has been endorsed by organizations that both deal with pain issues on a regular basis and are in a position to judge the merits of the legislation. Among a notable list of supporters are the American Medical Association, the National Hospice Organization, the Hospice Association of America and the American Academy of Pain Management.

In the end, the federal government, in concert with groups that understand and are active practitioners of pain management, must make a policy decision regarding the appropriate use of drugs that fall within its jurisdiction. Will they be used to kill pain or kill patients? I believe H.R. 2260 makes the right choice.

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD LEAD
POISONING PREVENTION WEEK**HON. CARRIE P. MEEK**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1999

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last week the Senate passed, by unanimous con-

sent, a resolution which designates this week—October 24, 1999, through October 30, 1999—and a similar week next year as "National Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Week." I would like to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues about the very serious problem of childhood lead poisoning.

Lead poisoning is a leading environmental health hazard to children in the United States. According to the United States Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 890,000 preschool children in the United States have harmful levels of lead in their blood which can cause serious, long-term harm to children, including reduced intelligence and attention span, behavior problems, learning disabilities, and impaired growth. Children from low-income families are 8 times more likely to be poisoned by lead than those from high income families.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked with the Alliance to End Childhood Lead Poisoning and other concerned groups to help address this problem. I would like to submit the following article from the American Journal of Public Health which further details the lead poisoning problem and strategies to combat it.

[From the American Journal of Public Health, June 1999]

PROTECTING CHILDREN FROM LEAD POISONING
AND BUILDING HEALTHY COMMUNITIES

Lead's toxicity to human organs and systems has been extensively documented for over 2 millennia. The 20th century is remarkable for the dispersal of lead throughout the human environment, making lead poisoning a community health problem of global dimensions.¹ Young children are at highest risk because of lead's neurotoxic effects, which reduce intelligence and attention span and cause learning difficulties and behavior problems.^{2,3} Blood lead screening and surveillance are important tools, but primary prevention requires controlling sources of exposure. Although the challenge varies from country to country, the steps needed to eliminate this disease are now apparent.

EVIDENCE THAT ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROLS
WORK

Over the past quarter century, progress on childhood lead poisoning in the United States has been remarkable: the mean blood lead level of US children fell by 80%, and the number of children with elevated blood leads declined by 90%.^{4,5} These changes did not occur spontaneously or by chance. Strict regulation of many lead uses, enacted after decades of determined industry opposition, has gradually detoxified the air, water, and food supply. The evidence is clear that controlling ongoing sources of lead exposure produces immediate and significant health benefits, which typically far outweigh the costs.⁶ The difficulty of cleaning up once lead contaminates the environment underscores the urgency of controlling it at the source.

THE LEGACY OF LEAD-BASED PAINT

Despite impressive progress, lead poisoning remains a serious environmental health hazard in the United States: 4.4% of all children aged 1 to 5 years have elevated blood lead levels ($\geq 10 \mu\text{g/dL}$).⁵ Lead-based paint in nearly two thirds of all U.S. housing poses by far the greatest remaining challenge.⁷ (In particular communities and populations, a variety of other sources and pathways also expose children to lead.) While children can be severely poisoned by eating paint chips, the principal pathway is chronic exposure to settled lead dust, which gets on children's

hands and toys and is ingested through normal hand-to-mouth behavior.⁸ Recent research has confirmed the important role of interior lead dust and the need for more protective standards.⁹

Two distinct scenarios account for most lead poisoning in U.S. children: paint deterioration because of poor maintenance and remodeling projects that inadvertently release lead particles. Remodeling and repainting projects that fail to control and clean up lead dust likely account for 5% to 10% of poisonings,¹⁰ a challenge that conventional health education and limited training can overcome. The dominant scenario of poisoning among U.S. children is unattended deteriorating paint and lead dust hazards in older, low-income housing. Water damage and excessive moisture are the principal causes of paint deterioration as well as of a multitude of other health hazards. For example, moisture encourages the growth of mold, mildew, mites, and microbes, which contributes to asthma and other respiratory problems.¹¹

In the 1980s, many considered the presence of leaded paint a health hazard. Paralyzed by the insuperable difficulties of full removal (the cost alone is estimated at \$500 billion),¹² the public health response was confined almost entirely to belatedly reacting to already poisoned children. Despite its appeal at many levels, literally "getting the lead out" of U.S. housing is not a feasible primary prevention strategy. Research has validated the effectiveness of strategies that safely manage leaded paint in place¹³⁻¹⁵ and has shown that poor paint condition is a stronger predictor of risk than the paint's lead content.⁸ Rather than removing lead paint from a few properties, the more effective path to protecting children at risk is to make housing lead safe, a formidable but surmountable public health challenge.

PROTECTING CHILDREN AT RISK REQUIRES NEW APPROACHES

Continuation of current strategies is unlikely to provide near-term protection to children living in low-income housing in distressed communities, who are at highest risk for lead poisoning. Four shifts in approach are required to eradicate childhood lead poisoning in the United States.

Make Lead Safety an Integral Part of Housing Activities

Recognition that poor housing condition is a root cause of lead hazards demands a shift from the traditional approach whereby experts deal with one environmental hazard at a time. Rather than being viewed as the province of a small corps of experts conducting one-time interventions, lead safety in older housing must be integrated into various activities. While "abatement contractors" are needed for complex projects, techniques for controlling moisture and lead dust must be incorporated into all housing activities, remodeling, and vacancy treatments. Basic training in moisture control and lead safety will arm painters, remodelers, maintenance staff with vital skills and can help build indigenous capacity within communities at high risk for lead poisoning. Housing codes must be updated and enforced to ensure control of moisture and lead dust hazards.

Identify and Control Lead Hazards Before Poisoning Occurs

Preventing poisoning requires demystifying the detection of property-specific lead hazards, the vast majority of which have never been identified, much less controlled. While only a certified lead expert can declare a property "safe" for legal purposes,¹⁶ visual inspections for maintenance deficiencies can trigger corrective preventive

measures. Sending a chip of peeling paint or a single "dust wipe" to an environmental laboratory for analysis (about \$5 per sample) is sufficient to detect a hazard in a high-risk property. Because deteriorated paint and dust lead levels on floors and other surfaces are strong predictors of risk, health departments need to screen high-risk housing as well as test children's blood lead levels. Parents, property owners, contractors, and community residents can be trained in a single day to conduct visual maintenance checks and environmental sampling. Environmental samples provide property-specific information that can transform the federal lead-based paint "right-to-know" law from an empty promise to a catalyst for action.¹⁷

Secure New Resources for Prevention

Both the public and private sectors need to dedicate additional resources to controlling housing-related health hazards. The lead, petroleum, and paint industries need to contribute their share to prevention through either the courts or the Congress. Managed care providers can reduce health care costs for asthma and lead poisoning by making strategic investments to address environmental hazards in housing before children are exposed. In particular, the Medicaid program, which serves children at high risk for lead poisoning,¹⁸ should explore ways to support the early identification and control of health hazards in high-risk housing. Medicaid must also start screening all young children as required¹⁹ and provide the recommended follow-up services.²⁰ Government support for affordable housing should be increased to recognize the importance of decent housing in controlling environmental health hazards and reducing health care and education costs.

Make Healthful Housing a National Environmental Priority

Protecting at-risk children from lead hazards in their homes requires reintegrating housing into public health and environmental health practice. The environmental and public health communities and those who fund their research, advocacy, and policy work must begin to shift attention from the ambient environment to confront the reality that substandard housing in distressed communities is the leading environmental health threat to U.S. children. There is no more chilling example of environmental injustice than concentrations of substandard housing in low-income urban neighborhoods, reflected by the fact that low-income children and Black children are at 8 times and 5 times higher risk for lead poisoning, respectively, than other U.S. children.⁵ Without leadership by the environmental, public health, medical, and philanthropic communities, the accelerating deterioration of housing in distressed communities will increasingly threaten health, spread blight, and devastate low-income families.

THE GLOBAL CHALLENGE

The causes of lead poisoning vary country by country and community by community.²¹ Because significant sources of lead exposure remain largely unregulated in most countries, both developed and developing, lead poisoning is typically more widespread and severe in other countries than in the United States.

A common excuse for delaying control at the source is the perceived need to determine the exact extent of the problem and the specific contribution of each source. Environmental and health officials must not allow industry's demands for screening, surveillance, or epidemiological studies to preempt or postpone the control of obvious and serious sources of exposure. Where dispersive uses of lead continue, the self-evidence of

both the problem and the remedy demands action. The ready availability of superior, practicable alternatives makes the continued use of lead inexcusable in any product with the potential for broad exposure (e.g., gasoline, paint, plumbing supplies, food cans, printing ink, fertilizer, and children's toys).

Leaded gasoline, the foremost cause of global lead exposure, is the obvious first candidate for control in the more than 150 countries in which it is still in use.²² All automobile engines can operate on unleaded gasoline,²³ and superior, cost-competitive alternatives are readily available to replace lead or reduce engine octane demand.²⁴ Removing lead from gasoline is the single greatest step to preventing lead poisoning as well as a prerequisite to achieving other air quality improvements through the introduction of catalytic converters and modern engine technology.²⁵ There is no excuse for leaded gasoline use to continue in any country after the end of this century.

Don Ryan, MURP, Alliance To End Childhood Lead Poisoning, Washington, DC; Barry Levy, MD, MPH, Barry S. Levy Associates, Sherborn, Mass; Stephanie Pollack, JD, Conservation Law Foundation, Boston, Mass; Bailus Walker, Jr, PhD, MPH, Howard University Cancer Center, Washington, DC.

REFERENCES

- ¹Florini K, Krumbhaar GC, Silbergeld EK. Legacy of Lead: America's Continuing Epidemic of Childhood Lead Poisoning. Washington, DC: Environmental Defense Fund; 1990.
- ²National Research Council. Measuring Lead Exposure in Infants, Children, and Other Sensitive Populations. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 1993.
- ³Schwartz J. Low-level lead exposure and children's IQ: a meta-analysis and search for a threshold. Environ. Res. 1994; 65:42-55.
- ⁴Pirkle JL, Brody DJ, Gunter RA, et al. The decline in blood lead levels in the United States. The National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys (NHANES). JAMA. 1994; 272:284-291.
- ⁵Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Update: blood lead levels—United States, 1991-1994 [published erratum appears in MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 1997; 46:607]. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 1997; 46:141-146.
- ⁶Salkever DS. Updated estimates of earnings benefits from reduced exposure of children to environmental lead. Environ Res. 1995; 70:1-6.
- ⁷Westat. Report on the National Survey of Lead-Based Paint in Housing. Washington, DC: Environmental Protection Agency; 1995. EPA report 747-R-95-005.
- ⁸Lanphear BP, Burgoon DA, Rust SW, et al. Environmental exposures to lead and urban children's blood levels. Environ Res. 1998; 76:120-130.
- ⁹Lanphear BP, Matte TD, Rogers J, et al. The contribution of lead-contaminated house dust and residential soil to children's blood lead levels. Environ Res. 1998; 79:51-68.
- ¹⁰Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Children with elevated blood lead levels attributed to home renovation and remodeling activities—New York, 1993-1994. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 1997; 45:1120-1123.
- ¹¹Hope A, Patterson R, Burge H, eds. Indoor Allergens: Assessing and Controlling Adverse Health Effects. Institute of Medicine. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 1993.
- ¹²US Dept of Housing and Urban Development. Report to Congress: Comprehensive and Workable Plan for the Abatement of Lead-Based Paint in Privately Owned Housing. Washington, DC: US Dept of Housing and Urban Development; 1990.
- ¹³KKI Repair and Maintenance Research Team. Lead-Based Paint Abatement and Repair and Maintenance Study in Baltimore: Findings Based on Two Years of Follow-Up. Washington, DC: Environmental Protection Agency; 1997. EPA report 747-R-97-005.
- ¹⁴Battelle Memorial Institute. Review of Studies Addressing Lead Abatement Effectiveness. Washington, DC: Environmental Protection Agency; 1995. EPA report 747-R-95-006.
- ¹⁵National Center for Lead-Safe Housing and University of Cincinnati. National Evaluation of the HUD Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control Grant Program: Fifth Interim Report. Columbia, Md: National Center for Lead-Safe Housing; 1998.

¹⁶US Dept of Housing and Urban Development. Putting the Pieces Together: Controlling Lead Hazards in the Nation's Housing. Washington, DC: US Dept of Housing and Urban Development; 1995. Publication HUD-1547-LBP.

¹⁷Disclosure of Known Lead-Based Paint Hazards Upon Sale or Lease of Residential Property. 35 CFR pt 35 subpt H and 40 CFR pt 745 subpt F (1996).

¹⁸US General Accounting Office. Lead Poisoning: Federal Health Care Programs Are Not Effectively Reaching At-Risk Children. Washington, DC: US General Accounting Office; 1999. Publication GAO/HEHS-99-18.

¹⁹State Medicaid Manual §5132.2, revision 12 (1998). Washington, DC: Health Care Financing Administration; update of 42 USC §1396d(r)(1) (1989).

²⁰Centers for Disease Control. Preventing Lead Poisoning in Young Children. Atlanta, Ga: Centers for Disease Control; 1991.

²¹Rapuano M, Florini K. The Global dimensions of Lead Poisoning. Washington, DC: Alliance To End Childhood Lead Poisoning and Environmental Defense Fund; 1994.

²²Lovei M. Phasing Out Lead From Gasoline: World-Wide Experience and Policy Implications. Washington, DC: The World Bank; 1996. Paper no. 040.

²³Environmental Protection Agency. Costs and Benefits of Reducing Lead in Gasoline: Final Regulatory Impact Analysis. Washington, DC: Environmental Protection Agency, 1985. EPA report 230-05-85-006.

²⁴Alliance To End Childhood Lead Poisoning. Myths and Realities of Phasing Out Leaded Gasoline. Washington, DC: Alliance To End Childhood Lead Poisoning; 1997.

²⁵Alliance To End Childhood Lead Poisoning. International Action Plan for Preventing Lead Poisoning. Washington, DC: Alliance To End Childhood Lead Poisoning; 1995.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, October 26, 1999 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 27

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold a business meeting on pending calendar business; to be followed by hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for elementary and secondary education assistance, focusing on Indian educational programs.

SR-285

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

Armed Services

To hold hearings on the nomination of The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601: Gen. Joseph W. Ralston, 9172, To be General; the nomination of The following named officer for appointment as Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 154: Gen. Richard B. Myers, 7092, To be General; the nomination of The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601: Gen. Thomas A. Schwartz, 0711, To be General; and the nomination of The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601: Gen. Ralph E. Eberhart, 7375, To be General.

SH-216

10 a.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on terrorism issues, focusing on victims' access to terrorist assets.

SD-226

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Securities Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the impact of ECNs, focusing on the changing face of capital markets.

SD-538

10:30 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the future of U.S.-China relations.

SD-419

1:45 p.m.

Judiciary

Criminal Justice Oversight Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the Justice Department's response to international parental kidnapping.

SD-226

3 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on numerous tax treaties and protocol.

SD-419

OCTOBER 28

9:30 a.m.

Small Business

To hold hearings on the Environmental Protection Agency's recent rulemaking in regards to small businesses.

SR-428A

Armed Services

To hold hearings on United States national security implications of the 1999 NATO Strategic Concept.

SH-216

10 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on issues relating to E-commerce.

SR-253

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on the nomination of Joshua Gotbaum, of New York, to be Controller, Office of Federal Financial Management, Office of Management and Budget.

SD-628

10:30 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of Joseph W. Prueher, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of China.

SD-419

1:30 p.m.

Judiciary

Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine media competition and consolidation in the new millennium, focusing on the Viacom/CBS merger.

SD-226

2 p.m.

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters.

SH-219

2:30 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Manufacturing and Competitiveness Subcommittee

To hold hearings on challenges confronting the machine tool industry.

SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources

Water and Power Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the Federal hydroelectric licensing process.

SD-366

OCTOBER 29

10 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of Joseph R. Crapa, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development; Willene A. Johnson, of New York, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank; and Alan Phillip Larson, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary of State (Economic, Business and Agricultural Affairs).

SD-419

NOVEMBER 2

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the recent announcement by President Clinton to review approximately 40 million acres of national forest lands for increased protection.

SD-366

10 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on the World Trade Organization, its Seattle Ministerial, and the Millennium Round.

SD-538

NOVEMBER 4

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Resources on S. 1586, to reduce the fractionated ownership of Indian Lands; and S. 1315, to permit the leasing of oil and gas rights on certain lands held in trust for the Navajo Nation or allotted to a member of the Navajo Nation, in any case in which there is consent from a specified percentage interest in the parcel of land under consideration for lease.

Room to be announced

POSTPONEMENTS

OCTOBER 27

2:30 p.m.

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings on S. 1405, to amend the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge Authority Act of 1995 to provide an authorization of contract authority for fiscal years 2004 through 2007.

SD-406

Monday, October 25, 1999

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S13067–S13107

Measures Introduced: Eleven bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1774–1784, and S. Res. 206. **Page S13089**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows: S. 1754, entitled the “Denying Safe Havens to International and War Criminals Act of 1999”, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S13089**

Measures Passed:

Death of Senator Chafee: Senate agreed to S. Res. 206, relative to the death of the Honorable John H. Chafee, of Rhode Island. **Page S13082**

African Growth and Opportunity Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for the consideration of the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 434, to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa, on Tuesday, October 26, 1999, with a vote on the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to occur at 10 a.m. **Page S13107**

Messages From the House: **Page S13087**

Measures Referred: **Page S13087–88**

Measures Placed on Calendar: **Page S13088**

Communications: **Pages S13088–89**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S13089–S13102**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S13102–03**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S13103–05**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S13105**

Authority for Committees: **Page S13105**

Additional Statements:

Pages S13105–07

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 noon, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator John Chafee, of Rhode Island, in accordance with S. Res. 206, adjourned at 6:01 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Tuesday, October 26, 1999. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S13107.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

HIGH-TECH FRAUD ON SMALL BUSINESS

Committee on Small Business: Committee held hearings to examine incidents of the high-tech fraud known as “cramming”, the inclusion of unauthorized, misleading, or deceptive charges on a consumer’s telephone bill, focusing on fraudulent Internet Web site services affecting small business, receiving testimony from Stanley J. Czerwinski, Associate Director, Housing and Community Development Issues, Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division, General Accounting Office; Jodie Bernstein, Director, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission; Peter L. Franchino, Elam Biggs Bed and Breakfast, Grass Valley, California; David W. Pickering, Pickering Funeral Home, Mexico, Missouri, on behalf of the First Baptist Church of Mexico; Susan Toney, Creative Car Works, Maryland Heights, Missouri; Kelly A. Cramer, Protel Advantage, Inc., and David D. Cramer, Eau Claire Police Department, both of Eau Claire, Wisconsin; and Joel Bittner, North County Distributions, San Diego, California.

Hearings recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 9 public bills, H.R. 3136–3144; and 3 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 205–206, and H. Res. 341, were introduced.

Page H10769

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 1801, to make technical corrections to various antitrust laws and to references to such laws (H. Rept. 106–411 Pt. 1);

H.R. 3028, to amend certain trademark laws to prevent the misappropriation of marks, amended (H. Rept. 106–412);

H.R. 2885, to provide uniform safeguards for the confidentiality of information acquired for exclusively statistical purposes, and to improve the efficiency and quality of Federal statistics and Federal statistical programs by permitting limited sharing of records among designated agencies for statistical purposes under strong safeguards, amended (H. Rept. 106–413); and

H. Res. 342, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1987) to allow the recovery of attorneys' fees and costs by certain employers and labor organizations who are prevailing parties in proceedings brought against them by the National Labor Relations Board or by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (H. Rept. 106–414).

Page H10769

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Morella to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H10727

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Rev. Dr. Robert Dvorak of Middletown, Connecticut.

Page H10729

Journal: Agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of Thursday, October 22 by yeas and nays vote of 349 yeas to 41 nays with one voting "present", Roll No. 533.

Pages H10729, H10743–44

Recess: The House recessed at 12:47 p.m. and reconvened at 2:00 p.m.

Page H10729

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Exempting Certain Reports from Automatic Elimination and Sunset: H.R. 3111, amended, to exempt certain reports from automatic elimination and sunset pursuant to the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995;

Pages H10730–31

Permitting Non-Congressional Federal Employees to Enroll Their Children in the House Child Care Center: H.R. 3122, to permit the enrollment in the House of Representatives Child Care Center of children of Federal employees who are not employees of the legislative branch;

Pages H10736–37

Authorizing Pay Adjustments for Administrative Law Judges: H.R. 915, amended, to authorize a cost of living adjustment in the pay of administrative law judges;

Pages H10740–43

Made in America Information Act: H.R. 754, amended, to establish a toll free number under the Federal Trade Commission to assist consumers in determining if products are American-made (passed by a yeas and nays vote of 390 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 534). Agreed to amend the title;

Pages H10731–33, H10744

History of the House Awareness and Preservation Act: H.R. 2303, amended, to direct the Librarian of Congress to prepare the history of the House of Representatives (passed by a yeas and nays vote of 388 yeas to 7 nays, Roll No. 535); and

Pages H10733–36, H10745

Recognizing the Contributions of 4-H Clubs: H. Con. Res. 194, recognizing the contributions of 4-H Clubs and their members to voluntary community service (agreed to by a yeas and nays vote of 391 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 536).

Pages H10737–40, H10745–46

Recess: The House recessed at 3:39 p.m. and reconvened at 6:02 p.m.

Page H10743

Condolences on the Death of the Honorable John H. Chafee: The House agreed to H. Res. 341, expressing the condolences of the House on the death of the Honorable John H. Chafee, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

Pages H10747–53

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate on October 22 and today appear on pages H10727 and H10729.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yeas and nays votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H10743–44, H10744, H10745, and H10745–46. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 341, adjourned at 9:58 as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable John H. Chafee of Rhode Island.

Committee Meetings

FAIR ACCESS TO INDEMNITY AND REIMBURSEMENT ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a modified open rule, providing 1 hour of debate on H.R. 1987, Fair Access to Indemnity and Reimbursement Act. The rule makes in order the Committee on Education and the Workforce amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, which shall be open for amendment at any point. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Congressional Record and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. The rule provides that each amendment printed in the Congressional Record may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee, and that each amendment shall be considered as read. The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce voting time to five minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a fifteen minute vote. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Fletcher, Clay and Andrews.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D1186)

H.J. Res.71, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000. Signed October 21, 1999. (P.L. 106-75)

S. 323, to redesignate the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument as a national park and establish the Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area. Signed October 21, 1999. (P.L. 106-76)

H.R. 560, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at the intersection of Comercio and San Justo Streets, in San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the "Jose V. Toledo Federal Building and United States Courthouse". Signed October 22, 1999. (P.L. 106-77)

H.R. 1906, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000. Signed October 22, 1999. (P.L. 106-78)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1999

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings on issues deal-

ing with the Puducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, 9:30 a.m., SD-124.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings on the status of United States military forces, 9:30 a.m., SH-216.

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, to hold hearings on the Real Property Management Program and the maintenance of the historic homes and senior offices' quarters, 2:30 p.m., SR-222.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold oversight hearings on the interpretation and implementation plans of subsistence management regulations for public lands in Alaska, 9:30 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings on the use of seclusion and restraints in mental hospitals; to be followed by a hearing on the nomination of William A. Halter, of Arkansas, to be Deputy Commissioner of Social Security, 10 a.m., SD-215.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, to hold hearings to examine Chinese espionage at United States nuclear facilities and the transfer of United States technology to China, 2 p.m., S-407, Capitol.

Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nomination of Ann Claire Williams, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit; Faith S. Hochberg, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey; Frank H. McCarthy, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Oklahoma; and Virginia A. Phillips, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, 3 p.m., SD-226.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Readiness, hearing on the readiness impact of operations in Kosovo: problems encountered, lessons learned, and reconstitution, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, hearing on Russian threat perceptions and plans for sabotage against the United States, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on the state of security at the Department of Energy's Los Alamos National Laboratory (New Mexico) and Sandia National Laboratory (New Mexico), 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection, oversight hearing on Federal Communications Commission Reform for the New Millennium, 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, to mark up the following: Presidential Transition Act Amendment of 1999; and H.R. 2376, to require executive agencies to establish expedited review procedures for granting a waiver to a State under a grant program administered by the agency if another State has already been granted a similar waiver by the agency under such program, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, to mark up H.R. 1838, Taiwan Security Enhancement Act, 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, hearing on U.S. Trade Policies and Agricultural Disease: Safety, Economic, and Global Considerations, 1:30 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, oversight hearing on Bankruptcy Judgeship Needs; followed by a hearing and mark-up of H.J. Res. 72, granting the consent of the Congress to the Red River Boundary Compact, 2 p.m., 2226 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Constitution, hearing on H.R. 2442, Wartime Violation of Italian American Civil Liberties Act, 9:30 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, to continue oversight hearings on the Federal Aid Programs administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Part III), 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 1509, to authorize the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor veterans who became disabled while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States; and H.R. 2532, National Heritage Areas Policy Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Basic Research, hearing on Education Research: Is What We Don't Know Hurting Our Children? 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Technology and the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology of the Committee on Government Reform, joint hearing on Y2K and Nuclear Power: Will Reactors React Responsibly?, 10:15 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Benefits, hearing on Persian Gulf War veterans issues, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE
9:30 a.m., Tuesday, October 26

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 434, African Growth and Opportunity Act, with a vote on the motion to close further debate thereon, to occur at 10 a.m. Also, Senate will consider any appropriations conference reports when available.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Tuesday, October 26

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of 14 suspensions:

(1) H.R. 3061, Amending the Immigration and Nationality Act to Extend for an Additional 2 Years the Period for Admission of an Alien as a Nonimmigrant;

(2) H. Con. Res. 190, Urging the United States to Seek a Global Consensus Supporting a Moratorium on Tariffs and on Special, Multiple and Discriminatory Taxation of Electronic Commerce;

(3) H. Con. Res. 197, Expressing the Sense of Congress that There Should Be No Increase in Federal Taxes in Order to Fund Additional Government Spending;

(4) H.R. 970, Perkins County Rural Water System Act of 1999;

(5) H.R. 1528, National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1999;

(6) H.R. 2970, Rongelap Resettlement Act of 1999;

(7) H.R. 2496, Reauthorizing the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994;

(8) H.R. 1753, Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act;

(9) H. Con. Res. 20, Concerning Economic, Humanitarian and Other Assistance to the Northern Part of Somalia;

(10) H. Con. Res. 46, Urging an End of the War Between Eritrea and Ethiopia and Calling on the United Nations Human Rights Commission and Other Human Rights Organizations to Investigate Human Rights Abuses in Connection with the Eritrean and Ethiopian Conflict;

(11) H. Con. Res. 188, Commending Greece and Turkey for Their Mutual and Swift Response to the Recent Earthquakes in Both Countries by Providing to Each Other Humanitarian Assistance and Rescue Relief;

(12) H.R. 1175, Locating and Securing the Return of Zachary Baumel, an American Citizen, and Other Israeli Soldiers Missing in Action;

(13) H. Con. Res. 102, Celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and Recognizing the Humanitarian Safeguards These Treaties Provide in Times of Armed Conflict; and

(14) H.R. 2885, Statistical Efficiency Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barcia, James A., Mich., E2179
Barr, Bob, Ga., E2168, E2172
Bentsen, Ken, Tex., E2176
Berman, Howard L., Calif., E2167, E2169
Capps, Lois, Calif., E2176
Crowley, Joseph, N.Y., E2175
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E2177
Dixon, Julian C., Calif., E2167
Gejdenson, Sam, Conn., E2167, E2170

Gekas, George W., Pa., E2174
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E2177
Lantos, Tom, Calif., E2174
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E2177
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E2174
Matsui, Robert T., Calif., E2173
Meek, Carrie P., Fla., E2179
Moakley, John Joseph, Mass., E2175
Moran, Jerry, Kans., E2175
Morella, Constance A., Md., E2177
Owens, Major R., N.Y., E2167

Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E2173
Radanovich, George, Calif., E2178
Rahall, Nick J., II, West Va., E2169, E2172
Riley, Bob, Ala., E2175
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana, Fla., E2174
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E2176
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E2178
Smith, Nick, Mich., E2172
Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E2168, E2170
Udall, Mark, Colo., E2171, E2173
Vitter, David, La., E2169, E2172



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, \$165.00 for six months, \$325.00 per year, or purchased for \$2.75 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. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954, or phone orders to (202) 512-1800, or fax to (202) 512-2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶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