



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1999

No. 153

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

November 3, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVEN C. LATOURETTE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray, using the words of Psalm 46:

God is our refuge and strength,
a very present help in trouble.
Therefore, we will not fear
though the earth should change,
though the mountains shake in the heart of
the sea;
though its waters roar and foam,
though the mountains tremble with its tumult.
There is a river whose streams make glad
the city of God,
the holy habitation of the Most High.
God is in the midst of her, she shall not be
moved;
God will help her right early.
The nations rage, the kingdoms totter;
He utters His voice,
the earth melts.
The lord of hosts is with us;
The God of Jacob is our refuge. 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. McNULTY. 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. McNULTY. 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The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.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 California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. McDevitt, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 440. An act to provide support for certain institutes and schools.

S. 1843. An act to designate certain Federal land in the Talladega National Forest, Alabama, as the "Dugger Mountain Wilderness".

S. 1844. An act to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide for an

alternative penalty procedure with respect to compliance with requirements for a State disbursement unit.

S. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of "Capitol Builder: The Shorthand Journals of Captain Montgomery C. Meigs, 1853-1861".

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of "The United States Capitol: A Chronicle of Construction, Design, and Politics".

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 15 1-minute speeches on each side.

GOOD NEWS

(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, no surprises, just some good news. Yesterday the U.S. Government announced that it paid off nearly \$16 billion of the national debt.

There is more. The Treasury Department also stated that it expected to retire another \$12 billion in the first quarter of next year alone. We are beginning to pay off that \$5.5 trillion national debt, and for the first time since Dwight D. Eisenhower was President, the U.S. can boast of back-to-back budget surpluses.

How did we achieve those budget surpluses? Simple, a Republican Congress remained committed to reducing wasteful government spending.

As we continue to debate the appropriation bills for next year, it is my hope that we can continue to build upon our successes. Americans want and deserve a Federal Government that spends their tax dollars wisely. Let us not disappoint them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of any remaining government waste that continues to permeate this area.

□ 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.

H11375

REGARDING THE BROOKLYN MUSEUM

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the First Amendment on a very important victory. A Federal court has ordered the mayor of the city of New York and his administration to end its campaign to evict the Brooklyn Museum from its facilities over an exhibit that he and some others found offensive.

This was not a serious challenge for the First Amendment, because it is clear to even students of the most basic constitutional law class that this case had no merit and was brought for entirely political reasons, though every once in a while it is nice to reaffirm that the First Amendment is as strong as ever.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill of Rights is clear, the government may not interfere with the free expression of anyone. What the mayor and his administration attempted to do was censorship, pure and simple. The mayor tried to impose his own cultural tastes on the museum, and tried to hold it hostage to his demands that a particular exhibition would be withdrawn.

If he had been victorious, it could have had a real chilling effect. But the First Amendment is stronger than the whims of elected officials. It has won yet again. Quoting from the said Federal court decision, "There is no Federal constitutional issue more grave than the effort by government officials to censor works of expression and to threaten the vitality of a major cultural institution as a punishment for failing to abide by governmental demands for orthodoxy."

This is a victory for the Brooklyn Museum, for the artistic community, a victory for the First Amendment, and for constitutional liberty.

REPUBLICANS MAKE WASHINGTON KICK TWO BAD HABITS AT ONCE

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, bad habits are hard to break, especially when those habits are 30 years old.

Maybe it should not surprise me that the Washington big spenders who have raided the social security trust fund for the last 30 years are having trouble kicking that habit.

But just because it is not surprising does not mean that it is okay. It is not okay to raid the social security trust fund and use the money for other governmental programs. It is not okay to jeopardize the retirement security of millions of hard-working Americans.

While I am not surprised that President Clinton and the Democrats in Congress are having such trouble kick-

ing this bad habit, I am disappointed by it. But we Republicans will stand firm. We have stopped the social security raid. We have passed a bill that protects the retirement money of America's working men and women, and at the same time we are rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse in Washington bureaucracy.

We are making Washington kick two bad habits at once. That is what I call good government.

REPUBLICANS' TAX BREAK PLANS STILL IGNORE NEEDS OF DESERVING AMERICANS

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, for 9 months out of this year the Republicans fought for a \$1 trillion tax cut at the expense of our balanced budget and at the expense of our social security system. That was overwhelmingly rejected by the people of this country.

Now the Republicans tell us that we cannot afford a prescription drug benefit for our seniors, that we cannot afford a Patients' Bill of Rights to protect our families against managed care and HMOs that deny them care, that we cannot afford a minimum wage for our low-income workers in this Nation, and that we cannot extend the fiscal security of social security by even one day.

No, the Republicans still want to try to pass tax breaks for the wealthiest individuals, corporations, and special interests in this country. When in this session, in the last remaining 8 or 10 days of this session, when is it that Republicans are going to start thinking about our elderly, our children, and the working families of this Nation?

LOCKBOX

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, this House demonstrated this year that it is indeed possible to stop the raid on social security. We know this is the right thing to do. Americans know this is the right thing to do. Of course, the right thing to do is not always the easy thing to do. It is a lesson we all learned as children, and it is a lesson we all hope to pass on to our own children.

On May 26, this House voted to make doing the right thing a little easier by passing the social security lockbox, with a vote of 416 to 12. With the lockbox protections in place, raiding social security will no longer be an easy thing for the President to do.

The House passed the lockbox bill 160 days ago. For 160 days, the Democrat party in the other Chamber has held this vital bill hostage. They are refusing to allow the bill to the Senate floor for a vote.

It is time to do the right thing for America's seniors, for their children, and for their children's children. One hundred sixty days is too long to leave social security unprotected from the President's propensity to spend and spend and spend.

THE LADY BUCKEYES AT THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. The Ohio State women's rugby team, Mr. Speaker, wanted to do something memorable in D.C. It was memorable, all right. Unlike Brandy Chastain's highly publicized sports bra expose, the Lady Buckeyes went topless. That is right, topless. The Lincoln Memorial became a strip joint. Bras were flying everywhere. Unbelievable.

Now, after all this, the University has suspended the team, and these Buckeye vixens are awaiting the final decision.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. Leave these foxy ladies alone. If America can forgive the President, the Ohio State University can forgive these Buckeye divas. I yield back all of the memorable excitement at the Lincoln Memorial.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to avoid personal references to the President of the United States.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS P. FISCHER

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

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Thomas P. Fischer as he today begins his last day of public service. After serving his country in Vietnam and other Federal positions, Tom Fischer accepted the challenge of serving in a leadership position in the Immigration and Naturalization Service, including heading the INS district office in Atlanta.

The people who have benefited from Tom Fischer's public service are legion: the hundreds of Federal workers who have served under him; the many public officials, including myself as the U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, that served alongside of him; and thousands of hopeful new American citizens that he helped guide on their road to citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, as Thomas Fischer begins today his last day of Federal service, I join in thanking him for an outstanding job, and wishing him well in his new endeavors, which will, I am certain, be marked by the same integrity, dedication, patriotism, and diligence that have characterized every day of his service to America.

A SALUTE TO JACK McNULTY ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS FIRST ELECTION TO PUBLIC OFFICE

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

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to salute the Honorable John J. McNulty, Junior, the mayor of the village of Green Island, New York. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, Jack McNulty celebrated the 50th anniversary of his first election to public office in November of 1949.

At various times during his career he has served as the supervisor of the town of Green Island, as the mayor of the village of Green Island, as the sheriff of Albany County, and as a member of the New York State Commission on Correction.

Mr. Speaker, if we ask anyone in public life in upstate New York, Republican, Democrat, liberal, or conservative, about the reputation of Jack McNulty, they will tell us that he stands for everything that is good and honest and decent about public life.

So I am very proud to salute this constituent today, Mr. Speaker. And oh, yes, incidentally, he is my dad.

ANNOUNCING PRESS CONFERENCE ON A NEW SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY BILL

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this morning at 11 a.m. I will be holding a press conference announcing a new social security bill that will keep social security solvent forever. That press conference at 11 a.m. this morning is going to be held at the triangle southeast of the steps. If it rains or snows it will be in room 210, the Committee on the Budget room.

I announce this, Mr. Speaker, because I notice some publications noted that it was going to be in the press gallery. It is going to be at the triangle.

The reason for the change is about a dozen organizations will be present that have agreed to support my bill.

I would just encourage, Mr. Speaker, everybody in this Chamber to decide what legislation, scored by the Social Security Administration keeps Social Security solvent, they support. There are several such bills already introduced, or come up with your own bill as long as it is scored by the Social Security Administration to make this important program solvent. I think time has gone for rhetoric. We need action to support and move ahead with legislation that is going to keep social security solvent.

ELECTIONS

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the floor of this assembly I spoke about the sleeper issue in the 2000 election that was emerging in the ballot initiatives across the country. The ballot results are in. We need look no further than northern Virginia to see that growth and livable communities, quality of life, are becoming the emerging issue.

Even the Virginia victory by the Republicans in the legislature was due to more than a huge infusion of campaign money. Republican candidates took moderate positions on gun violence, unplanned growth, and transportation.

We do not have to wait to the year 2000 election. I strongly urge my Republican colleagues to embrace these elements of livable communities: hiring more teachers, police, reducing gun violence, and giving communities the mechanisms to manage growth. America will be the winner.

LAST WEEK THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS STOPPED THE 30-YEAR RAID ON SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, last week was a truly remarkable week in Washington because the Republican Congress stopped the 30-year raid on social security. We passed all 13 appropriations bills without touching the surplus in the social security trust fund. We did it requiring big government in Washington to be a little more responsible with the taxpayers' hard-earned money.

A 1 percent across-the-board reduction in bureaucratic spending will mean less waste, fraud, and abuse in government, and it will mean that the social security will be there for American retirees. A penny saved is a retirement secured.

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a great accomplishment. If the President vetoes our plan to strengthen social security by cutting government waste, we will send him another bill that does the very same thing. This is no time for political gamesmanship, because the retirement security of the millions of Americans is at stake. Strengthening social security is a top priority for the Republican Congress, and I sincerely hope that the President and his party will join us in meeting that goal.

□ 1015

THE GOP TAKES A GUILLOTINE TO OUR VETERANS PROGRAMS

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

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, with the approach of Veterans' Day, we must re-

member the sacrifices made by those that have fought to preserve our freedom. Fortunately, our society has been blessed with many leaders who learned the values of responsibility and loyalty and leadership while wearing the uniform of this country. For without their dedication to duty, we would not enjoy the many freedoms this fortunate America has to offer.

Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility to honor the commitments that we have made our veterans. At a time when our economy is the strongest in decades and the Federal Government is experiencing budget surpluses, it is incomprehensible to me that Republicans would have, as its top priority, an across-the-board cut to our veterans' programs and benefits. This loss of funding would threaten the very survival of our veterans' health care system.

The Republicans' decision to cut these programs is misguided and ill-advised. Yes, we need to get to the Nation's work and we need to come to a budget agreement but let us not do it at the expense of our sick and disabled veterans.

THE \$3 MILLION DUCK, DISCOVERED AND STOPPED BY TWO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the previous speaker that the Republican budget has more money for veterans in it than was requested by the President.

Mr. Speaker, we have all heard about the million dollar man. Well, believe it or not, now we have a \$3 million duck. That is right, we now know that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service planned to spend \$30 million on a small island 1,000 miles south of Hawaii for a wildlife refuge for migratory ducks. The only problem is there are only 10 ducks on the island. That is \$3 million per duck.

The ducks probably think this is a pretty good deal. After all, they each get \$3 million. But I do not think taxpayers think this is such a great deal.

This is just the last example of government waste uncovered by Congress. It all comes down to whether or not we are willing to root out government waste or to protect Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have stopped the 30-year raid on Social Security. The President now shares our commitment. We can lock away every penny of Social Security if we simply root out some government waste.

Mr. Speaker, there is some good news. The 10 ducks on that island are not going to get their \$30 million because two Members of Congress discovered this program and they stopped this quack program.

All we have to do is stop all such programs and we can save Social Security from waste, inefficiency and absurdity.

CONGRESS SHOULD PASS SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on this House to pass school construction legislation before we adjourn for the year. We should not even consider ending this session until we tend to the needs of our children for new school construction.

Across the country at this very moment more than 53 million children are attending classes in our Nation's schools. We now have more children in our schools than we have had at any time in our history even at the height of the baby boom.

Our schools are bursting at the seams and we know that the explosion in enrollment growth we are experiencing and will experience over the next 10 years is going to stretch local communities even farther.

Today many of our children are in overstuffed classrooms. Too many of our teachers are forced to struggle in cramped trailers instead of a quality facility, and too many parents must watch helplessly as their children are condemned to attend a run-down school because Congress refuses to act.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress must not leave town without addressing this crisis. We must not sneak out the back-door without passing commonsense school construction assistance.

A SUCCESSFUL AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAM

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, after-school hours are the most vulnerable for school children to become involved with gangs, with drug abuse, with violence and with vandalism. Statistics demonstrate that between 3:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m., the immediate hour after most children are released from school, juvenile crime more than doubles from the preceding hour of 2:00 to 3:00.

It has become evident that safe and healthy alternatives need to be found for latchkey school children and that concentrated efforts, ones that focus on literacy, on tutoring, on homework assistance, are becoming necessary, especially for our at-risk youth.

YMCA's, like many after-school programs, have helped improve children's academic achievements, their school attendance, their behavior, their dropout rates and grade retention.

Denis Espinosa, a young man who recently testified at a Children's Caucus event here in Washington, is evidence that an after-school program can guide children to becoming responsible and productive adults. I congratulate Denis for his exemplary outlook, as well as

Anna Nechelles, executive director of the West Dade Branch of the YMCA, for her commitment to the future of south Florida's children.

GOP BUDGET IS A WOLF IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, all year the GOP Congress has employed gimmicks and distractions against the American people in their attempt to pass a nearly trillion dollar tax break for the wealthy and special interests in our country, a tax break soundly rejected by hard-working Americans. In the past few months, the GOP has dressed its trickle-down, wolf-like budget in sheep's clothing. They now claim to be protecting Social Security, even calling for across-the-board cuts to save the surplus, when their own CBO numbers show them dipping into the Social Security surplus by nearly \$17 billion.

Back in 1935, they voted to table Social Security. How can we expect them today to try to protect it?

Now they are advocating a minimum wage bill, but upon further examination the minimum wage bill is loaded down with a tax relief for the wealthiest special interests in this country with only a 33-cent raise each year over the next 3 years for hard-working men and women in this country; a tax break for the wealthiest corporate CEOs in the history of the world and a measly 30 cents an hour raise for their workers.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a back-door attempt, an attempt made in sheep's clothing, for the GOP leadership to give their best friends a tax break.

NO MEANS NO

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, they just do not get it. President Clinton, Vice President Gore and the Democrat leaders in Congress are failing to grasp one simple concept: No means no.

When we passed every appropriations bill this year, we did it in a way that will protect every last dollar in the Social Security trust fund, but the Democrat leaders have opposed us almost every step of the way. They are pulling out all the stops to try to get their hands on that Social Security money for their big government Washington programs. That is the way they have been doing things for 30 years, but the Republicans have changed that. We stopped the raid on the Social Security trust fund and we are asking the Washington bureaucracy to reduce its spending by just 1 percent to make sure that Social Security remains strong.

We want to root out some of the waste, fraud and abuse that plagues the bureaucracy. So I hope President Clinton will sign our legislation that protects Social Security, because if he keeps telling us to dip into that Social Security money we will keep telling him no, and we will mean it.

THE REAL CONCERNS OF AMERICA, SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, HMO REFORM, TO NAME A FEW

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the American people want us to put aside the partisanship of the last Republican Congress and to get to work on American families' real concerns, the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, real HMO reform, more teachers and lower class sizes for our children.

Unfortunately, this Republican Congress has been little different from the last. They are holding hostage real HMO reform and they refuse to help local communities reduce class size by hiring 100,000 new teachers.

The chief actuary of the Social Security Administration has found that the Republican budget would do nothing to extend the life of Social Security, not by even a single day. They have done nothing to strengthen Medicare, and GOP leaders refuse to even admit the existence of American seniors' most pressing problem, the astronomical cost of prescription drugs.

On the other hand, Republicans tried to squander the surplus, risking Medicare and Social Security, to fund a \$1 trillion tax break for special interests. Those are the values of this Republican Congress, Mr. Speaker, \$1 trillion for tax breaks for special interests but not a dime for prescription drugs for seniors.

WE NEED A PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this morning I rise to join my colleagues in lamenting legislation important to my constituents and the American people that the Republican leadership has ignored. I am speaking about gun safety, prescription drug benefits, the Patients' Bill of Rights and campaign finance reform.

The Republican leadership has disregarded the American people and killed these measures for this session of Congress. Democrats still believe we can get action on agendas that matter to reduce class size and raise student achievement by providing for local schools to hire 100,000 new teachers, make our neighborhoods safer and build on the progress we have made

over the last 7 years in reducing violent crime by funding 50,000 new police officers. We are committed to safeguarding the environment.

Another year, another Republican Congress that ignores the needs of middle class families; more interest in providing a trillion dollar tax cut for corporate and special interests, but they do not care about finding a dime for Medicare prescription drugs for seniors and now they are at the beck and call of the HMO lobbyists but they have failed to send a bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights to Congress. It is time for all of these programs to get in place now more than ever.

THE MONEY BELONGS TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, NOT THE GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in Washington there are a couple of things that are misunderstood, mostly by the liberals, that the government does not have money. Big shock, the government does not have money. It is the American people's money. It is hard-working America whose money is talked about as if it is theirs.

The money goes into two pots. One is for general spending and another pot, there are a lot of trust funds but the major two, the other pot is for Social Security. In the general fund pot, we are out. Yet we have heard today speaker after speaker say we need more spending for this, we need more spending for that.

Indeed, most of the liberals voted against the appropriations bills because they did not spend enough money. Well, my question is, if we are out of money in this pot and we have a lot of money in this pot, is that where we are going to get it? Because that is Social Security. If we are not going to take it from this trust fund, then we must want to increase taxes.

Wait a minute. Two weeks ago the other side joined Republicans and voted 419-to-0 against the Clinton tax proposals. The only way to do this, to make our budget, is to cut one cent out of the dollar. I hope the Democrats will join us on that.

THE FINAL YEAR OF THE 20TH CENTURY, A DISAPPOINTMENT FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, to my prior colleague, I would just say there is no money to deal with his budget and it is because they had an \$892 billion tax cut for the wealthiest people in this country. Had they not tried this trick, we would be in a different position here today.

This year, the final year, of the 20th century, has been a disappointing one for the American families. Every time Congress has had the opportunity to help families in a meaningful way, the Republican leadership has sided with the special interests over the public interests.

□ 1030

The list of casualties is long: A patients' bill of rights, campaign finance reform, Medicare prescription drug benefits, smaller class sizes, and sensible gun safety reform is also being killed.

Since the Columbine tragedy occurred more than 6 months ago, the Republican leadership has consistently stifled every attempt to pass common sense gun safety measures, and yet 13 children every day are killed by guns, with 100,000 kids bringing guns to school every year. They should be ashamed of themselves, the Republican leadership, for letting the NRA write our gun laws and obstructing our attempts to close the loopholes that give criminals and children easy access to guns.

REPUBLICANS WANT TO GIVE BACK TO HARD-WORKING AMERICANS

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, at the outset let me commend my friend from New York (Mr. McNULTY) and his dad for 50 years of wonderful service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is healthy, and for those who feel clouded by the debate here, I would just like to put it in very simple terms: The core difference between the parties here, as I see it, is the notion of who wants to strengthen personal freedom; who wants to give back to the hard-working Americans who go work at sometimes two and three jobs to support their families, to put food on the table, to buy clothes for their kids for school, to buy that new microwave oven; who wants to be on their side and give them more of their hard-earned money back, and who feels it is appropriate for Washington to keep as much money as possible?

We had the debate about the appropriations bills. Well, the ordinary American is telling us to do our business and come back home. But what we have heard is that Congress passes the bills within certain caps, the White House vetoes it, yet never says where they want to get the additional money from to spend on their additional programs. I think it is legitimate for the American people to ask where is that money coming from.

AMERICANS WANT A CONGRESS THAT WORKS FOR THEM

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, here we are in November, and, quite frankly, this Republican Congress has done very little. The appropriations bills languish and the needs of the American people are not being met.

The GOP has spent the year trying to convince the American people that they need a \$792 billion tax cut for the wealthiest Americans, but America saw through this tax giveaway which raided the Social Security Trust Fund and rejected it.

Instead, the American people asked for things that cost very little and would improve their lives, like a patients' bill of rights so Americans and doctors can make their medical decisions and not the HMOs; like the increase in the minimum wage so all Americans can enjoy this strong economy; like 100,000 more teachers so we can reduce the class sizes; and why, Mr. Speaker, can we not enforce all the gun laws on the books and do background checks on every commercial sale of a gun, even those at gun shows?

No more excuses, no more exceptions. Mr. Speaker, let us work for the American people. Unfortunately, under the Republican-led Congress, it is always the same old song: More tax breaks for the rich and more tax on government. America wants a Congress that works for them, like Democrats are fighting for.

SOCIAL SECURITY WILL BE SAVED

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, in 1997, I began traveling the 8th district of North Carolina, and I made two particular pledges; one was to save Social Security and the other was to do everything I could to balance the budget.

Well, here we are with the appropriations bills passed, we have stopped the raid on Social Security, and we have balanced the budget. It is that simple. Our spending appetite has been decreased, our priorities have been very clearly outlined.

Social Security will be saved because we have stopped the raid, and I applaud those for making the tough choices and making that possible.

JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceeding.

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. McNULTY. 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 336, nays 59, answered “present” 2, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 557]

YEAS—336

Abercrombie	Diaz-Balart	Kilpatrick
Ackerman	Dicks	Kind (WI)
Allen	Dingell	King (NY)
Andrews	Dixon	Kingston
Archer	Doggett	Klecza
Army	Dooley	Knollenberg
Bachus	Doolittle	Kuykendall
Baker	Doyle	LaFalce
Baldacci	Dreier	LaHood
Baldwin	Duncan	Lampson
Ballenger	Dunn	Lantos
Barcia	Edwards	Largent
Barr	Ehlers	Larson
Barrett (NE)	Ehrlich	Latham
Barrett (WI)	Emerson	LaTourette
Bartlett	Eshoo	Lazio
Barton	Etheridge	Leach
Bass	Evans	Lee
Bateman	Ewing	Levin
Becerra	Farr	Lewis (CA)
Bentsen	Fattah	Lewis (KY)
Bereuter	Fletcher	Linder
Berkley	Foley	Lofgren
Biggett	Forbes	Lowey
Bilirakis	Ford	Lucas (KY)
Bishop	Fossella	Lucas (OK)
Blagojevich	Fowler	Luther
Bliley	Frank (MA)	Maloney (CT)
Blumenauer	Franks (NJ)	Maloney (NY)
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	Manzullo
Boehlert	Frost	Martinez
Boehner	Galleghy	Mascara
Bonilla	Ganske	Matsui
Bono	Gejdenson	McCarthy (MO)
Boswell	Gekas	McCarthy (NY)
Boucher	Gephardt	McCollum
Boyd	Gilchrest	McGovern
Brady (TX)	Gillmor	McHugh
Brown (FL)	Gilman	McInnis
Brown (OH)	Goode	McIntosh
Bryant	Goodlatte	McIntyre
Burr	Goodling	McKeon
Buyer	Goss	McKinney
Calvert	Graham	Meehan
Camp	Granger	Meeks (NY)
Campbell	Green (TX)	Menendez
Canady	Green (WI)	Metcalfe
Cannon	Greenwood	Mica
Capps	Hall (OH)	Millender-
Capuano	Hall (TX)	McDonald
Cardin	Hansen	Miller (FL)
Castle	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Chabot	Hayes	Minge
Chambliss	Hayworth	Mink
Chenoweth-Hage	Herger	Moakley
Clayton	Hill (IN)	Hill (IN)
Clement	Hobson	Morella
Coble	Hoeffel	Murtha
Collins	Hoekstra	Myrick
Combest	Holden	Nadler
Condit	Holt	Napolitano
Conyers	Horn	Neal
Cook	Hostettler	Nethercutt
Cooksey	Houghton	Ney
Cox	Hoyer	Northup
Coyne	Hyde	Norwood
Cramer	Inslee	Nussle
Crowley	Istook	Obey
Cubin	Jackson (IL)	Olver
Cummings	Jefferson	Ose
Cunningham	Jenkins	Owens
Danner	John	Oxley
Davis (FL)	Johnson (CT)	Packard
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell
Davis (VA)	Johnson, Sam	Paul
Deal	Jones (NC)	Payne
DeGette	Jones (OH)	Pease
Delahunt	Kanjorski	Pelosi
DeLauro	Kaptur	Peterson (PA)
DeLay	Kelly	Petri
DeMint	Kennedy	Phelps
Deutsch	Kildee	Pickering

Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rangel
Regula
Rivers
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner

Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)

Terry
Thomas
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

Res. 213, I would have voted “yes.” H.
Res. 59, I would have voted “yes.” H.R.
3164, I would have voted “yes.” And H.
Res. 349, I would have voted “yes.”

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2990, QUALITY CARE FOR THE UNINSURED ACT OF 1999

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees on the bill (H.R. 2990) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals greater access to health insurance through a health care tax deduction, a long-term care deduction, and other health-related tax incentives; to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide access to and choice in health care through association health plans; to amend the Public Health Service Act to create new pooling opportunities for small employers to obtain greater access to health coverage through HealthMarts; to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DINGELL moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2990 be instructed to insist on the provisions of the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act of 1999 (Division B of H.R. 2990 as passed by the House), and within the scope of conference to insist that such provisions be paid for.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we will be shortly appointing conferees to the bipartisan Managed Care Improvements Act. Earlier this month, the House by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 275–151 approved a strong bill to protect patients' rights. Before voting on final passage, the House rejected three substitutes. We will shortly be going to conference with the Senate.

It will be noted that a number of the conferees appointed by the Senate and perhaps by the Speaker may not have shared the position of the House and in fact have voted against the bill. That is why this bipartisan motion to instruct is so important. It is a reminder to our conferees that the House voted for strong protections for patients and rejected weaker ones. This instructs the conferees to support the position of the House.

NAYS—59

Aderholt
Baird
Berry
Bilbray
Borski
Clay
Clyburn
Coburn
Costello
DeFazio
Dickey
English
Everett
Filner
Gibbons
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hilleary

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Carson
Tancredo

NOT VOTING—36

Berman
Bonior
Brady (PA)
Burton
Callahan
Crane
Engel
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gutknecht
Hinojosa
Hulshof
Hunter

□ 1059

Mr. EVERETT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. METCALF changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 557, approving the Journal, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

□ 1100

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately due to a family emergency I was not able to vote yesterday. Had I been here in reference to H. Con.

Specifically, it is a proposal that covers all health plans, not just a limited few. We want a bill that lets the doctors decide what is in the best interest of the patient, not health insurance bureaucrats. We want a bill that has a strong independent review of HMO decisions. We want a bill that is going to address the unfortunate case when your HMO causes an injury or wrongful death, that the HMO will be responsible like any other business in America. The Senate bill does none of these things.

The motion which I am offering jointly with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) reminds our House conferee Members to insist on strong patient protections. The motion is also fiscally responsible. It instructs House conferees to assure that the bill will be fully paid for. The President said that he will not sign a bill which is not fully paid for. The House can do no less than to see to it that the bill we send to the President is fully paid for, as he insists.

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

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

Last month, this House passed H.R. 2990, the Quality Care for the Uninsured Act, and I was proud to support this measure. I said before the final passage of this legislation that there was nothing of greater importance that this body can do in the area of health care than to help those who do not have health coverage gain access to affordable care.

I continue to believe in and look forward to working with the Senate on our proposals to provide tax relief to the uninsured and to the self-employed. I also look forward to working on the proposals to provide new options for small employers to gain coverage through HealthMarts. The House also passed H.R. 2723, the bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act of 1999, the so-called Norwood-Dingell bill.

In accordance with the rule that governed floor consideration of these two measures, the text of H.R. 2723 has now been included in H.R. 2990. The motion to instruct we are debating today seems harmless enough. It instructs conferees to insist on the provisions included in the House-passed managed care bill when negotiating with the Senate and also to insist that this measure be paid for.

However, I must oppose this motion. First, we are sending a strong team in to negotiate with the Senate. I recognize there are significant differences between the two bills that need to be reconciled, but I do not feel it is appropriate to tie the conferees' hands in any way prior to entering those negotiations. What kind of a message does it send our Senate colleagues if we give last-minute instructions that may hinder our negotiating ability? This could be interpreted improperly as a

vote of no confidence on behalf of the House and would seriously weaken our negotiating position.

Second, as the contentious debate over the Norwood-Dingell bill last month indicated, there are significant policy differences that divide Members of this body in the area of patient protections. I did not support final passage of this measure because I believe it goes too far by allowing patients to sue their health plans in State courts. I also fear it will ultimately be very costly and cause the number of uninsured to grow even more.

However, I do respect the will of the majority in passing the Norwood-Dingell bill. That said, I do not believe it is appropriate at this time to instruct conferees to insist that all the provisions of the Norwood-Dingell bill be included in the conference package. By its very nature, a conference requires compromise in order to be successful. Again, I oppose tying the hands of our conferees before we ever get to the negotiating table with our Senate colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to begin our negotiations with the Senate to craft a reasonable bipartisan compromise of our respective managed care bills. I want these negotiations to be free of any unnecessary instructions that may limit Members' ability to engage in free and open dialogue with the Senate regarding these important policy decisions. For this reason, I oppose this motion and ask my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Commerce for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, when we passed the bipartisan patients' bill of rights on October 7, we made a commitment to the American people to reform the managed health care system in our country. Webster's dictionary defines reform as, quote, "to put an end to a harm by introducing a better method or course of action."

The Senate bill does not provide a better course of action. Rather, its weak consumer protections continue to allow HMOs to sacrifice quality and reliability for profits. As we go to conference with the Senate, we must insist that the basic consumer protections included in the House-passed patients' bill of rights are retained, the guaranteed access to specialists at no additional cost, the access to saving clinical trials, the assurances that medical decisions are made by physicians, not insurance bureaucrats, the direct access to OB-GYN services, the ability to hold our health plans accountable in court when its decisions to withhold or limit care cause injury or death. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Dingell motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Cali-

fornia (Mr. THOMAS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me the time. I just think that in case someone thinks that what we are doing here is significant and important, you have to understand under the rules that either body, the House or the Senate, in this case the House, can instruct its conferees; and this is a motion to instruct. It has no binding on a conference between the House and the Senate. It is an attempt on the part of the folks who offered the motion to try to tilt the relationship between the House and the Senate.

Now, the measure that we are taking to conference was already debated and voted on in the House and we passed it, so the House's position is well known. The motion to instruct is to, in fact, insist on the provisions of the bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act. But there is no way that this motion to instruct can make anything happen. Remember in the Constitution in article 1, coming from the old Connecticut compromise between the large States and the small States, that both were concerned about the powers, and so there was created the concept of two separate Houses, one based upon geography, two representatives, or Senators, from each State and one based upon population, which continues to grow. There is no limit on the size of the House; it is tied to the population of the United States. And so you have State interests; and remember, initially under the Constitution, those Senators were appointed by State legislatures.

Now, the Senate is an entirely different body than the House. They have different rules. They are elected in a different way. And so when the House and the Senate come together in a conference, it is because the Constitution says that the House and the Senate have to agree exactly on the same piece of legislation that is then sent to the President; and if they cannot agree, then notwithstanding the effort in both the House and the Senate, the legislation passed in both the House and the Senate does not go anywhere.

So our job as conferees will be to go over with the Senate and sit down, equal bodies, both with the same ability to pass a piece of legislation but both of us helpless if we cannot come together. The House-passed one cannot get to the President; the Senate-passed one cannot get to the President unless the House and the Senate agree. And you have already heard the significant difference between the Senate-passed bill and the House-passed bill.

So what we are going to have to do is something that is uniquely American in terms of the political environment.

That is, from the very beginning, decisions made in this country in part, because of the two fundamentally different houses, has been based on accommodation and compromise. We cannot go anywhere without accommodation and compromise. The Senate feels strongly about their position. They passed it. There is a majority backing their position.

The House feels strongly about its position, those who voted for that measure. They had a majority backing them. But when we go to conference, if the House's position is, United States Senate, we don't care what you did, we're not going to look at what you're going to do, you have to accept everything in our bill, that is exactly the position that we take, and we ain't changing it. How successful do you think that is going to be? It is kind of absurd. So understand, this is a political exercise.

There is no reason to vote this motion to instruct. We have the bill; let us get on with our work. Let us vote down the motion to instruct. Let us not insult the Senate the very first day we are supposed to sit down with them and try to reconcile the differences between the two bills. Let us live up to what the American people expect us to do, sit down, accommodate, compromise, produce a good product and get it to the President, instead of posturing as this motion to instruct clearly is. Vote "no."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE), who has worked very, very hard on this matter.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct. I have always considered the Speaker of this House to be my friend and mentor, my coach. In urging him to run for Speaker, I did so because I considered him to be fair and to play not just by the letter of the rule but by the spirit of the rule as well. The Speaker and I are old wrestlers. One of the great things about wrestling is that you win or lose on the mat, not by selecting the referee.

□ 1115

If the Speaker as coach had a referee steal a deserved victory from one of his wrestlers, he would have lost respect for that referee. Well, the Patient Protection Act won on the mat 275 to 151. As the GOP authors of this bill, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and I should be named conferees. To technically deny us our spots would be to violate the spirit of naming conferees. To not name us as conferees would be like a referee disqualifying a wrestler for a legal move.

Mr. Speaker, your leadership rests on a small majority, and that rests on respect. If you deny the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Norwood) and I our spots as conferees, you will be endangering that respect. Payne Stewart and Walter Payton's legacies rest just as much

on the respect of their colleagues as honorable men as it did for their feats on the field.

Two hundred years ago Thomas Jefferson said that democracy rested not on leadership's sleight of hand, but on the active participation of its citizens. The House has spoken unequivocally on which bill it prefers for patient protection. I would hope that the conferees you name would reflect that decision.

It is rumored that not one of the GOP Members to be named as conferees voted for the Patient Protection Act. If that is the case, then, Mr. Speaker, you are relying on sleight of hand that Thomas Jefferson warned against.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO).

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I think this motion to recommit should be defeated for the following reasons. I think the gentleman from California laid out some of the reasons in terms of giving the conferees the maximum flexibility to get the best possible bill.

Let me give you one example as to why we need to provide flexibility for the conferees. Cancer patients have been waiting for years for the ability to have insurance companies pay for routine, routine, care for clinical trials. Under Dingell-Norwood the most important clinical trials that are conducted, FDA-approved clinical trials, fall outside the scope of the requirement for insurance companies to pay for routine care.

The conferees need to have the maximum flexibility to strengthen and improve this bill. Nobody, Mr. Speaker, in the end has got a market on all the wisdom on health and insurance, HMO reforms. We have to give our conferees the maximum flexibility to get the best possible bill for cancer patients and for others looking for our guidance.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are going to conference for the managed care reform bill. It is clearly the wish of the majority that the House bill as passed be enacted into law. Under the rules of the House, the Speaker is directed to appoint Members, and no less than a majority who generally supported the House position, as determined by the Speaker.

It is quite clear what the House position was. The conferees have not been appointed according, to my understanding, to that rule, and that does in fact necessitate our insisting that we hold to the position of the House. That is what you do in a democracy. The winner's position is the law and people should obey it.

The public wants this. They have spoken. Whatever the Senate or the other body may have or have not done is not our issue. We are here to see that we fulfill the wishes of the vast majority of this body representing the vast majority of Americans, I believe it is close to 80 percent, who favor the strongest possible managed care control bill. The distinguished authors of this bill have done that, the House has worked its will, and it is our job to carry it out.

It is my hope that the leadership will not frustrate this by slowing down, stalling, postponing the conference in other procedural moves, which is their prerogative. But I suggest they do so and they will incur the wrath of many Americans who are denied adequate and fair treatment from many managed care plans. They are the people who will be the losers if we do not insist on the House position and see that it prevails.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BRYANT).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, reluctantly I must rise in opposition to this motion. I have a great deal of respect for the senior Member in this Congress, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who cosponsored this bill with other people I have tremendous respect for, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and other primary sponsors, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE), who are undoubtedly experts in this area of health care.

Likewise, I have great respect for other positions in this body who supported other measures, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG), a cosponsor of the Shadegg-Coburn bill which I voted for.

There is no perfect bill. Norwood-Dingell is not a perfect bill. Shadegg-Coburn contained many good provisions I think that ought to be considered. One hundred-fifty Members supported that bill, and, as we move toward a conference, we have to look to the Senate and look at the bill that they have got. They have got some good ideas there too.

My concern is that we all I think agree that we want to be able to have patients that are under managed care to receive the best quality treatment that they can get, and we want the managed care groups that manage this care and the costs associated with that to be accountable in some way. All of these bills do that.

We want to do all these things, while making sure we do not make it so expensive that we chase employers, people who provide insurance to their employees, that we do not chase them out

of the market and add more employees to that list of uninsured. Already in this country we have 44 million people who do not have medical insurance, and we do not want to add to that list. So we have a great balancing act that we must accomplish here, and, as we move towards conference, I think we can do that.

I think we can make this bill a better bill. But we do not do that, and the reason I rise in opposition to this motion, is we do not do that by unduly restricting our negotiators, tying their hands, because there are other good ideas in this House, there are other good ideas in the Senate, and it is at that point that our rules provide that we sit down and negotiate in the interest of all Americans interested in health care, we do so on a good faith basis, not with our hands tied, and come up with a more perfect bill. I think we can do that if we do not pass this motion.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion to instruct conferees, with the trust and assurance that we can make this bill an even better one for the American people.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), who has displayed extraordinary courage and diligence and vigor throughout this matter.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this motion to instruct. I want the people in this House to understand what we are doing here. We are saying we support the House bill, which covers 161 million Americans, that is all the Americans in this country who are covered by insurance plans whereas the bill from the Senate discriminates against our people based on the state from which you come. The Senate legislation only covers 48 million Americans. So remember that when you vote on this. That is one of the reasons this bill passed overwhelmingly with bipartisan support in the House. Lets not discriminate. We must cover all 161 million insured constituents.

Finally, I just want to point out something. If you have any doubt about the backlash and the politics out there among your constituents, just look at this week's Newsweek Magazine (November 8, 1999). If you cannot see it, I will read it to you. "The war over patient rights. HMO hell."

Then it says in the body of the article, "From the Capitol to the kitchen tables, from frustration with HMOs to worries about health care, it is topic A, and the patients are ready to rumble." Again, reading from this Newsweek magazine, "H.M.O. Hell: The Backlash."

Mr. Speaker, I say we have to support the House position and go to conference with this motion to instruct in the interests of our patients who are suffering a rationing of professional care.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I have the same edition of Newsweek Magazine and noted various things in it, including the fact that it pointed out that access to specialists is denied much more frequently by HMO plans than by fee-for-service plans. But I wonder if the last speaker, who is supporting the motion to instruct, understands that that motion to instruct puts fee-for-service plans under the same regulation as HMO plans? That is, they impose the same regulatory burdens on fee-for-service, which is treating people well, according to this magazine article, as it does to HMOs.

I suggest that sticking to the motion to instruct and tying our hands is not the right answer.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, there are two obvious reasons why this motion to instruct the conferees to support the Norwood-Dingell bill should be supported. The first is that the Norwood-Dingell bill provides meaningful patient protections, whereas the Republican leadership bill in the other body is a sham proposal designed to protect the insurance industry.

The second is that the vote in the House on the Norwood-Dingell bill was one of overwhelming support and fairness demands that that vote be reflected in the conference.

When it comes to the substance of the bills, my colleague from New Jersey pointed out that the partisan bill passed by the GOP in the other body excludes more than 100 million people from its provisions. It applies only to people in self-funded plans. These types of plans are typically offered only by large employers and cover only 48 million Americans. The Norwood-Dingell bill, on the other hand, applies to all 161 million privately insured Americans.

The differences between the bills though run a lot deeper than this gross disparity in the coverage. The protections in the Norwood-Dingell bill are vastly superior to those limited protections proposed by the GOP leadership in the other body.

Just as some examples, the GOP leadership bill in the Senate provides no guarantees that if you have to go to the nearest emergency room in a situation where you have an emergency, that is going to be covered or you will not have to foot the bill yourself. In the Norwood-Dingell bill, if you go to the nearest emergency room, you are going to be covered.

The GOP leadership bill does not guarantee direct access to OB-GYN for women. The Norwood-Dingell bill does. The leadership bill does not guarantee access to specialists out of the network, but the Norwood-Dingell bill does. The GOP leadership bill allows HMOs to continue to define what type

of care is medically necessary. The Norwood-Dingell bill allows doctors and patients to make that determination, not the insurance company bureaucrats.

Finally, the GOP leadership bill does not provide for an independent external appeals process. The Norwood-Dingell bill does.

In addition to that, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) mentioned that the GOP leadership bill does not allow you to sue your HMO because it leaves the ERISA exemption from liability in place. The Norwood-Dingell bill sides with the patients and lifts this preemption, giving individuals the right to sue their HMOs when they are denied needed care and their health suffers as a result.

Support this motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), one of the co-authors of a bill which could not be considered if this motion to instruct were adopted.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have less than a year left in this body, and if I could make a change in anything, I would return it 150 years earlier so that the trick that we are seeing today would not be used. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). He is a great politician, and rarely do I use that word in a positive sense in my lifetime. But I want to tell you what this motion does.

What this motion does is it is going to allow the unions and the trial lawyers to run the hospitals, based on the clause that is in this as far as whistle blowers. It is a totally unneeded portion of the bill, but was put in to build constituencies and consensus.

□ 1130

It will ruin quality assurance in all the hospitals. There is no question in my mind about that.

Number 2, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) said at the outset that we were mainly interested in patients. I happen to be qualified because I voted for the bill of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) when it left the House. I am one of that 270.

I voted for it for one purpose, I think we need to have some action. With this motion to commit, there will be no health care bill for my patients. There will be no right to go after our HMO, if we follow this motion to commit, because there will be no combined bill, no compromise, and therefore, the President will never get to sign a bill out of this conference.

If that is what we want to accomplish, and we want to use that as a political pawn in the next year's debate over who should be in control of Congress, then that is a legitimate thing.

But it ought to be said that that is what it is for.

That is not what a motion to instruct should be for. A motion to instruct should be, take out the whistleblower. Give the members of the committee, the conference committee, the ability to do what is right for our patients and for our country, not what is right for the Republican or the Democrat party.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) deserves a lot of credit for his work in this body. He worked, worked, worked. We have a health care bill on this floor because because of the courage of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD); not for any other reason, because of the courage of the gentleman from Georgia. Let us not ruin a display of courage by making this a purely political ploy. That is what this is.

I was not going to speak against it, but Mr. Speaker, my patients, the people in this country, the people in my district who are under HMOs who have no right of recourse today against unqualified medical personnel making decisions about their health care, they have no right, and this bill that we are going to have has no adequacy of network whatsoever in it.

They do not even have to have an adequate network. The heck with specialists. They can say, I have a specialist, and they can have 1 and they need 200. This bill does not even address that. Do Members want to leave that that way in conference? No, they do not. I know they do not.

Let us talk about what this really is. This is a political ploy, partly because of the inappropriate, and I will agree, the inappropriate naming of conferees on this bill. I agree with that. But it is the wrong way to accomplish the purpose.

If we really care about patients, if we really want to solve the inequities in the health care system, and if we really want to solve the overall problem, which is opening up the market and allowing choice and markets to work in health care, Members will defeat this thing solidly.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past time for Congress to ensure that managed care means quality care for American families. Doctors and patients must make medical decisions, not insurance companies. If a patient is wrongly denied care, there must be some accountability. We expect individuals to take responsibility for their actions in this country. HMOs should be no different.

We finally took up a Patients' Bill of Rights 4 weeks ago, but only after the Republican leadership was dragged there kicking and screaming. Republican leaders never wanted this debate because it was all too clear that they had chosen special interests over the national interest.

Finally, after 4 weeks, the GOP leadership is bringing up a motion to go to conference on this bill. I hope that despite the maneuvering of the Republican leadership, that the common sense and the bipartisanship of this bill will prevail.

Our colleagues from Michigan, Georgia, and Iowa teamed up to write a bipartisan balanced bill that protects patients' rights without undue burdens or threats to health care coverage. Now, after weeks of the GOP leadership's stall tactics, my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, in conjunction with his Republican colleagues, is offering a motion to instruct that will insist upon the provisions of the bipartisan bill passed by the House on October 7, and upon offsetting the \$7 billion on the House floor to fully pay for the bill.

I urge my colleagues, vote yes on the motion to instruct. We need to ensure that patients have access to specialists, clinical trials, and OB-GYN services, among the many other patient protections that are found in the Norwood-Dingell agreement.

We cannot allow the watered-down Senate provisions to prevail. Vote yes on the motion to instruct.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, today we call upon the conferees for H.R. 2990 to insist on the House-passed version of the Patients' Bill of Rights. That is the portion of H.R. 2990 that reminds health insurers that if they want to get paid, they must actually provide a meaningful health insurance product, not a cheap imitation.

The Senate-passed bill may accomplish many things. It leaves out most Americans from coverage under the Patients' Bill of Rights. It may appease the insurance industry. It may provide cover for politicians who want to appear responsive to their constituents, when in fact they are too often catering to insurance industry lobbyists.

What the Senate bill does not do is the one thing it is supposed to do. It does not ensure that employers and employees get what they pay for when they purchase insurance.

In fact, there are HMO fingerprints all over the Senate version of the Patients' Bill of Rights. Pivotal reforms like the right to see a doctor outside the HMO network and the right to sue when a health plan acts in bad faith are simply missing. Other reforms have been watered down to such an extent that patients may be no better off with them than without them.

Can anyone in this Chamber honestly say that that is what the public had in mind when it called for a Patients' Bill of Rights? If we ask the insurance industry which bill it prefers, there is no contest. The Senate bill would win. Managed care organizations take huge

gambles, gambles they perceive as benign business decisions, with potentially harmful or even fatal consequences for their enrollees.

I join my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), in urging the conferees to act in the best interests of the public and insist on the House-passed version of the Patients' Bill of Rights.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to recommend conferees. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) demonstrate real leadership on protecting patients.

I urge the House conferees to ensure that the Dingell-Norwood protections are included in the final bill. Patients and providers across this country have told us that HMO reform is their top priority.

Congress now has a real chance to enact managed care reform and to improve patient care. But time is running out. With only a few days left before Congress adjourns, the time has come to put patients ahead of profits. The conferees need to meet before Congress goes out of session, and Congress should enact the Norwood-Dingell bill.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us know that the motion before us is a non-binding motion of the House.

All of our colleagues understand clearly that this is an opportunity to have a political debate about the issue of health care reform in America. So let us have the political debate. But understand, this really does not mean anything.

But as we have gone through the whole issue of reforming health care over the last 7 years or so, the debate has grown. We have focused the debate away from the uninsured to accountability of HMOs. I do not think there is any Member of the House who does not believe that there is a way to bring accountability, more accountability, to managed care if it is done in a reasonable way.

I think also we have learned over the last few years that when we start to bring accountability into the picture, we can get carried away with too much accountability that leads to less affordability for the American people, and we know that less affordability means less accessibility.

While we all want managed care reforms and we want more accountability, we know that the far greater problem in America today is the fact

that we have 44 million people who have no health insurance at all. We know that if we do things that are going to raise costs, we are going to drive down access.

This is about a balance. We cannot consider access or accountability without considering affordability and accessibility. That is why the bill that left the House had a large access piece authored by my good friends, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), that would help ensure we could address the growing problem of the uninsured in America.

The bill that I think the House passed will lead to more uninsured if we do not do something about increasing the access provisions that were called for in the Shadegg-Talent access bill.

Mr. Speaker, as we go to conference with the Senate, they have a completely different position, a much narrower bill. Some may argue they have a much more practical bill. What we as conferees have to do on behalf of the House is to find the right balance, find the right balance between accountability without driving employers out of the process, without driving up premium costs, and without driving more people into the ranks of uninsured, because what are these accountability measures going to mean to Americans if they have no health insurance? They mean nothing.

Mr. Speaker, let us go work with the Senate. Let us find the right balance between accountability, affordability, and accessibility. I think that is what the American people expect of their representatives on both sides of the aisle, is to find that right balance.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion. Mr. Speaker, if Members have ever lived in a neighborhood and they want to build a shopping center in the neighborhood, Members would understand why we are here making this argument today.

If we have 100 of our neighbors together and two-thirds of them do not want the shopping center, and then we find out there is going to be a meeting at the town hall about whether to build the shopping center, and you have to pick seven of your neighbors to go represent your position, and someone says, let us take five people who want the shopping center and two who do not and send them to the meeting, I think most of us would say that that is ridiculous, the delegation we send from our neighborhood ought to reflect the sentiment of the neighborhood.

On October 7, 275 of us voted strongly in favor of holding managed care plans

accountable, over 60 percent of the Members of the House. We are going to go negotiate with the other body over a bill that does not have similar accountability provisions. As one of the prior speakers said, it should be self-evident what the House's position is, and it is. Over 60 percent of us believe that there ought to be accountability provisions, consistent with Norwood-Dingell.

But we have every reason to believe that the delegation we are sending from our neighborhood is not going to reflect that point of view. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) should be one of those conferees, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) should be one of those conferees. But it appears that will not be the case.

The reason we are on the floor today is to tell our negotiating committee to keep in mind the sentiment of this neighborhood. We supported this legislation because the American people want accountability for health insurance companies. We are supporting this motion because the Members of this House want accountability from our conference negotiators. Support the motion.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the essence of this motion to instruct on its substance is very clear. It would bind the House conferees to the Norwood-Dingell version of the bill.

I would like to ask a series of questions of whether we really want to do that.

Let me begin with this one. The substitute offered on the House, one of the substitutes offered on the House side that did not pass allowed access to ambulance services. Norwood-Dingell did not. Would the proponents of this motion to instruct say we should not allow or guarantee access to ambulance services?

The substitute offered external appeal timelines that were shorter than Dingell-Norwood, getting people more care even more quickly than Dingell-Norwood.

□ 1145

Do the proponents of this motion to instruct oppose an even shorter time period for special appeals, getting people care even more quickly?

The substitute that we offered we called for binding arbitration for those who did not want to go to court. There was no similar provision in Norwood-Dingell.

Did the proponents of this substitute which would bind us to Dingell-Norwood and Dingell-Norwood only say that we should not allow binding arbitration?

The substitute that we offered provided access to all cancer clinical trials, as one of the earlier speakers noted. That is much broader than Dingell-Norwood for cancer patients because Dingell-Norwood does not in-

clude FDA-approved clinical trials. Two-thirds of new cancer drug tests are FDA approved.

Do the proponents of this motion to instruct say that we should not have the broader provision that does more for cancer victims on clinical trials?

The Norwood-Dingell bill does not guarantee either pathology or laboratory services. The substitute did.

Did the proponents say we should be bound to their version and not offer pathology or laboratories services?

We created a panel to ensure network adequacy, to make sure that if a plan said they had a doctor, there were enough doctors with that specialty to actually service their patient base. Norwood-Dingell has nothing to cover network adequacy.

This motion to instruct would commit us to a plan that does not even require network adequacy, and that indeed is one of the problems noted in the Newsweek article discussed earlier.

We prohibit plans from considering FDA-approved drugs or medical devices as experimental or investigational. Norwood-Dingell does not do that.

The proponents of this motion to instruct would tie our hands and say, yes, we can take a procedure that has been approved by the FDA, a drug or a medical device; and even though it has been approved, label it experimental or investigational. The motion to instruct would tie our hands to a series of provisions that are not near as strong for patients as the substitute that was offered here on the floor.

I urge my colleagues to reject the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, if our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), would read the experience of Texas, he would know that his statements about unions and lawyers is false, and he would vote yes on this motion.

Not long ago I spoke about a constituent of mine, Regina Cowles, who was diagnosed with breast cancer but was being denied payment of a treatment by her insurance company. Regina ultimately got some of the help that we wanted for her from her insurance company, but it was too little too late. I am sad to report that Regina died last week.

Regina and my own daughter, Stephanie, who was also denied coverage until a big fight reversed a decision, brought to mind the problem we have in this country with access to health care. It is one thing to keep costs down, but it cannot be done at the patient's expense. If adoption of this motion is supported, that will ensure in the conference that medical judgments will be made by medical experts.

Adoption of this motion to instruct will give people like Regina Cowles and Stephanie Lampson the health care

they deserve. It is time for us to put our money where our mouth is and prove to the American people that this Congress can work together to address issues they really care about.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to yield 4 minutes to the next speaker, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), a very distinguished, very courageous, very energetic man who has provided enormous leadership in this matter, and my good friend.

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, on October 7, the House passed a patient protection bill, 275 votes; and if we listened to the argument today, it is very clear to me that those who did not vote for that bill want to go into conference and have the bill that they put up that failed be the bill before conference.

The gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from California have all made it very clear that this is not binding, though the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG), says, well, this is binding; but it is not and we all know that. It is not legal.

The gentleman from Tennessee stood up and said that well, this would restrict our negotiators, which is not true.

We are going to send our Members into conference, and they are going to do the best they can to work against a Senate bill that is absolutely not worth the paper it is written on. Now, that is a tall order; but we are told by the gentleman from California that this is our effort to tilt the relationship between the House and the Senate, and we are told by the gentleman from Oklahoma this is a political ploy.

Well, I will say what this really is. This is about rumors floating around from a conference that will not even allow the authors on the Republican side to be on the conference. That is what this is all about. This is about a conference that is going to put everybody on the conference from the Republican side who voted against the bill.

Now I think we might ought to be concerned about what is going to happen in conference when we send everybody in there who voted against the bill. That is what we call tilting the relationship between the House and the Senate, and that is what we call a political ploy.

I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), on the other side of the aisle, for having considered me for one of the seats on the conference committee since my own party as yet has not offered me a seat. I am grateful.

I humbly declined, as I believe my outspokenness against my own party's position in this matter might become the issue, and the committee does not need any distractions from the real issues before us, and that is protecting patients. Therefore, as I remain free to

continue my outspokenness, I implore my leaders to be aware of the political reality as they seek a final course of action on this issue.

They have for the last 5 years opposed patient protections and publicly allied themselves in joint news conferences with HMO lobbyists. Under public pressure, we forced a vote on October 7. They have even refused to allow a single subcommittee vote on this legislation. This, in spite of the support by the majority of the House, and a third of the Republican caucus, the majority of patients in this country support it; the majority of doctors, the majority of hospitals, even the majority of employers.

I feel these same opponents believe they can now subvert the conference committee to produce a report repugnant to the original legislation in order to force the House of Representatives to really reject the final report. These opponents believe a multimillion dollar public relations campaign can shift that blame to the other party.

I say today that the fate of the next election is in the balance and that plan will fail. Because of their past actions and affiliations, our party has no credibility on HMO reform. All the clever commercials that money can buy will not change that fact, but that fact can and should change if our conferees act with courage to enforce the will of this House.

That is what this motion is all about. Go into the conference and fight for the position of this House. It is in perfect concert with the will of the American people. I urge my colleagues to support these instructions, to insist on full unencumbered legal accountability for HMOs; true external appeals and the protections of all Americans, all Americans, with health insurance, not just the few who need this the least. I want both Republican and Democratic patients to win. To accomplish that, both parties need to honor the will of the people instead of the will of the lobbyists. As I recall, that is our job and that is our duty.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. COOKSEY).

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

Mr. COOKSEY. Mr. Speaker, the patients and the public deserve managed care reform. The patients and the public deserve protection from the overreaching of the HMOs. For those who have a real knowledge of health care and the problems of the overreaching of HMOs, we know that we need HMO accountability. For those who have been refused health care by HMO, CEOs and HMO clerks, they know about the overreaching of the HMOs. They know that we need HMO reform.

Unfortunately, the proposed rule or the proposed motion to instruct is too restrictive and will result in no HMO reform this year. This Congress, in its wisdom, passed ERISA protections

some years ago; but, as so often occurs, there was overreaching by the HMOs. So today when we vote we need to vote against this motion to instruct, because this motion to instruct again gives the appearance that, in fact, the HMOs, the lobbyists, the big insurance companies, the CEOs of the HMOs have a disproportionate amount of influence in this body.

We need to do the right thing for the public, for the patients, for the Americans who are under HMO health care.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the leader of the minority, and my good friend.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote for this motion to instruct. The issue that we are dealing with here is not a political issue. It is not a partisan issue, and it is not a party issue. After we passed a very strong and good bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights here a few weeks ago, I had people come up to me in my district, people that I saw around the country and they came up to me and they said, finally the Congress, the House, has stood against the special interests and done what is good for patients, what is good for doctors, what is good for people. I want to urge us to keep that effort going and to realize it in this conference.

Too often we have seen strong bipartisan measures be watered down to kill the real intent of legislation. We cannot let the bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights fall prey to a back-door attempt to derail meaningful reform.

The Senate bill does not measure up. We need to get a final report that looks more like the House bill and contains the solid protections that it contains.

The Senate bill fails to ensure that medical judgments are made by doctors and patients, in consultation with their patients. The medical relationship that is important here is what goes on between doctors and patients. They are the ones that should make the decisions about medical care, not some bureaucrat thousands of miles away who is looking at the bottom line and not what is good for that patient.

The Senate bill fails to allow patients to see an outside specialist, at no additional cost, when their specialist in the health plan fails to meet their needs.

The House bill allows patients to do that. The Senate bill fails to hold managed care plans accountable when their decisions to withhold or limit care injure patients. The House bill holds plans accountable.

If doctors are accountable, the people that are making half the decisions ought to be accountable. How can we have a system that says doctors are accountable for the decisions they make, but we let the bureaucrats in the health plans that are just looking at

the bottom line and profit totally unaccountable for the decisions they make?

The Senate bill applies only to 48 million people in private employment-based plans, where the employer self-insures. The House bill applies to all people with employment-based insurance, as well as people who buy insurance on their own.

We have to get to work on this. It has been 4 weeks since we passed the bill here. We are going toward a recess where nothing can get done. Let me say what I have said before. If someone is in a health care plan and they need something that their doctor says they need and their life is on the line today, they need this bill now. They do not need to wait until next spring or next summer or next fall or not at all.

If a loved one in their family is waiting to be able to get the right decision out of a health care plan that could save their life, they need this bill now.

I urge the leaders of the Congress in the House and in the Senate to get this conference going, to get a bill that is more like the House bill than the Senate bill, and to get it done in the next 2 weeks before we leave this Congress. We owe that to the patients and the doctors and the medical professionals in this country. We can have a better health care system in this country, and this bill will go a long way toward doing it.

I commend the physicians in this Congress in both parties who have stood tall for doing the right thing. God bless them for standing for their beliefs and their patients.

□ 1200

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, this is not about a binding resolution, this is about having a political debate. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader, who just spoke realizes that the other body has a very different bill. In the legislative process, our jobs are to come to some consensus with the other body, some consensus that is good for the American people.

Now, there is not a bill that came to this floor that did not provide for more accountability for those in managed care. There is not a bill that came to this floor that did not provide for more physicians' judgments in controlling the treatments that the patient was going to get.

We all want more accountability. But we have got to do it in a way that will not drive millions of people into the ranks of the uninsured. I think all of my colleagues know that I believe that we can have more accountability without introducing unending and open-ended litigation into the process. Bringing trial lawyers and frivolous lawsuits into health care will do nothing more than drive up the cost and drive down access.

We all know that today about 125 million Americans get their insurance through their employer. I realize that some want to change that. But today that is, in fact, the system. Every employee will tell us the number one benefit that they get from their employer is their health benefit. Why did we want to jeopardize the ability of employers to provide this benefit to their employees by opening up the health care system to an open-ended liability?

Now, there is a great concern about the liability portion of the bill passed by this House, that in fact many employers will not open themselves up to that liability and will begin dropping coverage for their employees. Is that really what the House wants to do? I think what we need to do is to go to conference with the Senate and to find the right consensus for the American people.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let us be honest here. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) said this is a political discussion. It is. What we do is deal with politics, and we have many of those on this floor. We flew back here Monday evening, not to vote on a budget, but to vote on a few political suspension matters. So let us be honest with what we are doing.

The reality is my colleagues refuse to appoint the two folks in this House who, in many ways, personify and embody this issue for all America, not just Democrats, not just Republicans.

We have another body on the other side that some of my colleagues on this side are essentially doing the bad work for, doing the homework for. They do not want campaign finance. They do not want managed care reform. They figure out the procedural games to play, and we figure it out on this side.

We just had elections around the Nation yesterday in many localities, and congratulations to the winners throughout the Nation. Imagine having an election and the voters selecting someone, then the party leaders and the bosses in the party say, well, the people want this person; but this other fellow, he pretty much agrees with this guy on about 70, 80 percent of the stuff he wants, so the party leaders, we are going to pick the other guy even though the people want the guy that won.

We passed an HMO reform bill here in this House of Representatives. I know the money chase is on. I know the Senate in their leadership may want certain things. But allow the will of this House to be heard in the conference. Allow the conferees, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) to represent us. Allow the will of the people to be heard, not HMO bosses. I ask this House to support the motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, this is obviously an issue of great importance to the body, and I have great affection and esteem for the authors of the competing proposal.

I think it is quite clear that we need some type of health care reform. What we need to decide upon is what is something we can agree upon between the two bodies and that can be signed by the President and become law.

The Dingell-Norwood is not a perfect bill. Most bills here are not perfect; I will stipulate to that. I do not think we want to tie the hands of our conferees as they go in trying to produce a product that is acceptable to everyone.

I would just point out, and I know it has been pointed out before by the author of the substitute, but I just want to reemphasize this, that the substitute, for example, allows access to ambulance services. The substitute has external appeal time lines that are shorter to allow expedited review.

The substitute provides access to all cancer clinical trials. That provision is much broader than Dingell-Norwood for cancer patients because the Dingell-Norwood bill does not include FDA approved clinical trials.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this motion.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has 4¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to myself 1 minute.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to express great pleasure at the way that this debate has been conducted. I also want to point out that we are now talking about what our conferees are going to do for the House as a part of their duties.

The traditions of the House say that the conferees should be appointed by the Speaker, and the rules say so, too, to carry out the purposes of the House bill and to be supporters of the House bill.

The traditions of the House say that the conferees should be supporters of the House bill. Quite honestly, 275 of our Members say that they should be the supporters of the House bill, as do millions of Americans in all walks of life say that we should be supporting the House bill, because that is the bill that the people want.

Having said these things, we do not know who the conferees are going to be. We do not know what the Senate is going to do. But we can be pretty assured, on the basis of what we have seen, that we may not see either the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) or the gentleman from Iowa (Mr.

GANSKE) or any of the other supporters on the Republican side being named as conferees on this bill.

If that is true, it will tell us at the time we vote that we desperately have needed this bill. It is necessary that we should have had the instructions that we are now seeking to give to enable us to see that the conferees carry out the will of the House.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has the right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield to myself the balance of the time remaining.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a critically important debate. It is a debate that is reflected on thoughtful concerns across America, as pointed out in this week's edition of Newsweek, which talks about this issue about patients' rights. But we really are engaged in very much of a political discussion of what ought to occur from here forward.

There is, indeed, no question but that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) deserve credit for their hard work on this issue. Indeed, I would suggest quite clearly that of the two major bills before this House, they were written by four people, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), and myself. That is true of the bill on the other side, the Norwood-Dingell bill, and it is also true of the substitute which got the most votes on this side.

I would also point out that there has been much made of the fact that perhaps some of the conferees will not have voted for the bill that passed the House. The bill that actually is in conference is H.R. 2990, and I believe every single one of the Republican conferees voted for H.R. 2990.

Now, it is true that many of the conferees may not have voted for Dingell-Norwood, and I understand the concerns of those who have expressed that reservation, their belief that, indeed, there perhaps should be more Members on the conference committee who did vote for Dingell-Norwood.

I do not know the full context of the conference committee, but I can tell my colleagues this, I for one am committed to the concept behind the major distinguishing point between Dingell-Norwood and the substitute; and that is that HMOs must be held accountable.

But please make it clear that this debate is vitally important, and it is a political debate. It is a debate about whether we do something for the patients of America or whether we do nothing.

The minority leader spoke about keeping the process moving forward. I urge every one in this House to work hard to keep the process moving forward, and I agree with him on that.

But passing this motion to instruct, passing this set of instructions, announcing today that we are unwilling to compromise on anything but that which is in Norwood-Dingell would be a tragic mistake, because if we abide by that position, make no mistake about it, if we adopt Norwood-Dingell and Norwood-Dingell only, there will be no health care reform for this country arising out of this bill this year or next year, because that bill cannot pass and will not pass because of its extreme positions on the issue of liability.

Now, its health care provisions, quite frankly, are not quite as good as ours, but they are very close. But the issue here, the fundamental question here is that we must come to a compromise.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the President have announced they want to do absolutely nothing about access to insurance for the uninsured and absolutely nothing about the cost of insurance and absolutely nothing about choice for those who have insurance, because their bill, Dingell-Norwood, did nothing for access, it did nothing for choice, it did nothing for cost. I say that we must move them on that issue. They must compromise, or we will not help the American people.

My other colleagues on the other side who say immunity works, we should leave the HMOs absolutely immune when they injure or kill somebody, I suggest to them that if we take that stand, then, indeed, there will be no legislation this year to help the American people.

This is too critical a moment in time, vastly too important for the lives of the American people for us to sit on our hands and take either an extreme position on that side in which we do nothing about access, nothing about choice, nothing about affordability, or an extreme position which says we do nothing about making health care plans accountable.

This is a critically important moment in time, and the proponents of this motion to instruct would have us pass it by. They would save this issue for a political fight in the next election campaign. I believe that would be a tragic mistake.

What must happen in this conference committee is that the Senate must move, because its bill is inadequate; and what must happen in the conference committee is that the House must move, because we do not get good legislation for the American people if we do not compromise.

I believe that this motion to instruct, which would leave us bound to one position and one position only and would abandon the notion of compromise, would be a tragic mistake for the American people for that reason.

I urge my colleagues to give the conferees the option to compromise on good legislation so we can pass and enact health care reform this year.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3¼ minutes, the balance of the time, to

the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) for purposes of closing.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely amazing that 275 Members of the House of Representatives voted for the worst bill. I rise in support of this motion to instruct conferees.

I do agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma who referred to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) as a politician. But I would add to that that he is also a great statesman, along with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE). It is an unbelievable miscarriage of the will of this House that they would not be conferees on this conference committee.

When my colleagues and I brought this legislation to the Committee on Rules, we brought it with a manager's amendment that would have allowed the bill to be paid for. We did so because all of us are concerned about the budgetary impacts of policies that are not paid for. Unfortunately, the Committee on Rules did not allow our bill to be paid for, and even worse added on a \$48 billion tax package that was not paid for.

This motion to instruct conferees requires the conference committee to find a way to pay for the compromised legislation.

Given the fact that some in Congress voted just last week to borrow more from the Social Security Trust Fund, given the fact that the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has certified that some in Congress have already dipped into the Social Security Trust Fund by 17 billion more dollars, given the fact that none of us want to spend what belongs to Social Security, I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Our job is to get the best deal we can for the American people. We should follow the will of this House. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) should be conferees.

If my colleagues care about Social Security, and if my colleagues care about HMO reform, and if my colleagues care about the American people getting a good deal, being treated fairly, and having access to good health care under their HMOs, I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees regarding the bipartisan consensus Managed Care Improvement Act.

Since this bill passed overwhelmingly almost one month ago, the Republican leadership has delayed the appointment of conferees, thereby generating concern that it was seeking to either kill the bill by running out the clock, or undermine the strong support for patient protections and enforcement reflected by the House vote.

Because of this, the Members of this body need to once again send a strong

message that Americans want the freedom to choose their health care providers, to have treatment decisions made by physicians and not insurance company bureaucrats, and to hold insurance companies responsible for the injuries they cause.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership blocked the addition of offsets to the Norwood-Dingell bill when it was on the floor, and pushed through a so-called "access" bill loaded with tax breaks that were not paid for. The motion appropriately instructs our managers to insist on fiscal responsibility and produce managed care reform legislation that does not tap into the surplus.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we will finally be going to conference for managed care reform. We passed this bill nearly a month ago and I don't understand why it has taken so long to get to this point.

My hunch is that the main reason is that by holding this motion to go to conference until this late date, the Republican leadership will be able to delay any actual convening of the conference until the next Congress. Nonetheless, this action is an important step forward in our continued effort to protect consumers in managed care plans.

Last month, the U.S. House of Representatives passed H.R. 2723, The Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Reform Act, by a decisive bipartisan margin of 275-151. That same day, the House soundly rejected three other more limited approaches to managed care reform.

The House bill is much stronger than its Senate counterpart. It applies to all private health plans unlike the Senate bill which is mostly limited to the 40 million Americans in self-insured plans. The external appeal provisions in the House bill are much stronger. And, most importantly, the House bill also includes health plan liability—a provision sorely lacking in the Senate version of the legislation.

Health plan liability is a vital component of meaningful managed care reform. Only the threat of legal consequences will be strong enough to ensure the enforcement of these managed care consumer protections. It must be included in the final bill approved by Congress or we will have failed in our duty to protect consumers in managed care plans.

To that end, the Conference should report a bill that closely mirrors that passed by the House in the form of H.R. 2723, The Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Reform Act.

It is also important that the final product be paid for. During the House consideration of the legislation, the sponsors of H.R. 2723 went to the Rules Committee to bring the bill to the House floor fully financed. We were forbidden by the Republican leadership from bringing our bill to the floor fully paid for—and likewise prevented from offering an amendment on the floor that provided such funding. The conference must rectify that problem. We have offsets for the costs—they must be included in the final product.

The Republican leadership also played games by adding a number of costly tax provisions to the package which they billed as new "access" provisions. In fact, there is precious little evidence that those provisions would expand insurance coverage. Instead, there is definite Congressional Budget Office evidence

that those provisions would cost the taxpayers some \$48 billion over the next ten years. The Conference should drop these provisions which do nothing to expand coverage and therefore needlessly increase the federal price tag of this otherwise very affordable, sensible legislation.

As a Conferee, you can be sure that this will be my agenda: the final product should closely mirror H.R. 2723, it should be fully financed, and the costly, ineffective provisions of H.R. 2990 should be dropped. I hope that is an agenda we can all pursue.

Managed care reform should no longer be a partisan issue. The bill passed by this House was a consensus package with broad-based bipartisan support within the House and the support of more than 300 organizations representing consumers, doctors, nurses, other health care providers, public health advocates. Let's take our consensus bill and make it law. I look forward to working with my colleagues to achieve this important goal. Let's get to work.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this motion to instruct.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. SHADEGG. 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 257, nays 167, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 558]

YEAS—257

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop

Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehert
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson

Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner

Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graham
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur

Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy

Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—167

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chenoweth-Hage

Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Fossella
Fowler
Gallegly
Gekas
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling

Goss
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hutchinson
Isakson
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kelly
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood

Largent	Peterson (PA)	Smith (MI)
Latham	Petri	Smith (TX)
Lazio	Pickering	Souder
Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Spence
Lewis (KY)	Pombo	Stearns
Linder	Portman	Stump
Lucas (OK)	Pryce (OH)	Sununu
Manzullo	Radanovich	Sweeney
McCrery	Ramstad	Talent
McInnis	Regula	Tancred
McIntosh	Riley	Tauzin
McKeon	Rogan	Taylor (NC)
Metcalf	Rogers	Terry
Mica	Rohrabacher	Thomas
Miller (FL)	Royce	Thornberry
Miller, Gary	Ryan (WI)	Thune
Moran (KS)	Ryun (KS)	Tiahrt
Myrick	Salmon	Toomey
Nethercutt	Sanford	Upton
Ney	Schaffer	Vitter
Northup	Sensenbrenner	Walden
Nussle	Sessions	Wamp
Ose	Shadegg	Watkins
Oxley	Sherwood	Watts (OK)
Packard	Shinkus	Whitfield
Paul	Shuster	Wicker
Pease	Simpson	Wilson
Peterson (MN)	Skeen	

NOT VOTING—9

Bereuter	Jackson-Lee	Sawyer
Berman	(TX)	Scarborough
Hulshof	Murtha	Weldon (PA)
	Rush	

□ 1236

Mrs. CUBIN, and Messrs. SKEEN, BURTON of Indiana, BASS, and LEWIS of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. STUPAK, OWENS, JENKINS, and Ms. MCKINNEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

NOTIFICATION OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to present a question of privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Calling on the President to abstain from renegotiating international agreements governing antidumping and countervailing measures.

Whereas under Art. I, Section 8 of the Constitution, the Congress has power and responsibility with regard to foreign commerce and the conduct of international trade negotiations;

Whereas the House of Representatives is deeply concerned that, in connection with the World Trade Organization ("WTO") Ministerial meeting to be held in Seattle, Washington, and the multilateral trade negotiations expected to follow, a few countries are seeking to circumvent the agreed list of negotiations topics and reopen debate over the WTO's antidumping and antisubsidy rules;

Whereas the Congress has not approved new negotiations on antidumping or antisubsidy rules and has clearly, but so far informally, signaled its opposition to such negotiations;

Whereas strong antidumping and antisubsidy rules are a cornerstone of the liberal trade policy of the United States and are essential to the health of the manufacturing and farm sectors in the United States;

Whereas it has long been and remains the policy of the United States to support its

antidumping and antisubsidy laws and to defend those laws in international negotiations;

Whereas an important part of Congress' participation in the formulation of trade policy is the enactment of official negotiating objectives against which completed agreements can be measured when presented for ratification;

Whereas the current absence of official negotiating objectives on the statute books must not be allowed to undermine the Congress' constitutional role in charting the direction of United States trade policy;

Whereas, under present circumstances, launching a negotiation that includes antidumping and antisubsidy issues would effect the rights of the House and the integrity of its proceedings;

Whereas the WTO antidumping and antisubsidy rules concluded in the Uruguay Round has scarcely been tested since they entered into effect and certainly have not proved defective;

Whereas opening these rules to renegotiation could only lead to weakening them, which would in turn lead to even greater abuse of the world's open markets, particularly that of the United States;

Whereas conversely, avoiding another divisive fight over these rules is the best way to promote progress on the other, far more important, issues facing WTO members; and

Whereas it is therefore essential that negotiations on these antidumping and antisubsidy matters not be reopened under the auspices of the WTO or otherwise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives calls upon the President—

(1) not to participate in any international negotiations in which antidumping or antisubsidy rules are part of the negotiating agenda;

(2) to refrain from submitting for congressional approval agreements that require changes to the current antidumping and countervailing duty laws and enforcement policies of the United States; and

(3) to enforce the antidumping and countervailing duty laws vigorously in all pending and future cases.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). Under rule IX, a resolution that is offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair does not at this point determine whether or not the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be heard, at the appropriate time, on the question of whether this resolution constitutes a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) will be notified at that time.

NOTIFICATION OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of House Rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to present a question of privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Calling on the President to abstain from renegotiating international agreements governing antidumping and countervailing measures.

Whereas under Art. I, Section 8 of the Constitution, the Congress has power and responsibility with regard to foreign commerce and the conduct of international trade negotiations;

Whereas the House of Representatives is deeply concerned that, in connection with the World Trade Organization ("WTO") Ministerial meeting to be held in Seattle, Washington, and the multilateral trade negotiations expected to follow, a few countries are seeking to circumvent the agreed list of negotiation topics and reopen debate over the WTO's antidumping and antisubsidy rules;

Whereas the Congress has not approved new negotiations on antidumping or antisubsidy rules and has clearly, but so far informally, signaled its opposition to such negotiations;

Whereas strong antidumping and antisubsidy rules are a cornerstone of the liberal trade policy of the United States and are essential to the health of the manufacturing and farm sectors in the United States;

Whereas it has long been and remains the policy of the United States to support its antidumping and antisubsidy laws and to defend those laws in international negotiations;

Whereas the current absence of official negotiating objectives on the statute books must not be allowed to undermine the Congress' constitutional role in charting the direction of United States trade policy;

Whereas the WTO antidumping and antisubsidy rules concluded in the Uruguay Round have scarcely been tested since they entered into effect and certainly have not proved defective;

Whereas opening these rules to renegotiation could only lead to weakening them, which would in turn lead to even greater abuse of the world's open markets, particularly that of the United States;

Whereas conversely, avoiding another divisive fight over these rules is the best way to promote progress on the other, far more important, issues facing WTO members; and

Whereas it is therefore essential that negotiations on these antidumping and antisubsidy matters not be reopened under the auspices of the WTO or otherwise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House off Representatives calls upon the President—

(1) not to participate in any international negotiation in which antidumping or antisubsidy rules are part of the negotiating agenda;

(2) to refrain from submitting for congressional approval agreements that require changes to the current antidumping and countervailing duty laws and enforcement policies of the United States; and

(3) to enforce the antidumping and countervailing duty laws vigorously in all pending and future cases.

□ 1245

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other

than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I would ask to be notified at the proper time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will be notified at the proper time.

Mr. KLINK. I thank the Speaker for his courtesy.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2389, COUNTY SCHOOLS FUNDING REVITALIZATION ACT OF 1999

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 352 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 352

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2389) to restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to States and counties containing National Forest System lands and public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management for use by the counties for the benefit of public schools, roads, and other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 1 pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVIII, modified by the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the

Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 352 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2389, the County Schools Funding Revitalization Act. Under the rule, 1 hour of general debate will be controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. For the purpose of amendment, the rule makes in order as base text a substitute amendment which is printed and numbered 1 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This substitute language, which will replace H.R. 2389, represents a bipartisan compromise brokered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) to address the concerns of some environmental groups. The rule further amends this compromise language to make technical amendments and clarify a budgetary issue.

As my colleagues know, under an open rule any Member may offer any germane amendment to the bill, but under the rule priority recognition will be given to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And, of course, the rule offers the minority an additional opportunity to amend the bill through a motion to recommit, with or without instructions. During consideration of amendments, the Chair will have the flexibility to postpone votes and reduce voting time to 5 minutes, as long as the first vote in a series is 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the goals of the County School Funding Revitalization Act are straightforward. The bill seeks to provide a temporary solution to a very real problem for counties that include Federal land. Since the enactment of two compacts, one in 1908 and the other in 1937, these counties have counted on

revenue from the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to pay for public schools and roads. This revenue compensates the counties for the revenue they would have otherwise received had the land been sold or transferred into private ownership. However, in recent years these Federal revenue payments have plummeted as Federal timber sales have declined by 70 percent, leaving communities searching for the resources they need to educate their children and maintain basic infrastructure. This has been especially devastating for students who have seen their classes canceled, teachers laid off and extracurricular activities eliminated as budgets shrink.

Mr. Speaker, education reform has become a top national priority for both parties, and this bill plays a small yet meaningful role in enabling local communities to give their children a quality education. Specifically, the bill will stabilize payments to forest communities by providing for a 7-year safety net of guaranteed funding. The payments to States and counties with Federal land will be based on the average of the highest three payments received by States and counties between 1984 and 1999. However, the legislation is not without controversy. Because the Federal payments made to forest counties are linked to timber sales, some believe there is a perverse incentive to cut down more trees. These opponents advocate a decoupling of timber sales from the revenues. To address some of these concerns, this rule incorporates compromise language into the bill.

Under the compromise, revenues will still come from timber sales, but if this source of funding proves inadequate, dollars from the general fund may be used to pay forest communities. This effectively takes the pressure off the Forest Service to cut more trees. Further, counties that receive more than \$100,000 through the Forest Service will be required to use 80 percent for schools and roads and the remaining 20 percent for local projects on Federal lands. These local projects will be designed to restore forest health for economic or recreational use and will be approved by a local committee representing a broad range of community interests. Additionally, the project must comply with all Federal laws, environmental and otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, the payments that this legislation guarantees are meant only as a short-term safety net. The bill establishes a forest county payments committee that is tasked with developing a long-term policy to improve upon the current system of revenue sharing between the Federal Government and forest counties. Within 18 months, the committee will submit its recommendations to Congress for our consideration.

In summary, this legislation offers a balanced approach to ensure that the agreement the Federal Government made with States and counties that include Federal land within their borders

is honored. By providing these safety net payments, we will enable local communities to provide better educational opportunities to children, as well as maintain their socioeconomic infrastructures. The rule is balanced as well. It presents a compromise version of this legislation to the House for open debate and amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support this open rule as well as the communities who need our assistance to educate their children.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is an open rule. It will allow for full and fair consideration of H.R. 2389. As the gentlewoman from Ohio has explained, this rule will provide for 1 hour of debate to be equally divided between the majority and the minority, especially the members of the Committee on Agriculture. The rule permits germane amendments under the 5-minute rule, the normal amending process in the House, and all Members will have the opportunity to offer amendments.

Under current law, 25 percent of the revenues generated by timber sales, mining and oil and gas development in national forests goes to the counties where the national forests are located. The counties use the money for public schools and roads. This compensates for the loss of taxable property. In recent years, timber sales from national forests have fallen by 70 percent. This has caused a hardship on the rural public schools near the national forests that depend on the money.

In the State of Ohio, which the gentlewoman and I represent, although we do not represent the area where Wayne National Forest is, that generates funds for schools in some of the poorest counties in the State. This bill attempts to strike a compromise between environmental concerns and the needs of the rural public schools that benefit from the national forest payments. It will provide a stable source of funds for the schools. It also will establish a national advisory committee to develop long-term solutions to the funding problems of these schools.

Some environmentalists do have concerns about the bill because rural schools will still depend on dwindling timber sales in national forests. But this is an open rule, as I said. Members will have a chance to offer germane amendments and they will have the opportunity to improve the bill on the House floor. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I have other responsibilities today so I am not going to be able to stay on the floor for general debate but

I wanted to voice my concerns about the general policy path that this measure puts in place. I think what we really need here is sort of a reality check in terms of what is going down with this bill.

I have no objections to the rule, I think it is a fair rule which permits amendments, but I do not think that this bill is going to be corrected by amendment. The underlying premise of the bill fundamentally is sound. I think that many of us could agree with such policy as counties and school districts that are dependent upon the 25 percent of total fund yielded from resource extraction in the national forests to support their basic governing structure, to support their schools. Such funds have become limited and cut back because of the reality of forest science and policies that have curtailed the harvest of timber and other activities. Most importantly, I think here, is the realization of new forestry and what is sustainable and what is not and what the impacts are and how those multiple uses of our national forests have come to conflict with one another so obviously in the last decade in terms of forest science timber harvest has been limited. So the reduction in dollars is significant to these communities.

I think I would stand with my colleagues to try and maintain some stable funding. This bill obviously does maintain stable funding by giving them the highest amount, their average for the highest 3-year period in terms of funding for their counties and their schools from 1985. While there are a lot of other programs around in terms of Impact Aid for military and other issues, I think we have tried to recognize nationally where we have significant lands like through the PILT program, payment in lieu of taxes program and other programs, some funding for communities where we have significant public ownership, Federal ownership of lands, and where that does impact, we have provided assistance in trying to stabilize that, in this case is a good thing to do. At the same time in terms of extending and authorizing the significant amounts of money in this bill Congress should also try and delink and reform the system to a greater extent. That means to try and establish once and for all that these communities should not be receiving the dollars based wholly on timber production, that we should delink that as we stabilize and assure stable funding. While there is a token attempt to do that in this bill, it totally fails in the final analysis to do that—to delink timber receipts from state/local funding.

□ 1300

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems with this bill is that it provides for communities that do receive over \$100,000, and in many other instances where they receive significant aid under this measure, to in fact establish dozens of different advisory

committees which would then sit down and decide how in a local area and make recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture or Interior on how to expend 20 percent of the resources that they are provided under this bill's authority. I know the counties and school districts would just as well receive the money themselves, this sets up a big problem—in fact a grant program under cover of this measure.

First of all, it creates a lot more government than probably anyone need. We already have county boards and school boards that could make decisions on how to expend this money. Frankly, I think these advisory groups set up the potential and set up the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the Forest Service for a lot more controversy and conflict. Frankly, it is going to be up to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the Forest Service to make decisions to say no to a lot of local advisory groups in a very unpleasant way, delivering the bad news, that some of these proposals are not worthy.

It is up to the Secretary with such little details as requiring whether or not an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment is needed; and if it is needed, then the cost will go back to the local group to pay for writing. That's another unpopular decision, to say the least.

I just think it is going to create a lot more conflict. I do not see this as being helpful. I think that it is a step in the wrong direction, creating all this governing structure is not an improvement. It is not what America is demanding with regards to deal with this problem, quite the contrary. I think it expands the original problem, creating controversy and confusing the topic.

I have questions about whether all Federal laws are going to be complied with, such as enforcing the prevailing wage law. I have questions about the use of individuals in this that are put into a situation where they are forced to work in the county because they are under mandatory work-type requirements, both adults and juveniles. That provision is in the bill.

There are a lot of concerns that I have. But fundamentally I think the bill fails on the basis of not delinking the roller coaster ride of up-and-down timber revenues sharing that occur as the local receipts from our national forests to these local communities. In other words, it keeps that link in place; it creates all this governing structure, and I think it is going to create more conflict.

This is not an interim bill. It lasts for 7 or 8 years. The description of this as an interim bill is flawed on its surface and misleading. I urge the defeat of this measure.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio

(Mr. REGULA), the dean of the Ohio delegation and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to explain my vote on this because I am pro-education, but I think there are a couple of things I would bring to the attention of my colleagues here. It is temporary for 7 years. That is not exactly "temporary" as I would define it. But the real fundamental concern that I have is that the policy involved, we are establishing a policy that when Federal receipts are diminished, we, therefore, step in and fill the breach.

Now, in the case that is outlined in this bill, that may have some validity. But as a matter of precedent, what happens if offshore oil production goes down, because a portion of offshore oil revenues go to the States? Do we then make up the difference to the highest years for the States that are receiving offshore oil receipts? Or how about the States that are receiving revenues from on-shore oil, and you have in this case timber; but we produce a lot of other things on Federal lands. In most cases, 50 percent of those revenues are shared with the States.

Now, you can see that as these revenues diminish, and they may well, because our resources are not finite, that then we would be called on to make up the difference. I think that is a precedent that we ought to give serious consideration to today in establishing this as a policy of the Government.

I know it is temporary, if you define that by 7 years, but it seems to me if we are going to get into this kind of a policy change, we ought to have a long-term set of conditions that address this in the case of other types of revenues.

Also the question of where it is funded arises. The way it is established, it comes out of the Interior budget. I have, along with my colleagues on the subcommittee and all of us essentially, responsibility for the funding of parks and forests and fish and wildlife and Bureau of Land Management, about 30 percent of America's land; and if I would read this correctly, the money to fund it, which could grow as forest receipts are diminished, would have to come out of the Interior budget. That means, of course, there would be less for parks in the U.S. or less for other forms of responsibilities that we have in the committee, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the land agencies I mentioned, the cultural institutions here in the city.

While I understand the objective here, it seems to me that we may be getting into something that has greater ramifications than we think.

I also would point out that the national forests, while the amount of cut has been diminished, do provide revenues to communities through the

recreation uses. People come in to hunt, fish, camp, and do a lot of other types of activities. Interestingly, and this is a little known fact, the forests of this Nation generate triple the visitor days of the Park Service, and the Bureau of Land Management lands generate double the visitor days of the Park Service.

We think of the parks as our recreation dimension, when in reality the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service collectively probably produce five to six times as many visitor days as the Park Service. I say this because as people visit these forests, as they visit BLM lands, they are spending money, for housing, for food, for fishing gear, you name it; and this in turn helps to support the local economy.

So for these reasons I think it is maybe premature to try to band-aid a problem that has a greater potential policy impact down the road. If we were to make legislation like this permanent, if we were to make it part of our responsibility, then I think there ought to be a separate source of funding, because I do not believe we should be penalizing the revenues that we have available to the appropriate committees for the parks and the recreation and the ecosystem of this Nation and the many responsibilities that go with the Department of Interior.

I understand this and I commend the Members that are supporting this. They are trying to help their school districts. But with the exception of about three big States in terms of forests, it primarily affects about three or four States, about 150 counties, out of the total in the United States. So I believe that we ought to move cautiously in establishing the precedent that is embodied in this legislation, and I hope my colleagues will give some thought to that as we make a judgment in voting for or against this bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. I support the rule because it appropriately allows the House to consider amendments, including one that I will offer and I will describe in a moment. But I believe the bill is another story. I cannot support the bill in its present form because it is not addressing the real problem with the current law that links Federal assistance for schools and roads to the size of the annual timber harvest on Federal lands.

The real problem, if you look at it, is the link itself. This link needs to be broken, but this bill does not do that.

I strongly support Federal assistance to education. The need for this assistance is particularly important in areas that are undergoing economic or other

stress. In Colorado, for example, the stress that we feel at this point is because of our rapid growth and urban sprawl. In other areas it has other causes, including changes in local economies that have depended on timber harvests.

But I think the Congress should provide assistance in ways that are most efficient and will have the fewest of side effects. In other words, if we are going to assist schools or provide help to local governments with funds for schools or fire fighting or whatever needs they may have, we should do so directly in a way as simple as possible to administer and in proportion to the needs.

The current law that links payments to timber harvests does not meet those tests of directness, simplicity, and proportionality. So we need to break the link, in other words, to decouple payments as some have described it. We should also break the link because it would free the captives, those captives at the local areas.

Local schools, roads or other vital functions of government should no longer be held financial hostage to the very contentious issues that surround the management of our forests. School boards and county commissioners should not be forced to argue that it is necessary to cut more trees in order to repair roofs or keep the roads plowed.

I do not mean to say that local officials do not have a legitimate interest in the management of our forests or that they should not speak out about them. I do mean that they and everyone else should be free to debate those issues on the basis of what is best for the lands themselves and for our society as a whole and not in terms of the financial needs of our schools or other institutions.

But this bill does not only break the link; it not only does not free the captives. I believe it would make things worse for these local people. The bill would impose a new Federal mandate on the very communities for whom this Federal assistance is most important. It says, for example, that if the local government gets more than \$100,000 under the bill, 20 percent of the total payment must be set aside and used for projects on the Federal lands. To put it another way, the bill says that the hostages will have to help pay for things that otherwise would be funded from the budgets of the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management.

Some of those things could be good things, like repairing trails or removing old logging roads that cause erosion. But suppose the local government has other priorities? What if they would rather spend all their Federal payment on schools or roads, rather than helping the Forest Service or BLM. Then what? Under current law it is their choice. They have that option. Under the bill, the way it is written, they would not.

I think that is just flat wrong. So at an appropriate time I will offer an

amendment that will return discretion to the local governments. My amendment would allow any local government to spend 20 percent of its Federal payment on Federal land projects, but it would not require that those monies are spent on Federal land projects.

Under my amendment, a local government could decide to use all this year's payment for schools and roads and then, next year, perhaps apply some of those monies to these Federal land projects. But in the end it would remove this potential Federal mandate and restore local discretion.

My amendment would not cure all the problems with the bill. I think the bill is fundamentally flawed because it does not break this link between Federal assistance and timber receipts. So, to be straight with this body, even if my amendment is adopted, I cannot support the bill. At least my amendment would mean that this bill, which is entitled the Community Self-Determination Act, would come a little closer to living up to its name.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

Mr. Speaker, I wish that every day on the floor we had rules like this. This is an open rule. It will allow any Member of the House to offer an amendment, and I believe that is something that we should do much more often around here. So this will be a rare moment where I can support a rule for a bill. Too many times we are muzzled and not allowed to offer amendments that would improve or alter bills before us.

The bill that is before us is very different and did not go through a regular committee process; and for that reason, some Members may be puzzled as to exactly what the bill does, as are advocacy groups on both sides of the issue among the public; and I would like to take a couple of minutes to explain that.

I had a very different approach in mind when I introduced my legislation, which would be 100 percent guaranteed, very clean, complete decoupled. That bill garnered very, very little support; and a different bill passed in the Committee on Agriculture, the Boyd-Deal bill; and then, of course, we had a bill recommended on the Senate side by Senators who I do not think the rules of the House allow me to name. But, anyway, there were some Senators that introduced a bill over.

This bill is different than all of those bills, but it combines some of the most important aspects of all. First and foremost, this bill requires that anything and everything done under this legislation follow and absolutely comply with every environmental law, every environmental rule, every forest plan, every resource management plan that is currently on the books in the United States, that it fully follow the Endangered Species Act, and allow appeals.

□ 1315

All that is within the scope of this bill. Any projects which might occur under this bill, which are a small part of the bill, are subject to Secretarial discretion, in addition to having to follow all rules, laws, and regulations.

There will be much controversy over the projects. The projects were not my preferred alternative, but they have been altered in a way that makes them environmentally neutral, and potentially they could be projects that would be beneficial to local communities and areas.

They could be spent for road obliteration for problem roads, for watershed restoration, they could be spent for other revenue-generating activities on the forests that do not go to timber production. They could be spent on recreation.

The gentleman from Minnesota objected to a provision I had added which would allow them to be used for work camps; that is, to be allowed for a correctional facility for nonviolent offenders to work on the forest lands. I do not find that to be objectionable. I think that is very desirable, better than having them sit in jail and watch television. So I do not understand why the gentleman would object to that.

It could also be used at their initiative for reimbursing counties for the huge unmet costs of search and rescue on Federal lands. The bottom line is, my State is more than half owned by the Federal government. The Federal government has dramatically changed the laws and rules that pertain to timber harvests, as I believe many of those changes were necessary, because we were overharvesting.

The question is, since no other productive use that generates revenues for those counties, we cannot levy taxes in those lands can go forward, should the government pay something to those counties for their ongoing obligations to provide a road network through those lands, and to provide law enforcement services and the other things? I believe the answer is yes. I hope that a majority of the body here today decides that the answer is yes.

The gentleman before me, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) said this creates a bad precedent. He talked about offshore oil drilling. That is not analogous. The analogy would be base closings. When the Federal government closes a military base, it admits there are huge impacts on the communities, it dumps a whole bunch of money into that community, it does retraining, does a whole host of other things, and ultimately it turns the lands over to those communities for future purposes.

I am not advocating these lands be turned back over to the States. I am absolutely and adamantly opposed to that. But in lieu of that, we are asking for a modest replacement of revenues that were formerly created off these lands, while there will be ongoing and perpetual obligations to the counties for law enforcement and infrastruc-

ture, roads and other activities on those lands.

These are vital payments that go to schools, that go to vital county services; as I already mentioned, law enforcement, road construction, reconstruction, and maintenance. Those funds will not exist if this legislation does not pass.

In the case of my counties, we have 3 more years of a guarantee under law, but after that, we fall off the cliff. For many other counties, they have already fallen off the cliff. They need this help to rebuild the social infrastructure of their communities and maintain vital county services.

I would urge people to keep an open mind in the debate today and realize, unfortunately, having not followed a regular process, my committee having decided not to take jurisdiction, the Committee on Resources, that this has not been before Members in its final form for very long. It is very different than what was proposed. I urge the Members to read the bill and ask questions of any of us who were involved in the writing.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there could be some problems with this bill, I am not sure. The most important thing as far as what we have right now is that the rule is open. It gives Members a chance to change this bill if they do not like it. For that reason we support the rule.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me remind my colleagues, as my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, just did, that this is an open rule. Not only does it provide for a completely open amendment process, it provides balance for the process by inserting compromise language into H.R. 2389 as well.

This bipartisan compromise has the support of the National Association of Counties, the National Education Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and some 800 rural education, government, business, and labor organizations from 37 States.

For any Member who still has concerns about the legislation, the rule allows any germane amendment to be debated and voted upon. I hope my colleagues will support this very fair, balanced, open rule.

More importantly, I urge my colleagues to support the children and the schools who will benefit from the needed assistance this bill will provide. This is a great opportunity to shore up public education in rural forest communities through a balanced, equitable approach. I hope Members can support this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.
The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2990, QUALITY CARE FOR THE UNINSURED ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on the bill (H.R. 2990) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals greater access to health insurance through a health care tax deduction, a long-term care deduction, and other health-related tax incentives, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide access to and choice in health care through association health plans, to amend the Public Health Service Act to create new pooling opportunities for small employers to obtain greater access to health coverage through HealthMarts; to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage; and for other purposes:

From the Committee on Commerce, for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. BILEY, BILIRAKIS, SHADEGG, DINGELL, and PALLONE.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. ARCHER and Mr. THOMAS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. RANGEL and Mr. STARK, provided that Mr. MCCRERY is appointed in lieu of Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut for consideration of title XIV of the House bill and sections 102, 111(b) and 304 and title II of the Senate amendment.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. BOEHNER, TALENT, FLETCHER, CLAY, and ANDREWS.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Government Reform, for consideration of section 503 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. BURTON of Indiana, SCARBOROUGH, and WAXMAN.

As additional conferees for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. GOSS and Mr. BERRY.

There was no objection.

COUNTY SCHOOLS FUNDING REVITALIZATION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 352 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 2389.

□ 1322

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2389) to restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to States and counties containing National Forest System lands and public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management for use by the counties for the benefit of public schools, roads, and other purposes, with Mr. KOLBE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) will each control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, today the House considers H.R. 2389, a bill that has been under consideration in my subcommittee for several months, but whose time has been long in coming. Nearly 100 years ago the Federal Government, as a condition of managing our national forest lands, established a compact with forest-dependent communities in rural America. Under the terms of this compact, the government would own and manage the forests, not only for the long-term environmental benefit of the resource, but also for the long-term social and economic benefit of rural communities in and adjacent to the forest.

Recently, revenue-sharing payments with rural communities guaranteed under the compact have dropped in some communities by as much as 90 percent. Local administrator after local administrator told my subcommittee about the drastic and tragic measures their school systems have taken just to fight foreclosure. The compact is not working, and our rural schools cannot wait any longer.

A coalition of local school systems developed a set of principles which attempts to breath new life into their compact with the Federal Government. Their idea has been well received across the country. Their supporters top 800 grass roots organizations in 36 States, that range from school districts and administrators to the National Education Association, the National Association of Counties, the United States Chamber of Commerce, organized labor, and other groups.

Their principles are embodied in H.R. 2389, the Secure Rural Schools and Communities Self-determination Act of 1999. As we consider this legislation

today, we, as Members of this House, are faced with one overriding question: Who knows better what needs to be done to help forest-dependent communities in rural America, rural America, or Washington?

This bill is representative government at its best. Local leaders recognize that the compacts of 1908 and 1937 need to be strengthened for the short term to immediately arrest the decline in and stabilize the revenues derived from Federal forest lands until permanent improvements to existing law can be made.

They crafted their solution, garnered support from all regions of the country, and entrusted us to do the right thing.

The challenges facing forest counties are so dramatic and so widespread that soon after the House Committee on Agriculture unanimously approved H.R. 2389, several Members expressed a strong interest in the bill. The legislation was introduced by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), and I commend them for their initiative.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) became actively engaged, and spent countless hours working with us to ensure the compacts between the Federal government and the forest counties are honored.

The bill we consider today is the product of the locally-crafted solution and our intense interest to promote the interests of forest counties. H.R. 2389 establishes a temporary national safety net which ensures a stable payment to forest communities for the short term, while giving local communities and educators a direct stake in crafting a long-term policy that will put schoolchildren in forest communities on equal footing with their peers in other parts of the country.

Despite the overwhelming support for this bill, we do expect a poison pill amendment to be offered. The expected amendment will be dressed up to appear as a county-friendly amendment. We have talked it through with the counties, and they oppose this and all amendments, and support H.R. 2389 as it is finally crafted.

Time is of the essence. Forest counties cannot wait any longer. Key Senators have agreed to take this bill and use it as their vehicle in the Senate. We must oppose this and any other amendment, for quick passage in both the House and Senate. H.R. 2389 is strongly supported by the National Education Association and the National Association of Counties, two longtime advocates of rural education. They also oppose any amendments.

I hope that we will be fully committed to helping all the proponents of H.R. 2389, the most important being the families and communities of rural America. This bill helps rural America achieve what they have set out to achieve. It revitalizes their compact with the Federal government in a way

that will truly benefit their children and maintain the ecological, social, and economic integrity of our forests and forest-dependent rural communities in both the short and long term.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2389, the County Schools Funding Revitalization Act of 1999.

The funding and day-to-day operation of schools and county governments located within our vast network of national forests present a unique situation for rural America. In fact, there are more than 800 rural communities that cannot include national forest lands in their taxable land base because the Federal government prohibits that option.

This limits a rural community's tax base, and presents a serious problem when 98 percent of an individual county's total land is located within the boundaries of a national forest.

In order to provide replacement revenue, Congress enacted a 25 percent receipt-sharing requirement in 1908 for national forest system land and a 50 percent receipt-sharing requirement in 1937 for Bureau of Land Management land. Over time, communities have understandably grown to depend on the 25 percent payment from the Forest Service, as well as the 50 percent payment from the BLM.

Faced with the stringent requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and its judicial interpretations, there is not a single community within the national forest system that can rationally depend on timber harvest alone as a source of revenue for schools or county roads.

□ 1330

The current situation in east Texas is a prime example. Prior to the August 16, 1999, a court injunction banning all timber sales in east Texas National Forest counties received more than \$5.6 million from the 25 percent receipt sharing requirement in 1998 alone.

Under the serious stipulations of this court injunction, however, that figure will now be zero, placing unimaginable financial strain on school systems.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an isolated occurrence. School systems and local governments all over rural America are dependent on revenue from the National Forest System, but an injunction that prevents receipt sharing leaves these entities without the ability to do orderly budget planning.

H.R. 2389 and the substitute amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) are a good start towards correcting this situation. The Goodlatte amendment in the nature of a substitute improves upon the central goal of stabilizing the payment to schools and counties.

First, a full annual payment should be calculated by averaging the highest 3 years of the 25 percent payments between 1985 to 1999. The first portion of full payment would come from annual timber harvest, and the remainder of the full payment would come from appropriated funds. A similar formula is provided for BLM lands.

In addition, the Goodlatte substitute requires the counties to use a portion of their full payment to initiate local projects on Federal Forest land. By placing a 20 percent limitation on the use of the full payment, the counties are given incentives to organize and develop sustainable forest harvest plans. These plans will then be presented to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior for further consideration.

Mr. Chairman, there is an important connection between the viability of our rural communities and the vast resources that all citizens have a vested interest in protecting. This legislation allows local input in guiding the management of our National Forest lands for the communities and individuals who rely on them most. I encourage my colleagues to support passage of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2389, the County Schools Funding Revitalization Act of 1999.

The funding and day-to-day operations of schools and county governments located within our vast network of national forests present a unique situation for rural America. In fact, there are more than 800 rural communities that cannot include national forest lands in their taxable land base because the federal government prohibits that option. This limits a rural community's tax base and presents a serious problem when 98% of an individual county's total land is located within the boundaries of a national forest.

In order to provide replacement revenue, Congress enacted a 25% receipt sharing requirement in 1908 for National Forest System Lands, and a 50% receipt sharing requirement in 1937 for Bureau of Land Management (BLM) land. Over time, communities have understandably grown to depend on the 25% payment from the Forest Service, as well as the 50% payment from the BLM.

Faced with the stringent requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and its judicial interpretations, there is not a single community within the National Forest System that can rationally depend on timber harvest alone as a source of revenue for schools or county roads.

The current situation in East Texas is a prime example. Prior to the August 16, 1999 court injunction banning all timber sales in East Texas, National Forest counties received more than \$5.6 million dollars from the 25% receipt sharing requirement in 1998 alone. Under the serious stipulations of this court injunction, however, that figure will now be zero, placing unimaginable financial strain on school systems.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an isolated occurrence. School systems and local governments all over rural America are dependent on revenue from the National Forest System, but an injunction that prevents receipt sharing leaves

these entities without the ability to do orderly budget planning.

H.R. 2389, and the substitute amendment to be offered by Mr. GOODLATTE, are a good start towards correcting this situation. The Goodlatte amendment, in the nature of a substitute, improves upon the central goal of stabilizing the payments to schools and counties.

First, a full annual payment would be calculated by averaging the highest three years of the 25% payments between 1985 to 1999. The first portion of full payment would come from annual timber harvest, and the remainder of the full payment would come from appropriated funds. A similar formula is provided for BLM lands.

In addition, the Goodlatte substitute requires the counties to use a portion of their full payment to initiate local projects on federal forestlands. By placing a 20% limitation on the use of the full payment, the counties are given incentives to organize and develop sustainable forest harvest plans. These plans will then be presented to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior for further consideration.

Mr. Chairman, there is an important connection between the viability of our rural communities and the vast resources that all citizens have a vested interest in protecting. This legislation allows local input in guiding the management of our national forest lands for the communities and individuals who rely on them most.

I encourage my colleagues to support passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO).

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation, and I would also like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), for all of his hard work in putting together such a strong bill that enjoys wide bipartisan support.

This legislation also enjoys the support of the National Forest Counties and Schools Coalition, which represents 800 rural counties, 5,000 school districts and 1.2 million school children and includes an impressive and diverse array of interest groups representing education, labor unions, forest products, State and local governments and farm groups.

This bill will accomplish several important goals. First and foremost, it will stabilize the revenue sharing payments made by the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management to counties with Federal lands.

It will help local governments and school districts restore the quality of education provided to the school children.

It will provide temporary relief to counties and school districts by authorizing a reliable and predictable level of payments. These payments will have the added advantage of neither encouraging the long-term reliance on appropriations nor discouraging the

management of Federal lands in a manner that will generate revenues.

Lastly, it will facilitate the development of a long-term method of providing payments to States and counties by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation will ensure that we continue to honor the commitment that we established with rural counties and schools; a commitment that dates back to 1908 when our National Forests were formed.

In addition to helping reverse the 10-year decline in forest reserve funds, it will allow counties and schools to restore many important school functions, such as hiring more teachers, re-establishing music and art programs, providing student transportation and purchasing library books. And, it treats all 800 counties that rely on National Forests very equitably.

This bill is incredibly important for the 1.2 million school children in rural forest-dependent counties, to help ensure that these children have the same quality of schools and education as other students do.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would note that this bill is a piece of win-win legislation of legislation for the forests, for the communities which depend on forests, and for the hard-working families that make up these communities. It authorizes forest improvement projects that will stimulate local economic growth while promoting forest improvements and it sets up a panel designed to help all of us look for the most effective ways of fostering and preserving this long-term relationship for the future.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague and my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Goodlatte substitute amendment to H.R. 2389, the County Schools Funding Revitalization Act of 1999. The issue of forest revenue payments by the Federal Government to local affected communities is very important to many communities across rural America and to a large portion of the Second Congressional District of Florida, which is a very rural district that encompasses 19 counties which has two national forests in it, the Apalachicola and the Osceola.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I have been working on this issue for many years and even before I came to Congress when I was serving in the Florida State legislature. I am happy that this Congress is finally addressing and trying to solve this issue that affects so many communities across the Nation.

As has been said before, in 1908, the Federal Government entered into a compact with rural communities in which the government was the dominant landowner. Under this compact, counties with National Forest lands received 25 percent of the revenue gen-

erated from the forest lands to compensate them for diminished local property tax base. By law, these revenues finance public schools and local road infrastructure. However, in recent years, in the last 10 years, the principal source of these revenues has sharply curtailed due to changes in Federal forest management policy.

Those revenues, shared with States and counties, have declined significantly. As we know, payments to some counties have dropped to less than 10 percent of the historic levels under this compact, and the impact on rural communities and schools has been staggering. In fact, in the Apalachicola National Forest in North Florida the revenues have dropped 89 percent in the last 10 years. This decline in shared revenues has severely impacted or crippled educational funding and the quality of education provided and the services offered in the affected counties.

I will not detail all the various painful cuts that have been incurred by our communities and our schools, but I want to emphasize the severity of the actions that has been required. The most far-reaching and devastating impact of the declining revenues is the adverse effect on the future of our children. An education system crippled by such funding cuts cannot train our young people in the skills needed to join tomorrow's society as contributing, productive, taxpaying citizens. It is clear to me and many others that the compact of 1908 is broken and needs to be fixed immediately. That is why the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and I introduced the County Schools Funding Revitalization Act of 1999.

This legislation was based on principles that were part of a compromise agreement reached by the National Forest Counties and Schools Coalition. This bill is significant because it was developed not by a Washington-knows-best approach but from a bottom-up approach and based on a consensus of 800 groups from approximately 26 States, including school superintendents, county commissioners, educators, the National Education Association and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

In an effort to improve the bill's chance of passage and to be as inclusive as possible, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and I began to work with key members of the Senate and with the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

As many know, reaching a compromise with that group was no small accomplishment in itself. However, I honestly believe that we have come together and have improved this bill and in doing so have increased the chance of it becoming law.

This substitute contains three main provisions. First, it would restore stability to the 25 percent payment compact by ensuring a predictable payment

level to forest communities for an interim 7-year period. That payment would be 80 percent of the highest of the 3-year average since 1984.

Secondly, counties would receive an additional 20 percent of the average amount described above for projects recommended by local community advisory committees, if approved by the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management. All projects would have to comply, as was said earlier, with all environmental laws and regulations, as well as all applicable forest plans.

Finally, the bill requires the Federal Government to collaborate with local community and school representatives as part of the Forest Counties Payment Committee to develop a long-term permanent exclusion that will fix the 1908 compact for the long-term.

I want to thank my four colleagues, my partner in writing this bill, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), who has walked us through this maze, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), who has been wonderful in helping us reach a compromise, along with the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), for their efforts to bring a piece of legislation that actually has a chance of becoming law.

In closing, the Federal Government must fulfill the promise made to these communities in 1908. I urge support of the Goodlatte substitute and opposition to any amendments that would upset this fine balance that has been achieved. Together we can fix the compact and restore long-term stability to our rural schools.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL), the chief sponsor of the legislation on our side of the aisle.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, before I proceed, I would like to join in thanking those who have made this compromise as it comes to the floor today possible. First of all, to my original cosponsor, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), who just spoke, his efforts and those of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), as he has taken this legislation and worked with us; the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and others on the Committee on Agriculture who have worked with us to bring this issue to the floor today.

We believe that the proposal that is before us is a reasonable, short-term solution to a problem that has continued to get worse over the years. As we have heard other speakers say, this legislation grows out of the existing law that was a compact arrangement beginning in 1908 for Forest Service counties and then in 1937 for those Bureau

of Land Management counties, to share revenue generated from Federal lands with the local communities in which those lands are located.

We have heard the statistics that we have seen across the board on Forest Service lands, about a 70 percent decrease in some communities, as much as in excess of a 90 percent decrease in the revenue they were receiving to support their local school systems, road programs and so forth.

Let me give a dollar idea of how much that is. For Forest Service lands, the peak year was in 1989 when the revenue that was being shared was \$1.44 billion. That dropped in 1998 to only \$557 million.

On the Oregon and California receipts, they declined to \$51 million in 1998 from the peak year of 1989 of some \$235 million. So it is easy to see that when a revenue stream is reduced by more than 70 percent and sometimes more than 90 percent to local communities, the impact can be devastating.

We recognize that this legislation is not a long-term permanent solution. It has built into it a mechanism whereby we hope to arrive at that solution; a committee that is appointed, made up of local officials, Forest Service officials, Bureau of Land Management officials, who will study the issue and come back to Congress with a proposal.

As has already been indicated, this legislation is an outgrowth of the communities themselves asking us to take action. In March of this year, a national conference was held in Reno, Nevada, and out of that came the National Forest Counties and Schools Coalition, this 800-member group that we have heard referenced here. This legislation is in response to their request.

In conclusion, I would like to once again thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), and in particular all of our staffs who have worked diligently to bring this issue to the floor today. I would urge its adoption without amendment.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for providing me the opportunity to speak in support of the critical issue of county schools funding. We must support our rural schools and communities, and H.R. 2389 is an important effort for those with forest lands in their districts.

In the ninth congressional district I serve in Georgia, 15 of my 20 counties include national forest land. In fact, the Chattahoochee National Forest encompasses more than fifty percent of my district. Counties that have the largest amount of forest land in my district include Towns County with 64% and Rabun County with 63%. Such communities do not collect property taxes for these federal lands and greatly depend upon forestry resources for their schools and economies. Therefore, effective forest management is an issue of vital importance in rural areas such as mine, and there are multiple forest uses to consider (scenic areas, wilderness, timber production, recreation, and wildlife designation). As a Co-Chairman of the Forestry 2000 Congressional Task Force, I am working to provide balance between societal and environmental concerns and the timber industry, specifically in the

areas of forest management and health, taxes, endangered species, property rights, funding matters, and public land revisions.

Additionally, nothing is more important to the future of our country than the opportunity for high quality education for all Americans. I believe in the value of education, and we must prepare our nation's children for the 21st century. As a member of the House Education and the Workforce Committee, I am actively involved in designing and examining legislation to benefit those who are closest to our nation's students. Those at the local level have the greatest responsibility in educating and preparing our children for the future.

While education is predominantly a state and local issue, many have taken the "Washington knows best" attitude and have attached endless strings to federal dollars. What I hear schools and educators really need is not more paperwork and red tape, but the flexibility to help children more efficiently. Thus, I have focused my attention on assisting state and local governments in providing a quality education for America's youth.

For too long, we have relied on Washington bureaucracies to solve our nation's problems. It is time to create a more rational approach in addressing issues at the federal level by basing decisions on what works back at home. With those thoughts in mind, I introduced with my colleague, Representative ALLEN BOYD, the County Schools Funding Revitalization Act of 1999 (H.R. 2389).

This legislation is a locally designed solution to the education funding shortages in communities dependent upon timber revenues. Specifically, in March of 1999, a national conference of organizations concerned about forest revenue sharing payments and rural socio-economic stability convened in Reno, Nevada. From this conference emerged the National Forest Counties and Schools Coalition (NFCSC), a unique group of over 800 local, regional, and national organizations which share the common objective of strengthening and improving rural schools and forest dependent communities in both the short and long term. The NFCSC developed a set of joint principles to guide lawmakers in developing legislation to improve forest revenue sharing payments. I urge lawmakers to pay attention to these principals submitted from communities across the country as we work to address this issue.

As a matter of background, the National Forest System, managed by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) within the Department of Agriculture, was established in 1907 and has grown to include 192 million acres of federal lands. In addition, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) within the Department of the Interior manages over 2.6 million acres of federal lands.

The federal government recognized that, when it secured these lands in federal ownership, it deprived the adjacent counties of revenues they would have otherwise received if the lands were sold or transferred into private ownership. Accordingly, in 1908 Congress enacted a law providing that 25% of the revenues from National Forests be paid to the counties in which those lands were situated for the benefit of public schools and roads. Similarly, in 1937, Congress established that 50% of the revenues from the revested and reconveyed BLM lands be paid to the counties in which those lands were located for similar public purposes.

Since that time, counties adjacent to federal forests have relied on the compacts of 1908 and 1937 to help finance rural schools and roads and maintain a stable socio-economic infrastructure. In recent years, however, the principal source of these revenues, federal timber sales, has declined by over 70% nationwide, a payments to many counties have dropped to less than 10% of their historic levels under the compact. The corresponding revenues shared with rural counties throughout the country have declined dramatically, crippling educational funding and severely eroding the quality of education offered to rural school children. Many have been forced to lay off teachers, bus drivers, nurses, and other employees; postpone badly needed building repairs and other capital expenditures; eliminate lunch programs; and curtail extracurricular activities. Further, local county budgets have been badly strained as communities have been forced to cut funding for social programs and local infrastructure to offset lost 25% payment revenues. As a result, rural communities are suffering severe economic downturns with increases in unemployment, family dislocation, domestic violence, substance abuse, and welfare enrollment.

In 1993, Congress enacted a partial response to this crisis by establishing a temporary safety net payment system for 72 counties in Oregon, Washington and Northern California, where federal timber sales were reduced by over 80% to protect the northern spotted owl. To date, Congress has not provided similar assistance to the other 730 counties across the nation, which have suffered similar hardships because of declining forest revenues.

The Goodlatte substitute to H.R. 2389, entitled the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act, was developed with input and support from the National Forest Counties & Schools Coalition and is a unique compromise endorsed by over 800 education, labor, industry, and country government organizations. The bill would restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to states and counties containing national forest system lands for use by the counties for the benefit of public schools, roads, and communities.

H.R. 2389 restores stability to the 25% payment compact by ensuring a predictable payment level to federal forest communities for an interim 7-year period. The measure also requires the federal government to collaborate with local community and school representatives to develop a permanent solution that will fix the 1908 compact for the long term.

It is my hope that members in Congress will respect the solutions and opinions of our local communities put forth by the National Forest Counties and Schools Coalition. By supporting and passing the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act, together we can fix the compact and restore long-term stability to our rural schools and governments and the families that depend on them.

Again, thank you for the honor to speak today. I ask you to support your local and rural schools by voting for H.R. 2389.

□ 1345

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. STENHOLM) for yielding the time and also for his leadership on the Committee on Agriculture in allowing us to pass this bill out of the committee and now bring it to the floor.

I also want to thank the many who have joined together, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL), and the others, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) to be sure that we have a bill that we have reasonable expectations of seeing passed through the Congress, through the House, through the Senate.

I want to emphasize at the outset that this bill is a very carefully crafted compromise; and though there will be an amendment offered today, at least one, I want all of the Members of the House to understand that the efforts that have gone into crafting this compromise, this very delicate compromise, is very important to preserve, to ensure that this bill will be well received when it reaches the Senate.

This bill really arises out of a problem that has been growing for a number of years in many of our counties that are dependent upon revenues from our National Forest to support our county budgets and to support our school district budgets.

In my own case, in east Texas, where we have four National Forests, the problem has been particularly acute, because we have been under an injunction in east Texas that has, for almost 2 years now, halted all harvesting in our National Forest.

I think if we look at the situation in east Texas and all across the country, what we see is that our school districts and our county governments have been held hostage to the ongoing national debate over National Forest policy.

I think that it is time for us to let our counties and our school districts be free of the impact, the adverse impact of that national debate. This bill is designed to do that by providing a guaranteed level of funding from our National Forest for those forest dependent counties and school districts. This is a very real problem.

In fact, today we have with us here in the gallery two county judges from my own district, Judge Mark Evans and Judge Chris VonDoenhoff, who have fought the problems that have been brought about by the lack of revenues from our National Forest on their particular county budgets.

They were a part of the coalition of school districts and county officials that have worked to bring this bill to the floor, a coalition that has 800 different organizations supporting this legislation.

The counties that they represent each have lost significant dollars as a result of the injunction that now exists halting all harvesting of timber in our National Forests. In fact, when we compare the revenues that those two counties, Houston County and Trinity County, in east Texas received in 1996 to what they are receiving today, they

have lost 90 percent of their revenues from the National Forest. So this is a very serious problem for all of the counties and school districts in areas where there are National Forests.

We talked to an individual today in one of our school districts who advised us of the hardship that they are feeling as a result of the loss of revenues. There was even an article in one of my local papers recently that talked about the fact that one of the school bus drivers is having to drive a broken down school bus solely because the school district had to lay off the mechanics that take care of the maintenance of the school buses because of the loss of Federal forest revenues.

So I am very pleased to be an original cosponsor of this bill. I am very pleased to have all of the Members that have joined with us on this compromise legislation. I think it is important for us all to understand that this is a bill that not only should be well received by those who are dependent upon forest revenues to operate their schools and their counties, but this is also a bill that should enjoy the support of the environmental community because it does have the effect of taking our school districts and our counties out of the middle of the national debate over National Forest management practices.

I think it is time to do this. Our school districts deserve this kind of protection. Our counties deserve the protection. In the long-term, I think it is the right thing to do for the country. I hope all the Members will reject any amendments, help us preserve this compromise and vote in favor of this very good piece of legislation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO
TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The Chair will remind the Member not to refer to occupants of the gallery.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), and to thank him for his hard work in fashioning the compromise that we have here today.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his kind words.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2389 as amended by the Goodlatte substitute. The Goodlatte substitute reflects many, many hours of tough negotiations, 7 hours on last Friday alone.

I want to thank all of the staff who worked on getting the details of this draft right. I especially wish to thank Greg Kostka of the Legislative Counsel's Office for his responsiveness and dedication. So often we fail to appreciate the talent and the professionalism of the Legislative Counsel's Office. I want to make certain that is acknowledged here and now.

I need to begin with two caveats about this agreement just so there is no risk of misunderstanding as we go through the remainder of the legislative process. This substitute is a reasonable agreement. But it represents just about as far as we can possibly compromise on this issue. If the other body changes anything at all in this bill, we are under no obligation whatsoever to accept those changes, nor are we under any obligation to support a bill that supports those changes. We should be willing, as we always must be, to look at changes. But keep in mind that any changes would unnecessarily threaten the House coalition that is supporting the Goodlatte amendment. That needs to be clear.

There is, however, one change that all House supporters agree that the other body has to make. The Goodlatte substitute uses appropriations to fund county payments. The final bill will have to use mandatory funds for that purpose.

I would point out that previously in the well the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, addressed this subject very eloquently and articulately. Let me repeat, the final bill will have to use mandatory funds for that purpose.

I know that that is the intention of all the supporters of this bill. Unless this becomes a mandatory spending bill, this legislation would threaten both the guaranteed payment to the counties, and we do not want to do that, and other Forest Service appropriations, which might be cannibalized to provide the guaranteed payment, something that I would oppose vehemently.

So, too, I point out, do my friends associated with the League of Conservation Voters who, in a mailing to all Members, addressed that point. They happen to be right on that point. We are working together with them.

With those caveats, I do urge my colleagues to support this substitute and to oppose all amendments.

The substitute ensures that schools and areas with National Forests will have a generous stream of Federal funding. Like all other versions of this bill, the substitute provides counties with full payment equal to 100 percent of the average payment received during the top 3 years between 1984 and 1999. Again, this is quite generous. But I do not mind being generous with education. That is a wise investment in our future.

The substitute protects the counties while also protecting our National Forests, which were needlessly put at risk in some other versions, early incantations of this bill. The substitute accomplishes that by adding environmental safeguards to title II of this bill, something that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) pointed out, which requires counties to spend money on projects in National Forests

instead of just applying the money to the traditional purposes of roads and schools.

The substitute makes clear that the Federal Government decides whether proposed projects can go forward, and that that decision is made only after completing the usual environmental analyses. The projects must comply with all Federal laws. The Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior alone have the power to reject a proposed project, but approved projects are subject to all the standard appeals and reviews. That is very important to emphasize.

In short, the bill now clearly lays out the role of the counties, the advisory board, and the Secretaries, and makes clear that these projects are to be treated just as if they had originated with the Secretaries.

The substitute also eliminates the incentives to use project funds to harvest trees. Under earlier versions of this bill, the counties and the Forest Service each would have received 50 percent of the timber receipts, thereby recoupling the counties' treasuries to forestry payments, that is something we do not want to do, as well as creating an enormous incentive to choose timber harvesting over other such sorts of projects, such as ecosystem restoration. That was totally unacceptable.

Under the substitute, all the receipts from the program will go into special funds in each region to which counties may apply to projects, and those funds will return to the general fund of the Treasury at the end of fiscal 2007.

Madam Chairman, we believe this substitute has eliminated the provisions of the bill that would have been of greatest detriment to the environment.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), chairman of the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry, for his willingness to negotiate. I urge that the House pass this substitute and oppose all amendments thereto.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time.

Madam Chairman, this is a compromise that has been in the making for some time. It is a compromise that has come with a lot of people coming to the tables and a lot of variance of it. But it also, I think, is exemplary what we can do when we set our mind to do it.

Now, this is not a permanent fix, though it is, indeed, a reasonable and celebrated victory to move this forward and to make sure that school systems that are in these areas where there are large holdings of Federal lands are not put at the mercy of how we make these decisions, nor should it be seen as a substitute to put the environment at the risk of having to fund our schools.

So this is why we celebrate the compromise. It recognizes both of those forces are good, that the environment, protecting our forest is good, but equally as important is making sure that the children in rural area have an opportunity for the education that they, not choosing, but live in communities that are heavily dependent on lands that are held by the Federal Government.

So I want to urge that we support this bill and also hold this process that is perhaps a process that we can look at other difficult issues to try to work out a compromise.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2389, a bill that will provide much needed financial security for our rural communities and schools that have been so hard hit by the decline in timber production on our Nation's forests.

In 1908, Congress recognized that the Federal Government's control of the huge amount of untaxed land in rural areas would have a serious negative impact on the ability of rural counties to maintain schools and other basic services. Congress enacted a law to pay 25 percent of the revenues from National Forests to the local counties so they can provide for their schools and their roads.

So how does Federal land control affect a county today? Let me give my colleagues a couple of examples. Lake County, in rural southeastern Oregon, is larger than the State of New Jersey, and four times the size of Delaware. About three-quarters of the county is controlled by the Federal Government. So what do my colleagues think would happen to Delaware or New Jersey if three-quarters of their tax roll was eliminated and three-quarters of their land was handed over to the Federal Government? I think they would have problems meeting the bottom line just as Lake County does.

I asked Lake County Commissioner Jane O'Keefe what this legislation will mean to her county. She said that, if the bill becomes law, the county would be able to again adequately maintain one of its most important investments, that of its infrastructure of its roads and its schools. It will keep the critical linkage between Lake County and the Federal forests that lie within its boundaries. It will provide Lake County with a temporary solution to the fiscal crisis that many rural counties are facing in maintaining infrastructure while creating a process to permanently address the county payments issue.

Grant County Judge Dennis Reynolds told me that, in 1992 and 1993, Grant County received \$12 million. Last year, they received less than \$1.5 million. Next year they are expected to receive only a million.

□ 1400

With a tenth of the receipts they received just 7 years ago, Judge Reynolds said Grant County is not doing any new contribution or reconstruction of their roads; they are simply trying to maintain the roads they currently have. I could cite similar examples in the other 18 counties in my district. This legislation is good for our schools, it is good for our counties, it is good for our communities.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), and all my colleagues who stayed at the table and made this legislation possible.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I would first like to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for their work on this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to more adequately compensate counties for the losses that they sustain at the expense of the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management-owned lands. Schools, local roads and county budgets should not suffer because national forest lands lie in their county.

This bill sets an important precedent that Congress must follow in the future. If the Federal Government owns land in a particular locality, we should see to it that these counties receive funds to make up the lost property tax base.

My home county of Arkansas County in Southeast Arkansas receives a payment in lieu of taxes from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. While the structure of these payments is not affected by this bill, the bill makes the point that all counties containing Federal land should be sufficiently compensated. Parts of the St. Francis National Forest and the Ozark National Forest do lie in my district, and those counties will benefit from this bill.

Madam Chairman, we should vote to pass this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. COOKSEY).

Mr. COOKSEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2389. Rural communities that depend on national forest receipts to fund education are facing a crisis. By law, the Forest Service must share 25 percent of national forest revenues with the counties in which they are generated as a "payment in lieu of property taxes." This payment is used to fund local schools and roads.

However, severe declines in forest receipts over the last several years have drained school budgets in hundreds of

rural counties, forcing deep cuts in education programs and bringing some school districts to the brink of collapse. Schools have canceled classes, cut teachers, eliminated extra-curricular activities, and cut corners in every conceivable way to keep their doors open.

Recently, rural communities from all over America have come together in a unique coalition, the National Forest Counties and Schools Coalition, a unique and diverse grass roots coalition of over 550 local and national organizations representing rural communities in 36 States. This coalition has come together to address this serious problem.

Their proposal, H.R. 2389, the County Schools Funding Revitalization Act of 1999, will stabilize funding for forest-dependent schools and allow rural communities to help craft a new Federal policy that will strengthen and improve education in forest communities for the long term.

H.R. 2389 is strongly supported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Counties. I join them in supporting H.R. 2389.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank my colleagues for all their hard work on this important piece of legislation.

When the Federal Government decided to reclaim the Oregon and California Railroad grant lands in 1916 and 1919, the Government took on a responsibility and made a promise to reimburse those counties that lost their tax base after these lands were reclaimed by the Federal Government. These counties, including six in my district, expend their local tax revenues on efforts that directly affect these Federal lands and the people that use them.

But times have changed, people's attitudes have changed, and the way we manage our lands have changed. We realize that logging at will impacted our lands and clean water. The logging of the 1980s, that saw extensive revenue brought into my district for schools and roads, are long gone. Over the last 10 years, I have seen class sizes grow, teachers, after-school programs and many other services reduced or eliminated because, without the timber receipts, we simply did not have the additional money for education and infrastructure.

In 1993, Congress recognized this trend and enacted an alternative safety net payment to 72 counties in Oregon, Washington, and California. Federal timber sales have been restricted or prohibited due to protection of certain species under the Northwest Forest Plan. This safety net is expected to expire in 2 years. This is not just a problem in the Northwest. This affects over 800 counties throughout the country from Oregon to Florida.

The children in these 800 counties, including six in my district, deserve the

same opportunity and the same quality of schools and education opportunities as the rest of America. We made a promise to them. We must extend the safety net for an additional 4 years while we work with these communities to draft a permanent solution to fund infrastructure and, most importantly, our schools.

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting "yes" for education and voting "yes" on this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH).

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Chairman, I want to tell my colleagues about Mariposa County, where I was born and raised. It has a single school district within it struggling to make ends meet for about 2,600 students. Arts programs for children have been cut back, six of the districts schools do not have a lunchroom where the children can eat, 60 percent of Mariposa County school buildings are modular, temporary structures, and the school district's bus fleet is rapidly aging.

Such decay is due in part to a lack of management on the national forests. Over the past decade, Mariposa County has gone from generating \$800,000 each year from the receipt program to less than \$100,000 as a result of diminished forest management.

Mariposa County's resources are Federal lands, so the county is unable to generate a sufficient tax base. It, therefore, relies on funds derived from the receipt program. It is vital that Congress pass H.R. 2389, which creates a system to encourage rural forest communities to be self-sufficient and provide funding for schools in these areas.

Approval of H.R. 2389 is also necessary to prevent the administration from implementing its plan to remove economic incentives to rural communities by decoupling forest receipts and giving direct payments to counties that are not linked to forest management. The loss of the 25 percent receipts would further devastate rural schools and their already economically ailing communities experiencing decreased forest management.

The economies of some rural communities, in Northern California in particular, depend almost entirely on the management of forest. In the absence of receipts, the areas have little else except government welfare upon which to survive. The County Schools Funding Revitalization Act is needed to establish a stable system of funds to provide a solid future for rural school-children.

I strongly support H.R. 2389 on behalf of the rural children throughout my district who simply have had enough cuts in their schools and must be afforded the opportunity to receive the best education possible.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me

this time. This is very important legislation before this body, and we are hearing from Members coast to coast on what this means to people in their home States and their counties, particularly to smaller rural school districts and rural counties where there is little other economic opportunity and where the county property tax bases are not sufficient.

In my district it is doubly important. We have not only Forest Service lands, we have something called the O and C lands. More than half of my district is owned by the United States Government. And with the changes that have come about in forest management in the last few years, the revenues to those counties have dropped off dramatically, or would have dropped off dramatically, had we not gotten a guarantee in 1993 when the Clinton forest plan was put into place. That plan expires in the year 2003, and each year under that plan we get fewer revenues.

If this legislation passes today and becomes law, those revenues will immediately increase, and that will mean more funding for schools, that will mean more funding for rural law enforcement, that will mean some additional funds to meet unmet road maintenance and repair needs across southwest Oregon. Those are important programs.

This is legislation that has tremendous merit. As I mentioned earlier, for my colleagues who do not have these sorts of Federal lands, if they can think of it in the way we have dealt with base closings in this Congress; that when Federal bases are closed, payments are made into those communities for the conversion of their economies; and often, again, those bases revert to those local communities.

Again, I am not, nor would I ever suggest, and I will adamantly oppose, any return of these lands to the States or local governments. I believe they are best managed in the Federal interest. But there is no option to raise revenues off of these lands. And some of the things that were mentioned earlier, in terms of recreation and all that, yes, in fact, the recreation can possibly be enhanced by some of these local projects, investments can be made. I have a bicycle path created between two formerly timber-dependent communities in the southern part of my district. It is beginning to attract additional tourism and economic development to that area. But much, much more can be done.

The payments that were to be made for the transition under the President's forest plan were not adequate for many of these rural economies. Our rate of unemployment in Oregon is one of the highest in the United States. And in rural Oregon it is among the highest in the United States. We need a little bit more help, and this bill will provide that additional help.

So I would recommend this bill to my colleagues, not just because it benefits the people of Oregon but because it

benefits hundreds of counties all across America and from a wide breadth of folks on both sides of the aisle, whose voices I think we are hearing asking for their colleagues' support.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

Mr. OSE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today in strong support of the County Schools Funding Revitalization Act.

Back in my home district, I have heard firsthand the worries of educators about the lack of funding in their school districts. My good friend, Mr. Bob Douglas, the superintendent of schools in Tehama County, recently shared with me information about deteriorating conditions in Tehama's school system. And they are bad. Teachers have been laid off, causing increases in classroom size; some school bus services have been discontinued, leaving children stranded at the beginning or end of the day and parents forced to either delay going to work or to come home from work to take them home. Textbook budgets have been slashed, vocational training restricted, counseling programs reduced, and that single most valuable piece of our educational system, the library, has had its hours curtailed.

Virtually every part of the school system in forest counties, like many of mine, have been affected by the reductions in this funding. And this is not restricted to Tehama County. I have also heard from folks in Butte, Colusa, and Glenn Counties. Parents and teachers who every day see the impact of reduced funding on our children have stressed to me the urgency of this matter.

We spend a lot of time here throwing rhetoric back and forth across that center aisle. We argue about who is spending more on education and who is spending less. Well, my colleagues, now is the time to put our money where our mouth is. This bill will help level the playing field between children of rural counties and those who live in cities so that every child, regardless of where they live, has the opportunity to meet the expectations and expand the horizons that their parents hold so dear.

This bill will help ensure that the local communities who have fallen on hard times in recent years have the funding to provide an adequate education for that most valuable resource, that one thing we all live and breathe for every day, that being for our children. My colleagues, we cannot let down our children from America's rural areas. We must continue to make education a priority.

Please join me in voting "yes" on the County Schools Funding Revitalization Act.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

Ms. MCKINNEY. Madam Chairman, right now the United States Govern-

ment is destroying public land at a loss of \$300 million per year to taxpayers. That is a lot of money to spend on the destruction of our national forests.

□ 1415

Some of my colleagues say that if we do not expand our corporate welfare to the timber industries, there will be no money for our Nation's children. That is like robbing Peter to pay Paul. Timber sales have been decreasing and the money for rural schools is on the decline. We need to provide a real solution to the problem, not a false choice between trees or schools.

Supporters of this bill say we need to address the declining rate of funding for schools. Yet 13 States will experience a permanent reduction in education and infrastructure funding under this bill. The fact is we can afford to give our rural schools the funding they need and deserve, but we must separate funding to rural countries from timber receipts.

I am a strong supporter of rural education. I ask my colleagues that if they are true supporters of rural education, then give students what they need, payments that are not dependent upon fluctuating timber sales. Our children deserve a steady supply of funding and a healthy environment. This bill provides neither.

This bill was not written to help students. It actually scratches the back of the timber industry. The National Forest Protection and Restoration Act provides for rural counties by offering them guaranteed annual funding. Counties would no longer have to depend on the Forest Service for what they need. They would have a budget that allows them to plan for the future. They would no longer have to clearcut for our kids.

It seems that the supporters of this bill cannot see the students through the trees, so their solution is to chop the trees down. We are talking about the future of our Nation's children. Let us give them what they need without pandering to big business.

I support a no vote on H.R. 2389.

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

Madam Chairman, I would just say that we have heard the term used over and over by speaker after speaker on both sides of the aisle that this is a reasonable short-term solution, it is a compromise, there has been a good-faith effort put forward by those who have worked very hard on this legislation they bring to us today; and, as indication of that, whereas when we started the administration was threatening to ask for a presidential veto of this legislation, they have withdrawn that threat.

There is still opposition from the administration for the bill, but we are making good progress; and I believe that it is very highly probable that this can become law.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I rise to support this legislation.

Madam Chairman, I think it is important, because for the first time in a long time, there is a realization that we own a lot of this country. We own a third of America, we, the national taxpayers.

In my view, there has been a real insensitivity toward Federal policy and how it impacts rural America. And that is the problem that we are finally facing up to today. It is a matter of when we change the Federal land use policies and counties and States are predominantly opened by the Federal Government, it has a huge impact on the economic base and the quality of life in those communities.

I am here to say that I think the Congresses in the past and administrations have been very insensitive to the impact on rural America.

Why do we own a third of this country? For a number of reasons. So that we have land for recreation. So that we have land for wilderness areas. So that we have land for people to hunt and fish and recreate on. Also, it was purchased so that we would have the natural resources that we have that would be well managed and that would be available for the future.

Now, somehow all that got mixed up by legislators and administrations and this whole policy kind of got thrown out of the window, that part of the reason that we own a third of this country is that we have resources for our future and the multi-use prospect was kind of thrown out, the baby with the bath water. I think that is the discussion that needs to be clear today and precise, that we are here today.

Now, we are going to help fix schools. We are going to help fix local roads. But the loss of those industries that used natural resources are still gone, and that base out there is still very fragile.

I urge Members of Congress, because so often I have ended up debating suburbanites who come from suburbia and urban areas who have little sensitivity towards rural America, that out in rural America we cut timber, we drill for oil, we dig for coal, we mine natural resources, and we farm and we manufacture.

When they take over half of that away from us, and we have counties and States that are predominantly owned by Government, and the Government changes its policies quickly, we have huge impacts on the quality of rural life and the opportunities that are there. There is enough land for all. If we manage it well, if we used good sound science, our future can be strong.

I wish we could get by this debate that cutting down a tree is some moral

act. It is the one most renewable resource we have in America. Well-managed forests will produce logs forever. Our great grandchildren will be logging on the same forests that we log on if it is done right. It is a resource.

So I am pleased today that there is finally a realization that Federal policies have had an impact on rural America and it has not been good.

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

Madam Chairman, I first want to refute the statement made by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) a little while ago that 13 States were going to lose funding or have reduced funding as a result of this legislation. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Forty-six States and Puerto Rico will receive increases in funding under this legislation, including the State of Georgia, from which the gentlewoman hails, which will receive an 87 percent increase. No States will receive a reduction. Four States will be level-funded under this legislation.

Some of the increases, to give my colleagues an example, Alaska will receive a 204 percent increase, Arizona a 264 percent increase, California a 93 percent increase, Florida a 125 percent increase, Georgia an 87 percent increase, Indiana an 185 percent increase, Missouri a 103 percent increase, New Mexico a 173 percent increase, New York a 212 percent increase, Ohio 1,203 percent increase, South Carolina 226 percent increase. The list goes on and on. Many, many States will receive substantial increases. No State will be cut as a result of this legislation.

Secondly, it is important to note that the amendment that is about to be offered is a poison pill amendment. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I would call to their attention the organizations that are a part of the National Forest, Counties, and Schools Coalition that opposes this legislation and want to see more funds get into rural schools.

The Alliance for America, the American Association of Educational Service Agencies, and the American Association of School Administrators support this legislation and oppose the poison pill amendment.

The Forest Products Industry National Labor Management Committee; the Independent Forest Products Association; the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers; the National Association of Counties; the National Association of County Engineers; the National Education Association; Organizations Concerned About Rural Education; the Paper, Allied Industrial, Chemical, and Energy Workers International; People for the U.S.A.; the Southern Forest Products Association; the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; the United Mine Workers of America; the United States Chamber of Commerce; and the Western Council of Industrial Workers, just to name a few of the

more than 800 organizations in 39 States which support this legislation and oppose any amendments thereto.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. VENTO. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation. H.R. 2389 followed a flawed path since its inception, both in the development of its policy and in the secrecy with which its language was closely guarded until early this week. The underlying goal behind H.R. 2389 was to establish an interim procedure that would provide more money to rural counties for education and road building. This was to make up for reduced payments to the Twenty-Five Percent Fund because of decreases in timber harvesting over the past decade. Unfortunately, there is nothing interim about this legislation. It establishes a multi year program that increases logging in our National Forests and further solidifies a pattern created at the beginning of the century that educated our children at the expense of environment. Sacrificing their natural heritage isn't necessary today so as to assure an investment in their future and a sound educational opportunity.

H.R. 2389 had the potential to reverse Twenty-Five Percent Fund's century long destructive path by creating a program that decouples county payments tied to the amount of timber harvested from public lands. Instead, this legislation gives counties some of the highest timber payments ever and yet encourages them to harvest already thinned forests in a potentially unsustainable manner. This legislation should have broken that policy and spending pattern. Instead, it enshrines it. This country should educate our children about protecting the environment, not educate our children at its expense.

H.R. 2389 establishes a special community projects program in Title II, but its method of implementation will unknowingly to most create a tenuous relationship between federal land managers and the counties who will manage Federal lands through Title II projects. These projects will reduce funds going to rural governments and school systems by requiring that 20 percent of the county payments be spent on local forest management projects. The profits from these projects will then be funneled into a special projects account to be spent on more of these projects, thus creating an everlasting sort of synergistic logging effect. If the overall goal of this legislation is aid our rural schools and counties, then I hope that this House will at least use common sense and give all counties the option to use up 20 percent of their funds on these special projects instead of requiring that they use 20 percent of their funds only on special projects.

This interim legislation establishes a working advisory group whose goal is to solve the county payment issue. Unfortunately, Title III attempts to reinvent Government by creating a top heavy advisory panel that fails to represent all interests involved in the formulation of a new program. When we look down the road nearly a decade from now, after this legislation sunsets, the Forest Service Chief should have, in his hands, the advisory panels recommendation. Will he act on it? Who knows? The chief is certainly not bound to. The advisory panel, for all its bells and whistles, in effect, serves little purpose and most likely will accomplish nothing. The Forest Service has no compelling reason to accept

their recommendation, and, frankly, when I look at the make up of the panel, it's not likely to come up with recommendations that are balanced.

This body must comprehensively revise the county payments issue and decouple all payment to counties from timber production, and understand that the issue is how and if to make this program a permanent mandatory appropriation. The framework for this solution has already been laid. This body must build the structure into a working program that benefits our counties, our forests and our children.

It was my hope that this legislation would come to the floor today. Many of us went into this week with blinders over our eyes. We were given little opportunity to review this legislation and determine innovative solutions to correct this complex issue. H.R. 2389 is a flawed proposal that takes an antiquated approach to providing counties funds for education and road building at the expense of our National Forests. Proponents want to keep their cake and eat it too. This legislation is promoting a century old program at a time when the Forest Service is managing our forests in a progressive, ecological sound and scientific manner. Everyone in this body recognizes the need for the education of our young. Should it come at the expense of our environment when there are sound proposals already on the table for the House to consider? The short answer to this is no. We are one of the richest nations in the world and this sends a signal that we cannot afford to properly educate our children without using the slash and burn techniques of years past. I urge my colleague to vote no on this legislation.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, the bill before us today, H.R. 2389, the County Schools Funding Revitalization Act, is important to the people and communities of Northern Michigan.

Much of my congressional district lies in the Ottawa, and Hiawatha, National Forests. Forest products are my district main industry, and they have a great financial, environmental, cultural, historical and recreational impact on my constituents.

My constituents depend on strong, vibrant national forests. We have been good stewards of our land and its natural resource; the forests depend on us for nurturing and protection.

This proper stewardship helps both the economy and the environment. Continued timber sales help in guaranteeing the future health of our national forests.

Since 1991, more trees die and rot each year in national forests than is sold for timber. I doubt if anyone in this chamber would view this as a proper and efficient use of our resources.

Since the Federal government does not pay property taxes on its own lands, the several counties in my district with national forest lands depend on the 25-percent payments in order to provide essential services such as education, law enforcement, emergency fire and medical, search and rescue, solid waste management, road maintenance, and other health and human services.

The forest industry is one of the top employers in my district. Overall, Michigan generates over \$90 million in timber-based employment.

My district has been suffering from high unemployment. The financial guarantee and funding stability provided by this legislation will help the economy of Northern Michigan.

While I would like to see higher levels of funding in this bill for Region Nine of the Upper Midwest, I also accept the need to provide stable levels of funding for our communities and for our schools.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2389.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 1, modified by the amendments printed in House Report 106-437, is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, is as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 1999".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Findings and purpose.
- Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—SECURE PAYMENTS FOR STATES AND COUNTIES CONTAINING FEDERAL LANDS

- Sec. 101. Determination of full payment amount for eligible States and counties.
- Sec. 102. Payments to States from Forest Service lands for use by counties to benefit public education and transportation.
- Sec. 103. Payments to counties from Bureau of Land Management lands for use to benefit public safety, law enforcement, education, and other public purposes.

TITLE II—LOCALLY INITIATED PROJECTS ON FEDERAL LANDS

- Sec. 201. Definitions.
- Sec. 202. General limitation on use of project funds.
- Sec. 203. Submission of project proposals by participating counties.
- Sec. 204. Evaluation and approval of projects by Secretary concerned.
- Sec. 205. Local advisory committees.
- Sec. 206. Use of project funds.
- Sec. 207. Duration of availability of a county's project funds.
- Sec. 208. Treatment of funds generated by locally initiated projects.

TITLE III—FOREST COUNTIES PAYMENTS COMMITTEE

- Sec. 301. Definitions.
- Sec. 302. National advisory committee to develop long-term methods to meet statutory obligation of Federal lands to contribute to public education and other public services.
- Sec. 303. Functions of Advisory Committee.
- Sec. 304. Federal Advisory Committee Act requirements.
- Sec. 305. Termination of Advisory Committee.
- Sec. 306. Sense of Congress regarding Advisory Committee recommendations.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- Sec. 401. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 402. Treatment of funds and revenues.
- Sec. 403. Conforming amendments.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The National Forest System, which is managed by the United States Forest Service, was established in 1907 and has grown to include approximately 192,000,000 acres of Federal lands.

(2) The public domain lands known as re-vested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands and the reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, which are managed predominantly by the Bureau of Land Management were returned to Federal ownership in 1916 and 1919 and now comprise approximately 2,600,000 acres of Federal lands.

(3) Congress recognized that, by its decision to secure these lands in Federal ownership, the counties in which these lands are situated would be deprived of revenues they would otherwise receive if the lands were held in private ownership.

(4) Even without such revenues, these same counties have expended public funds year after year to provide services, such as education, road construction and maintenance, search and rescue, law enforcement, waste removal, and fire protection, that directly benefit these Federal lands and people who use these lands.

(5) To accord a measure of compensation to the affected counties for their loss of future revenues and for the critical services they provide to both county residents and visitors to these Federal lands, Congress determined that the Federal Government should share with these counties a portion of the revenues the United States receives from these Federal lands.

(6) Congress enacted in 1908 and subsequently amended a law that requires that 25 percent of the revenues derived from National Forest System lands be paid to States for use by the counties in which the lands are situated for the benefit of public schools and roads.

(7) Congress enacted in 1937 and subsequently amended a law that requires that 50 percent of the revenues derived from the re-vested and reconveyed grant lands be paid to the counties in which those lands are situated to be used as are other county funds.

(8) For several decades during the dramatic growth of the American economy, counties dependent on and supportive of these Federal lands received and relied on increasing shares of these revenues to provide educational opportunities for the children of residents of these counties.

(9) In recent years, the principal source of these revenues, Federal timber sales, has been sharply curtailed and, as the volume of timber sold annually from most of the Federal lands has decreased precipitously, so too have the revenues shared with the affected counties.

(10) This decline in shared revenues has severely impacted or crippled educational funding in, and the quality of education provided by, the affected counties.

(11) In the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, Congress recognized this trend and ameliorated its adverse consequences by providing an alternative annual safety net payment to 72 counties in Oregon, Washington, and northern California in which Federal timber sales had been restricted or prohibited by administrative and judicial decisions to protect the northern spotted owl.

(12) The authority for these particular safety net payments is expiring and no comparable authority has been granted for alternative payments to counties elsewhere in the United States that have suffered similar losses in shared revenues from the Federal lands and in the educational funding those revenues provide.

(13) Although alternative payments are not an adequate substitute for the revenues, wages, purchasing of local goods and services, and social opportunities that are gen-

erated when the Federal lands are managed in a manner that encourages revenue-producing activities, such alternative payments are critically needed now to stabilize educational funding in the affected counties.

(14) Changes in Federal land management, in addition to having curtailed timber sales, have altered the historic, cooperative relationship between counties and the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

(15) Both the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management face significant backlogs in infrastructure maintenance and ecosystem restoration that are not likely to be addressed through annual appropriations.

(16) New relationships between the counties in which these Federal lands are located and the managers of these Federal lands need to be formed to benefit both the natural resources and rural communities of the United States as the 21st century begins.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to provide Federal funds to county governments that are dependent on and supportive of the Federal lands so as to assist such counties in restoring funding for education and other public services that the counties must provide to county residents and visitors;

(2) to provide these funds on a temporary basis in a form that is environmentally sound and consistent with applicable resource management plans;

(3) to facilitate the development, by the Federal Government and the counties which benefit from the shared revenues from the Federal lands, of a new cooperative relationship in Federal land management and the development of local consensus in implementing applicable plans for the Federal lands;

(4) to identify and implement projects on the Federal lands that enjoy broad-based local support; and

(5) to make additional investments in infrastructure maintenance and ecosystem restoration on Federal lands.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) FEDERAL LANDS.—The term "Federal lands" means—

(A) lands within the National Forest System, as defined in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)); and

(B) the Oregon and California Railroad grant lands re-vested in the United States by the Act of June 9, 1916 (Chapter 137; 39 Stat. 218), Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands reconveyed to the United States by the Act of February 26, 1919 (Chapter 47; 40 Stat. 1179), and subsequent additions to such lands.

(2) ELIGIBILITY PERIOD.—The term "eligibility period" means fiscal year 1984 through fiscal year 1999.

(3) ELIGIBLE COUNTY.—The term "eligible county" means a county or borough that received 50-percent payments for one or more fiscal years of the eligibility period or a county or borough that received a portion of an eligible State's 25-percent payments for one or more fiscal years of the eligibility period. The term includes a county or borough established after the date of the enactment of this Act so long as the county or borough includes all or a portion of a county or borough described in the preceding sentence.

(4) ELIGIBLE STATE.—The term "eligible State" means a State that received 25-percent payments for one or more fiscal years of the eligibility period.

(5) FULL PAYMENT AMOUNT.—The term "full payment amount" means the amount calculated for each eligible State and eligible county under section 101.

(6) 25-PERCENT PAYMENTS.—The term “25-percent payments” means the payments to States required by the 6th paragraph under the heading of “FOREST SERVICE” in the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500), and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500).

(7) 50-PERCENT PAYMENTS.—The term “50-percent payments” means the payments that are the sum of the 50-percent share otherwise paid to a county pursuant to title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (Chapter 876; 50 Stat. 875; 43 U.S.C. 1181f), and the payment made to a county pursuant to the Act of May 24, 1939 (chapter 144; 53 Stat. 753; 43 U.S.C. 1181f-1 et seq.).

(8) SAFETY NET PAYMENTS.—The term “safety net payments” means the payments to States and counties required by sections 13982 or 13983 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-66; 16 U.S.C. 500 note; 43 U.S.C. 1181f note).

TITLE I—SECURE PAYMENTS FOR STATES AND COUNTIES CONTAINING FEDERAL LANDS

SEC. 101. DETERMINATION OF FULL PAYMENT AMOUNT FOR ELIGIBLE STATES AND COUNTIES.

(a) CALCULATION REQUIRED.—

(1) ELIGIBLE STATES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall calculate for each eligible State an amount equal to the average of the three highest 25-percent payments and safety net payments made to that eligible State for fiscal years of the eligibility period.

(2) BLM COUNTIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall calculate for each eligible county that received a 50-percent payment during the eligibility period an amount equal to the average of the three highest 50-percent payments and safety net payments made to that eligible county for fiscal years of the eligibility period.

(b) ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT.—For each fiscal year in which payments are required to be made to eligible States and eligible counties under this title, the Secretary of the Treasury shall adjust the full payment amount in effect for the previous fiscal year for each eligible State and eligible county to reflect changes in the consumer price index for rural areas (as published in the Bureau of Labor Statistics) that occur after publication of that index for fiscal year 1999.

SEC. 102. PAYMENTS TO STATES FROM FOREST SERVICE LANDS FOR USE BY COUNTIES TO BENEFIT PUBLIC EDUCATION AND TRANSPORTATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE STATES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall make to each eligible State a payment in accordance with subsection (b) for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2006. The payment for a fiscal year shall be made as soon as practicable after the end of that fiscal year.

(b) PAYMENT AMOUNTS.—The payment to an eligible State under subsection (a) for a fiscal year shall consist of the following:

(1) The 25-percent payments and safety net payments under section 13982 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-66; 16 U.S.C. 500 note) applicable to that State for that fiscal year.

(2) If the amount under paragraph (1) is less than the full payment amount in effect for that State for that fiscal year, such additional funds as may be appropriated to provide a total payment not to exceed the full payment amount, but only to the extent such additional funds are provided in advance as discretionary appropriations included in appropriation Acts.

(c) DISTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE OF PAYMENTS.—

(1) DISTRIBUTION METHOD.—An eligible State that receives a payment under subsection (a) shall distribute the payment

among all eligible counties in the State, with each eligible county receiving the same percentage of that payment as the percentage of the State's total 25-percent payments and safety net payments under section 13982 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-66; 16 U.S.C. 500 note) that were distributed to that county for fiscal years of the eligibility period.

(2) EXPENDITURE PURPOSES.—Subject to subsection (d), payments received by eligible States under subsection (a) and distributed to eligible counties shall be expended in the same manner in which 25-percent payments are required to be expended.

(d) EXPENDITURE RULES FOR ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of an eligible county to which \$100,000 or more is distributed in a fiscal year pursuant to subsection (c)—

(A) 80 percent of the funds distributed to the eligible county shall be expended in the same manner in which the 25-percent payments are required to be expended; and

(B) 20 percent of the funds distributed to the eligible county shall be reserved and expended by the eligible county in accordance with title II.

(2) COUNTIES WITH MINOR DISTRIBUTIONS.—In the case of each eligible county to which less than \$100,000 is distributed for fiscal year 2000 pursuant to subsection (c), the eligible county shall make an election whether or not to be subject to the requirements of paragraph (1) for that fiscal year and all subsequent fiscal years for which payments are made under subsection (a). The county shall notify the Secretary of Agriculture of its election under this subsection not later than 60 days after the county receives its distribution for fiscal year 2000.

SEC. 103. PAYMENTS TO COUNTIES FROM BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LANDS FOR USE TO BENEFIT PUBLIC SAFETY, LAW ENFORCEMENT, EDUCATION, AND OTHER PUBLIC PURPOSES.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall make to each eligible county that received a 50-percent payment during the eligibility period a payment in accordance with subsection (b) for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2006. The payment for a fiscal year shall be made as soon as practicable after the end of that fiscal year.

(b) PAYMENT AMOUNTS.—The payment to an eligible county under subsection (a) for a fiscal year shall consist of the following:

(1) The 50-percent payments and safety net payments under section 13983 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-66; 43 U.S.C. 1181f note) applicable to that county for that fiscal year.

(2) If the amount under paragraph (1) is less than the full payment amount in effect for that county for that fiscal year, such additional funds as may be appropriated to provide a total payment not to exceed the full payment amount, but only to the extent such additional funds are provided in advance as discretionary appropriations included in appropriation Acts.

(c) EXPENDITURE OF PAYMENTS.—Subject to subsection (d), payments received by eligible counties under subsection (a) shall be expended in the same manner in which 50-percent payments are required to be expended.

(d) EXPENDITURE RULES FOR ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.—In the case of an eligible county to which a payment is made in a fiscal year pursuant to subsection (a)—

(1) 80 percent of the payment to the eligible county shall be expended in the same manner in which the 50-percent payments are required to be expended; and

(2) 20 percent of the payment to the eligible county shall be reserved and expended by

the eligible county in accordance with title II.

TITLE II—LOCALLY INITIATED PROJECTS ON FEDERAL LANDS

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) PARTICIPATING COUNTY.—The term “participating county” means an eligible county that—

(A) receives Federal funds pursuant to section 102 or 103; and

(B) is required to expend a portion of those funds in the manner provided in section 102(d)(1)(B) or 103(d)(2) or elects under section 102(d)(2) to expend a portion of those funds in accordance with section 102(d)(1)(B).

(2) PROJECT FUNDS.—The term “project funds” means all funds reserved by an eligible county under section 102(d)(1)(B) or 103(d)(2) for expenditure in accordance with this title and all funds that an eligible county elects under section 102(d)(2) to reserve under section 102(d)(1)(B).

(3) LOCAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The term “local advisory committee” means an advisory committee established by the Secretary concerned under section 205.

(4) RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term “resource management plan” means a land use plan prepared by the Bureau of Land Management for units of the Federal lands described in section 3(1)(B) pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712) and land and resource management plans prepared by the Forest Service for units of the National Forest System pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604).

(5) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term “Secretary concerned” means the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the Federal lands described in section 3(1)(B) and the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the Federal lands described in section 3(1)(A).

(6) SPECIAL ACCOUNT.—The term “special account” means an account in the Treasury established under section 208(c) for each region of the Forest Service, and for the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 202. GENERAL LIMITATION ON USE OF PROJECT FUNDS.

Project funds shall be expended solely on projects that meet the requirements of this title and are conducted on the Federal lands.

SEC. 203. SUBMISSION OF PROJECT PROPOSALS BY PARTICIPATING COUNTIES.

(a) SUBMISSION OF PROJECT PROPOSALS TO SECRETARY CONCERNED.—

(1) PROJECTS FUNDED USING PROJECT FUNDS.—Not later than September 30, 2001, and each September 30 thereafter through 2009, each participating county shall submit to the Secretary concerned a description of any projects that the county proposes the Secretary undertake using any project funds reserved by the county during the three-fiscal year period consisting of the fiscal year in which the submission is made and the preceding two fiscal years. A participating county does not have to submit all of its project proposals for a year at the same time.

(2) PROJECTS FUNDED USING SPECIAL ACCOUNTS.—Until September 30, 2007, a participating county may also submit to the Secretary concerned a description of any projects that the county proposes the Secretary undertake using amounts in a special account in lieu of or in addition to the county's project funds.

(3) JOINT PROJECTS.—Participating counties may pool their project funds and jointly propose a project or group of projects to the Secretary concerned under paragraph (1). Participating counties may also jointly propose a project or group of projects to the Secretary concerned under paragraph (2).

(b) **REQUIRED DESCRIPTION OF PROJECTS.**—In submitting proposed projects to the Secretary concerned under subsection (a), a participating county shall include in the description of each proposed project the following information:

- (1) The purpose of the project.
- (2) An estimation of the amount of any timber, forage, and other commodities anticipated to be harvested or generated as part of the project.
- (3) The anticipated duration of the project.
- (4) The anticipated cost of the project.
- (5) The proposed source of funding for the project, whether project funds, funds from the appropriate special account, or both.
- (6) The anticipated revenue, if any, to be generated by the project.

(c) **ROLE OF LOCAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—A participating county may propose a project to the Secretary concerned under subsection (a) only if the project has been reviewed and approved by the relevant local advisory committee in accordance with the requirements of section 205, including the procedures issued under subsection (d) of such section.

(d) **AUTHORIZED PROJECTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Projects proposed under subsection (a) shall consist of any type of project or activity that the Secretary concerned may otherwise carry out on the Federal lands.

(2) **SEARCH, RESCUE, AND EMERGENCY SERVICES.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a participating county may submit as a proposed project under subsection (a) a proposal that the county receive reimbursement for search and rescue and other emergency services performed on Federal lands and paid for by the county. The source of funding for an approved project of this type may only be the special account for the region in which the county is located or, in the case of a county that receives 50-percent payments, the special account for the Bureau of Land Management.

(3) **COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK CAMPS.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a participating county may submit as a proposed project under subsection (a) a proposal that the county receive reimbursement for all or part of the costs incurred by the county to pay the salaries and benefits of county employees who supervise adults or juveniles performing mandatory community service on Federal lands.

SEC. 204. EVALUATION AND APPROVAL OF PROJECTS BY SECRETARY CONCERNED.

(a) **CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL OF PROPOSED PROJECT.**—The Secretary concerned may make a decision to approve a project submitted by a participating county under section 203 only if the proposed project satisfies each of the following conditions:

- (1) The project complies with all Federal laws and all Federal rules, regulations, and policies.
- (2) The project is consistent with the applicable resource management plan and with any watershed or subsequent plan developed pursuant to the resource management plan and approved by the Secretary concerned.
- (3) The project has been approved by the relevant local advisory committee in accordance with section 205, including the procedures issued under subsection (d) of such section.

(4) The project has been described by the participating county in accordance with section 203(b).

(b) **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.**—

(1) **REVIEW REQUIRED.**—Before making a decision to approve a proposed project under subsection (a), the Secretary concerned shall complete any environmental review required by the National Environmental Policy Act of

1969 (42 U.S.C. 321 et seq.) in connection with the project and any consultation and biological assessment required by the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) in connection with the project.

(2) **TREATMENT OF REVIEW.**—Decisions of the Secretary concerned related to an environmental review or consultation conducted under paragraph (1) shall not be subject to administrative appeal or judicial review unless and until the Secretary approves the project under subsection (a) for which the review or consultation was conducted.

(3) **PAYMENT OF REVIEW COSTS.**—

(A) **REQUEST FOR PAYMENT BY COUNTY.**—The Secretary concerned may request the participating county or counties submitting a proposed project to use project funds to pay for any environmental review or consultation required under paragraph (1) in connection with the project. When such a payment is requested, the Secretary concerned shall not begin the environmental review or consultation until and unless the payment is received.

(B) **EFFECT OF REFUSAL TO PAY.**—If a participating county refuses to make the requested payment under subparagraph (A) in connection with a proposed project, the participating county shall withdraw the submission of the project from further consideration by the Secretary concerned. Such a withdrawal shall be deemed to be a rejection of the project for purposes of section 207(d).

(c) **TIME PERIODS FOR CONSIDERATION OF PROJECTS.**—

(1) **PROJECTS REQUIRING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.**—If the Secretary concerned determines that an environmental review or consultation is required for a proposed project pursuant to subsection (b), the Secretary concerned shall make a decision under subsection (a) to approve or reject the project, to the extent practicable, within 30 days after the completion of the last of the required environmental reviews and consultations.

(2) **OTHER PROJECTS.**—If the Secretary concerned determines that an environmental review or consultation is not required for a proposed project, the Secretary shall make a decision under subsection (a) to approve or reject the project, to the extent practicable, within 60 days after the date of that determination.

(d) **DECISIONS OF SECRETARY CONCERNED.**—

(1) **REJECTION OF PROJECTS.**—A decision by the Secretary concerned to reject a proposed project shall be at the Secretary's sole discretion. Within 30 days after making the rejection decision, the Secretary concerned shall notify in writing the participating county that submitted the proposed project of the rejection and the reasons therefor.

(2) **NOTICE OF PROJECT APPROVAL.**—The Secretary concerned shall publish in the Federal Register notice of each project approved under subsection (a) if such notice would be required had the project originated with the Secretary.

(3) **PROJECT APPROVAL AS FINAL AGENCY ACTION.**—A decision by the Secretary concerned to approve a project under subsection (a) shall be considered a final agency action under the Administrative Procedures Act.

(e) **SOURCE AND CONDUCT OF PROJECT.**—For purposes of Federal law, a project approved by the Secretary concerned under this section shall be considered to have originated with the Secretary.

(f) **IMPLEMENTATION OF APPROVED PROJECTS.**—

(1) **RESPONSIBILITY OF SECRETARY.**—The Secretary concerned shall be responsible for carrying out projects approved by the Secretary under this section. The Secretary concerned shall carry out the projects in compliance with all Federal laws and all Federal

rules, regulations, and policies and in the same manner as projects of the same kind that originate with the Secretary.

(2) **COOPERATION.**—The Secretary concerned may enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with States and local governments, private and nonprofit entities, and landowners and other persons to assist the Secretary in carrying out an approved project.

(3) **BEST VALUE STEWARDSHIP CONTRACTING.**—To enter into a contract authorized by paragraph (2), the Secretary concerned may use a contracting method that secures, for the best price, the best quality service, as determined by the Secretary based upon the following:

(A) The technical demands and complexity of the work to be done.

(B) The ecological sensitivity of the resources being treated.

(C) The past experience by the contractor with the type of work being done, using the type of equipment proposed for the project, and meeting or exceeding desired ecological conditions.

(D) The use by the contractor of low value species and byproducts.

(E) The commitment of the contractor to hiring highly qualified workers and local residents.

(g) **TIME FOR COMMENCEMENT.**—

(1) **PROJECTS FUNDED USING PROJECT FUNDS.**—If an approved project is to be funded in whole or in part using project funds to be provided by a participating county or counties, the Secretary concerned shall commence the project as soon as practicable after the receipt of the project funds pursuant to section 206 from the county.

(2) **PROJECTS FUNDED USING SPECIAL ACCOUNTS.**—If an approved project is to be funded using amounts from a special account in lieu of any project funds, the Secretary concerned shall commence the project as soon as practicable after the approval decision is made.

SEC. 205. LOCAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE OF LOCAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary concerned shall establish and maintain, for each unit of Federal lands, a local advisory committee to review projects proposed by participating counties and to recommend projects to participating counties.

(2) **COMBINATION OR DIVISION OF UNITS.**—The Secretary concerned may, at the Secretary's sole discretion, combine or divide units of Federal lands for the purpose of establishing local advisory committees.

(b) **APPOINTMENT BY THE SECRETARY.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT AND TERM.**—The Secretary concerned shall appoint the members of local advisory committees for a term of 2 years beginning on the date of appointment. The Secretary concerned may reappoint members to subsequent 2-year terms.

(2) **BASIC REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary concerned shall ensure that each local advisory committee established by the Secretary meets the requirements of subsection (c).

(3) **INITIAL APPOINTMENT.**—The Secretary concerned shall make initial appointments to the local advisory committees not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) **VACANCIES.**—The Secretary concerned shall make appointments to fill vacancies on any local advisory committee as soon as practicable after the vacancy has occurred.

(5) **COMPENSATION.**—Members of the local advisory committees shall not receive any compensation.

(c) **COMPOSITION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **NUMBER.**—Each local advisory committee shall be comprised of 15 members.

(2) **COMMUNITY INTERESTS REPRESENTED.**—Each local advisory committee shall have at least one member representing each of the following:

- (A) Local resource users.
- (B) Environmental interests.
- (C) Forest workers.
- (D) Organized labor representatives.
- (E) Elected county officials.
- (F) School officials or teachers.

(3) **GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.**—To the extent practicable, the members of a local advisory committee shall be drawn from throughout the area covered by the committee.

(4) **CHAIRPERSON.**—A majority on each local advisory committee shall select the chairperson of the committee.

(d) **APPROVAL PROCEDURES.**—

(1) **ISSUANCE.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretaries concerned shall jointly issue the approval procedures that each local advisory committee must use in order to ensure that a local advisory committee only approves projects that are broadly supported by the committee. The Secretaries shall publish the procedures in the Federal Register.

(2) **TREATMENT OF PROCEDURES.**—The issuance and content of the procedures issued under paragraph (1) shall not be subject to administrative appeal or judicial review. Nothing in this paragraph shall affect the responsibility of local advisory committees to comply with the procedures.

(e) **OTHER COMMITTEE AUTHORITIES AND REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **STAFF ASSISTANCE.**—A local advisory committee may submit to the Secretary concerned a request for staff assistance from Federal employees under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

(2) **MEETINGS.**—All meetings of a local advisory committee shall be announced at least one week in advance in a local newspaper of record and shall be open to the public.

(3) **RECORDS.**—A local advisory committee shall maintain records of the meetings of the committee and make the records available for public inspection.

(f) **FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT EXEMPTION.**—The local advisory committees shall be exempt from the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

SEC. 206. USE OF PROJECT FUNDS.

(a) **AGREEMENT REGARDING SCHEDULE AND COST OF PROJECT.**—

(1) **AGREEMENT BETWEEN PARTIES.**—As soon as practicable after the approval of a project by the Secretary concerned under section 204, the Secretary concerned and the chief administrative official of the participating county (or one such official representing a group of participating counties) shall enter into an agreement addressing, at a minimum, the following with respect to the project:

(A) The schedule for completing the project.

(B) The total cost of the project, including the level of agency overhead to be assessed against the project.

(C) For a multi-year project, the estimated cost of the project for each of the fiscal years in which it will be carried out.

(D) The remedies for the participating county or counties for the failure of the Secretary concerned to comply with the terms of the agreement.

(2) **LIMITED USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.**—The Secretary concerned may decide, at the Secretary's sole discretion, to cover the costs of a portion of an approved project using Federal funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Secretary for the same purposes as the project.

(b) **TRANSFER OF PROJECT FUNDS.**—

(1) **INITIAL TRANSFER REQUIRED.**—As soon as practicable after the agreement is reached under subsection (a) with regard to a project to be funded in whole or in part using project funds, the participating county or counties that are parties to the agreement shall transfer to the Secretary concerned an amount of project funds equal to—

(A) in the case of a project to be completed in a single fiscal year, the total amount specified in the agreement to be paid by the county or counties; or

(B) in the case of a multi-year project, the amount specified in the agreement to be paid by the county or counties for the first fiscal year.

(2) **CONDITION ON PROJECT COMMENCEMENT.**—The Secretary concerned shall not commence a project pursuant to section 204(g)(1) until the project funds required to be transferred under paragraph (1) for the project have been received by the Secretary.

(3) **SUBSEQUENT TRANSFERS FOR MULTI-YEAR PROJECTS.**—For the second and subsequent fiscal years of a multi-year project to be funded in whole or in part using project funds, the participating county or counties shall transfer to the Secretary concerned the amount of project funds required to continue the project in that fiscal year according to the agreement entered into under subsection (a). The Secretary concerned shall suspend work on the project if the county fails to transfer the required amounts as required by the agreement.

(4) **SPECIAL RULE FOR WORK CAMP PROJECTS.**—In the case of a project described in section 203(d)(3) and approved under section 204, the agreement required by subsection (a) shall specify the manner in which a participating county that is a party to the agreement may retain project funds to cover the costs of the project.

(c) **AVAILABILITY OF TRANSFERRED FUNDS.**—Project funds transferred to the Secretary concerned under this section shall remain available until the project is completed.

SEC. 207. DURATION OF AVAILABILITY OF A COUNTY'S PROJECT FUNDS.

(a) **SUBMISSION OF PROPOSED PROJECTS TO OBLIGATE FUNDS.**—By the end of each of the fiscal years 2003 through 2009, a participating county shall submit to the Secretary concerned pursuant to section 203(a)(1) a sufficient number of project proposals that, if approved, would result in the obligation of at least the full amount of the project funds the county received under title I in the second preceding fiscal year.

(b) **TRANSFER OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.**—If a participating county fails to comply with subsection (a) for a fiscal year, any project funds that the county received in the second preceding fiscal year and remaining unobligated shall be returned to the Secretary of the Treasury for disposition as provided in subsection (c).

(c) **DISPOSITION OF RETURNED FUNDS.**—

(1) **DEPOSIT IN SPECIAL ACCOUNTS.**—In the case of project funds returned under subsection (b) in fiscal year 2004, 2005, or 2006, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit the funds in the appropriate special account.

(2) **DEPOSIT IN GENERAL FUND.**—After fiscal year 2006, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit returned project funds in the general fund of the Treasury.

(d) **EFFECT OF REJECTION OF PROJECTS.**—Notwithstanding subsection (b), any project funds of a participating county that are unobligated at the end of a fiscal year because the Secretary concerned has rejected one or more proposed projects shall be available for the county to expend in the same manner as the funds reserved by the county under section 102(d)(1)(A) or 103(d)(1), whichever applies to the funds involved. The project funds

covered by this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(e) **EFFECT OF COURT ORDERS.**—

(1) **PROJECTS FUNDED USING PROJECT FUNDS.**—If an approved project is enjoined or prohibited by a Federal court after funds for the project are transferred to the Secretary concerned under section 206, the Secretary concerned shall return any unobligated project funds related to that project to the participating county or counties that transferred the funds. The returned funds shall be available for the county to expend in the same manner as the funds reserved by the county under section 102(d)(1)(A) or 103(d)(1), whichever applies to the funds involved. The funds shall remain available until expended and shall be exempt from the requirements of subsection (b).

(2) **PROJECTS FUNDED USING SPECIAL ACCOUNTS.**—If an approved project is enjoined or prohibited by a Federal court after funds from a special account have been reserved for the project under section 208, the Secretary concerned shall treat the funds in the same manner as revenues described in section 208(a).

SEC. 208. TREATMENT OF FUNDS GENERATED BY LOCALLY INITIATED PROJECTS.

(a) **PAYMENT TO SECRETARY.**—Any and all revenues generated from a project carried out in whole or in part using project funds or funds from a special account shall be paid to the Secretary concerned.

(b) **DEPOSIT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary concerned shall deposit the revenues described in subsection (a) as follows:

(1) Through fiscal year 2006, the revenues shall be deposited in the appropriate special account as provided in subsection (c).

(2) After fiscal year 2006, the revenues shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) **REGIONAL AND BLM SPECIAL ACCOUNTS.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the Treasury an account for each region of the Forest Service and an account for the Bureau of Land Management. The accounts shall consist of the following:

(A) Revenues described in subsection (a) and deposited pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

(B) Project funds deposited pursuant to section 207(c)(1).

(C) Interest earned on amounts in the special accounts.

(2) **REQUIRED DEPOSIT IN FOREST SERVICE ACCOUNTS.**—If the revenue-generating project was carried out in whole or in part using project funds that were reserved pursuant to section 102(d)(1)(B), the revenues shall be deposited in the account established under paragraph (1) for the Forest Service region in which the project was conducted.

(3) **REQUIRED DEPOSIT IN BLM ACCOUNT.**—If the revenue-generating project was carried out in whole or in part using project funds that were reserved pursuant to section 103(d)(2), the revenues shall be deposited in the account established under paragraph (1) for the Bureau of Land Management.

(4) **PROJECTS CONDUCTED USING SPECIAL ACCOUNT FUNDS.**—If the revenue-generating project was carried out using amounts from a special account in lieu of any project funds, the revenues shall be deposited in the special account from which the amounts were derived.

(d) **USE OF ACCOUNTS TO CONDUCT PROJECTS.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY TO USE ACCOUNTS.**—The Secretary concerned may use amounts in the special accounts, without appropriation, to fund projects submitted by participating counties under section 203(a)(2) that have been approved by the Secretary concerned under section 204.

(2) SOURCE OF FUNDS; PROJECT LOCATIONS.—Funds in a special account established under subsection (c)(1) for a region of the Forest Service region may be expended only for projects approved under section 204 to be conducted in that region. Funds in the special account established under subsection (c)(1) for the Bureau of Land Management may be expended only for projects approved under section 204 to be conducted on Federal lands described in section 3(1)(B).

(3) DURATION OF AUTHORITY.—No funds may be obligated under this subsection after September 30, 2007. Unobligated amounts in the special accounts after that date shall be promptly transferred to the general fund of the Treasury.

TITLE III—FOREST COUNTIES PAYMENTS COMMITTEE

SEC. 301. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The term “Advisory Committee” means the Forest Counties Payments Committee established by section 302.

(2) HOUSE COMMITTEES OF JURISDICTION.—The term “House committees of jurisdiction” means the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Resources, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(3) SENATE COMMITTEES OF JURISDICTION.—The term “Senate committees of jurisdiction” means the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(4) SUSTAINABLE FORESTRY.—The term “sustainable forestry” means principles of sustainable forest management that equally consider ecological, economic, and social factors in the management of Federal lands.

SEC. 302. NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO DEVELOP LONG-TERM METHODS TO MEET STATUTORY OBLIGATION OF FEDERAL LANDS TO CONTRIBUTE TO PUBLIC EDUCATION AND OTHER PUBLIC SERVICES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FOREST COUNTIES PAYMENTS COMMITTEE.—There is hereby established an advisory committee, to be known as the Forest Counties Payments Committee, to develop recommendations, consistent with sustainable forestry, regarding methods to ensure that States and counties in which Federal lands are situated receive adequate Federal payments to be used for the benefit of public education and other public purposes.

(b) MEMBERS.—The Advisory Committee shall be composed of the following members:

(1) The Chief of the Forest Service, or a designee of the Chief who has significant expertise in sustainable forestry.

(2) The Director of the Bureau of Land Management, or a designee of the Director who has significant expertise in sustainable forestry.

(3) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, or the Director's designee.

(4) Two members who are elected members of the governing branches of eligible counties; one such member to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate (in consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the Senate committees of jurisdiction) and one such member to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (in consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the House committees of jurisdiction) within 60 days of the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) Two members who are elected members of school boards for, superintendents from, or teachers employed by, school districts in eligible counties; one such member to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the

Senate (in consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the Senate committees of jurisdiction) and one such member to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (in consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the House committees of jurisdiction) within 60 days of the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) GEOGRAPHIC REPRESENTATION.—In making appointments under paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (b), the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall seek to ensure that the Advisory Committee members are selected from geographically diverse locations.

(d) ORGANIZATION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

(1) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the Advisory Committee shall be selected from among the members appointed pursuant to paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (b).

(2) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the membership of the Advisory Committee shall be filled in the same manner as required by subsection (b). A vacancy shall not impair the authority of the remaining members to perform the functions of the Advisory Committee under section 303.

(3) COMPENSATION.—The members of the Advisory Committee who are not officers or employees of the United States, while attending meetings or other events held by the Advisory Committee or at which the members serve as representatives of the Advisory Committee or while otherwise serving at the request of the Chairperson, shall each be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not in excess of the maximum rate of pay for grade GS-18, as provided in the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including traveltime, and while away from their homes or regular places of business shall each be reimbursed for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

(e) STAFF AND RULES.—

(1) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The Advisory Committee shall have an Executive Director, who shall be appointed (without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service) by the Advisory Committee and serve at the pleasure of the Advisory Committee. The Executive Director shall report to the Advisory Committee and assume such duties as the Advisory Committee may assign. The Executive Director shall be paid at a rate not in excess of pay for grade GS-18, as provided in the General Schedule under 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) OTHER STAFF.—In addition to authority to appoint personnel subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments to the competitive service, and to pay such personnel in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, the Advisory Committee shall have authority to enter into contracts with private or public organizations which may furnish the Advisory Committee with such administrative and technical personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Advisory Committee under section 303. To the extent practicable, such administrative and technical personnel, and other necessary support services, shall be provided for the Advisory Committee by the Chief of the Forest Service and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

(3) COMMITTEE RULES.—The Advisory Committee may establish such procedural and administrative rules as are necessary for the

performance of its functions under section 303.

(f) FEDERAL AGENCY COOPERATION.—The heads of the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall cooperate with the Advisory Committee in the performance of its functions under subsection (c) and shall furnish to the Advisory Committee information which the Advisory Committee deems necessary to carry out such functions.

SEC. 303. FUNCTIONS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Committee shall develop recommendations for policy or legislative initiatives (or both) regarding alternatives for, or substitutes to, the short-term payments required by title I in order to provide a long-term method to generate annual payments to eligible States and eligible counties at or above the full payment amount.

(2) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Advisory Committee shall submit to the Senate committees of jurisdiction and the House committees of jurisdiction a final report containing the recommendations developed under this subsection. The Advisory Committee shall submit semiannual progress reports on its activities and expenditures to the Senate committees of jurisdiction and the House committees of jurisdiction until the final report has been submitted.

(b) GUIDANCE FOR COMMITTEE.—In developing the recommendations required by subsection (a), the Advisory Committee shall—

(1) evaluate the method by which payments are made to eligible States and eligible counties under title I and the use of such payments;

(2) evaluate the effectiveness of the local advisory committees established pursuant to section 205; and

(3) consider the impact on eligible States and eligible counties of revenues derived from the historic multiple use of the Federal lands.

(c) MONITORING AND RELATED REPORTING ACTIVITIES.—The Advisory Committee shall monitor the payments made to eligible States and eligible counties pursuant to title I and submit to the Senate committees of jurisdiction and the House committees of jurisdiction an annual report describing the amounts and sources of such payments and containing such comments as the Advisory Committee may have regarding such payments.

(d) TESTIMONY.—The Advisory Committee shall make itself available for testimony or comments on the reports required to be submitted by the Advisory Committee and on any legislation or regulations to implement any recommendations made in such reports in any congressional hearings or any rule-making or other administrative decision process.

SEC. 304. FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT REQUIREMENTS.

Except as may be provided in this title, the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Advisory Committee.

SEC. 305. TERMINATION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

The Advisory Committee shall terminate three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 306. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS.

It is the sense of Congress that the payments to eligible States and eligible counties required by title I should be replaced by a

long-term solution to generate payments conforming to the guidance provided by section 303(b) and that any promulgation of regulations or enactment of legislation to establish such method should be completed within two years after the date of submission of the final report required by section 303(a).

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

SEC. 402. TREATMENT OF FUNDS AND REVENUES.

Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 401, funds transferred to a Secretary concerned under section 206, and revenues described in section 208(a) shall be in addition to any other annual appropriations for the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 403. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 6903(a)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (J) as subparagraphs (E) through (K), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

“(D) the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 1999.”.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he or she has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

Page 24, line 5, insert after “Federal laws” the following: “(including the Act of March 3, 1931, commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act)”.

Page 24, line 16, strike “T” and insert “subject to paragraph (1), to”.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I will be brief on this amendment.

Under this legislation, which many of my colleagues are supporting, and in their efforts to try and address a real problem about support for school finance in a number of rural areas and resource dependent areas, they have provided for a set-aside of some 20 percent of the money to be used in local projects. And in the consideration of that, in the secretarial approval of those projects, they state that “the Secretary concerned shall carry out all projects in compliance with all Federal laws, rules, and Federal regulations.” I would add to that including the law known as the Davis-Bacon Act.

The reason for doing this is it is not quite clear after discussing with a number of people, including some of the staff on the committee, exactly the impact of the stewardship contracts under which these would be let, which I think is an effort to try to make sure that the Government, in fact, gets both the best quality work and gets the best price for that work and provides some flexibility in making that determination.

I just want to make sure that, in that process, since this will be done with Federal dollars, that we do not undermine the prevailing wage provisions of the existing law. So that is why I am offering this amendment. I understand it may be acceptable to the committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, this we view as a technical amendment. We think the bill's language is clear on its face, that it includes all Federal laws, which would include the Davis-Bacon Act. But since it is, in our view, simply surplusage and that the language in the bill is not changed by the Miller amendment and it does nothing to affect the provisions related to the Davis-Bacon Act and it is not the intent of the language to exclude the Davis-Bacon Act, we do not object to the adoption of this amendment, which is technical in nature.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

Page 12, strike line 11 and all that follows through line 9 on page 13, and insert the following:

(d) ELECTION TO RESERVE PORTION OF PAYMENT FOR TITLE II PROJECTS.—Each eligible county that receives a distribution under subsection (c) for a fiscal year may elect to reserve up to 20 percent of the funds for expenditure in accordance with title II.

Page 14, strike lines 13 through 22, and insert the following:

ELECTION TO RESERVE PORTION OF PAYMENT FOR TITLE II PROJECTS.—Each eligible county to which a payment is made under subsection (a) for a fiscal year may elect to reserve up to 20 percent of the payment for expenditure in accordance with title II.

Page 15, strike lines 9 through 19, and insert the following:

(B) elects under section 102(d) or 103(d) to expend a portion of those funds in the manner provided in this title.

(2) PROJECT FUNDS.—The term “project funds” means all funds reserved by an eligible county under section 102(d) or 103(d) for expenditure in accordance with this title.

Page 33, lines 18 and 19, strike “the funds reserved by the county under section 102(d)(1)(A) or 103(d)(1)” and insert “25-percent payments or 50-percent payments”.

Page 34, lines 8 and 9, strike “the funds reserved by the county under section 102(d)(1)(A) or 103(d)(1)” and insert “25-percent payments or 50-percent payments”.

Page 35, line 24, strike “section 102(d)(1)(B)” and insert “section 102(d)”.

Page 36, line 6, strike “section 103(d)(2) and insert “section 103(d)”.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, as I begin, I wanted to acknowledge the work of my colleagues, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

I think we all share the same goal, which is to provide the secure and steady and consistent funding for that important resource known as our public schools. And in that spirit, I believe that the amendment that I offer is a simple one but an important one. It would give local discretion on the use of the payments that would go to local governments under the bill.

□ 1430

As I said earlier, the amendment would not make the bill perfect. In fact, I do not believe it would make the bill acceptable so far as I am concerned, because it does not break the link between Federal assistance and timber harvests. But the amendment would at least mean that a county would not be forced to spend 20 percent of its payment for doing things that otherwise would be funded under the budgets of the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management.

That is what the bill as it stands now would do. It says that if a county gets more than \$100,000 under the bill, that 20 percent of the total payment would have to be used for public land projects. But suppose that a county had other priorities. Suppose that the school board and county commissioners had reviewed their needs and decided that they wanted to spend all of the payments on schools and roads. Remember, under current law that is where the money would go. But under this bill, the answer would be, too bad. The bill says that Congress does not want them to have that choice.

My amendment would provide that discretion. It would allow a local government to use up to 20 percent of its payment for work on the Federal lands, but it would not require it. It would let the local officials decide for themselves. I think that is the right thing to do, regardless of how much money might be involved. But this is not a matter of theory, Madam Chairman.

We could be talking about some substantial sums, especially for some of our rural counties. Let me give my colleagues an example. Based on Forest Service estimates from 1998 payment levels, under the bill one county in my district, Clear Creek County, stands to lose its discretion over \$100,000. In a rural county like Clear Creek, that is real money. As I look at other counties in Colorado, they might be in the same boat. In fact, 22 counties would have less to spend on roads and schools under this bill than under current law according to the same Forest Service estimates based on 1998 payments.

I will not list them all, but I will mention that this bill's Federal mandate would override local discretion over more than \$22,000 in Park County; \$27,000 in Gunnison County; and more than \$53,000 in Mesa County. And the bill would impose its Federal mandate on Grand County to the tune of \$336,000.

Those other three counties I just mentioned are not in my district; but even if they were, I do not think their commissioners would agree if I said the Federal Government knew better about how they should spend their money than they do. In fact, I do not think that they should have to make that choice, which is why my amendment would let them decide how to spend those funds regardless of how much money is involved.

Madam Chairman, I think there are many serious questions about this whole idea of getting local governments into the business of paying for projects on Federal lands. But my amendment does not deal with those questions. It is much more limited. In fact, it seems to me that the bill's supporters should welcome this amendment. After all, the bill is called the Secure Rural Schools and Communities Self-Determination Act of 1999; and this is a self-determination amendment, pure and simple.

Madam Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment. I would again mention that I think it is not the dollars we are talking about; it is the principle of local control.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. This amendment is the poison pill that many of the folks who have spoken on the floor here thus far have talked about. This legislation, the substitute that I offered that was made the underlying text as a part of the rule, is a very carefully crafted compromise involving Members of the House, Members of the Senate. It involves Members of the Republican side of the aisle, Members of the Democratic side of the aisle. It involves Members representing environmental interests; it involves Members representing local government interests, and they are joined by the 800-member coalition that constitutes hundreds and hundreds of local county governments and local school boards that are opposed to this amendment and which

support the underlying legislation because they want to see something done on this issue.

This amendment is a deal-breaker. This amendment will cause this entire process to collapse. We will not get this bill through the Senate; we will not get it signed into law unless we keep this carefully crafted compromise together. This is a compromise that I worked on very extensively with the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL).

It is an agreement that is a crafted compromise, drafted in conjunction with Senators CRAIG and WYDEN in the Senate to assure swift action in the Senate. This amendment would undermine this compromise, pushing the effort to stabilize payments to the States and counties back months and perhaps for good. Local education, county, labor and business interests have studied both the Goodlatte compromise and the Udall-Vento amendment and have determined that the Goodlatte compromise is a better idea. The National Education Association, the National Association of Counties, labor, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Forest Counties and Schools Coalition representing 800 counties, 5,000 school districts, 1.2 million school children in rural America have all supported the Goodlatte compromise and oppose the Udall-Vento amendment. I would urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I was curious what the objection was to increasing local control as my amendment intends to do.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Counties want to have the connection between not only the people that live in that county but the land in that county, and the connection that exists now and as a part of this compromise continues with the 20 percent that will be dealt with by members of the community. Local government, environmental organizations, business organizations, and the Forest Service will sit down together and using those funds, plan how they can best promote the environmental health of their county and the economic health of their county. We are determined to continue that connection between the federally owned land and those people who live in those counties and who want to, knowing that their livelihood comes from that, want to make sure that that connection persists.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. If I might, I would point out that the amendment would allow that to occur, those kinds of collaborative efforts could continue to take place, but they just would not require as the bill now does that 20 per-

cent of those dollars would have to go to those kinds of collaborations. It would give the commissioners, the school boards, the option of doing those kinds of projects but also if they felt their schools needed all of those resources, that they could be applied in that fiscal year to those resources, and the next year they might put them into a bike path project or into ecotourism or whatever the opportunity might be.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Reclaiming my time, let me just say to the gentleman that it is a 100-year-old connection that we are talking about here that is being preserved. A substantial change has been made to assure that those counties will get, and will get quickly, the kind of support that they need. But if this decoupling that the gentleman is advocating takes place in the legislation, it will go asunder in the United States Senate and nothing will happen and we will be at the current levels of support that currently exist.

So I have to strongly oppose the amendment and support the strong nationwide coalition of Members from 39 States who want to make sure that that connection between the land and the counties continues and that we not get into this business of each year having the decision made in each county whether or not that is going to go forward.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The time of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOODLATTE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, I would just say that I would hazard a guess, there is no district in America that is more affected by this legislation than mine. I think we could run the numbers and probably find that to be clearly the case. Every county commission within that district supports this legislation. And, further, I want this kind of a guarantee, because we have got some habitat improvement projects and other activities that need to take place on those watersheds, in those communities and in those counties that I want to see take place.

Normally, I would be one to advocate for local option and local control, but this is part of a bigger compromise that will help the environment, it will help our schools, it will help our counties; and nobody in this House is probably more affected by this legislation than I and the counties that I represent.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I believe that we are all working toward the same goal. My amendment would not serve as a decoupling mechanism. In fact, I think we still have more work to do in that particular way. I would

again just emphasize that I think we are trying to reach the same outcomes. My amendment would make sure that local communities have the ultimate say in how those moneys are used year to year, and they could take part in the kinds of projects my good colleague and friend from Oregon suggests, but it just would not require that they take part in those projects.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I would just say, following on to what the gentleman from Colorado has just said about his amendment, as you look through even in the cases of the counties that get more than \$100,000 so the set-aside kicks in, in a number of instances the set-aside is \$8,000, \$15,000, \$10,000, it is a very small amount of money. To believe that you are going to somehow initiate a big comprehensive planning operation on the forest for \$8,000, while \$8,000 would buy you a lot of textbooks or contribute to one of 100,000 teachers—

Mr. GOODLATTE. Reclaiming my time, I was in a county in the gentleman's State earlier this year in which on one timber sale, \$2 million was going to go to the county, which would require that in this instance 20 percent of that, or \$400,000.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I understand that. That is fine.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GOODLATTE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. We have no problem with you doing this. The question is mandating it. We were out here a couple of weeks ago, we were all for Ed-flex, because in many instances you have small programs that cost you more to administer than the benefit. The gentleman from Colorado's point is that the county can then make that option. If you have got \$400,000 coming in out of \$2 million in receipts, you can probably do something meaningful on the forest. If you have \$8,000 coming in with all due respect, you may be better off helping the schools buy the textbooks or supplies where you can get a dollar-to-dollar benefit instead of engaging in some kind of mythical planning process when you only have 8 to 10 to \$12,000. That is the benefit of his amendment.

It goes for the most efficient use in those counties where the set-aside turns out to be relatively small. Obviously in some counties in Oregon and probably even in California where you have substantial receipts, this option may make some sense. But that is because you are playing with the critical mass of dollars where you can create some of those projects on the forest that might even benefit—

Mr. GOODLATTE. Reclaiming my time, under \$100,000 they can opt out. Under \$100,000, that is \$20,000, to use the gentleman's example.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Counties that are over \$100,000, when they opt out, the 20 percent amounts to 7, 8, \$9,000; so it is a relatively small amount of money. They ought to have the option to use the money as they see fit, which may mean they go into this program but also—

Mr. GOODLATTE. When the total receipts by the county are under \$100,000, they do have the option to opt out.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. But over \$100,000, they get \$100,000 and 20 percent is \$20,000. The list of set-asides is here, and some of it is as low as \$8,000. So they could put that into their schools in a more efficient fashion. That is the argument here.

Mr. GOODLATTE. If it is over \$100,000, it is going to be \$20,000 plus 20 percent of whatever the amount over \$100,000 was, so I do not see where the gentleman's example would ever apply.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

First of all, I think it is important to know that the numbers that he was quoting earlier in his presentation during the amendment would be numbers that that county might receive if the bill were written in a different way. It is not dollars that they are receiving now. He is assuming that it was written so that they would get 100 percent of the 3-year average rather than the 80 percent, so it is a little bit misleading to say they are going to be losing that money. They do not get it now under current law.

The other thing that I want to say about the community projects is that this was an idea that was brought to us by some folks in the other body. We thought it was a good idea, because what has happened in our local communities as we have engaged in this bitter battle over forest management practices, and we have recognized the impact that it has had on our local economies and our local schools, is that many people in those local economies have engaged in a bitter and divisive battle with the local environmentalist community. They have created some real hard feelings in the communities.

I think the intent of this community projects idea is to get everybody to come back to working together, to figure out how we can use this money in a way that benefits the whole community. I can see in some of the areas in the district that I represent in north Florida, that we have had a community that has been totally timber-dependent basically. That timber industry now is gone. We are trying to move to an ecotourism industry, for instance. We could use some of these dollars to help develop that, bike paths have been mentioned here, search and rescue missions, fire protection, those kinds of

things that are needed in the national forest whose costs now are borne by the local governments. I would urge strongly that the House reject this amendment, because it would kick out of balance this very fine compromise that we have here and could cost the bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

□ 1445

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I point out during the debate on the rule the gentleman from Colorado indicated that even if this amendment were to pass, he would still oppose the bill. So clearly this is nothing more than a poison pill to derail this effort to help get some funds back to these local counties and to make sure that we still maintain this compact that has existed for 100 years between the Federal Government, the owner of in some instances 60, 70, 80 percent of the land in some of these counties, and the people who are trying to make a living in these counties.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is a very good point. I want to again say this provision, title II, could go a long way toward restoring some cooperative spirit in our communities among some groups that have not liked each other very much. I would strongly oppose the amendment.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I want to respond to my friend from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE). I want to be frank and up front with my comments on the rule about where I stood on the legislation itself. I think, again, we are all striving to find a way to provide consistent and steady funding for school districts, particularly in rural areas. I stand shoulder to shoulder with the gentleman in attempts to make sure that we do that as soon as possible, frankly.

As far as my amendment being a poison pill, the gentleman may wish to characterize it that way, but I think it is offered in a spirit of local control and the principle that if an area wants to spend the money on the projects that are suggested, it can. However, it is not required to. I do not think in my opinion that that should be enough to kill what is an important effort, and a sincere effort on your parts, to meet the needs of these rural areas.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, I strongly oppose the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), and encourage the other Members to vote against it.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Udall amendment, and I commend the Goodlatte compromise legislation that is in front of us. A lot of work went into this and there is a huge amount of support across the Nation to see this bill through, to make sure that we have better support for our schools, not just in the Western States, but across the Nation where these programs have impacted all of our States.

There is no topic that has greater ramifications for the schools in my State than this particular issue, because my State is generally a rural State. In the last year alone, funds distributed to Idaho counties from Federal timber receipts declined by 44 percent.

One can imagine the impact in these small rural counties that it has on schools. Idaho County alone lost \$1.3 million. Now, when we are dealing with trillions of dollars here, \$1.3 million seems like small change. But to an Idaho county, where our schools are involved, it is not small change.

This follows many years of similar reductions because of the reduction in activity on the forest lands. The effects on local schools have been very staggering. In some of our schools, school services like nursing and art and music programs, athletics, counseling, and lunch programs have been eliminated.

Madam Chairman, in some of our schools in Idaho they have actually reduced the number of days they can keep the schools open. We have some schools now operating only 4 days. In other areas, local school boards are actually having to make decisions with regard to the future of certain schools in their counties.

Now, is this what we really want for our rural children with regard to the uncertainty of their educational future? H.R. 2389 will give the rural children these opportunities that they need, and it does it without artificially severing the historic partnership between counties and the national forests that began back in 1908.

Two days ago, President Clinton addressed over 400 of the Nation's top teachers and called on Congress to adequately fund public education in the inner cities. Well, two months ago this same President also visited urban schools and stated that he wanted to offer a hand up, rather than a handout.

Well, by opposing H.R. 2389, he, this administration, this President, is saying that urban schools are important, but rural schools are not. It is a bad message.

We must make all children a priority in this Nation, and that is what H.R. 2389 does. Please join me and the National Education Association, the National Association of Counties, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the National Forest, Counties and Schools Coalition in reaffirming our commitment to our American children in rural America, as well as the children in urban America. Please support H.R. 2389.

Mr. VENTO. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I first want to point out that I had received correspondence yesterday from the League of Conservation Voters, which has sent correspondence in opposition to this measure. Of course, I joined them in opposition to the measure and in support of my colleague from Colorado's amendment that would provide discretion to the counties that received this money as to how they would utilize it.

I understand for counties that receive over \$100,000 and those under the O and C lands, that there is no discretion, that they mandate that 20 percent of these dollars would be used for these special projects which are initiated by the advisory committees and submitted to the respective Secretary for funding.

Now, I submit that all of this advocacy about education is very interesting, but the first thing you are doing with these dollars, at least in these counties that get over \$100,000, which is most of the counties I expect affected by this, is taking 20 percent of it away and putting it into other special projects.

This is sort of a grant program that is embedded in here into this initiative. What it does, of course, is set up some more government in terms of dozens of advisory committees who would basically have to initiate, and, therefore, would have the power to submit or not submit. So basically it is only up to them.

I do not know about what correspondence my colleagues are getting from back home; but the last time I read mine, it did not say we need more government structure back here, our school boards are not good enough to do the job, we need more people that are in these positions to make these decisions; that we want to take power away from school board, take power away from county commissioners, and create special advisory committees which would control 20 percent of the receipts that we would otherwise receive from having national forests in our area, because, of course, now we are not talking about production anymore in the forests, not talking about the 25 percent in terms of production in the good years and bad years. You are trying to eliminate the roller coaster. I appreciate that issue. But the fact is you are just taking that money out of there, and you are objecting to the Udall amendment which would give discretion to the county commissioners to do that.

In other words, this is one of those amendments that I hear often reported by some colleagues in this chamber as Washington knows best; one size fits all.

These are the types of discussions that we have had. Of course, this grant program, this initiative that is buried in this bill, is going to completely fly under the cover here, under the radar,

in terms of what goes down. So I do not think we need these dozens of advisory committees.

But the very least you could do is, if one suggests the counties support this, is let them make the decision locally as to how those dollars are spent. They might have some of their own ideas about how to use this, because you are guaranteeing 1 dollar out of 5 will not be used for schools by virtue of the way the resolution is written in most of the counties that are affected.

You are ensuring that every project, of course, has to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, or Interior, I guess, in the case of the O and C lands, but the fact is that that is setting the Secretary up for confrontation. And I do not think that these amendments in this particular mode you are talking about, and I appreciate the good intentions of bringing everyone together, holding hands and talking about how they are going to get along; but the fact of the matter is the way this is structured, I can tell you right now you are going to have a lot of proposals that are going to come up here; the Secretary is going to decide you need an environmental impact statement; you need an environmental assessment. He has just so many days to make the decisions. Those costs have to be borne by the local communities. I just think it is an unworkable proposition.

We do not need more government. At the very least you can improve this bill somewhat, I do not think it is saveable, as I said earlier, but you can improve it somewhat by letting the local governments or the counties make the decisions on how they are going to use these resources.

This bill has many flaws to it. This is one very obvious flaw. I think there are many other problems with the bill, but I would think that in presenting this particular solution, that you would do a lot better letting the counties, rather than just superimposing this program all across the forests, there is no working model any place, this is not a pilot, this is going to go into effect in each county and the counties that receive the dollars under this bill.

So, there is no working model of this in any place that I am aware of, and I think it is not easily demonstrable that it is workable. So there are many provisions written into this that I think are unwieldy. I think at least letting the counties make this decision and avoiding the Washington-knows-best type of model here would serve you much better. So I would urge Members to vote for the Udall amendment.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I want to speak in opposition to this amendment and for the community project section of this bill. I do so for one main reason, and that is that this bill, as it is so crafted, gives flexibility for local governments to do local forest management plans, like Quincy Library groups. This

amendment would prevent that from happening.

The Quincy Library group, as you may well recall, was something that developed in the Town of Quincy after the Spotted Owl wars, and the President came out and said, "Why do you not solve your problems locally?"

That gave the incentive for local environmentalists, local business folks, local government leaders, to sit in what was the Quincy Library group, and they met there because they could not shout at each other at a library, and they actually got together and put together a forest management plan that worked for the local communities and also provided for better forest health than the current law that applied in that land.

Now, this is a wonderful plan; and I think that the bill as it is crafted allows for flexibility in the local governments to develop Quincy Library groups all across the country. I might remind this body too that the Quincy Library group, the forest plan that resulted from that, when it was brought to a vote on the floor of the House, passed 429 to 1 and is currently being stymied by the administration because it drives a wedge into the local and national leaders of the environmental community; and the national environmental leaders are threatened for the loss of power, even at the expense of a plan that provides better forest health. I would submit that is really what is going on here.

I think it is ironic that the national environmental lobby is opposed to a bill such as this, even when the possibility of local forest management plans will result in better forest health. That is why I oppose this amendment and urge for the passage of the bill as it stands.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RADANOVICH. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, I wanted to just for the record clarify that my amendment would not prevent these kinds of local projects that the gentleman mentioned and that have great success in some areas. You draw attention to the Quincy Library model.

What it would require, it would not prevent a county from deciding to undertake these kinds of projects. It just would not require that a county would have to spend up to 20 percent of the monies allocated on these kinds of projects.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, the bill allows funding for counties should they propose to set up local Quincy Library plans. I agree with the gentleman, it does not prevent that from happening; but in poor counties like the one I come from, it gives the flexibility to local officials to decide to use some of that money to fund a Quincy Library group plan locally. I do submit that that is what has got the national envi-

ronmental lobby scared to death, because it is a threat to their power base.

□ 1500

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Again, the law as it is now written and as I read it, it would be a mandate that these local communities would have to spend 20 percent, no less, on these kinds of projects.

I would also submit that a number of the national environmental groups very much want to find a solution to this situation, where timber receipts are tied to school funding, but they are not necessarily driven by a fear of additional Quincy Library groups.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Reclaiming my time, Madam Chairman, I would submit that the national environmental lobbies' primary reason for opposing this bill is because it gives local communities the ability to fund Quincy Library type groups in their district. I submit that is why the national environmental lobby is scared to death of this bill. That is why I support it wholeheartedly and oppose the amendment.

Mr. TURNER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Udall amendment.

It is interesting to listen to the debate thus far, and what we see is those who offer the amendment are opposed and will vote against the legislation, no matter whether the amendment goes on or not.

In fact, it is important here to understand that when the delicate compromise was put together on this bill, the provision that we are now debating, the 20 percent set-aside for local projects, when that was placed in this delicate compromise, it was a major concession by the county officials, the school officials who formed the coalition that represents the group that is pushing the passage of this bill.

I think it is important for us to understand that the passage of this bill will be a major victory, not only for the counties and schools that depend on forest revenues to run their counties and their school districts, but this bill will be a major victory for the environmentalists, because the formula placed in this bill will minimize the impact of harvesting of timber in our national forests, on our county budgets and school district budgets.

That effect will remove our counties and school districts from the national debate over the management of our national forests, and that clearly is a big victory for the environmental community.

With regard to the specific amendment being offered, I think it is interesting to note that if we survey the national battle over forest management policy, what we will find is more often than not the only discussion over that policy occurs in the courthouse when somebody files a suit, as happened in my own district in East Texas, where

currently we are under an injunction where we cannot harvest timber, creating a severe financial hardship for my counties and school districts.

What this amendment does, it basically requires the interested parties to get together and talk about the national forest, to talk about the proper utilization of it. The language was carefully crafted to ensure protection of environmental interests, because the advisory committee that will make a determination, with the approval of the Secretary, of what the 20 percent will be spent on locally consists of, and I am reading from the bill, "Local resource users, environmental interests, forest workers, organized labor, elected county officials, school officials, or teachers."

That is the coalition, that is the advisory group that will make the determination as to what happens with the 20 percent.

So I say it was a major concession on the part of county officials and school officials to accept this language, which is a pro-environmental language section of the bill which ironically is now being opposed by those who purport to represent the environmental interests.

I say that we are at a critical point in time in the national debate over forest policy. To defeat this bill would give up a historic opportunity to strike a compromise that will end the battle that has been ongoing between our school districts and our counties and the environmental community.

So I would urge rejection of the Udall amendment, not because it is offered in bad faith, but because it jeopardizes a compromise that was reached with environmental interests that was agreed to by the coalition that supports the bill in the first place, and it will jeopardize the future of this legislation in the Senate.

Mr. POMBO. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, the opponents of this legislation, the supporters of this amendment, have raised two objections to this legislation, two areas of objections. First is the downlink issue, and I believe that what they would really like to do is to turn our counties into wards of the State, to be totally dependent upon the appropriations process, totally dependent upon the Federal government to fund their local school districts.

I am totally opposed to doing that. That is exactly what they have proposed that we do, that no longer would there be a link between what is happening locally, what is happening with their local economy. No longer would they have an interest in what is happening in their local forests. They would now have to come, hat in hand, to the Members of Congress to beg for school funding. That is exactly what the downlink issue would do.

Again, it would increase the power of the Federal government, increase the power of the individual Members of

Congress, and make all of their local school districts beholden to the appropriations process that happens here in the House of Representatives, ever more powerful.

We heard someone talk about the era of big government, and wanting no more big government. The truth is that this is big government in and of itself. All of a sudden, Members of Congress become more powerful. Their school board members have to come to them for funding for their schools. That is exactly the wrong thing we ought to be doing. Yet, it is one of the objections that has been brought up on this legislation.

The second objection, which is related to this particular amendment, talks about the 20 percent set-aside. We wonder, how could people that claim to be environmentalists, people who claim to care about the environment, be opposed to what this legislation does?

The real truth of it is that the national environmental groups are opposed to this because they need confrontation. They do not want solution. What happens when we get all of the local stakeholders together, what happens when we get somebody who actually lives in the community to sit down with somebody else that lives in the community and talk about a forest plan that actually solves the problem, is they come up with the solution, because people who live there, people who work there, people who see each other in the grocery store every day and whose kids go to the same school all of a sudden have to sit down together and come up with a solution, and they do it because they live there and they have something at stake.

But the national environmental groups do not want a solution. They thrive on controversy. Members have all seen the letters they send out. If all of a sudden we had a solution they cannot raise money anymore, so they are opposed to finding that kind of a solution. They are terrified of finding a solution. What they want is they want to continue the controversy.

Why did they oppose the Quincy Library group? Not because it did not solve the environmental problems, not because it did not solve a problem that was very real, that was local, that was driving the locals nuts. They were opposed to it because it was a solution. They were opposed to it because, darn it, people got together and they came up with a solution. It was the local resource users, the local schools, the local businessmen and the local environmentalists that sat down and came up with a solution.

By passing this legislation as is, what we end up with is we end up with people all over the country, not just in Quincy, not just sitting down in a little library that was underfunded in an area where the schools are getting nowhere near the funding that they should, but it would be all over the country, local people would sit down and they would come up with a solution to solve their local problems.

That is what we want. That is what we are trying to solve with this particular legislation.

I realize that the gentleman is saying that he wants to make this optional, but he knows as well as I do that if we do not craft this legislation in the very delicate balance that we have, that all of a sudden, these projects just do not happen, because there is always a need for school funding. There is always the necessity for more money for local schools. That is why we try to solve it by increasing the money substantially.

What he is trying to do is he is trying to take away the ability for them to sit down and solve these problems. That is the result of this amendment, and he knows it, the end result of all of this.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. POMBO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMBO. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I want to point out again that the amendment would only give the local entities the option. It would not require them to involve themselves in the kinds of I think very effective local decision-making processes that the gentleman talks about.

Mr. POMBO. Reclaiming my time, I realize, as I said, that the gentleman's amendment does not completely take away that option. But the practical reality of the gentleman's amendment is it does take away the option, because once we create that competition for funding, we take away that option.

What we are attempting to do with this legislation is encourage these people to sit down and do the right thing and come up with local solutions. If the gentleman's amendment were to be adopted by this body, in practical reality, we take away that option. They will never have that option of doing that, as a direct result of what the gentleman is doing.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the projects of which the gentleman speaks, if they are that high a priority, we ought to be looking at other ways of supporting them, as well.

I would remind the gentleman, in the bill there is talk of all kinds of other kinds of projects on Federal lands, bike paths, ecotourism. We should see we do that in the future.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. POMBO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. POMBO. Just to respond to what the gentleman is saying, Madam Chairman, I understand that there are a

great many needs and a great many issues that are out there. They are very important.

In this legislation, we are trying to take care of a very specific need in the education of our children in rural counties. That is the primary focus of what we are trying to do.

But at the same time that all of this is going on, we have an administration that is talking about setting aside an additional 40 to 60 million acres. We have them running around talking about setting aside hundreds of millions of dollars a year to buy more private land and turn it into public land. This problem is going to be exacerbated. This problem is only going to get worse.

We are attempting to try to solve a very real problem with the education of our students in rural counties.

Mr. PHELPS. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I first want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), for providing the leadership of one of the few bipartisan compromises I have seen that is meaningful, as a new Member, to pass or at least come to this stage in this session.

I am very thrilled to rise in support and be a cosponsor of this measure, which provides new hope for struggling rural school districts across the country.

I respectfully rise to oppose the amendment of my good friend, a new Member, who shares a commitment to strong funding for education, both of us do. I know that he has proven and will prove to be that.

But my Southern Illinois district is home to the Shawnee National Forest, which covers 8 of the 27 counties I represent. Any Member with Federal land in his or her district knows that for centuries these counties have depended on Federal payments to compensate for a diminished local property tax base.

The Forest Service has historically shared a portion of its receipts with counties that include large tracts of Forest Service lands. Unfortunately, many counties have seen these payments decline drastically in recent years due to reductions in logging and other revenue-generating activities.

Madam Chairman, I understand the need to alter our forest management practice to reflect increased concerns for habitat protection and greater use of forests for recreation. However, our children should not be forced to suffer when these changes result in a shortfall in funding for schools and other basic needs.

H.R. 2389 promises that rural forest communities will once again be able to depend on adequate and consistent payment for county schools and roads, regardless of forest management decisions over which they have no control.

Under this bill, Illinois will enjoy a 68 percent increase in the payments it

receives from the Forest Service. Because H.R. 2389 promises counties the higher of either of their 25 percent annual payment or their high 3-year average payment, no State and no county will lose money under this legislation.

It is also important to note that the final version of this measure represents a compromise carefully crafted by rural communities, education groups, business leaders, and labor organizations. They all have agreed that this legislation provides an effective solution to a growing problem, allowing for the improvement of schools and local infrastructure while stakeholders and policymakers work toward a permanent resolution to the county payment issue.

□ 1515

Madam Chairman, this legislation is critical to rural communities across the country, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

Mr. FARR of California. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. Let me say why. First of all, we have a lousy policy in the United States. It is an addiction policy. It is addiction where we say to schools they have to be addicted to cutting publicly-owned trees in order to have enough money to run their school. Congress has made it that way and it should have never been that way.

That addiction to cutting trees is because the more trees that are cut the more revenue that can be generated. Now, take rural schools in agricultural communities, they are not addicted to how much wheat is cut or corn is cut.

This is a foolish policy. We say that if one is a school in a National Forest county, that they have to be in favor of cutting as much timber as they possibly can in publicly-owned forests, National Forests. This does not apply to State forests. This does not apply to private lands that are cut, only to National Forests.

There is a debate going on of why we have this silly policy of addicting schools to forest timber harvests. That is why the President has said let us cure this addiction; let us delink the funding of schools to the cutting of trees. It is the only area in the United States where public policy has this linkage. It is foolish.

Now, the proponents of this bill, and I think we are moving in the right direction, are trying to do something about it but they want to keep people a little bit addicted. They want to keep that 20 percent set aside by saying, with this money it can be used but remember the demand is whether it is going to be used for an ecotourism trail, fine, how much revenue is that going to generate versus revenue to cut more trees? We know where the interests are going to be. They are going to say let us spend that money to promote more tree cutting. That is not

delinkage. That is not trying to cure the addiction.

This amendment does that. This amendment says if one is interested in schools in the United States, then give all of this money to schools because that is what this bill is about, funding schools. So this silly idea that part of that can be set aside and it will be delinked, and will essentially get schools off the addiction, is totally wrong. I support 100 percent this amendment. If this amendment fails we ought not to be passing the bill.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR of California. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, I would like to point out that I think we should delink trees and schools, but I want to make sure all of the body understands that my amendment does not go that far. It just says when the money is delivered to the county's doorstep that the counties and those elected officials and those decisionmakers decide how it is spent; that there is no requirement that 20 percent be used on projects on Federal lands.

It is about local control. It is about making sure that the people on the ground make the decisions about whether that money is used for schools or for roads or for a Quincy Library effort.

Mr. FARR of California. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for reminding me that he still has that local control because, frankly, schools in the United States are funded by property taxes and the only reason we are in this is because some States have still made those schools totally dependent on property taxes, so when there is federally-owned land they do not have a lot of property taxes.

In California, it has shifted because we do not do that by property taxes anymore. The State funds the schools. Those counties that still have Federal property have some impact, but do not think that this is a bill where one is going to try to get schools totally and fully financed as long as they are linked to cutting trees. That is the wrong policy for the United States.

We should not be having our National Forests be the only way we can fund an adequate education in the United States.

Mr. HERGER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, just in brief response to my good friend from California, we have major problems in our forests today. I represent 11 National Forests. Particularly in California, where we have stopped fires since the early 1900s and we have forests that the Forest Service says are 2 and 3 and 4 times denser than they have been historically, we have forests that are burning down, forests that we can use some of that wood to provide the wood product, the paper product that our

Nation needs, and at the same time we have extremists within some of the environmental movements that would not allow us to remove one single tree, even if it is dead, from our National Forests, and that really stands at the crux of the problem here today.

Madam Chairman, on behalf of the rural school children in my district, I rise in strong opposition to the Udall-Vento amendment which will gut the substance of this bill.

The Northern California District I represent contains all or part of 11 National Forests. The citizens of my district have seen firsthand how the Clinton-Gore administration's locking up of our National Forest through their zero-cut forest management policy has virtually crippled educational funding in rural America.

Allow me to provide one example of the drastic drop in school funding that we have seen in my district. The Plumas National Forest, which is tied to schools in Plumas, Butte and Sierra Counties, generated \$3.1 million in education funding in 1993. In contrast, the Plumas National Forest only generated \$1.7 million in 1997. Because of this drastic drop in funding, schools have been forced to drop classes, cut programs and eliminate extracurricular activities.

This bill provides the short-term stability in educational funding which these communities desperately need while enabling them to participate with their Federal agencies in a program that will help to begin to restore health to our overgrown National Forest System.

The Udall-Vento amendment would take away this local control.

Madam Chairman, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act was created in the spirit of the Quincy Library Group, a diverse coalition of local environmentalists, forest-product industry representatives, labor, local officials and concerned citizens that developed a forest health proposal for the forests surrounding the small rural community of Quincy, California, in my northern California district.

The Quincy Group developed a forest pilot project that became the basis of Federal legislation, which I sponsored and which passed last Congress overwhelmingly by a margin of 429-to-1. The group crafted a way to manage our forests for health and safety while providing for a responsible ecologically sound level of harvesting to benefit local counties and schools.

By passing the Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act, this Congress recognized that local groups are better able to craft solutions that best benefit their local forests, communities and schools and that we can create win-win solutions when local communities, not Washington, are the source of those solutions. Contrary to this administration's policies, Washington does not know best.

Madam Chairman, this bill will create hundreds of Quincy Library Groups

across the country, where communities will finally be given a greater voice in the management of their local National Forests and the funding of their schools. The Udall amendment will take away this important voice. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and for the bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERGER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) for yielding.

Madam Chairman, the last speaker on the other side raised the administration's position on this, and I think it is important to find out exactly where the administration is.

The administration has been AWOL on this issue from the beginning. The administration continues to maintain the Sierra Club/Wilderness Society position of decoupling or nothing, and when the gentleman says we should not have to cut trees in order to fund schools, what the gentleman is overlooking is that this bill moves in the direction of assuring that the schools get the funds no matter what level of timber harvesting takes place but it continues to maintain that connection not just for timber harvesting.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) has expired.

(On request of Mr. GOODLATTE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HERGER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERGER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, the effect of that is that for watershed protection, for recreational projects, for environmental improvement of our forests by thinning and other tree-harvesting measures that are environmentally sound, every one of these projects has to comply with every single Federal law. The effect of this is to continue that connection.

More importantly, even if the other side were successful in passing what they want, the reality will never change that these communities are dependent upon these forests because they use such a great portion of the land in those counties. So the jobs that are lost, that is additional loss to the schools in a particular county. When businesses close down and move out, that is additional tax revenue that does not go to the schools and so the net effect of what the gentleman is saying that we should have no connection between the land and its people is a very, very bad policy.

This amendment should not be supported because the effect of it is going to disconnect people with centuries of connection to their communities and to their land for their economic survival.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Chairman, it is my opinion that it is the administration's goal to get everybody out of the forest and put rural communities on welfare.

A very good point was made in that the best forest management plans are from local input. This administration's ill-conceived notion is that no management is good forest health, and that is just not true. So I agree and align myself with the gentleman's statement. The administration's goal is to get people out of Federal lands and put rural communities on welfare. That is the goal.

Mr. POMBO. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. POMBO. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) for yielding.

Madam Chairman, we heard a few minutes ago my colleagues talk about the addiction, and what this legislation would do is it would give us the opportunity to break that addiction. It would give us the opportunity to find a solution that is driven locally.

We hear about local control. Well, all the people that vote against every bill that ever comes to this floor that has anything to do with local control all of a sudden are talking about it. The reason they are talking about it is that the national environmental groups are terrified, they are terrified, that local people are actually going to get together and find a solution, because they thrive on conflict. It is the very existence of their organizations, and if we get local people together talking about the problems and finding solutions we will have a solution and that addiction will be broken.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, from the beginning there are people on the poles of this issue who have wanted this to be a debate about forest policy and not a debate about schools, about vital county services. I have to say a few of the last speakers are succeeding in dragging us back to that point.

Successfully, throughout the day, we have been addressing the needs of the schools, the needs of counties that are more than half owned by the Federal Government, with few alternatives, with depressed rural economies, with underfunded schools, with few sheriffs deputies and other tremendous needs going unmet.

What we heard out of the last few speakers, they want to assassinate the administration here. Well, let us get it straight. Who proposed giving this money to the counties and schools to begin with? It was the President, in the budget a year ago.

What did the Republican majority do in the last Congress on this issue?

Nothing. They did not even hold a hearing.

Now, this Congress there has been some action, but not through a regular process. It did not go through my committee where I sit, the Committee on Resources, which it should have by all rights. Now we are down on the floor and there are people here who would just as soon blow this up as opposed to get something done here today.

This is an important issue. This is not a perfect bill. It is not the bill I would have written. It is probably not the bill that we would have had if it had gone through the regular process, but it is vitally important and it is the best we can do today here in the United States House of Representatives.

The administration has not sent a veto threat. They have raised concerns about parts of this bill, concerns which can be worked out with the Senate if it is going to be signed into law, and it needs to be signed into law. For the sake of the kids and the counties, it must pass.

So let us not go where the poles in this debate want us to go. Let us not drag this out into a debate of forest policy. We can debate that every day of the week and we can all disagree and we can come down here and just have a great time pounding on each other or we can do it in committee, we can do it in the hallways, in the cloakrooms, everywhere else. This is not about forest policy. It is about money. It is about vital funds for kids, for schools, for counties, for law enforcement, for roads and infrastructure. Please support passage of this bill.

□ 1530

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Udall amendment. As one who has participated in this discussion for the last couple of years, I am glad to see us finally get to the point to where we can achieve what the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) was just talking about that we need to achieve today with the amendment before us.

At first glance, the Udall amendment seems to make sense, and I know that is certainly the gentleman's intention by allowing local entities total discretion in the use of their full payments.

Usually, I support that kind of flexibility given to the local level for the use of such funds. But this is not a simple amendment as it appears. We have over 830 local entities that are suggesting that the compromise that we have heard mentioned over and over and over again is the best solution for us to date.

An extensive coalition of grassroots or organizations, including education, rural development and labor organizations, have come together to determine the parameter of the payments provided. They recognize that local communities need a steady source of funding for things like education and the

investment to ensure the long-term viability of these local communities dependent on timber resources.

The Udall amendment, unfortunately, provides no assurance that funding would be available for local communities to develop a long-term sustainable solution for management of their forestlands. The bill will provide an incentive for local communities to participate and develop the resources available to the communities.

Please oppose the Udall amendment. Support the bill on final passage.

Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for yielding to me.

Madam Chairman, I sense that we are about to wind up here. We have had a spirited debate. I think the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) have best said it in the last two statements.

I would be remiss at this point in time if I did not pause to again thank the Members, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), and also the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for their role in making this happen.

Also, I want to thank all of the staff. This is my first opportunity to be heavily involved in a bill like this on the floor. I want to tell my colleagues that we have some very professional staff here, Dave Tenny and Kevin Kramp from the House Committee on Agriculture, Doug Crandall from the House Committee on Resources, Jennifer Rich from the office of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL), Penny Dodge from the office of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), David Goldston from the office of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), Chris Schloesser from my staff, and also Greg Kosta from Legislative Counsel. I want to give my thanks to all of those folks.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam chairman, as we come to the conclusion of the debate on this amendment, I quite frankly am surprised we can still see across this room because it has become smoke filled, and traditional smoke screens have all been thrown up as we debated this amendment. But let me just deal with some basic, pure legislative arithmetic.

This bill, as the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) says, is not a debate about forest policy. It was not intended to be. This amendment is a smoke screen for that debate. Because, in all honesty, and I admire his candor on it, the proponent of the amendment admits that, even if it is adopted, he will not support the bill because he does want to debate the forest policy of delinkage.

That is a debate for another day. If we debate delinkage, we ought to debate the issues of delinking those local sheriff's departments of having to provide law enforcement protection for those forests in their counties. We ought to debate their search and rescue efforts that cost them tens of thousands of dollars in very small rural communities when they have to find somebody who has drowned in one of our rivers or whose plane has crashed in one of our National Forests. But that is a debate for another day.

But let us talk about the legislative math, about what is before us. We are talking about giving to our counties that qualify the average of the highest 3 years from 1984 through 1999. I want to tell my colleagues what that does in my State of Georgia. The debate of the amendment is about 80 percent or 100 percent, let me tell my colleagues what the real story is.

In my State of Georgia, if they get 80 percent of the highest 3 years for that time frame compared with what they have gotten on average for the last 3 years, they will get a 250 percent increase. Now, that is Georgia math. 250 percent, even if it is at an 80 percent level, is a whole lot better than 100 percent of what one is getting now. That holds true for almost every State across this country.

Now, let me tell my colleagues what the math of the amendment is; and that is 100 percent of nothing is still nothing. If this amendment passes, that is exactly what will happen. The compromise of the groups that have supported this bill as it now comes before us, that compromise will disintegrate, and the gentleman will get 100 percent, but it will be 100 percent of nothing. I oppose the amendment. I urge its defeat, and I urge the adoption of the bill as proposed.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Let me just say that I rise in strong support of the Udall amendment because I think it is an important amendment. There will be varying amounts of money that will be available if one has the 20 percent set-aside, a 20 percent that is mandated within this legislation.

This is supposedly an argument, as the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) said and as has been said over the last several years as timber policy in this country has changed, that this is an argument about sustaining the rural schools and county roads and other obligations of county governments where one has high ownership of Federal lands and timber based economies.

If this is about maintaining those schools, schools that are in dire straits, I sit on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, we listen to these schools every day in that committee talk about the problems of rural schools, talk about the problems of the western United States, of rural schools.

We just had a bipartisan effort to try to get additional money to those schools under ESEA to provide them additional flexibility. We understand that problem. It is a very real problem. The administration, as the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) pointed out, offered legislation to make whole these schools without coupling it to forest policy.

Why is this amendment important? This amendment is important, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), because it recognizes what this 20 percent set-aside is. This 20 percent set-aside is the last gasping of the forest industry in these areas to try to see whether or not they can bootstrap themselves into additional logging in these areas, to try to tell the communities that they can bring in additional monies even if it is contrary to the national interest of the National Forests and the people of this country.

That is what this 20 percent set-aside is. That is why they fought so hard about it. I do not know how they got the school districts to do it. I do not know how they got the NEA and the School Boards Association and others, because supposedly the school boards are in such terrible trouble, that is why we need this legislation, but they took 20 percent of the money off the top on a mandatory mandate by the Congress.

Now, we are told that, if one wants local flexibility, it is a poison pill. Six weeks ago, we are out here arguing that we had to give absolute flexibility to local governments, we had to give absolute flexibility to local schools. My, how far we have come from the Contract on America when local flexibility is a poison pill.

But we are going to go ahead, if this legislation is passed without the Udall amendment, we are going to set up 150 Federal advisory committees. They are going to try to see whether or not they can come up with projects on the forests. That is not a problem.

But do my colleagues know what? If the local community decides that 100 percent of these receipts should go into the schools, why should not they be able to make that determination? They are prohibited from making that determination because there is a Federal mandate in this legislation that says the local community cannot make that decision.

So even if they decide what is in their best interest, they do not get to make that decision. They do not get to make that decision. That is why the Udall amendment is important. Because the fact of the matter is, what we are trying to do here and what this formula tries to do, is we take the highest users of forest policy when maybe, perhaps, the poorest policy was at its most irresponsible level, where we were timbering lands far beyond their sustained yield, far beyond their sustained productivity.

That is why we are in the fix we are in today, because those lands have been

butchered in such a fashion that they no longer will yield, because the people 10 years ago decided they would take everything they could get and they would rip and run. Now these communities are left without the resources to educate the children.

We happen to believe, I think most people, that those communities can be made whole still, and the administration proposed that. But the timber industry said that is not good enough. That is not good enough. We have got to have the means to try to come in the back door and see whether or not we can, again, drive the timber harvest.

So, therefore, one has a mandatory 20 percent set-aside, a 20 percent set-aside against the best interest of the community if the community decides that its roads and its school children are important.

Plus in some cases, as I tried to point out earlier, the amount of money is so small that it is hard to believe that one can efficiently use it. But we will set up these committees, we will have 150 of them on every unit of the Forest, and they can decide what to do with \$8,000 or \$10,000.

But if the community said we want to buy 10 computers or we want to buy software or we want to buy books or we want to contribute to the payment of one of the 100,000 teachers the President is trying to get passed, they will not be able to do that, because they will have to spend this 20 percent in a mandated set-aside to try to come up with some project on the Forest that the community, in fact, may not agree with.

That is the wisdom of the Udall amendment. It is about understand what this 20 percent set-aside does.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, it is about understanding the need for communities to be able to make the full range of decisions that affect them. Because apparently from the debate and from the remarks of most of my colleagues in the affected areas, it becomes very clear that the money for schools today is insufficient. The money for schools in 1984 was insufficient.

So now, out of an insufficient amount of money, the Federal Government is going to mandate that one has got to set aside 20 percent, so the schools cannot have it, the county roads cannot have it, even if the community decides that is what is important.

I suggest what we do is make a bad bill better, we vote for the Udall amendment, and we give these local communities the controls that they need and they desire and that are most beneficial for their local communities

and for the school children in those areas.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Madam Chairman, I would like to respond to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) on some of his comments. He mentioned that the forests were being over cut back some years ago, and that is true. But as the gentleman knows, we have laws now, Federal laws, and certainly those in California that do not allow this anymore.

Our predicament now is just the opposite of what it was 15 and 20 years ago. Today we have forests that are two and three and four times denser than they have ever been. We have fire hazards now where we are having catastrophic wildfires, and we need to go in and actually thin out our forests, of which we are unable to do.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, I would just like to raise the issue that I think we have been asked today to trust the Federal Government to take care of these 800 communities just like we have had in the past.

When we look at the history of Congress and previous administrations, we have about a billion acres in this country in public land owned by the Federal Government plus local governments more. But now that billion acres we have a payment in lieu of tax program. If one looks at it, can one say we should trust Congress to take care of communities who have huge mounts of their acreage owned by the Federal Government?

This year, we will appropriate \$125 million for a billion acres. That is 12 cents an acre. In Pennsylvania where we own a lot of land, the State I come from, we pay \$1.20 for every acre that the State owns to help local schools, to help local roads. That does not break the State. Congress has paid 12 cents an acre, and they are saying trust us, Congress will take care of these school districts, these law enforcement agencies, and these local governments who have the bulk of the land in their communities.

I want to tell my colleagues, when I look at that record, I am not going to trust Congress. I am not going to trust future administrations. Everything we can do to help rural America have a base of government, the great amount of ownership of this Congress, of this country, and our closed and calloused attitude towards it, our unwillingness to be sensitive to the needs out there as we change Federal policy is historic.

So I say today let us defeat the amendment that is before us, and let us pass this bill. It is a major step. It does not fix the problem, but it is a major step of help to rural America. It shows rural America that we care about their educational building in small rural communities that are surrounded with

public land. It shows we care a little bit.

I urge a defeat of this amendment and passage of the bill.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WU. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado. I would like to thank my good friend for bringing this important amendment to the floor. I believe that this amendment will improve H.R. 2389.

The Udall amendment helps bring decision making closer to home. Under the proposed bill, any county, which receives over \$100,000 in safety net payments, will be required to use 20 percent for "projects on federal lands." Those counties, which receive less than \$100,000 in safety net payments, have the choice to use the entire payment for schools and roads or elect to use 20 percent for "projects on federal lands." The federal government will in effect be mandating to counties, which receive over \$100,000, how to spend 20 percent of the assistance.

Madam Chairman, by mandating that 20 percent of the revenue be used for purposes other than education and transportation, we, the U.S. Congress, are tying the hands of local decision-makers about local priorities.

The Udall amendment allows the affected county to make the decision. The Udall amendment allows local officials to decide if smaller class size is more important than a new Search and Rescue unit, whether new books for third graders are needed more than forest management. These are the difficult choices that need to be left in the hands of the people who are most affected by them, local communities.

□ 1545

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 241, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 559]

AYES—186

Abercrombie	Carson	Evans
Ackerman	Castle	Farr
Allen	Clay	Fattah
Andrews	Clyburn	Filner
Baird	Condit	Forbes
Baldacci	Conyers	Frank (MA)
Baldwin	Costello	Ganske
Barcia	Coyne	Gejdenson
Barrett (WI)	Crowley	Gephardt
Becerra	Cummings	Gillman
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Gutierrez
Berman	DeGette	Hall (OH)
Berry	Delahunt	Hastings (FL)
Blagojevich	DeLauro	Hill (IN)
Blumenauer	Deutscher	Hilliard
Bonior	Dickey	Hinchey
Borski	Dicks	Hinojosa
Boucher	Dixon	Hoefel
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Holden
Brown (OH)	Dooley	Holt
Campbell	Doyle	Horn
Capps	Ehlers	Hutchinson
Capuano	Engel	Insliee
Cardin	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)

Jackson-Lee (TX)
 Jefferson
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kasich
 Kelly
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kind (WI)
 Kleczka
 Kucinich
 LaFalce
 Lantos
 Larson
 Lazio
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 LoBiondo
 Lowey
 Luther
 Maloney (CT)
 Markey
 Martinez
 Matsui
 McCarthy (MO)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHugh
 McInnis
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meehan

Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Menendez
 Millender-McDonald
 Miller, George
 Minge
 Mink
 Moakley
 Mollohan
 Moore
 Moran (VA)
 Morella
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Obey
 Olver
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor
 Paul
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Porter
 Price (NC)
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Rivers
 Rodriguez
 Roemer
 Rohrabacher
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Rush
 Sabo

Sanchez
 Sanders
 Sawyer
 Schakowsky
 Scott
 Serrano
 Shays
 Sherman
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Spratt
 Stabenow
 Stark
 Stearns
 Strickland
 Stupak
 Sweeney
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Towns
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Velazquez
 Vento
 Visclosky
 Walsh
 Waters
 Watt (NC)
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Wexler
 Weygand
 Wise
 Woolsey
 Wu

NOES—241

Aderholt
 Archer
 Arney
 Bachus
 Baker
 Ballenger
 Barr
 Barrett (NE)
 Bartlett
 Barton
 Bass
 Bateman
 Bentsen
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop
 Bliley
 Blunt
 Boehlert
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bono
 Boswell
 Boyd
 Brady (TX)
 Brown (FL)
 Bryant
 Burr
 Burton
 Buyer
 Callahan
 Calvert
 Camp
 Canady
 Cannon
 Chabot
 Chambliss
 Chenoweth-Hage
 Clayton
 Clement
 Coble
 Coburn
 Collins
 Combest
 Cook
 Cooksey
 Cox
 Cramer
 Crane
 Cubin
 Cunningham
 Danner
 Davis (FL)
 Davis (VA)
 Deal
 DeFazio
 DeLay

DeMint
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doolittle
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Edwards
 Ehrlich
 Emerson
 English
 Etheridge
 Everett
 Ewing
 Fletcher
 Foley
 Ford
 Fossella
 Fowler
 Franks (NJ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Frost
 Gallegly
 Gekas
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gonzalez
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Goodling
 Gordon
 Goss
 Graham
 Granger
 Green (TX)
 Green (WI)
 Greenwood
 Gutknecht
 Hall (TX)
 Hansen
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Herger
 Hill (MT)
 Hilleary
 Hobson
 Hoekstra
 Hooley
 Hostettler
 Houghton
 Hoyer
 Hunter
 Hyde
 Isakson
 Istook

Jenkins
 John
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Klink
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kuykendall
 LaHood
 Lampson
 Largent
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 Lofgren
 Lucas (KY)
 Lucas (OK)
 Maloney (NY)
 Manzullo
 Mascara
 McCollum
 McCreary
 McIntosh
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 Metcalf
 Miller (FL)
 Miller, Gary
 Moran (KS)
 Murtha
 Myrick
 Nethercutt
 Ney
 Northup
 Norwood
 Nussle
 Oberstar
 Ortiz
 Ose
 Oxley
 Packard
 Pease
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Phelps
 Pickering
 Pickett
 Pitts
 Pombo
 Pomeroy
 Portman

Pryce (OH)
 Quinn
 Radanovich
 Regula
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Riley
 Rogan
 Rogers
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roukema
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)
 Salmon
 Sandlin
 Sanford
 Saxton
 Schaffer
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Sherwood

Shimkus
 Shows
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sisisky
 Skeen
 Skelton
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (TX)
 Spence
 Stenholm
 Stump
 Sununu
 Talent
 Tancredo
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Tauzin
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thornberry

Thune
 Thurman
 Tiahrt
 Toomey
 Traficant
 Turner
 Upton
 Vitter
 Walden
 Wamp
 Watkins
 Watts (OK)
 Weldon (FL)
 Weller
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson
 Wolf
 Wynn
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Bereuter
 Hulshof

Kilpatrick
 Scarborough

Souder
 Weldon (PA)

□ 1609

Messrs. NORWOOD, ISAKSON, MCCOLLUM, KOLBE, FRELINGHUYSEN, REYES, HALL of Texas, and Mrs. FOWLER, and Ms. LOFGREN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. OBEY, HORN, MCHUGH, HOLDEN, DOYLE, LEACH, SCOTT, LAZIO, and CAMPBELL changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Madam Chairman, on roll-call No. 559, I inadvertently voted “no.” I meant to vote “aye.”

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any other amendments?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having resumed the chair, Mrs. EMERSON, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2389) to restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to States and counties containing National Forest System lands and public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management for use by the counties for the benefit of public schools, roads, and other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 352, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 274, noes 153, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 560]

AYES—274

Aderholt
 Allen
 Archer
 Arney
 Bachus
 Baird
 Baker
 Baldacci
 Ballenger
 Barcia
 Barr
 Barrett (NE)
 Bartlett
 Barton
 Bass
 Bateman
 Bentsen
 Berry
 Biggert
 Bilirakis
 Bishop
 Bliley
 Blumenauer
 Blunt
 Boehlert
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bono
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boyd
 Brady (TX)
 Bryant
 Burr
 Burton
 Buyer
 Callahan
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Canady
 Cannon
 Chabot
 Chambliss
 Chenoweth-Hage
 Clayton
 Clement
 Coble
 Collins
 Combest
 Condit
 Cook
 Cooksey
 Costello
 Cox
 Cramer
 Cubin
 Cunningham
 Danner
 Davis (FL)
 Davis (VA)
 Deal
 DeFazio
 DeLay
 DeMint
 Diaz-Balart
 Dickey
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Dooley
 Doolittle
 Doyle
 Dreier

Duncan
 Dunn
 Edwards
 Ehrlich
 Emerson
 English
 Etheridge
 Everett
 Ewing
 Fletcher
 Foley
 Ford
 Fossella
 Fowler
 Frost
 Gallegly
 Ganske
 Gekas
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Goodling
 Gordon
 Goss
 Graham
 Granger
 Green (TX)
 Green (WI)
 Greenwood
 Gutierrez
 Gutknecht
 Hall (OH)
 Hall (TX)
 Hansen
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Herger
 Hill (IN)
 Hill (MT)
 Hilleary
 Hilliard
 Hinojosa
 Hobson
 Hoekstra
 Hooley
 Horn
 Hostettler
 Houghton
 Hoyer
 Hunter
 Hutchinson
 Hyde
 Isakson
 Istook
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jenkins
 John
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Kasich
 Kind (WI)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Klink
 Knollenberg
 Kuykendall

LaHood
 Lampson
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Leach
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 Lucas (KY)
 Lucas (OK)
 Manzullo
 Martinez
 Mascara
 McCollum
 McCreary
 Gekas
 McHugh
 McInnis
 McIntosh
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 Metcalf
 Mica
 Miller, Gary
 Mollohan
 Moore
 Moran (KS)
 Morella
 Murtha
 Myrick
 Napolitano
 Nethercutt
 Ney
 Northup
 Norwood
 Nussle
 Ortiz
 Ose
 Oxley
 Packard
 Pease
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Phelps
 Pickering
 Pickett
 Pitts
 Pombo
 Pomeroy
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Quinn
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Riley
 Rodriguez
 Roemer
 Rogers
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Rothman
 Royce
 Ryun (KS)
 Salmon
 Sanchez
 Sandlin
 Schaffer
 Sensenbrenner

Sessions	Stump	Velazquez
Shadegg	Stupak	Visclosky
Shaw	Sweeney	Vitter
Sherwood	Talent	Walden
Shimkus	Tancredo	Walsh
Shows	Tanner	Watkins
Shuster	Tauzin	Watt (NC)
Simpson	Taylor (MS)	Watts (OK)
Sisisky	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (FL)
Skeen	Terry	Weller
Skelton	Thomas	Whitfield
Smith (MI)	Thompson (CA)	Wicker
Smith (TX)	Thornberry	Wilson
Snyder	Thune	Wise
Souder	Thurman	Wolf
Spence	Tiahrt	Wu
Spratt	Traffant	Young (AK)
Stenholm	Turner	Young (FL)
Strickland	Udall (NM)	

NOES—153

Abercrombie	Hoefel	Olver
Ackerman	Holden	Owens
Andrews	Holt	Pallone
Baldwin	Inslee	Pascrell
Barrett (WI)	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Becerra	Jefferson	Paul
Berkley	Jones (OH)	Payne
Berman	Kanjorski	Pelosi
Bilbray	Kaptur	Porter
Blagojevich	Kelly	Portman
Bonior	Kennedy	Ramstad
Borski	Kildee	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Klecicka	Regula
Brown (FL)	Kolbe	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Kucinich	Roukema
Capps	LaFalce	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Lantos	Rush
Cardin	Largent	Sabo
Carson	Larson	Sanders
Castle	Lazio	Sanford
Clay	Lee	Sawyer
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Saxton
Coburn	LoBiondo	Schakowsky
Conyers	Lofgren	Scott
Coyne	Lowey	Serrano
Crane	Luther	Shays
Crowley	Maloney (CT)	Sherman
Cummings	Maloney (NY)	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	Markey	Smith (NJ)
DeGette	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Delahunt	McCarthy (MO)	Stabenow
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
Deutsch	McDermott	Stearns
Dixon	McGovern	Sununu
Doggett	McKinney	Tauscher
Ehlers	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
Engel	Meehan	Tierney
Eshoo	Meek (FL)	Toomey
Evans	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Farr	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Fattah	Millender	Upton
Filner	McDonald	Vento
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Waters
Franks (NJ)	Minge	Waxman
Frelinghuysen	Mink	Weiner
Gedensson	Moakley	Wexler
Gephardt	Moran (VA)	Weygand
Gilman	Nadler	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Neal	Wynn
Hastings (FL)	Oberstar	
Hinchey	Obey	

NOT VOTING—6

Bereuter	Kilpatrick	Scarborough
Hulshof	Ryan (WI)	Weldon (PA)

□ 1627

Mr. VISCLOSKEY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 560, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have noted "yes."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2389, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2389, COUNTY SCHOOLS FUNDING REVITALIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill (H.R. 2389) the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, citations and cross references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1832

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1832, the Muhammad Ali Boxing Reform Act.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 353 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 353

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time on or before the legislative day of Wednesday, November 10, 1999, for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules, provided that the object of any such motion is announced from the floor at least two hours before the motion is offered. In scheduling the consideration of legislation under this authority, the Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee.

□ 1630

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good and hard-working late-at-night friend, the gentleman from South Boston, Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY). Pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time I will be yielding will be for debate purposes only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his re-

marks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 353 will provide for the consideration of motions to suspend the rules at any time up to and including the legislative day of Wednesday, November 10. In addition, this resolution requires that the Speaker or his designee consult with the minority leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration under suspension of the rules. Finally, this resolution provides that the object of any motion to suspend the rules be announced, based on a brilliantly crafted amendment from the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for at least 2 hours prior to its consideration.

Under clause 1 of rule XV of the rules of the House, the Speaker may only entertain motions to suspend the rules on Mondays, Tuesday, and the last 6 days of the session. Since the House has not yet passed an adjournment resolution, the last 6 days of this session have not been determined, although we still hope they will be the last 6 days that begin before too terribly long. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary for us to pass this resolution in order to allow the House to consider suspensions on days other than those designated as suspension days under the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of the first session of this Congress, it is imperative we allow ourselves the utmost flexibility in scheduling and considering the remaining matters before us. While we have produced such success in this session, most notably reforming education, providing for our national defense and protecting Social Security, there still are a number of items that do need to be considered. This resolution will allow us to expeditiously consider the noncontroversial and narrowly tailored, yet important matters, that remain unresolved.

Every year around this time we consider a resolution such as this in order to officially dispose of the remaining bipartisan matters before us.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in pursuit of that, I urge adoption of this resolution and thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for helping us in this quest.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and my very dear friend, the illustrious gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, by bringing up this rule making every day a suspension day, one might be led to believe my Republican colleagues have seen the light at the end of the tunnel; but from what I can tell, we still have a lot to do before Congress finishes the work for the year.

I hope the people negotiating the omnibus appropriations bill will be able to

come to an agreement by Veterans' Day, but, Mr. Speaker, I have my reservations. Omnibus bills are traditionally very big and very complicated, and there is no reason to think this year's will be any different.

I want to thank my chairman and my Republican colleagues on the Committee on Rules for graciously allowing us an extra hour's notice on these suspension bills. Although my chairman was personally opposed to it, he supported our request nonetheless, and I appreciate this very much.

But as a Member of the minority, I have to object to this rule making every day a suspension day. Suspensions, by their very nature, bypass House rules, including the rules that protect the minority. Far too many bills this Congress has bypassed the committee process. Both the D.C. appropriations bill coming up next and the foreign operations appropriations bill that is probably coming up tomorrow have completely skipped the committee process; and the Labor, Health and Human Services bill was never considered in such a way that Members could actually amend it. So I fear this rule will make it even easier for my Republican colleagues to continue to run rough-shod over the rules of the House, and particularly the rules that protect the minority.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply say my good friend from Sugarland, Texas, has just informed me that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) referred to some omnibus bill that is out there, and none of us on this side are aware of that at all. I do not know that we are going to be considering anything like that. We are not planning to consider anything like that at all.

The second thing I would like to say is that I was very happy to encourage all of the majority Members to support the Moakley amendment upstairs last night when we considered this, and I only assumed that having done that that my friend would enthusiastically join us in helping move these suspension measures, as is always the case at the end of the year.

I would also add that on both the D.C. and the Labor, Health and Human Services bills, we did see full committee action on both of those, and there are clearly, on the D.C. bill modifications that have been made, but we know the chairman of that Subcommittee on the District of Columbia spent a lot of time on the D.C. bill, and on the Labor-HHS bill, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) did. So we are doing what is very much the norm for trying to move legislation towards the end of the session. So I think there should be very strong bipartisan support of this measure.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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 222, nays 200, answered “present” 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 561]

YEAS—222

Aderholt	Foley	McCrery
Archer	Fossella	McHugh
Armey	Fowler	McInnis
Bachus	Franks (NJ)	McIntosh
Baker	Frelinghuysen	McKeon
Ballenger	Gallegly	McNulty
Barr	Ganske	Metcalfe
Barrett (NE)	Gekas	Mica
Bartlett	Gibbons	Miller (FL)
Barton	Gilchrest	Miller, Gary
Bass	Gillmor	Moran (KS)
Bateman	Gilman	Morella
Biggert	Goodlatte	Myrick
Bilbray	Goodling	Nethercutt
Bilirakis	Goss	Ney
Bliley	Graham	Northup
Blunt	Granger	Norwood
Boehlert	Green (WI)	Nussle
Boehner	Greenwood	Ose
Bonilla	Gutknecht	Oxley
Bono	Hall (TX)	Packard
Brady (TX)	Hansen	Paul
Bryant	Hastings (WA)	Pease
Burr	Hayes	Peterson (PA)
Burton	Hayworth	Petri
Buyer	Hefley	Pickering
Callahan	Herger	Pitts
Calvert	Hill (MT)	Pombo
Camp	Hilleary	Porter
Campbell	Hobson	Portman
Canady	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)
Cannon	Horn	Quinn
Castle	Hostettler	Radanovich
Chabot	Houghton	Ramstad
Chambliss	Hunter	Regula
Chenoweth-Hage	Hutchinson	Reynolds
Coble	Hyde	Riley
Coburn	Isakson	Rogan
Collins	Istook	Rogers
Combest	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Cook	Johnson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cooksey	Johnson, Sam	Rothman
Cox	Jones (NC)	Roukema
Crane	Kasich	Royce
Cubin	Kelly	Ryan (WI)
Cunningham	King (NY)	Ryun (KS)
Davis (VA)	Kingston	Salmon
Deal	Knollenberg	Sanford
DeLay	Kolbe	Saxton
DeMint	Kuykendall	Schaffer
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Dooley	Largent	Sessions
Doolittle	Latham	Shadegg
Dreier	LaTourette	Shaw
Duncan	Lazio	Shays
Ehlers	Leach	Sherman
Ehrlich	Lewis (CA)	Sherwood
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Shimkus
English	Linder	Shuster
Eshoo	LoBiondo	Simpson
Everett	Lucas (OK)	Skeen
Ewing	Manzullo	Smith (MI)
Fletcher	McCollum	Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)

Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Trafigant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh

Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—200

Abercrombie	Gordon	Napolitano
Allen	Green (TX)	Neal
Andrews	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Baird	Hall (OH)	Obey
Baldacci	Hastings (FL)	Olver
Baldwin	Hill (IN)	Ortiz
Barcia	Hilliard	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Hinchey	Pallone
Becerra	Hinojosa	Pascrell
Bentsen	Hoefel	Pastor
Berkley	Holden	Payne
Berman	Holt	Pelosi
Berry	Hooley	Peterson (MN)
Bishop	Hoyer	Phelps
Blagojevich	Inslee	Pickett
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Borski	(TX)	Rangel
Boswell	Jefferson	Reyes
Boucher	John	Rivers
Boyd	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski	Roibal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Rush
Capps	Kennedy	Sabo
Capuano	Kildee	Sanchez
Cardin	Kind (WI)	Sanders
Carson	Klecza	Sandlin
Clay	Klink	Sawyer
Clayton	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Clement	LaFalce	Serrano
Clyburn	Lampson	Shows
Condit	Lantos	Sisisky
Conyers	Larson	Skelton
Costello	Lee	Slaughter
Coyne	Levin	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Crowley	Lipinski	Spratt
Cummings	Lofgren	Stabenow
Danner	Lowey	Stark
Davis (FL)	Lucas (KY)	Stenholm
Davis (IL)	Luther	Strickland
DeFazio	Maloney (CT)	Stupak
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Tanner
Delahunt	Markey	Tauscher
DeLauro	Martinez	Taylor (MS)
Deutch	Mascara	Thompson (CA)
Dickey	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Thurman
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Dixon	McDermott	Towns
Doggett	McGovern	Turner
Doyle	McIntyre	Udall (CO)
Edwards	McKinney	Udall (NM)
Engel	Meenan	Velazquez
Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Vento
Evans	Meeks (NY)	Visclosky
Fattah	Menendez	Waters
Filner	Miller, George	Watt (NC)
Forbes	Minge	Waxman
Ford	Mink	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Wexler
Frost	Mollohan	Weygand
Gejdenson	Moore	Wise
Gephardt	Moran (VA)	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Murtha	Wu
Goode	Nadler	Wynn

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Farr

NOT VOTING—10

Ackerman	Kilpatrick	Scarborough
Bereuter	Millender-	Scott
Dunn	McDonald	Weldon (PA)
Hulshof	Rahall	

□ 1659

Mr. FATTAH and Mr. LEVIN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 561, I was detained by constituents and was unable to make it in time for this vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3194, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 354 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 354

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3194) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

□ 1700

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 354 is a closed rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3194, the D.C. appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000.

The rule provides for one hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. Additionally, the rule waives all points of order against the bill.

House Resolution 354 also provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 354 is a closed rule, recognizing the full and fair debate that the House had on similar legislation earlier in this Congress. This rule will assist the House to move forward in the appropriations process.

H.R. 3194 continues to fund the District of Columbia at \$75 million over the President's request and makes no changes to funding levels from the previous D.C. appropriations bill. With this bill, we continue to provide \$17 million for scholarships to low-income D.C. residents, \$2.5 million to help im-

prove children's health centers, and \$5 million to provide incentives for the adoption of foster children.

The President's request did not include funding for any of these important programs.

With this legislation, charter schools will have access to construction funds, the schools will have the same opportunity to expand as other public schools, and parents will be able to send all of their children to the same charter school. H.R. 3194 enacts the \$59 million tax cut passed by the D.C. City Council, and it works with the Council to make vital changes in city management that will place Washington, D.C. on the road to financial recovery.

This bill also restores the original language for needle exchange initiatives, continuing our commitment to prohibit Federal support for these dubious and irresponsible programs. The Clinton administration's own Department of Health and Human Resources prohibits the use of Federal funds for needle exchanges, and we should maintain this consistent standard.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have taken the necessary steps in this bill to bring this chapter of the appropriations process to a close. I applaud the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) for his patience and his willingness to work through this difficult process, and I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in the immortal words of Yogi Berra, it is *deja vu* all over again. The first District of Columbia appropriations bill was loaded with Republican riders and it was vetoed. The second D.C. appropriations bill was loaded not just with riders but also with the Labor-HHS appropriation. It is yet to be vetoed but it certainly will be.

Before us today is D.C. Three, yet another attempt on the part of the Republican majority to move a Christmas tree to the White House even before the Thanksgiving turkey is on the table.

Mr. Speaker, pity the residents of this city. What have they done to the Republicans in this body to deserve this mistreatment? Why should their appropriation be loaded up with ornaments designed to make good Republican boys and girls happy? This bill is truly a turkey and the Republican majority ought to face the facts and start dealing straight with the people of this city, the Democratic Members of this body and the President of the United States.

Enough is enough, Mr. Speaker. Let us get on with legislating and stop all this tree trimming and turkey stuffing. Give the people of this city a break and send the President an appropriations bill he can sign. Give us all a real Christmas present so that we can finish our business and go home for the holidays.

I urge Members to vote against this bill so that we can send the residents of this city a real holiday treat, a bill he can sign.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, forgive me. Is the gentleman confused? I am. I feel like saying, where are we? Why are we here? Why is there another D.C. bill on the floor? How could there be another D.C. bill on the floor? One was just voted in the Senate yesterday.

I did not realize that this body loved D.C. so much that it wanted to keep voting D.C. bills. One is on its way to the President's desk. Remember last Thursday we just voted for a D.C. bill. It was called the Labor-HHS-D.C. bill. That must be a new agency.

We passed the D.C. bill they wanted. That one is about to be vetoed. Let me try to get this straight. One veto is not enough? They want two vetoes? Do they want them simultaneously or do they want them sequentially?

The last bill, we were told, was the one the majority wanted. That is why they put Labor-HHS on the D.C. bill. All of them voted for that in conference. Now they are back again with another D.C. bill. What could be the reason for a stand-alone bill? What we are seeing is the majority manipulating the smallest, most defenseless appropriation. They do not want yet another D.C. bill before the last D.C. bill is vetoed. They want another vehicle for the majority. The District is no longer a city. It is a vehicle. They want to send this vehicle over to the Senate in order to tie on yet some more bills to send to the White House to be vetoed.

What kind of way is that to treat a city of half a million people whose own money and virtually alone their own money is in this bill?

Free up the D.C. bill. Three D.C. bills are enough. Let D.C. go.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the problem with this rule is that it does not allow us to make a tiny, minuscule little change, but as little a change as it would be it would have profound consequences. We simply want to make it clear that a private, nonprofit organization in the District of Columbia can receive private funds and do with those private funds whatever they choose to do. In other words, treat that organization like we do every other private nonprofit organization.

All we are asking for is that this bill be given what the full, entire House Committee on Appropriations approved; give us the bill that the full House of Representatives on this floor approved; give us the bill that the full Senate Committee on Appropriations,

the full Senate itself approved; give us the bill that the conference between the House and Senate approved. One tiny little change would give us that bill.

Then not only would we agree with this rule, we would agree with the bill. The bill would be sent over to the White House. It would be signed and that little \$429 million, which is infinitesimal compared to our Federal budget, would then be able to be spent in the District of Columbia as its citizens deem appropriate. To them, it means the difference between a solvent government that can respond to the needs of its citizens and one that is kept hostage by the Congress of the United States.

That is the problem with the rule. Let us act reasonably. Then we can both get together and do what is right in the interest of the citizens of the District of Columbia and in the public interest.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
OFFERED BY MR. LINDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. LINDER:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert in lieu thereof:

That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3194) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. An amendment striking section 175 shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) yield the balance of his time?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, at this point let me state that though this amendment is somewhat unusual, we have no objection to the amendment being offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, is not a vote automatic, a roll call vote automatic on an appropriations conference report?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The vote before us was on the rule.

Mr. FROST. On the appropriations bill. I am sorry, on the rule. I withdraw my question. There will be a vote; because Members had asked me, there will be a vote on the actual appropriations conference report?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. FROST. Not on the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. The gentlemen are correct.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include tabular and extraneous material on H.R. 3194.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 354, I call up the bill (H.R. 3194), making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 3194, as amended pursuant to House Resolution 354, is as follows:

H.R. 3194

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—FISCAL YEAR 2000
APPROPRIATIONS

FEDERAL FUNDS

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR RESIDENT TUITION
SUPPORT

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia for a program to be administered by the Mayor for District of Columbia resident tuition support, subject to the enact-

ment of authorizing legislation for such program by Congress, \$17,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds may be used on behalf of eligible District of Columbia residents to pay an amount based upon the difference between in-State and out-of-State tuition at public institutions of higher education, usable at both public and private institutions of higher education: *Provided further*, That the awarding of such funds may be prioritized on the basis of a resident's academic merit and such other factors as may be authorized: *Provided further*, That if the authorized program is a nationwide program, the Mayor may expend up to \$17,000,000: *Provided further*, That if the authorized program is for a limited number of States, the Mayor may expend up to \$11,000,000: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia may expend funds other than the funds provided under this heading, including local tax revenues and contributions, to support such program.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR INCENTIVES FOR
ADOPTION OF CHILDREN

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia to create incentives to promote the adoption of children in the District of Columbia foster care system, \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That such funds shall remain available until September 30, 2001 and shall be used in accordance with a program established by the Mayor and the Council of the District of Columbia and approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That funds provided under this heading may be used to cover the costs to the District of Columbia of providing tax credits to offset the costs incurred by individuals in adopting children in the District of Columbia foster care system and in providing for the health care needs of such children, in accordance with legislation enacted by the District of Columbia government.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE CITIZEN COMPLAINT
REVIEW BOARD

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia for administrative expenses of the Citizen Complaint Review Board, \$500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
HUMAN SERVICES

For a Federal payment to the Department of Human Services for a mentoring program and for hotline services, \$250,000.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA CORRECTIONS TRUSTEE OPERATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the District of Columbia Corrections Trustee, \$176,000,000 for the administration and operation of correctional facilities and for the administrative operating costs of the Office of the Corrections Trustee, as authorized by section 11202 of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-33; 111 Stat. 712): *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act for the District of Columbia Corrections Trustee shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of other Federal agencies: *Provided further*, That in addition to the funds provided under this heading, the District of Columbia Corrections Trustee may use a portion of the interest earned on the Federal payment made to the Trustee under the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1998, (not to exceed \$4,600,000) to carry out the activities funded under this heading.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

For salaries and expenses for the District of Columbia Courts, \$99,714,000 to be allocated as follows: for the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, \$7,209,000; for the District of Columbia Superior Court, \$68,351,000; for the District of Columbia Court System, \$16,154,000; and \$8,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001, for capital improvements for District of Columbia courthouse facilities: *Provided*, That of the amounts available for operations of the District of Columbia Courts, not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be for the design of an Integrated Justice Information System and that such funds shall be used in accordance with a plan and design developed by the courts and approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all amounts under this heading shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of other Federal agencies, with payroll and financial services to be provided on a contractual basis with the General Services Administration (GSA), said services to include the preparation of monthly financial reports, copies of which shall be submitted directly by GSA to the President and to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

DEFENDER SERVICES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

For payments authorized under section 11-2604 and section 11-2605, D.C. Code (relating to representation provided under the District of Columbia Criminal Justice Act), payments for counsel appointed in proceedings in the Family Division of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia under chapter 23 of title 16, D.C. Code, and payments for counsel authorized under section 21-2060, D.C. Code (relating to representation provided under the District of Columbia Guardianship, Protective Proceedings, and Durable Power of Attorney Act of 1986), \$33,336,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the funds provided in this Act under the heading "Federal Payment to the District of Columbia Courts" (other than the \$8,000,000 provided under such heading for capital improvements for District of Columbia courthouse facilities) may also be used for payments under this heading: *Provided further*, That in addition to the funds provided under this heading, the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration in the District of Columbia may use a portion (not to exceed \$1,200,000) of the interest earned on the Federal payment made to the District of Columbia courts under the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1999, together with funds provided in this Act under the heading "Federal Payment to the District of Columbia Courts" (other than the \$8,000,000 provided under such heading for capital improvements for District of Columbia courthouse facilities), to make payments described under this heading for obligations incurred during fiscal year 1999 if the Comptroller General certifies that the amount of obligations lawfully incurred for such payments during fiscal year 1999 exceeds the obligational authority otherwise available for making such payments: *Provided further*, That such funds shall be administered by the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, this appropriation shall be apportioned

quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for expenses of other Federal agencies, with payroll and financial services to be provided on a contractual basis with the General Services Administration (GSA), said services to include the preparation of monthly financial reports, copies of which shall be submitted directly by GSA to the President and to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For salaries and expenses of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, as authorized by the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, (Public Law 105-33; 111 Stat. 712), \$93,800,000, of which \$58,600,000 shall be for necessary expenses of Parole Revocation, Adult Probation, Offender Supervision, and Sex Offender Registration, to include expenses relating to supervision of adults subject to protection orders or provision of services for or related to such persons; \$17,400,000 shall be available to the Public Defender Service; and \$17,800,000 shall be available to the Pretrial Services Agency: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all amounts under this heading shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of other Federal agencies: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$20,492,000 shall be used in support of universal drug screening and testing for those individuals on pretrial, probation, or parole supervision with continued testing, intermediate sanctions, and treatment for those identified in need, of which \$7,000,000 shall be for treatment services.

CHILDREN'S NATIONAL MEDICAL CENTER

For a Federal contribution to the Children's National Medical Center in the District of Columbia, \$2,500,000 for construction, renovation, and information technology infrastructure costs associated with establishing community pediatric health clinics for high risk children in medically underserved areas of the District of Columbia.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

For payment to the Metropolitan Police Department, \$1,000,000, for a program to eliminate open air drug trafficking in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the Chief of Police shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives by the 15th calendar day after the end of each quarter beginning December 31, 1999, on the status of the project financed under this heading.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS
OPERATING EXPENSES
DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The following amounts are appropriated for the District of Columbia for the current fiscal year out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, except as otherwise specifically provided.

GOVERNMENTAL DIRECTION AND SUPPORT

Governmental direction and support, \$162,356,000 (including \$137,134,000 from local funds, \$11,670,000 from Federal funds, and \$13,552,000 from other funds): *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,500 for the Mayor, \$2,500 for

the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, and \$2,500 for the City Administrator shall be available from this appropriation for official purposes: *Provided further*, That any program fees collected from the issuance of debt shall be available for the payment of expenses of the debt management program of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That no revenues from Federal sources shall be used to support the operations or activities of the Statehood Commission and Statehood Compact Commission: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall identify the sources of funding for Admission to Statehood from its own locally-generated revenues: *Provided further*, That all employees permanently assigned to work in the Office of the Mayor shall be paid from funds allocated to the Office of the Mayor: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law now or hereafter enacted, no Member of the District of Columbia Council eligible to earn a part-time salary of \$92,520, exclusive of the Council Chairman, shall be paid a salary of more than \$84,635 during fiscal year 2000.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION

Economic development and regulation, \$190,335,000 (including \$52,911,000 from local funds, \$84,751,000 from Federal funds, and \$52,673,000 from other funds), of which \$15,000,000 collected by the District of Columbia in the form of BID tax revenue shall be paid to the respective BIDs pursuant to the Business Improvement Districts Act of 1996 (D.C. Law 11-134; D.C. Code, sec. 1-2271 et seq.), and the Business Improvement Districts Temporary Amendment Act of 1997 (D.C. Law 12-23): *Provided*, That such funds are available for acquiring services provided by the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That Business Improvement Districts shall be exempt from taxes levied by the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE

Public safety and justice, including purchase or lease of 135 passenger-carrying vehicles for replacement only, including 130 for police-type use and five for fire-type use, without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, \$778,770,000 (including \$565,511,000 from local funds, \$29,012,000 from Federal funds, and \$184,247,000 from other funds): *Provided*, That the Metropolitan Police Department is authorized to replace not to exceed 25 passenger-carrying vehicles and the Department of Fire and Emergency Medical Services of the District of Columbia is authorized to replace not to exceed five passenger-carrying vehicles annually whenever the cost of repair to any damaged vehicle exceeds three-fourths of the cost of the replacement: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available from this appropriation for the Chief of Police for the prevention and detection of crime: *Provided further*, That the Metropolitan Police Department shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on efforts to increase efficiency and improve the professionalism in the department: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, or Mayor's Order 86-45, issued March 18, 1986, the Metropolitan Police Department's delegated small purchase authority shall be \$500,000: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia government may not require the Metropolitan Police Department to submit to any other procurement review process, or to obtain the approval of or be restricted in any manner by any official or employee of the District of Columbia government, for purchases that do not exceed \$500,000: *Provided further*, That the Mayor shall reimburse the District of Columbia National

Guard for expenses incurred in connection with services that are performed in emergencies by the National Guard in a militia status and are requested by the Mayor, in amounts that shall be jointly determined and certified as due and payable for these services by the Mayor and the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard: *Provided further*, That such sums as may be necessary for reimbursement to the District of Columbia National Guard under the preceding proviso shall be available from this appropriation, and the availability of the sums shall be deemed as constituting payment in advance for emergency services involved: *Provided further*, That the Metropolitan Police Department is authorized to maintain 3,800 sworn officers, with leave for a 50 officer attrition: *Provided further*, That no more than 15 members of the Metropolitan Police Department shall be detailed or assigned to the Executive Protection Unit, until the Chief of Police submits a recommendation to the Council for its review: *Provided further*, That \$100,000 shall be available for inmates released on medical and geriatric parole: *Provided further*, That commencing on December 31, 1999, the Metropolitan Police Department shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives, quarterly reports on the status of crime reduction in each of the 83 police service areas established throughout the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That up to \$700,000 in local funds shall be available for the operations of the Citizen Complaint Review Board.

PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM

Public education system, including the development of national defense education programs, \$867,411,000 (including \$721,847,000 from local funds, \$120,951,000 from Federal funds, and \$24,613,000 from other funds), to be allocated as follows: \$713,197,000 (including \$600,936,000 from local funds, \$106,213,000 from Federal funds, and \$6,048,000 from other funds), for the public schools of the District of Columbia; \$10,700,000 from local funds for the District of Columbia Teachers' Retirement Fund; \$17,000,000 from local funds, previously appropriated in this Act as a Federal payment, for resident tuition support at public and private institutions of higher learning for eligible District of Columbia residents; \$27,885,000 from local funds for public charter schools: *Provided*, That if the entirety of this allocation has not been provided as payments to any public charter schools currently in operation through the per pupil funding formula, the funds shall be available for new public charter schools on a per pupil basis: *Provided further*, That \$480,000 of this amount shall be available to the District of Columbia Public Charter School Board for administrative costs; \$72,347,000 (including \$40,491,000 from local funds, \$13,536,000 from Federal funds, and \$18,320,000 from other funds) for the University of the District of Columbia; \$24,171,000 (including \$23,128,000 from local funds, \$798,000 from Federal funds, and \$245,000 from other funds) for the Public Library; \$2,111,000 (including \$1,707,000 from local funds and \$404,000 from Federal funds) for the Commission on the Arts and Humanities: *Provided further*, That the public schools of the District of Columbia are authorized to accept not to exceed 31 motor vehicles for exclusive use in the driver education program: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2,500 for the Superintendent of Schools, \$2,500 for the President of the University of the District of Columbia, and \$2,000 for the Public Librarian shall be avail-

able from this appropriation for official purposes: *Provided further*, That none of the funds contained in this Act may be made available to pay the salaries of any District of Columbia Public School teacher, principal, administrator, official, or employee who knowingly provides false enrollment or attendance information under article II, section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved February 4, 1925 (D.C. Code, sec. 31-401 et seq.): *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be available to subsidize the education of any nonresident of the District of Columbia at any District of Columbia public elementary and secondary school during fiscal year 2000 unless the nonresident pays tuition to the District of Columbia at a rate that covers 100 percent of the costs incurred by the District of Columbia which are attributable to the education of the nonresident (as established by the Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools): *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be available to subsidize the education of nonresidents of the District of Columbia at the University of the District of Columbia, unless the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia adopts, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, a tuition rate schedule that will establish the tuition rate for nonresident students at a level no lower than the nonresident tuition rate charged at comparable public institutions of higher education in the metropolitan area: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia Public Schools shall not spend less than \$365,500,000 on local schools through the Weighted Student Formula in fiscal year 2000: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia shall apportion from the budget of the District of Columbia Public Schools a sum totaling 5 percent of the total budget to be set aside until the current student count for Public and Charter schools has been completed, and that this amount shall be apportioned between the Public and Charter schools based on their respective student population count: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia Public Schools may spend \$500,000 to engage in a Schools Without Violence program based on a model developed by the University of North Carolina, located in Greensboro, North Carolina.

HUMAN SUPPORT SERVICES

Human support services, \$1,526,361,000 (including \$635,373,000 from local funds, \$875,814,000 from Federal funds, and \$15,174,000 from other funds): *Provided*, That \$25,150,000 of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, shall be available solely for District of Columbia employees' disability compensation: *Provided further*, That a peer review committee shall be established to review medical payments and the type of service received by a disability compensation claimant: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall not provide free government services such as water, sewer, solid waste disposal or collection, utilities, maintenance, repairs, or similar services to any legally constituted private nonprofit organization, as defined in section 411(5) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (101 Stat. 485; Public Law 100-77; 42 U.S.C. 11371), providing emergency shelter services in the District, if the District would not be qualified to receive reimbursement pursuant to such Act (101 Stat. 485; Public Law 100-77; 42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.).

PUBLIC WORKS

Public works, including rental of one passenger-carrying vehicle for use by the Mayor

and three passenger-carrying vehicles for use by the Council of the District of Columbia and leasing of passenger-carrying vehicles, \$271,395,000 (including \$258,341,000 from local funds, \$3,099,000 from Federal funds, and \$9,955,000 from other funds): *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for collecting ashes or miscellaneous refuse from hotels and places of business.

RECEIVERSHIP PROGRAMS

For all agencies of the District of Columbia government under court ordered receivership, \$342,077,000 (including \$217,606,000 from local funds, \$106,111,000 from Federal funds, and \$18,360,000 from other funds).

WORKFORCE INVESTMENTS

For workforce investments, \$8,500,000 from local funds, to be transferred by the Mayor of the District of Columbia within the various appropriation headings in this Act for which employees are properly payable.

RESERVE

For a reserve to be established by the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, \$150,000,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE AUTHORITY

For the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, established by section 101(a) of the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995 (109 Stat. 97; Public Law 104-8), \$3,140,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds contained in this Act may be used to pay any compensation of the Executive Director or General Counsel of the Authority at a rate in excess of the maximum rate of compensation which may be paid to such individual during fiscal year 2000 under section 102 of such Act, as determined by the Comptroller General (as described in GAO letter report B-279095.2).

REPAYMENT OF LOANS AND INTEREST

For payment of principal, interest and certain fees directly resulting from borrowing by the District of Columbia to fund District of Columbia capital projects as authorized by sections 462, 475, and 490 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, approved December 24, 1973, as amended, and that funds shall be allocated for expenses associated with the Wilson Building, \$328,417,000 from local funds: *Provided*, That for equipment leases, the Mayor may finance \$27,527,000 of equipment cost, plus cost of issuance not to exceed 2 percent of the par amount being financed on a lease purchase basis with a maturity not to exceed 5 years: *Provided further*, That \$5,300,000 is allocated to the Metropolitan Police Department, \$3,200,000 for the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department, \$350,000 for the Department of Corrections, \$15,949,000 for the Department of Public Works and \$2,728,000 for the Public Benefit Corporation.

REPAYMENT OF GENERAL FUND RECOVERY DEBT

For the purpose of eliminating the \$331,589,000 general fund accumulated deficit as of September 30, 1990, \$38,286,000 from local funds, as authorized by section 461(a) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (105 Stat. 540; D.C. Code, sec. 47-321(a)(1)).

PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON SHORT-TERM BORROWING

For payment of interest on short-term borrowing, \$9,000,000 from local funds.

CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION

For lease payments in accordance with the Certificates of Participation involving the

land site underlying the building located at One Judiciary Square, \$7,950,000 from local funds.

OPTICAL AND DENTAL INSURANCE PAYMENTS

For optical and dental insurance payments, \$1,295,000 from local funds.

PRODUCTIVITY BANK

The Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia, under the direction of the Mayor and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, shall finance projects totaling \$20,000,000 in local funds that result in cost savings or additional revenues, by an amount equal to such financing: *Provided*, That the Mayor shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate by the 15th calendar day after the end of each quarter beginning December 31, 1999, on the status of the projects financed under this heading.

PRODUCTIVITY BANK SAVINGS

The Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia, under the direction of the Mayor and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, shall make reductions totaling \$20,000,000 in local funds. The reductions are to be allocated to projects funded through the Productivity Bank that produce cost savings or additional revenues in an amount equal to the Productivity Bank financing: *Provided*, That the Mayor shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate by the 15th calendar day after the end of each quarter beginning December 31, 1999, on the status of the cost savings or additional revenues funded under this heading.

PROCUREMENT AND MANAGEMENT SAVINGS

The Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia, under the direction of the Mayor and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, shall make reductions of \$14,457,000 for general supply schedule savings and \$7,000,000 for management reform savings, in local funds to one or more of the appropriation headings in this Act: *Provided*, That the Mayor shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate by the 15th calendar day after the end of each quarter beginning December 31, 1999, on the status of the general supply schedule savings and management reform savings projected under this heading.

ENTERPRISE AND OTHER FUNDS

WATER AND SEWER AUTHORITY AND THE WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT

For operation of the Water and Sewer Authority and the Washington Aqueduct, \$279,608,000 from other funds (including \$236,075,000 for the Water and Sewer Authority and \$43,533,000 for the Washington Aqueduct) of which \$35,222,000 shall be apportioned and payable to the District's debt service fund for repayment of loans and interest incurred for capital improvement projects.

For construction projects, \$197,169,000, as authorized by the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the laying of watermains and service sewers in the District of Columbia, the levying of assessments therefor, and for other purposes" (33 Stat. 244; Public Law 58-140; D.C. Code, sec. 43-1512 et seq.): *Provided*, That the requirements and restrictions that are applicable to general fund capital improvements projects and set forth in this Act under the Capital Outlay appropriation title shall apply to projects approved under this appropriation title.

LOTTERY AND CHARITABLE GAMES ENTERPRISE FUND

For the Lottery and Charitable Games Enterprise Fund, established by the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 (95 Stat. 1174 and 1175; Public Law 97-91), for the purpose of implementing the Law to Legalize Lotteries, Daily Numbers Games, and Bingo and Raffles for Charitable Purposes in the District of Columbia (D.C. Law 3-172; D.C. Code, sec. 2-2501 et seq. and sec. 22-1516 et seq.), \$234,400,000: *Provided*, That the District of Columbia shall identify the source of funding for this appropriation title from the District's own locally generated revenues: *Provided further*, That no revenues from Federal sources shall be used to support the operations or activities of the Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board.

SPORTS AND ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION

For the Sports and Entertainment Commission, \$10,846,000 from other funds for expenses incurred by the Armory Board in the exercise of its powers granted by the Act entitled "An Act To Establish A District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes" (62 Stat. 339; D.C. Code, sec. 2-301 et seq.) and the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 619; Public Law 85-300; D.C. Code, sec. 2-321 et seq.): *Provided*, That the Mayor shall submit a budget for the Armory Board for the forthcoming fiscal year as required by section 442(b) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (87 Stat. 824; Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 47-301(b)).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HEALTH AND HOSPITALS PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

For the District of Columbia Health and Hospitals Public Benefit Corporation, established by D.C. Law 11-212; D.C. Code, sec. 32-262.2, \$133,443,000 of which \$44,435,000 shall be derived by transfer from the general fund and \$89,008,000 from other funds.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RETIREMENT BOARD

For the District of Columbia Retirement Board, established by section 121 of the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act of 1979 (93 Stat. 866; D.C. Code, sec. 1-711), \$9,892,000 from the earnings of the applicable retirement funds to pay legal, management, investment, and other fees and administrative expenses of the District of Columbia Retirement Board: *Provided*, That the District of Columbia Retirement Board shall provide to the Congress and to the Council of the District of Columbia a quarterly report of the allocations of charges by fund and of expenditures of all funds: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia Retirement Board shall provide the Mayor, for transmittal to the Council of the District of Columbia, an itemized accounting of the planned use of appropriated funds in time for each annual budget submission and the actual use of such funds in time for each annual audited financial report: *Provided further*, That section 121(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1-711(c)(1)) is amended by striking "the total amount to which a member may be entitled" and all that follows and inserting the following: "the total amount to which a member may be entitled under this subsection during a year (beginning with 1998) may not exceed \$5,000, except that in the case of the Chairman of the Board and the Chairman of the Investment Committee of the Board, such amount may not exceed \$7,500 (beginning with 2000)."

CORRECTIONAL INDUSTRIES FUND

For the Correctional Industries Fund, established by the District of Columbia Correctional Industries Establishment Act (78 Stat. 1000; Public Law 88-622), \$1,810,000 from other funds.

WASHINGTON CONVENTION CENTER ENTERPRISE FUND

For the Washington Convention Center Enterprise Fund, \$50,226,000 from other funds.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

For construction projects, \$1,260,524,000 of which \$929,450,000 is from local funds, \$54,050,000 is from the highway trust fund, and \$277,024,000 is from Federal funds, and a rescission of \$41,886,500 from local funds appropriated under this heading in prior fiscal years, for a net amount of \$1,218,637,500 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds for use of each capital project implementing agency shall be managed and controlled in accordance with all procedures and limitations established under the Financial Management System: *Provided further*, That all funds provided by this appropriation title shall be available only for the specific projects and purposes intended: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the foregoing, all authorizations for capital outlay projects, except those projects covered by the first sentence of section 23(a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 827; Public Law 90-495; D.C. Code, sec. 7-134, note), for which funds are provided by this appropriation title, shall expire on September 30, 2001, except authorizations for projects as to which funds have been obligated in whole or in part prior to September 30, 2001: *Provided further*, That upon expiration of any such project authorization, the funds provided herein for the project shall lapse.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 102. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, all vouchers covering expenditures of appropriations contained in this Act shall be audited before payment by the designated certifying official, and the vouchers as approved shall be paid by checks issued by the designated disbursing official.

SEC. 103. Whenever in this Act, an amount is specified within an appropriation for particular purposes or objects of expenditure, such amount, unless otherwise specified, shall be considered as the maximum amount that may be expended for said purpose or object rather than an amount set apart exclusively therefor.

SEC. 104. Appropriations in this Act shall be available, when authorized by the Mayor, for allowances for privately owned automobiles and motorcycles used for the performance of official duties at rates established by the Mayor: *Provided*, That such rates shall not exceed the maximum prevailing rates for such vehicles as prescribed in the Federal Property Management Regulations 101-7 (Federal Travel Regulations).

SEC. 105. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for expenses of travel and for the payment of dues of organizations concerned with the work of the District of Columbia government, when authorized by the Mayor: *Provided*, That in the case of the Council of the District of Columbia, funds may be expended with the authorization of the chair of the Council.

SEC. 106. There are appropriated from the applicable funds of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary for making refunds and for the payment of judgments that have been entered against the District

of Columbia government: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as modifying or affecting the provisions of section 11(c)(3) of title XII of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (70 Stat. 78; Public Law 84-460; D.C. Code, sec. 47-1812.11(c)(3)).

SEC. 107. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for the payment of public assistance without reference to the requirement of section 544 of the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1982 (D.C. Law 4-101; D.C. Code, sec. 3-205.44), and for the payment of the non-Federal share of funds necessary to qualify for grants under subtitle A of title II of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.

SEC. 108. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 109. No funds appropriated in this Act for the District of Columbia government for the operation of educational institutions, the compensation of personnel, or for other educational purposes may be used to permit, encourage, facilitate, or further partisan political activities. Nothing herein is intended to prohibit the availability of school buildings for the use of any community or partisan political group during non-school hours.

SEC. 110. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be made available to pay the salary of any employee of the District of Columbia government whose name, title, grade, salary, past work experience, and salary history are not available for inspection by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the House Committee on Government Reform, the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, and the Council of the District of Columbia, or their duly authorized representative.

SEC. 111. There are appropriated from the applicable funds of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary for making payments authorized by the District of Columbia Revenue Recovery Act of 1977 (D.C. Law 2-20; D.C. Code, sec. 47-421 et seq.).

SEC. 112. No part of this appropriation shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes or implementation of any policy including boycott designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress or any State legislature.

SEC. 113. At the start of the fiscal year, the Mayor shall develop an annual plan, by quarter and by project, for capital outlay borrowings: *Provided*, That within a reasonable time after the close of each quarter, the Mayor shall report to the Council of the District of Columbia and the Congress the actual borrowings and spending progress compared with projections.

SEC. 114. The Mayor shall not borrow any funds for capital projects unless the Mayor has obtained prior approval from the Council of the District of Columbia, by resolution, identifying the projects and amounts to be financed with such borrowings.

SEC. 115. The Mayor shall not expend any moneys borrowed for capital projects for the operating expenses of the District of Columbia government.

SEC. 116. None of the funds provided under this Act to the agencies funded by this Act, both Federal and District government agencies, that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2000, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for an agency through a re-

programming of funds which: (1) creates new programs; (2) eliminates a program, project, or responsibility center; (3) establishes or changes allocations specifically denied, limited or increased by Congress in this Act; (4) increases funds or personnel by any means for any program, project, or responsibility center for which funds have been denied or restricted; (5) reestablishes through reprogramming any program or project previously deferred through reprogramming; (6) augments existing programs, projects, or responsibility centers through a reprogramming of funds in excess of \$1,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or (7) increases by 20 percent or more personnel assigned to a specific program, project, or responsibility center; unless the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and House of Representatives are notified in writing 30 days in advance of any reprogramming as set forth in this section.

SEC. 117. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act shall be obligated or expended to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of the District of Columbia government.

SEC. 118. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act shall be obligated or expended to procure passenger automobiles as defined in the Automobile Fuel Efficiency Act of 1980 (94 Stat. 1824; Public Law 96-425; 15 U.S.C. 2001(2)), with an Environmental Protection Agency estimated miles per gallon average of less than 22 miles per gallon: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to security, emergency rescue, or armored vehicles.

SEC. 119. (a) CITY ADMINISTRATOR.—The last sentence of section 422(7) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1-242(7)) is amended by striking “, not to exceed” and all that follows and inserting a period.

(b) BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY.—Section 1108(c)(2)(F) of the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-612.8(c)(2)(F)) is amended to read as follows:

“(F) Redevelopment Land Agency board members shall be paid per diem compensation at a rate established by the Mayor, except that such rate may not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level 15 of the District Schedule for each day (including travel time) during which they are engaged in the actual performance of their duties.”.

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the provisions of the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 (D.C. Law 2-139; D.C. Code, sec. 1-601.1 et seq.), enacted pursuant to section 422(3) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (87 Stat. 790; Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 1-242(3)), shall apply with respect to the compensation of District of Columbia employees: *Provided*, That for pay purposes, employees of the District of Columbia government shall not be subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 121. No later than 30 days after the end of the first quarter of the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall submit to the Council of the District of Columbia the new fiscal year 2000 revenue estimates as of the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 2000. These estimates shall be used in the budget request for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001. The officially revised estimates at midyear shall be used for the midyear report.

SEC. 122. No sole source contract with the District of Columbia government or any agency thereof may be renewed or extended without opening that contract to the com-

petitive bidding process as set forth in section 303 of the District of Columbia Procurement Practices Act of 1985 (D.C. Law 6-85; D.C. Code, sec. 1-1183.3), except that the District of Columbia government or any agency thereof may renew or extend sole source contracts for which competition is not feasible or practical: *Provided*, That the determination as to whether to invoke the competitive bidding process has been made in accordance with duly promulgated rules and procedures and said determination has been reviewed and approved by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority.

SEC. 123. For purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (99 Stat. 1037; Public Law 99-177), the term “program, project, and activity” shall be synonymous with and refer specifically to each account appropriating Federal funds in this Act, and any sequestration order shall be applied to each of the accounts rather than to the aggregate total of those accounts: *Provided*, That sequestration orders shall not be applied to any account that is specifically exempted from sequestration by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 124. In the event a sequestration order is issued pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (99 Stat. 1037; Public Law 99-177), after the amounts appropriated to the District of Columbia for the fiscal year involved have been paid to the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury, within 15 days after receipt of a request therefor from the Secretary of the Treasury, such amounts as are sequestered by the order: *Provided*, That the sequestration percentage specified in the order shall be applied proportionately to each of the Federal appropriation accounts in this Act that are not specifically exempted from sequestration by such Act.

SEC. 125. (a) An entity of the District of Columbia government may accept and use a gift or donation during fiscal year 2000 if—

(1) the Mayor approves the acceptance and use of the gift or donation: *Provided*, That the Council of the District of Columbia may accept and use gifts without prior approval by the Mayor; and

(2) the entity uses the gift or donation to carry out its authorized functions or duties.

(b) Each entity of the District of Columbia government shall keep accurate and detailed records of the acceptance and use of any gift or donation under subsection (a) of this section, and shall make such records available for audit and public inspection.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the term “entity of the District of Columbia government” includes an independent agency of the District of Columbia.

(d) This section shall not apply to the District of Columbia Board of Education, which may, pursuant to the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia, accept and use gifts to the public schools without prior approval by the Mayor.

SEC. 126. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act may be used by the District of Columbia to provide for salaries, expenses, or other costs associated with the offices of United States Senator or United States Representative under section 4(d) of the District of Columbia Statehood Constitutional Convention Initiatives of 1979 (D.C. Law 3-171; D.C. Code, sec. 1-113(d)).

SEC. 127. (a) The University of the District of Columbia shall submit to the Mayor, the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority and the Council of the District of Columbia no later than 15 calendar days after the end of each quarter a report that sets forth—

(1) current quarter expenditures and obligations, year-to-date expenditures and obligations, and total fiscal year expenditure projections versus budget broken out on the basis of control center, responsibility center, and object class, and for all funds, non-appropriated funds, and capital financing;

(2) a list of each account for which spending is frozen and the amount of funds frozen, broken out by control center, responsibility center, detailed object, and for all funding sources;

(3) a list of all active contracts in excess of \$10,000 annually, which contains the name of each contractor; the budget to which the contract is charged, broken out on the basis of control center and responsibility center, and contract identifying codes used by the University of the District of Columbia; payments made in the last quarter and year-to-date, the total amount of the contract and total payments made for the contract and any modifications, extensions, renewals; and specific modifications made to each contract in the last month;

(4) all reprogramming requests and reports that have been made by the University of the District of Columbia within the last quarter in compliance with applicable law; and

(5) changes made in the last quarter to the organizational structure of the University of the District of Columbia, displaying previous and current control centers and responsibility centers, the names of the organizational entities that have been changed, the name of the staff member supervising each entity affected, and the reasons for the structural change.

(b) The Mayor, the Authority, and the Council shall provide the Congress by February 1, 2000, a summary, analysis, and recommendations on the information provided in the quarterly reports.

SEC. 128. Funds authorized or previously appropriated to the government of the District of Columbia by this or any other Act to procure the necessary hardware and installation of new software, conversion, testing, and training to improve or replace its financial management system are also available for the acquisition of accounting and financial management services and the leasing of necessary hardware, software or any other related goods or services, as determined by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority.

SEC. 129. (a) None of the funds contained in this Act may be made available to pay the fees of an attorney who represents a party who prevails in an action, including an administrative proceeding, brought against the District of Columbia Public Schools under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) if—

(1) the hourly rate of compensation of the attorney exceeds 120 percent of the hourly rate of compensation under section 11-2604(a), District of Columbia Code; or

(2) the maximum amount of compensation of the attorney exceeds 120 percent of the maximum amount of compensation under section 11-2604(b)(1), District of Columbia Code, except that compensation and reimbursement in excess of such maximum may be approved for extended or complex representation in accordance with section 11-2604(c), District of Columbia Code.

(b) Notwithstanding the preceding subsection, if the Mayor, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority and the Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools concur in a Memorandum of Understanding setting forth a new rate and amount of compensation, then such new rates shall apply in lieu of the rates set forth in the preceding subsection.

SEC. 130. None of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be expended for any abortion except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or where the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

SEC. 131. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement or enforce the Health Care Benefits Expansion Act of 1992 (D.C. Law 9-114; D.C. Code, sec. 36-1401 et seq.) or to otherwise implement or enforce any system of registration of unmarried, cohabiting couples (whether homosexual, heterosexual, or lesbian), including but not limited to registration for the purpose of extending employment, health, or governmental benefits to such couples on the same basis that such benefits are extended to legally married couples.

SEC. 132. The Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools shall submit to the Congress, the Mayor, the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, and the Council of the District of Columbia no later than 15 calendar days after the end of each quarter a report that sets forth—

(1) current quarter expenditures and obligations, year-to-date expenditures and obligations, and total fiscal year expenditure projections versus budget, broken out on the basis of control center, responsibility center, agency reporting code, and object class, and for all funds, including capital financing;

(2) a list of each account for which spending is frozen and the amount of funds frozen, broken out by control center, responsibility center, detailed object, and agency reporting code, and for all funding sources;

(3) a list of all active contracts in excess of \$10,000 annually, which contains the name of each contractor; the budget to which the contract is charged, broken out on the basis of control center, responsibility center, and agency reporting code; and contract identifying codes used by the District of Columbia Public Schools; payments made in the last quarter and year-to-date, the total amount of the contract and total payments made for the contract and any modifications, extensions, renewals; and specific modifications made to each contract in the last month;

(4) all reprogramming requests and reports that are required to be, and have been, submitted to the Board of Education; and

(5) changes made in the last quarter to the organizational structure of the District of Columbia Public Schools, displaying previous and current control centers and responsibility centers, the names of the organizational entities that have been changed, the name of the staff member supervising each entity affected, and the reasons for the structural change.

SEC. 133. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools and the University of the District of Columbia shall annually compile an accurate and verifiable report on the positions and employees in the public school system and the university, respectively. The annual report shall set forth—

(1) the number of validated schedule A positions in the District of Columbia public schools and the University of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1999, fiscal year 2000, and thereafter on full-time equivalent basis, including a compilation of all positions by control center, responsibility center, funding source, position type, position title, pay plan, grade, and annual salary; and

(2) a compilation of all employees in the District of Columbia public schools and the University of the District of Columbia as of the preceding December 31, verified as to its accuracy in accordance with the functions that each employee actually performs, by control center, responsibility center, agency

reporting code, program (including funding source), activity, location for accounting purposes, job title, grade and classification, annual salary, and position control number.

(b) SUBMISSION.—The annual report required by subsection (a) of this section shall be submitted to the Congress, the Mayor, the District of Columbia Council, the Consensus Commission, and the Authority, not later than February 15 of each year.

SEC. 134. (a) No later than November 1, 1999, or within 30 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs later, and each succeeding year, the Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools and the University of the District of Columbia shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, the Mayor, the District of Columbia Council, the Consensus Commission, and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, a revised appropriated funds operating budget for the public school system and the University of the District of Columbia for such fiscal year that is in the total amount of the approved appropriation and that realigns budgeted data for personal services and other-than-personal services, respectively, with anticipated actual expenditures.

(b) The revised budget required by subsection (a) of this section shall be submitted in the format of the budget that the Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools and the University of the District of Columbia submit to the Mayor of the District of Columbia for inclusion in the Mayor's budget submission to the Council of the District of Columbia pursuant to section 442 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 47-301).

SEC. 135. The District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, acting on behalf of the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) in formulating the DCPS budget, the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia, the Board of Library Trustees, and the Board of Governors of the University of the District of Columbia School of Law shall vote on and approve the respective annual or revised budgets for such entities before submission to the Mayor of the District of Columbia for inclusion in the Mayor's budget submission to the Council of the District of Columbia in accordance with section 442 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 47-301), or before submitting their respective budgets directly to the Council.

SEC. 136. (a) CEILING ON TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total amount appropriated in this Act for operating expenses for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2000 under the heading "Division of Expenses" shall not exceed the lesser of—

(A) the sum of the total revenues of the District of Columbia for such fiscal year; or
(B) \$5,515,379,000 (of which \$152,753,000 shall be from intra-District funds and \$3,113,854,000 shall be from local funds), which amount may be increased by the following:

(i) proceeds of one-time transactions, which are expended for emergency or unanticipated operating or capital needs approved by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority; or

(ii) after notification to the Council, additional expenditures which the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia certifies will produce additional revenues during such fiscal year at least equal to 200 percent of such additional expenditures, and that are approved by the Authority.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—The Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia and the Authority shall take such steps as are necessary to assure that the District of Columbia meets the requirements of this section, including the apportioning by the Chief Financial Officer of the appropriations and funds made available to the District during fiscal year 2000, except that the Chief Financial Officer may not reprogram for operating expenses any funds derived from bonds, notes, or other obligations issued for capital projects.

(b) ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF GRANTS NOT INCLUDED IN CEILING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Mayor, in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer, during a control year, as defined in section 305(4) of the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-8; 109 Stat. 152), may accept, obligate, and expend Federal, private, and other grants received by the District government that are not reflected in the amounts appropriated in this Act.

(2) REQUIREMENT OF CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER REPORT AND AUTHORITY APPROVAL.—No such Federal, private, or other grant may be accepted, obligated, or expended pursuant to paragraph (1) until—

(A) the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia submits to the Authority a report setting forth detailed information regarding such grant; and

(B) the Authority has reviewed and approved the acceptance, obligation, and expenditure of such grant in accordance with review and approval procedures consistent with the provisions of the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995.

(3) PROHIBITION ON SPENDING IN ANTICIPATION OF APPROVAL OR RECEIPT.—No amount may be obligated or expended from the general fund or other funds of the District government in anticipation of the approval or receipt of a grant under paragraph (2)(B) of this subsection or in anticipation of the approval or receipt of a Federal, private, or other grant not subject to such paragraph.

(4) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia shall prepare a quarterly report setting forth detailed information regarding all Federal, private, and other grants subject to this subsection. Each such report shall be submitted to the Council of the District of Columbia, and to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, not later than 15 days after the end of the quarter covered by the report.

(c) REPORT ON EXPENDITURES BY FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE AUTHORITY.—Not later than 20 calendar days after the end of each fiscal quarter starting October 1, 1999, the Authority shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Government Reform of the House, and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate providing an itemized accounting of all non-appropriated funds obligated or expended by the Authority for the quarter. The report shall include information on the date, amount, purpose, and vendor name, and a description of the services or goods provided with respect to the expenditures of such funds.

SEC. 137. If a department or agency of the government of the District of Columbia is under the administration of a court-appointed receiver or other court-appointed official during fiscal year 2000 or any succeeding fiscal year, the receiver or official shall prepare and submit to the Mayor, for inclusion in the annual budget of the Dis-

trict of Columbia for the year, annual estimates of the expenditures and appropriations necessary for the maintenance and operation of the department or agency. All such estimates shall be forwarded by the Mayor to the Council, for its action pursuant to sections 446 and 603(c) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, without revision but subject to the Mayor's recommendations. Notwithstanding any provision of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (87 Stat. 774; Public Law 93-198) the Council may comment or make recommendations concerning such annual estimates but shall have no authority under such Act to revise such estimates.

SEC. 138. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rule, or regulation, an employee of the District of Columbia public schools shall be—

(1) classified as an Educational Service employee;

(2) placed under the personnel authority of the Board of Education; and

(3) subject to all Board of Education rules.

(b) School-based personnel shall constitute a separate competitive area from nonschool-based personnel who shall not compete with school-based personnel for retention purposes.

SEC. 139. (a) RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF OFFICIAL VEHICLES.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, none of the funds made available by this Act or by any other Act may be used to provide any officer or employee of the District of Columbia with an official vehicle unless the officer or employee uses the vehicle only in the performance of the officer's or employee's official duties. For purposes of this paragraph, the term "official duties" does not include travel between the officer's or employee's residence and workplace (except: (1) in the case of an officer or employee of the Metropolitan Police Department who resides in the District of Columbia or is otherwise designated by the Chief of the Department; (2) at the discretion of the Fire Chief, an officer or employee of the District of Columbia Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department who resides in the District of Columbia and is on call 24 hours a day; (3) the Mayor of the District of Columbia; and (4) the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia).

(b) INVENTORY OF VEHICLES.—The Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia shall submit, by November 15, 1999, an inventory, as of September 30, 1999, of all vehicles owned, leased or operated by the District of Columbia government. The inventory shall include, but not be limited to, the department to which the vehicle is assigned; the year and make of the vehicle; the acquisition date and cost; the general condition of the vehicle; annual operating and maintenance costs; current mileage; and whether the vehicle is allowed to be taken home by a District officer or employee and if so, the officer or employee's title and resident location.

SEC. 140. (a) SOURCE OF PAYMENT FOR EMPLOYEES DETAILED WITHIN GOVERNMENT.—For purposes of determining the amount of funds expended by any entity within the District of Columbia government during fiscal year 2000 and each succeeding fiscal year, any expenditures of the District government attributable to any officer or employee of the District government who provides services which are within the authority and jurisdiction of the entity (including any portion of the compensation paid to the officer or employee attributable to the time spent in providing such services) shall be treated as expenditures made from the entity's budget, without regard to whether the officer or employee is assigned to the entity or otherwise treated as an officer or employee of the entity.

(b) MODIFICATION OF REDUCTION IN FORCE PROCEDURES.—The District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-601.1 et seq.), is further amended in section 2408(a) by striking "1999" and inserting "2000"; in subsection (b), by striking "1999" and inserting "2000"; in subsection (i), by striking "1999" and inserting "2000"; and in subsection (k), by striking "1999" and inserting "2000".

SEC. 141. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not later than 120 days after the date that a District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) student is referred for evaluation or assessment—

(1) the District of Columbia Board of Education, or its successor, and DCPS shall assess or evaluate a student who may have a disability and who may require special education services; and

(2) if a student is classified as having a disability, as defined in section 101(a)(1) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (84 Stat. 175; 20 U.S.C. 1401(a)(1)) or in section 7(8) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 359; 29 U.S.C. 706(8)), the Board and DCPS shall place that student in an appropriate program of special education services.

SEC. 142. (a) COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the funds the entity will comply with the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c).

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.—

(1) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or product that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided using funds made available in this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving the assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products to the greatest extent practicable.

(2) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance using funds made available in this Act, the head of each agency of the Federal or District of Columbia government shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in paragraph (1) by the Congress.

(c) PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS FALSELY LABELING PRODUCTS AS MADE IN AMERICA.—If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 143. None of the funds contained in this Act may be used for purposes of the annual independent audit of the District of Columbia government (including the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority) for fiscal year 2000 unless—

(1) the audit is conducted by the Inspector General of the District of Columbia pursuant to section 208(a)(4) of the District of Columbia Procurement Practices Act of 1985 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1182.8(a)(4)); and

(2) the audit includes a comparison of audited actual year-end results with the revenues submitted in the budget document for such year and the appropriations enacted into law for such year.

SEC. 144. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any office, agency or entity to expend funds for programs or functions for which a reorganization plan is required but has not been approved by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority. Appropriations made by this Act for such programs or functions are conditioned only on the approval by the Authority of the required reorganization plans.

SEC. 145. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rule, or regulation, the evaluation process and instruments for evaluating District of Columbia Public School employees shall be a non-negotiable item for collective bargaining purposes.

SEC. 146. None of the funds contained in this Act may be used by the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel or any other officer or entity of the District government to provide assistance for any petition drive or civil action which seeks to require Congress to provide for voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 147. None of the funds contained in this Act may be used to transfer or confine inmates classified above the medium security level, as defined by the Federal Bureau of Prisons classification instrument, to the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center located in Youngstown, Ohio.

SEC. 148. (a) Section 202(i) of the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-8), as added by section 155 of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1999, is amended to read as follows:

“(j) RESERVE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with fiscal year 2000, the plan or budget submitted pursuant to this Act shall contain \$150,000,000 for a reserve to be established by the Mayor, Council of the District of Columbia, Chief Financial Officer for the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority.

“(2) CONDITIONS ON USE.—The reserve funds—

“(A) shall only be expended according to criteria established by the Chief Financial Officer and approved by the Mayor, Council of the District of Columbia, and District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, but, in no case may any of the reserve funds be expended until any other surplus funds have been used;

“(B) shall not be used to fund the agencies of the District of Columbia government under court ordered receivership; and

“(C) shall not be used to fund shortfalls in the projected reductions budgeted in the budget proposed by the District of Columbia government for general supply schedule savings and management reform savings.

“(3) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The Authority shall notify the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and House of Representatives in writing 30 days in advance of any expenditure of the reserve funds.”.

(b) Section 202 of such Act (Public Law 104-8), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) POSITIVE FUND BALANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The District of Columbia shall maintain at the end of a fiscal year an annual positive fund balance in the general fund of not less than 4 percent of the projected general fund expenditures for the following fiscal year.

“(2) EXCESS FUNDS.—Of funds remaining in excess of the amounts required by paragraph (1)—

“(A) not more than 50 percent may be used for authorized non-recurring expenses; and

“(B) not less than 50 percent shall be used to reduce the debt of the District of Columbia.”.

SEC. 149. (a) No later than November 1, 1999, or within 30 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs later, the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Mayor, and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority a revised appropriated funds operating budget for all agencies of the District of Columbia government for such fiscal year that is in the total amount of the approved appropriation and that realigns budgeted data for personal services and other-than-personal-services, respectively, with anticipated actual expenditures.

(b) The revised budget required by subsection (a) of this section shall be submitted in the format of the budget that the District of Columbia government submitted pursuant to section 442 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 47-301).

SEC. 150. None of the funds contained in this Act may be used for any program of distributing sterile needles or syringes for the hypodermic injection of any illegal drug, or for any payment to any individual or entity who carries out such program.

SEC. 151. (a) RESTRICTIONS ON LEASES.—Upon the expiration of the 60-day period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, none of the funds contained in this Act may be used to make rental payments under a lease for the use of real property by the District of Columbia government (including any independent agency of the District) unless the lease and an abstract of the lease have been filed (by the District of Columbia or any other party to the lease) with the central office of the Deputy Mayor for Economic Development, in an indexed registry available for public inspection.

(b) ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS ON CURRENT LEASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the expiration of the 60-day period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, in the case of a lease described in paragraph (3), none of the funds contained in this Act may be used to make rental payments under the lease unless the lease is included in periodic reports submitted by the Mayor and Council of the District of Columbia to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate describing for each such lease the following information:

(A) The location of the property involved, the name of the owners of record according to the land records of the District of Columbia, the name of the lessors according to the lease, the rate of payment under the lease, the period of time covered by the lease, and the conditions under which the lease may be terminated.

(B) The extent to which the property is or is not occupied by the District of Columbia government as of the end of the reporting period involved.

(C) If the property is not occupied and utilized by the District government as of the end of the reporting period involved, a plan for occupying and utilizing the property (including construction or renovation work) or a status statement regarding any efforts by the District to terminate or renegotiate the lease.

(2) TIMING OF REPORTS.—The reports described in paragraph (1) shall be submitted for each calendar quarter (beginning with the quarter ending December 31, 1999) not later than 20 days after the end of the quarter involved, plus an initial report submitted not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, which shall provide

information as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) LEASES DESCRIBED.—A lease described in this paragraph is a lease in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act for the use of real property by the District of Columbia government (including any independent agency of the District) which is not being occupied by the District government (including any independent agency of the District) as of such date or during the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 152. (a) MANAGEMENT OF EXISTING DISTRICT GOVERNMENT PROPERTY.—Upon the expiration of the 60-day period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, none of the funds contained in this Act may be used to enter into a lease (or to make rental payments under such a lease) for the use of real property by the District of Columbia government (including any independent agency of the District) or to purchase real property for the use of the District of Columbia government (including any independent agency of the District) or to manage real property for the use of the District of Columbia (including any independent agency of the District) unless the following conditions are met:

(1) The Mayor and Council of the District of Columbia certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that existing real property available to the District (whether leased or owned by the District government) is not suitable for the purposes intended.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, there is made available for sale or lease all real property of the District of Columbia that the Mayor from time-to-time determines is surplus to the needs of the District of Columbia, unless a majority of the members of the Council override the Mayor's determination during the 30-day period which begins on the date the determination is published.

(3) The Mayor and Council implement a program for the periodic survey of all District property to determine if it is surplus to the needs of the District.

(4) The Mayor and Council within 60 days of the date of the enactment of this Act have filed with the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report which provides a comprehensive plan for the management of District of Columbia real property assets, and are proceeding with the implementation of the plan.

(b) TERMINATION OF PROVISIONS.—If the District of Columbia enacts legislation to reform the practices and procedures governing the entering into of leases for the use of real property by the District of Columbia government and the disposition of surplus real property of the District government, the provisions of subsection (a) shall cease to be effective upon the effective date of the legislation.

SEC. 153. Section 603(e)(2)(B) of the Student Loan Marketing Association Reorganization Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-293) is amended—

(1) by inserting “and public charter” after “public”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “Of such amounts and proceeds, \$5,000,000 shall be set aside for use as a credit enhancement fund for public charter schools in the District of Columbia, with the administration of the fund (including the making of loans) to

be carried out by the Mayor through a committee consisting of three individuals appointed by the Mayor of the District of Columbia and two individuals appointed by the Public Charter School Board established under section 2214 of the District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995."

SEC. 154. The Mayor, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, and the Superintendent of Schools shall implement a process to dispose of excess public school real property within 90 days of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 155. Section 2003 of the District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-134; D.C. Code, sec. 31-2851) is amended by striking "during the period" and "and ending 5 years after such date."

SEC. 156. Section 2206(c) of the District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-134; D.C. Code, sec. 31-2853.16(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ", except that a preference in admission may be given to an applicant who is a sibling of a student already attending or selected for admission to the public charter school in which the applicant is seeking enrollment."

SEC. 157. (a) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—There is hereby transferred from the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority (hereafter referred to as the "Authority") to the District of Columbia the sum of \$18,000,000 for severance payments to individuals separated from employment during fiscal year 2000 (under such terms and conditions as the Mayor considers appropriate), expanded contracting authority of the Mayor, and the implementation of a system of managed competition among public and private providers of goods and services by and on behalf of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That such funds shall be used only in accordance with a plan agreed to by the Council and the Mayor and approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That the Authority and the Mayor shall coordinate the spending of funds for this program so that continuous progress is made. The Authority shall release said funds, on a quarterly basis, to reimburse such expenses, so long as the Authority certifies that the expenses reduce re-occurring future costs at an annual ratio of at least 2 to 1 relative to the funds provided, and that the program is in accordance with the best practices of municipal government.

(b) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—The amount transferred under subsection (a) shall be derived from interest earned on accounts held by the Authority on behalf of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 158. (a) IN GENERAL.—The District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority (hereafter referred to as the "Authority"), working with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Director of the National Park Service, shall carry out a project to complete all design requirements and all requirements for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act for the construction of expanded lane capacity for the Fourteenth Street Bridge.

(b) SOURCE OF FUNDS; TRANSFER.—For purposes of carrying out the project under subsection (a), there is hereby transferred to the Authority from the District of Columbia dedicated highway fund established pursuant to section 3(a) of the District of Columbia Emergency Highway Relief Act (Public Law 104-21; D.C. Code, sec. 7-134.2(a)) an amount not to exceed \$5,000,000.

SEC. 159. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Mayor of the District of Columbia shall carry out through the Army Corps of Engineers, an Anacostia River environmental cleanup program.

(b) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—There are hereby transferred to the Mayor from the escrow account held by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority pursuant to section 134 of division A of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277; 112 Stat. 2681-552), for infrastructure needs of the District of Columbia, \$5,000,000.

SEC. 160. (a) PROHIBITING PAYMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS FROM FUND.—Section 16(e) of the Victims of Violent Crime Compensation Act of 1996 (D.C. Code, sec. 3-435(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and administrative costs necessary to carry out this chapter"; and

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: ", and no monies in the Fund may be used for any other purpose."

(b) MAINTENANCE OF FUND IN TREASURY OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 16(a) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 3-435(a)) is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: "The Fund shall be maintained as a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States. All amounts deposited to the credit of the Fund are appropriated without fiscal year limitation to make payments as authorized under subsection (e)."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 16 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 3-435) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(c) DEPOSIT OF OTHER FEES AND RECEIPTS INTO FUND.—Section 16(c) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 3-435(c)) is amended by inserting after "1997," the second place it appears the following: "any other fines, fees, penalties, or assessments that the Court determines necessary to carry out the purposes of the Fund."

(d) ANNUAL TRANSFER OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES TO MISCELLANEOUS RECEIPTS OF TREASURY.—Section 16 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 3-435), as amended by subsection (b)(2), is further amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection: "(d) Any unobligated balance existing in the Fund in excess of \$250,000 as of the end of each fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 2000) shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury of the United States not later than 30 days after the end of the fiscal year."

(e) RATIFICATION OF PAYMENTS AND DEPOSITS.—Any payments made from or deposits made to the Crime Victims Compensation Fund on or after April 9, 1997 are hereby ratified, to the extent such payments and deposits are authorized under the Victims of Violent Crime Compensation Act of 1996 (D.C. Code, sec. 3-421 et seq.), as amended by this section.

SEC. 161. CERTIFICATION.—None of the funds contained in this Act may be used after the expiration of the 60-day period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act to pay the salary of any chief financial officer of any office of the District of Columbia government (including any independent agency of the District) who has not filed a certification with the Mayor and the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia that the officer understands the duties and restrictions applicable to the officer and their agency as a result of this Act.

SEC. 162. The proposed budget of the government of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2001 that is submitted by the District to Congress shall specify potential adjustments that might become necessary in the event that the management savings achieved by the District during the year do not meet the level of management savings projected by the District under the proposed budget.

SEC. 163. In submitting any document showing the budget for an office of the District of Columbia government (including an independent agency of the District) that contains a category of activities labeled as "other", "miscellaneous", or a similar general, nondescriptive term, the document shall include a description of the types of activities covered in the category and a detailed breakdown of the amount allocated for each such activity.

SEC. 164. (a) AUTHORIZING CORPS OF ENGINEERS TO PERFORM REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS.—In using the funds made available under this Act for carrying out improvements to the Southwest Waterfront in the District of Columbia (including upgrading marina dock pilings and paving and restoring walkways in the marina and fish market areas) for the portions of Federal property in the Southwest quadrant of the District of Columbia within Lots 847 and 848, a portion of Lot 846, and the unassessed Federal real property adjacent to Lot 848 in Square 473, any entity of the District of Columbia government (including the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority or its designee) may place orders for engineering and construction and related services with the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army Corps of Engineers. The Chief of Engineers may accept such orders on a reimbursable basis and may provide any part of such services by contract. In providing such services, the Chief of Engineers shall follow the Federal Acquisition Regulations and the implementing Department of Defense regulations.

(b) TIMING FOR AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS UNDER 1999 ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277; 112 Stat. 2681-124) is amended in the item relating to "FEDERAL FUNDS—FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR WATERFRONT IMPROVEMENTS"—

(A) by striking "existing lessees" the first place it appears and inserting "existing lessees of the Marina"; and

(B) by striking "the existing lessees" the second place it appears and inserting "such lessees".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect as if included in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1999.

(c) ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR IMPROVEMENTS CARRIED OUT THROUGH CORPS OF ENGINEERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby transferred from the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority to the Mayor the sum of \$3,000,000 for carrying out the improvements described in subsection (a) through the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

(2) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—The funds transferred under paragraph (1) shall be derived from the escrow account held by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority pursuant to section 134 of division A of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277; 112 Stat. 2681-552), for infrastructure needs of the District of Columbia.

(d) QUARTERLY REPORTS ON PROJECT.—The Mayor shall submit reports to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate on the status of the improvements described in subsection (a) for each calendar quarter occurring until the improvements are completed.

SEC. 165. It is the sense of the Congress that the District of Columbia should not impose or take into consideration any height, square footage, set-back, or other construction or zoning requirements in authorizing

the issuance of industrial revenue bonds for a project of the American National Red Cross at 2025 E Street Northwest, Washington, D.C., in as much as this project is subject to approval of the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts pursuant to section 11 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, District of Columbia", approved July 1, 1947 (Public Law 100-637; 36 U.S.C. 300108 note).

SEC. 166. (a) PERMITTING COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY TO CARRY OUT SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION.—Section 11233(c) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (D.C. Code, sec. 24-1233(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION.—The Agency shall carry out sex offender registration functions in the District of Columbia, and shall have the authority to exercise all powers and functions relating to sex offender registration that are granted to the Agency under any District of Columbia law."

(b) AUTHORITY DURING TRANSITION TO FULL OPERATION OF AGENCY.—

(1) AUTHORITY OF PRETRIAL SERVICES, PAROLE, ADULT PROBATION AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION TRUSTEE.—Notwithstanding section 11232(b)(1) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (D.C. Code, sec. 24-1232(b)(1)), the Pretrial Services, Parole, Adult Probation and Offender Supervision Trustee appointed under section 11232(a) of such Act (hereafter referred to as the "Trustee") shall, in accordance with section 11232 of such Act, exercise the powers and functions of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia (hereafter referred to as the "Agency") relating to sex offender registration (as granted to the Agency under any District of Columbia law) only upon the Trustee's certification that the Trustee is able to assume such powers and functions.

(2) AUTHORITY OF METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT.—During the period that begins on the date of the enactment of the Sex Offender Registration Emergency Act of 1999 and ends on the date the Trustee makes the certification described in paragraph (1), the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia shall have the authority to carry out any powers and functions relating to sex offender registration that are granted to the Agency or to the Trustee under any District of Columbia law.

SEC. 167. (a) None of the funds contained in this Act may be used to enact or carry out any law, rule, or regulation to legalize or otherwise reduce penalties associated with the possession, use, or distribution of any schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802) or any tetrahydrocannabinols derivative.

(b) The Legalization of Marijuana for Medical Treatment Initiative of 1998, also known as Initiative 59, approved by the electors of the District of Columbia on November 3, 1998, shall not take effect.

SEC. 168. (a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby transferred from the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority (hereinafter referred to as the "Authority") to the District of Columbia the sum of \$5,000,000 for the Mayor, in consultation with the Council of the District of Columbia, to provide offsets against local taxes for a commercial revitalization program, such program to be available in enterprise zones and low and moderate income areas in the District of Columbia: *Provided*,

That in carrying out such a program, the Mayor shall use Federal commercial revitalization proposals introduced in Congress as a guideline.

(b) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—The amount transferred under subsection (a) shall be derived from interest earned on accounts held by the Authority on behalf of the District of Columbia.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Mayor shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives on the progress made in carrying out the commercial revitalization program.

SEC. 169. Section 456 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (section 47-231 et seq. of the D.C. Code, as added by the Federal Payment Reauthorization Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-373)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking "District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority" and inserting "Mayor"; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "Authority" and inserting "Mayor".

SEC. 170. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The District of Columbia has recently witnessed a spate of senseless killings of innocent citizens caught in the crossfire of shootings. A Justice Department crime victimization survey found that while the city saw a decline in the homicide rate between 1996 and 1997, the rate was the highest among a dozen cities and more than double the second highest city.

(2) The District of Columbia has not made adequate funding available to fight drug abuse in recent years, and the city has not deployed its resources as effectively as possible. In fiscal year 1998, \$20,900,000 was spent on publicly funded drug treatment in the District compared to \$29,000,000 in fiscal year 1993. The District's Addiction and Prevention and Recovery Agency currently has only 2,200 treatment slots, a 50 percent drop from 1994, with more than 1,100 people on waiting lists.

(3) The District of Columbia has seen a rash of inmate escapes from halfway houses. According to Department of Corrections records, between October 21, 1998 and January 19, 1999, 376 of the 1,125 inmates assigned to halfway houses walked away. Nearly 280 of the 376 escapees were awaiting trial including two charged with murder.

(4) The District of Columbia public schools system faces serious challenges in correcting chronic problems, particularly long-standing deficiencies in providing special education services to the 1 in 10 District students needing program benefits, including backlogged assessments, and repeated failure to meet a compliance agreement on special education reached with the Department of Education.

(5) Deficiencies in the delivery of basic public services from cleaning streets to waiting time at Department of Motor Vehicles to a rat population estimated earlier this year to exceed the human population have generated considerable public frustration.

(6) Last year, the District of Columbia forfeited millions of dollars in Federal grants after Federal auditors determined that several agencies exceeded grant restrictions and in other instances, failed to spend funds before the grants expired.

(7) Findings of a 1999 report by the Annie E. Casey Foundation that measured the well-being of children reflected that, with one exception, the District ranked worst in the United States in every category from infant mortality to the rate of teenage births to statistics chronicling child poverty.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that in considering the Dis-

trict of Columbia's fiscal year 2001 budget, the Congress will take into consideration progress or lack of progress in addressing the following issues:

(1) Crime, including the homicide rate, implementation of community policing, the number of police officers on local beats, and the closing down of open-air drug markets.

(2) Access to drug abuse treatment, including the number of treatment slots, the number of people served, the number of people on waiting lists, and the effectiveness of treatment programs.

(3) Management of parolees and pretrial violent offenders, including the number of halfway house escapes and steps taken to improve monitoring and supervision of halfway house residents to reduce the number of escapes.

(4) Education, including access to special education services and student achievement.

(5) Improvement in basic city services, including rat control and abatement.

(6) Application for and management of Federal grants.

(7) Indicators of child well-being.

SEC. 171. The Mayor, prior to using Federal Medicaid payments to Disproportionate Share Hospitals to serve a small number of childless adults, should consider the recommendations of the Health Care Development Commission that has been appointed by the Council of the District of Columbia to review this program, and consult and report to Congress on the use of these funds.

SEC. 172. GAO STUDY OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study of the law enforcement, court, prison, probation, parole, and other components of the criminal justice system of the District of Columbia, in order to identify the components most in need of additional resources, including financial, personnel, and management resources; and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the results of the study under paragraph (1).

SEC. 173. Nothing in this Act bars the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel from reviewing or commenting on briefs in private lawsuits, or from consulting with officials of the District government regarding such lawsuits.

SEC. 174. WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS.—(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 7 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, shall—

(1) implement the notice of decision approved by the National Capital Regional Director, dated April 7, 1999, including the provisions of the notice of decision concerning the issuance of right-of-way permits at market rates; and

(2) expend such sums as are necessary to carry out paragraph (1).

(b) ANTENNA APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the receipt of an application, a Federal agency that receives an application submitted after the enactment of this Act to locate a wireless communications antenna on Federal property in the District of Columbia or surrounding area over which the Federal agency exercises control shall take final action on the application, including action on the issuance of right-of-way permits at market rates.

(2) EXISTING LAW.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the applicability of existing laws regarding—

(A) judicial review under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code (the Administrative Procedure Act), and the Communications Act of 1934;

(B) the National Environmental Policy Act, the National Historic Preservation Act and other applicable Federal statutes; and

(C) the authority of a State or local government or instrumentality thereof, including the District of Columbia, in the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities.

This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2000".

TITLE II—TAX REDUCTION

SEC. 201. COMMENDING REDUCTION OF TAXES BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—The Congress commends the District of Columbia for its action to reduce taxes, and ratifies D.C. Act 13-110 (commonly known as the Service Improvement and Fiscal Year 2000 Budget Support Act of 1999).

SEC. 202. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title may be construed to limit the ability of the Council of the District of Columbia to amend or repeal any provision of law described in this title.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 354, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

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

This, of course, is the appropriations bill for the District of Columbia, as has been mentioned. I want to express my appreciation for the efforts of working with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking member, with the Members of the appropriations staff and certainly with the delegate from the District of Columbia, the mayor of the District and the members of the council, as well as many other people who have been involved in this.

We received on Monday a letter from the President's office, from his Director of the Office of Management and Budget, saying that the contents of the District of Columbia appropriations bill, as it was included as a portion of the bill received by the President last week, that the contents of that portion of the bill, all the things relating to the District of Columbia, were acceptable to the President, and the President would sign it if it were presented to him as a separate bill.

Of course, we know that it was presented as part of a package. This bill before us, however, is a separate bill. It has the identical language which the President advised us Monday would be acceptable to the White House with only one variation.

□ 1715

The only variation is in the section that has to do with injection of illegal

drugs by needle. The bill that passed last week and that the President said was acceptable to him stated that no public funds, neither from the Federal Government, nor from the District of Columbia, no funds could be used on a program of providing free needles to drug addicts.

The only difference between that and this is this bill also has the additional phrase that says you also do not provide those funds to an entity that operates such a program of providing needles to drug addicts. Even though that is different from the bill that we had last week, and that is the only difference, it is identical to the bill that was signed into law by the President last year.

So the only change, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) earlier referred to it as a minuscule change, the only change is to continue the restriction under which the District and the Federal Government already operates that says you cannot operate a program of giving needles to drug addicts to inject themselves with illegal drugs and still qualify to receive government funds. That is it.

Now, I should point out that the other things in this bill remain constant. This is what I think is important to the District of Columbia, because, see, we are trying to assist the District in its crackdown on drugs. We do not want a mixed message. We do not want people on one hand saying we are cracking down on drugs and then on the other, wink, wink, we are helping people to run a program that gives needles to drug addicts to shoot themselves up.

No, we have in this bill a total of \$33.5 million, money the Congress is under no obligation to provide, but money that we think is important to attack the link between crime and drugs in the District of Columbia, \$20 million for drug testing, drug treatment, drug crackdown, because the District has a pervasive problem with the link between crime and drugs; and we want to crack down on it and break that link.

We also have the provisions in this bill for the \$17 million college assistance program for students in the District. We have \$5 million of incentives to adopt foster children, to get thousands of kids in D.C. that are stuck in foster homes and have been for years adopted into safe, permanent, stable, loving homes.

We have the provisions in this bill for the cleanup, several million dollars for

the cleanup of the Anacostia River, payment to assist the infrastructure build-out of the Children's National Medical Center.

We have provisions in this bill to assist the new mayor in one of his major initiatives of right-sizing the government in the District, \$18 million to assist them in reducing the size of the number of employees they have, reducing the number of employees doing contract buyouts and so forth.

There is a lot of stuff in here that has great value to help the District of Columbia recover. Unfortunately, there are some people that say all that matters to them is giving away free needles to drug addicts, and nothing else matters; all we are trying to do on that issue is preserve the status quo.

Now, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), if he wishes, may offer an amendment to this bill through his motion to recommit. He has that leeway. If there is some adjustment that he considers minuscule that he wants to make, he has the ability to offer it.

But we believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have important measures in here for the future, the vitality, the growth, the public safety, the value and strength of the schools and education, the infrastructure, things that are important to people who live and work and solicit here in the District of Columbia.

I would certainly hope that, if some people want to take an extreme position toward giving away needles to drug addicts, they would vote their conscience, but not use that as an excuse to vote against such an important measure to help with the improvement of the District of Columbia.

The provision in this bill is identical to the provision signed into law by the President last year. Every other provision in the bill is identical to what the President advised us he wants to sign into law regarding the District of Columbia.

I think we have a common sense approach here. If people wish the debate to center around the question of giving needles to drug addicts, then they should openly say so. But there is certainly no other excuse for anyone to vote against this bill unless they want to take that extreme position.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

H.R. 3194 - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	H.R. 2587	H.R. 3064	H.R. 3194	H.R. 3194 vs. enacted
FEDERAL FUNDS						
District of Columbia Resident Tuition Support.....			17,000	17,000	17,000	+17,000
Incentives for Adoption of Foster Children.....			5,000	5,000	5,000	+5,000
Citizens Complaint Review Board			500	500	500	+500
Federal Payment for Human Services.....			250	250	250	+250
Metrorail improvements and expansion.....	25,000					-25,000
Federal payment for management reform.....	25,000					-25,000
Federal payment for Boys Town U.S.A.....	7,100					-7,100
Nation's Capital Infrastructure Fund.....	18,778					-18,778
Environmental Study and Related Activities at Lorton Correctional Complex..	7,000					-7,000
Federal payment to the District of Columbia corrections trustee operations....	184,800	176,000	176,000	176,000	176,000	-8,800
Federal payment to the District of Columbia Courts.....	128,000	137,440	99,714	99,714	99,714	-28,286
Defender Services in D.C. Courts.....			33,336	33,336	33,336	+33,336
Federal payment to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency of the District of Columbia.....	59,400	80,300	93,800	93,800	93,800	+34,400
Federal payment for Metropolitan Police Department.....	1,200		1,000	1,000	1,000	-200
Federal payment for Fire Department.....	3,240					-3,240
Federal payment for Georgetown Waterfront.....	1,000					-1,000
Federal payment to Historical Society for City Museum.....	2,000					-2,000
Federal payment for a National Museum of American Music and Downtown Revitalization.....	700					-700
United States Park Police	8,500					-8,500
Federal payment for waterfront improvements.....	3,000					-3,000
Federal payment for mentoring services.....	200					-200
Federal payment for hotline services.....	50					-50
Federal payment for public charter schools	15,622					-15,622
Medicare Coordinated Care Demonstration Project.....	3,000					-3,000
Federal payment for Children's National Medical Center.....	1,000		2,500	2,500	2,500	+1,500
National Revitalization Financing:						
Economic Development.....	25,000					-25,000
Special Education.....	30,000					-30,000
Year 2000 Information Technology.....	20,000					-20,000
Infrastructure and Economic Development.....	50,000					-50,000
Y2K conversion emergency funding (courts).....	2,249					-2,249
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	61,800					-61,800
Total, Federal funds to the District of Columbia	683,639	393,740	429,100	429,100	429,100	-254,539
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS						
Operating Expenses						
Governmental direction and support	(164,144)	(174,667)	(167,356)	(167,356)	(167,356)	(+3,212)
Economic development and regulation.....	(159,039)	(190,335)	(190,335)	(190,335)	(190,335)	(+31,296)
Public safety and justice.....	(755,786)	(778,670)	(778,770)	(778,770)	(778,770)	(+22,984)
Public education system	(788,958)	(850,411)	(867,411)	(867,411)	(867,411)	(+78,455)
Human support services.....	(1,514,751)	(1,525,996)	(1,526,361)	(1,526,361)	(1,526,361)	(+11,610)
Public works.....	(266,912)	(271,395)	(271,395)	(271,395)	(271,395)	(+4,483)
Receivership Programs.....	(318,979)	(337,077)	(342,077)	(342,077)	(342,077)	(+23,098)
Workforce Investments		(8,500)	(8,500)	(8,500)	(8,500)	(+8,500)
Buyouts and Management Reforms			(18,000)	(18,000)	(18,000)	(+18,000)
Reserve		(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(+150,000)
District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority.....	(7,840)	(3,140)	(3,140)	(3,140)	(3,140)	(-4,700)
Financing and other		(384,948)				
Washington Convention Center Transfer Payment	(5,400)					(-5,400)
Repayment of Loans and Interest	(382,170)		(328,417)	(328,417)	(328,417)	(-53,753)
Repayment of General Fund Recovery Debt.....	(38,453)		(38,286)	(38,286)	(38,286)	(-167)
Payment of Interest on Short-Term Borrowing.....	(11,000)		(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)	(-2,000)
Certificates of Participation.....	(7,926)		(7,950)	(7,950)	(7,950)	(+24)
Human development.....	(6,674)					(-6,674)
Optical and Dental Insurance payments.....			(1,295)	(1,295)	(1,295)	(+1,295)
Productivity Bank.....			(18,000)	(18,000)	(18,000)	(+18,000)
Productivity Savings.....			(-18,000)	(-18,000)	(-18,000)	(-18,000)
Procurement and Management Savings.....	(-10,000)	(-21,457)	(-21,457)	(-21,457)	(-21,457)	(-11,457)
Total, operating expenses, general fund	(4,418,030)	(4,653,682)	(4,686,836)	(4,686,836)	(4,686,836)	(+268,806)
Enterprise Funds						
Water and Sewer Authority and the Washington Aqueduct	(273,314)	(279,608)	(279,608)	(279,608)	(279,608)	(+6,294)
Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board.....	(225,200)	(234,400)	(234,400)	(234,400)	(234,400)	(+9,200)
Office of Cable Television.....	(2,108)					(-2,108)
Public Service Commission.....	(5,026)					(-5,026)
Office of People's Counsel	(2,501)					(-2,501)
Office of Insurance and Securities Regulation.....	(7,001)					(-7,001)
Office of Banking and Financial Institutions	(840)					(-840)
Sports and Entertainment Commission	(8,751)	(10,846)	(10,846)	(10,846)	(10,846)	(+2,095)
Public Benefit Corporation	(66,764)	(89,008)	(89,008)	(89,008)	(89,008)	(+22,244)
D.C. Retirement Board	(18,202)	(9,892)	(9,892)	(9,892)	(9,892)	(-8,310)

H.R. 3194 - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	H.R. 2587	H.R. 3064	H.R. 3194	H.R. 3194 vs. enacted
Correctional Industries Fund	(3,332)	(1,810)	(1,810)	(1,810)	(1,810)	(-1,522)
Washington Convention Center	(48,139)	(50,226)	(50,226)	(50,226)	(50,226)	(+2,087)
Total, Enterprise Funds	(660,978)	(675,790)	(675,790)	(675,790)	(675,790)	(+14,812)
Total, operating expenses	(5,079,008)	(5,329,472)	(5,362,626)	(5,362,626)	(5,362,626)	(+283,618)
Capital Outlay						
General fund	(1,711,161)	(1,218,638)	(1,218,638)	(1,218,638)	(1,218,638)	(-492,523)
Water and Sewer Fund		(197,169)	(197,169)	(197,169)	(197,169)	(+197,169)
Total, Capital Outlay	(1,711,161)	(1,415,807)	(1,415,807)	(1,415,807)	(1,415,807)	(-295,354)
Total, District of Columbia funds	(6,790,169)	(6,745,279)	(6,778,433)	(6,778,433)	(6,778,433)	(-11,736)
Total:						
Federal Funds to the District of Columbia	683,639	393,740	429,100	429,100	429,100	-254,539
District of Columbia funds	(6,790,169)	(6,745,279)	(6,778,433)	(6,778,433)	(6,778,433)	(-11,736)

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me this time and for his endless and excellent work in trying to get the D.C. appropriations through.

I want to assure my colleagues what yet another D.C. bill on the floor is all about. One has got to have followed the machinations of the majority. This is about a bill number to hang other appropriations on. There are a number of appropriations that this appropriation becomes the vehicle for. It is going to be used in the Senate to hang the other appropriations on.

Above all, my colleagues know that this appropriation is not about needles. I have to come to the floor to concede that I lost that one. I wanted to use local funds for needle exchange, as is done in almost 115 jurisdictions. But each and every bill, including the one before us now, has said no local or Federal funds may be used for needle exchange. I have lost that one. It is a tragedy for the District of Columbia. But I have to concede that I lost that one before, and I have lost that one now.

This bill says no local or Federal funds may be used for needle exchange. I apologize that this is the fifth time that my colleagues have had to come to the floor to vote on the smallest appropriation, when it has the least to do with them and with the Nation.

But I believe that I deserve the apology. I believe that the people I represent deserve the apology because of the money at issue here. It is not the small change that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) just spoke about. Most of the money in this bill does not come from him or from the taxpayers of the Nation. It comes from the taxpayers of the District of Columbia.

This is cruel and unusual manipulation. We are here for one reason and one reason only. The majority needs another Christmas tree to hang other appropriations on. Watch what happens in the Senate. That is what the D.C. bill will be used for when it goes back over swiftly to the Senate before the last one even has been vetoed.

Stop holding the D.C. appropriation hostage to get other appropriations through. Let my people go.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), a member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, the subcommittee chairman, for yielding me this time.

This is a good bill, and I think it ought to be passed. The D.C. appropriations bill is the budget that was passed by the District city council. It was signed by the mayor. It truly fulfills

the requirement of home rule when it comes to the financial part of it.

The only roadblock that seems to be in the way is the needle exchange program. But I think we should do the compassionate thing when it comes to the needle exchange program. Current law says that, if one receives any Federal or any government dollars, one cannot conduct a needle exchange program; and that is what we are retaining in this bill.

This bill is actually what we have in current law today, signed by the President last year. But if one goes to other countries or other cities in the country that have a needle exchange program, just as close as Baltimore, which has had a needle exchange program for the last 7 years, we found out in a July 5 article, Associated Press article this summer, that 90 percent, according to Johns Hopkins University, 90 percent of injection drug users are infected with a blood borne virus.

Now, the whole purpose of having the needle exchange program is to prevent people from getting a blood borne virus. Yet, in Baltimore, after 7 years of trying to achieve this goal, 90 percent have a blood borne virus. It is a failure. It is a failed program. Ten percent should not be a passing grade in Baltimore. It should not be a passing grade in the District of Columbia.

So we should do the compassionate thing. Is it compassionate to aid an injection drug user in an action that will cut years off the end of his life? No. It is a tragedy. Is it compassionate to help an injection drug user to conduct actions that 90 percent of the time will result in a blood borne virus and put him in an early grave? No. It is a tragedy.

We should not allow a needle exchange program to become coffin nails, to drive nails into a coffin for people with an early grave because they have a drug-dependent personality. We should help them by getting them to a treatment center, by not aiding their actions, but helping them end those actions. That is what this bill does.

It is consistent with the President's own drug czar. His policy states that he does not support the injection drug using or needle exchange programs for injection drug users because it sends the wrong message, and it is ineffective, and there is no sound science supporting it.

So either one supports the President's drug czar and votes for this bill, or else one may as well call for his resignation because that is what is his policy. That is what is supporting this bill. I think it is a good bill and ought to be voted.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) that he may want to have his other speakers. We have restricted the number of speakers on our side out of deference for the rest of the Congress' schedule. So if he wants to have his speakers first, I will just speak when they are concluded, and he can wrap it up.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I think that is perfectly acceptable. I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me this time. Shakespeare said in Henry V: "Once more into the breach." The first D.C. budget was vetoed by the President on September 28. The second D.C. budget was passed by the House on October 14. This resolution today is our third attempt to enact a budget for the Nation's capital. The city, and I emphasize this is a city we are talking about, not an agency or department of the Federal Government, is still operating under a continuing resolution. This is not acceptable.

The Nation's capital is caught in the middle, and many urban needs here are being adversely affected. It is my sincere hope that the flexible approach taken by the House will encourage the administration to sign this budget. This may be the city's last clear chance to get resources and reform it needs.

While much progress has been made in the District, there are still enormous problems which must be addressed. A substantial number of functions remain in receivership, including foster care and offender supervision. The enhanced resources for foster care in this budget, to take just one example, are desperately needed by many children. The annual reports submitted by the Control Board to Congress just this week highlights the crisis we are facing with many of the city's receiverships.

Our local courts are funded in this budget. They too very much need the added resources this bill provides.

The House passed this week the legislation I sponsored and the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) sponsored to enhance college access opportunities for D.C. students. That money to fund that program is in this budget.

There is additional money in this budget for public education. There are 146 public schools in this city and now 29 charter schools. The money to help the children in those schools is in this budget.

This budget contains the largest tax cut in the city's history, which is central to our goal of retaining and attracting economic development to the Nation's capital.

There is money in this budget to clean up the Anacostia River, open more drug treatment programs, and study widening of the 14th Street Bridge.

What the city needs is a stronger tax base and more taxpayers. This bill takes us another step in that direction.

In the 5 years I have had the honor to serve as Chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, it has been my philosophy that one

cannot have a healthy region without a healthy city. Working in a bipartisan manner, building consensus, I am proud of the way we have helped to turn this city around. I want the House appropriators to help us continue this process.

Whatever the ultimate resolution is of the city's budget, it is important to keep the process going in order to achieve a positive result. I am very hopeful we can do this and keep this city from waiting for the funds they need.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), who has been very active and consistent as a leader against the drug problems of the country.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me this time.

The District of Columbia is probably a microcosm of what the Republican majority inherited some 4-plus years ago. We had big government and very high cost to the taxpayers. In fact, the District of Columbia, in my opinion, was the epitome of big government gone bad.

In 1995, the new Republican majority inherited a District of Columbia which should have been a shining example for the whole country; but, instead, we inherited a district, which is our responsibility under the Constitution, riddled with debt, three-quarters of a billion dollars annual debt, schools that were failing, hospitals that were a disaster one would not take a patient to, child care programs that were defunct, housing that was disgraceful, public housing that one would not put one's worst enemy in, prisons that were taken over by the prisoners, utilities that had to be turned over to operate.

□ 1730

And one of the saddest stories I read from the Washington Post was that mentally ill children, and the other side claims to be so compassionate about children, were fed jello and rice and chicken diets steady for a month because the District failed to pay its bills. That is what we inherited. That was the liberal policy. A liberal policy on spending, a liberal policy on government, and all done with the highest number of workers of any government unit probably except for the former Soviet Union, 48,000 employees. We cut that down to some 30,000-plus employees.

Now, this question today before us is not about spending, because there is some control we have brought and we have gotten them out of the wilderness of debt. This is about a criminal drug policy. Now, I chair the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform. This is what a liberal drug policy did for Baltimore. This is 1996. They had 39,000 drug addicts after a liberalized needle exchange and liberalized program in that city; 312 deaths in 1997; 312 deaths in 1998.

We were even able to bring down the deaths in the District of Columbia through a zero tolerance policy, through new administration that we have instituted in the District and through taking over these programs with fewer workers and fewer employees.

The situation was so bad in Baltimore that one out of 10 citizens was a drug addict. That is how bad it was with the liberal drug policy. So the major difference here is a liberal approach to drug policy. Needle exchange is, again, a more liberal policy.

Here is an example, again in Baltimore, 39,000 in 1996. Let me read from a Time magazine article dated September 6, 1999: "Government officials dispute that it is one in ten," that is a drug addict in Baltimore from a liberal policy, "it is more like one in eight." This is not my quote, "says a veteran city councilwoman, Rikki Spector, and we have probably lost count."

So the question before us today is do we let our people go? And I consider these my people, too. Do we let them go to a liberal policy, do we let them go into the devastation that we have seen in another community that has adopted these policies? I say no.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is such a shame. We have a good bill here. The District of Columbia is on its feet. They have got good leadership; responsible leadership. They have a budget that everybody agreed to, that has tax cuts in it, and generates a surplus. We provided what money we had under our discretion in a way that met their priorities.

This bill should have been signed long before the fiscal year began. And, in fact, the gentleman from Oklahoma may recall that the bill that we got out of the House Committee on Appropriations was agreed to unanimously, I think. And then we got to the House floor and it passed overwhelmingly with the support of the delegate from the District of Columbia, with the support of the ranking member, myself, and with the support of the leadership of both parties. The bill should have been enacted by now.

But then we get into conference and we get into mischief. We get into social riders, "gotcha" types of legislation. So we used D.C. for political purposes. So the bill was vetoed. That is why the bill was vetoed, because it was used as a political vehicle instead of an appropriations bill.

Then we get it back, and what happens but that the Senate made changes that made the bill itself acceptable, but then they added the Labor, Health and Human Services appropriations bill to it, plus an across-the-board spending cut. Again, the poor little D.C. bill gets crushed under these controversial measures. That was not right; it was not fair.

Now we have the bill before us that we should all agree on, it has been

pulled back from the across-the-board cut and the Labor-HHS bill, but we have gone back and reinserted language that the House Committee on Appropriations, in a bipartisan fashion, rejected. We have reinserted language that was rejected on the House floor, that was rejected by the Senate conferees. The Senate conferees took this language out, and we are going to put it back?

Now, maybe we are playing gamesmanship here again. Well, send it back to the Senate and the Senate will take it out again. But if that is what we are doing, it is wrong. There is no good reason to be doing it.

Let me try to explain what this particular issue is all about and why the White House and others feel strongly. Number one, it is an issue of home rule. That is the underlying issue before us. The gentleman from Kansas put this rider in. The gentleman from Kansas must be very well aware that Topeka, Kansas, has exactly the very same program that the District of Columbia wants to have. Kansas gets Federal funds, State funds, and uses its local funds for this needle exchange program. The gentleman has never attempted to deny Kansas its right to make that decision.

Why does Kansas do it? Not because they want to increase the drug abuse, obviously; not because they want to make it easier to engage in destructive acts. They do it because they need access to drug addicts so that they can cure them. And that is what this program is all about, it is gaining access to people in need.

That is why the Whitman-Walker Clinic did it. They decided to do it after the American Medical Association endorsed it, after the American Pharmaceutical Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Nurses Association, the American Public Health Association, the Council of State and Territorial Health Officers, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of County and City Health Officials endorsed it; and I could go down a long, long list. They have all looked at this program, and they have decided that we have a very serious problem across the country and this may be working.

Why did Whitman-Walker particularly do it? Because D.C. has the worst problem, 75 percent of the babies born with HIV. How horrible a thing for a baby to be born with the HIV infection, infected as a result of the use of dirty needles. Three out of four of these babies have no chance, born because of dirty needles. They are trying to stop that. The District of Columbia has the worst AIDS epidemic. Deaths attributed to AIDS in D.C. is more than seven times the national average. Let me repeat that. Deaths attributed to AIDS in the District of Columbia is more than seven times the national average. AIDS is the leading cause of death for city residents between the ages of 30 and 44. A serious problem.

I do not know the best way to address the problem, but I sure know that it is a serious problem that we ought to care about. And what this program does, we are told by experts who are working in the field, is that it gives them an opportunity to identify people who are addicted and get them into drug treatment and counseling. And now we come along with this amendment that says that if this clinic offers these needles, which needles cost nothing, with private funds it would cost pennies to provide the program itself; but if Whitman-Walker even engages in this, we will not let them, according to the letter of the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) to Mrs. Rivlin, we will not let Whitman-Walker, which is the principal organization in the city, a private nonprofit organization that addresses the AIDS epidemic, we will not let them get any Federal or District funds for any of their other programs; for their Ryan White money, for their NIH research grants; for their CDC grants. We will not let them get any of the local D.C. money if they participate in this program.

We heard from the representative from Baltimore saying it works. It is working in Baltimore, even though they have a horrible situation. The statistics are terrible, but they were worse before they started the program. This program in the District of Columbia has reduced the incidence of transmission by 29 percent. Unbelievable progress. And here we come and say, no, we know better; cut it out.

But the reason we are opposing it so strongly goes beyond this substantive issue itself. The reason we are opposing this so strongly is that we would not do this to Kansas. We would not do this to Topeka, Kansas. We would not do this to any city in Oklahoma. I would not allow the gentleman to do it to Virginia. We do not do this to any city across the country, even though 113 State and local organizations have this very same program. One hundred thirteen of them.

We have never attempted to tell any of those cities or counties or States that we represent how to run their business, but we would do it to the District of Columbia; and we would hold hostage \$429 million. We are talking here three millionths of the Federal budget, .000003 percent of the Federal budget, \$429 million, which means nothing. It gets rounded in the Federal budget, yet it is critical to the District of Columbia. How could we hold that up, deny that money?

We insist on imposing our attitudes, our cultural conservatism, our ideas, that we would not impose on people we directly represent; yet we impose them on the District of Columbia. That is what is so wrong. We should not be doing it. We passed legislation through the leadership of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia of the Committee on Government Reform, chaired by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), that said in the future D.C. is treated

like any other community. They get their Federal grants and loans. We do not treat them like we would some kind of plantation that we were overseers over.

D.C. has a right to be independent. D.C. has a right to rule itself. And that is what this issue is all about. If they decide that private, nonpublic money should be able to be used for a purpose that they think is necessary, then, gosh darn it, we ought to let them make at least that decision. To not allow them to make that decision is wrong, and that is why we oppose this bill.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for explaining fully what is at issue here.

I want to leave this body with a very important fact that could be overlooked. This bill says that no public funds of any kind may be used for needle exchange. Please understand. This bill says that no Federal funds and no local funds may be used for needle exchange, making the District of Columbia the only jurisdiction in the United States that may not use its own local money for needle exchange.

□ 1745

It is important to understand, therefore, that we are voting no differently from what this body has voted five times previously. When we say no public funds, we mean no public funds. I regret that. But it is important to understand what we are voting on.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for explaining that. That should be the closing comment, really.

I offered an amendment in the House Committee on Appropriations that said no Federal or local funds can be used for needle exchange, and the Republicans and the Democrats on the House Committee on Appropriations agreed. We got it to the House floor, and the House on the floor agreed. We went to conference with the Senate, and the Senate agreed in the last conference. No public funds, leave that language as it is.

Then, at least, we will show a modicum of respect to the citizens of the District. We will get this bill passed. We will let them use their own money, which they desperately need, over \$4 billion of their own local property tax money which we are holding up. We will give them the \$429 million of grants from the Federal Government. We will treat them like any other community that we represent directly that can vote for us. The President will sign it right away. And then we will have acted responsibly, at least with regard to the District of Columbia appropriations bill. But until we do, we have to urge this body to vote no.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as we close the debate on this bill, I can imagine that some people might have been confused listening to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN). For example, they might have thought that somehow this amendment came out of the blue or that this amendment permits funding from public treasuries for needle exchange programs. No, the amendment is what says public funding cannot happen.

The amendment was not inserted in the conference committee. It was not inserted in the committee at all. It was voted on on the floor of this House July 29. The identical language of which the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) now complains was approved by this House of Representatives in a freestanding vote, no other issues, on July 29 by 241-187. And 40 Democrats, Members of the own party of the gentleman, were among the 241 Members of this House who voted for it.

The language is identical to what was signed into law last year by the President of the United States. It is identical to what the District of Columbia operates with today. It says they cannot operate a needle exchange program and still receive District of Columbia money or Federal Government money, nor can they use District of Columbia money or Federal Government money to operate a so-called needle exchange program where they give needles to drug addicts so they can shoot themselves up.

They perpetuate their habit. They help them. They enable them. They give them drug paraphernalia. We have got laws on the books against drug paraphernalia. We are just saying they should not be encouraging that.

Is there a needle exchange program in the District of Columbia? Yes, there is one. Does it operate with any funds that come from the Government? No. Does it operate with an entity that receives Government money? No. It is a purely private operation.

The gentleman says needles cost nothing. Well, that particular program operates on a budget of somewhere in the general neighborhood of \$300,000 a year. Now, I admit that is not millions and millions or billions of dollars. But it is not nothing, either.

When we talk about protecting babies, I do not want to see more babies born addicted to heroin because somebody was helping their mother to continue shooting up while she was carrying that child. I do not want more people robbed, I do not want more people killed because somebody was stealing to protect their drug habit. They may have gotten a free needle, but they still had to buy the dope and they were still involved in it.

If we want to get them off, let us get them off. Let us not give them the means to destroy themselves and to destroy other people, as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I heard it contended that somehow this bill was being held hostage. My goodness, just asking to continue the language that the President approved last year and that this House has adopted in a separate vote is not holding anything hostage. We are only here because the President vetoed the original bill. He vetoed that September 28.

Why did he veto it? He gave seven reasons in his veto message.

One, he wanted to permit public money to be spent on this needle program. Two, he wanted to permit the District of Columbia to legalize marijuana, supposedly for medicine, but under extremely loose standards that, frankly, were a joke. It was not medical marijuana. But he wanted to permit it. Three, he wanted to allow higher pay for the District of Columbia Council members. Four, he wanted higher legal fees for attorneys that were suing the schools of the District of Columbia. Five, he wanted taxpayers' money to be spent to finance a lawsuit trying to make the District of Columbia a State. Six, he wanted to overturn a rider that has been on the bill for, I think, about 9 years now and that he has approved a number of times before saying we do not treat people who are living together the same as a married couple. And last, he did not want to accept a provision that has been a part of this bill for over 20 years, limiting public funding of abortion so it does not apply in cases other than rape or incest or the life of the mother being involved.

That is what the President said his veto was about. Every one of those were things that have been a part of this bill before. They were things that the President had signed into law before, with the exception of the District of Columbia Council members' salaries.

Now we have made a couple of adjustments in the salary provision, in the legal fee provision, and made clear that the City's attorneys can keep them advised of lawsuits. But it is the President that picked these social issues. He picked the fight over old issues that have been decided in this Congress before.

He vetoed the bill. He made us come back multiple times with this bill. We have not punished the District. We have not come back and said, my goodness, if these things mean so little to them, we are not going to help their kids go to college, we are not going to help with cleaning up the Anacostia River.

We have not punished the District. We have a special constitutional responsibility. Article 1, section 8 says this Congress is responsible for the laws of the District of Columbia. We recognize that it is the Nation's capital, it is not just another city.

Now, I was sorry to hear, Mr. Speaker, the delegate from the District of Columbia demean the efforts that we have undertaken to honor and respect and assist the District of Columbia by

saying that things in the bill were "small change."

We did not touch the budget that the District wanted. We have applauded them. With the help of this Congress, they have achieved a balanced budget in the District of Columbia. We want to keep it that way. They have passed and we have approved the most significant tax cut that they have ever had, a bipartisan effort by the local government here in the District of Columbia. We have endorsed that. And we have done things we were not obligated to do.

The \$17 million to help kids in the District go to college, I do not consider that small change. The efforts to help them with charter schools so they have choices and are not trapped in a dead-end school, I do not consider that small change. The environmental clean-up, millions of dollars to clean up the fouled Anacostia River, I do not consider that small change. The Nation's largest drug testing and drug treatment program to break the link between crime and drugs, \$34 million, I do not consider that small change. The \$5 million in incentives to help kids be adopted into stable, safe, loving homes instead of being shuttled around in foster homes, I do not consider that small change.

There are many things in this bill I do not consider small change and I do not think the residents will consider them, either, Mr. Speaker, the people who see it brings them lower taxes, better schools, more efficient government, a better environment, less crime, and less drugs, a city government that is more responsive. I do not think it is small change. I think it is important.

I am sorry that some people think that what is more important is giving away needles to drug addicts. They can have all the private programs that they want to. They just should not try to mix those up with taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill. I thank the many people that have worked so valiantly and especially the cooperation that I have received working with local officials here in the District.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 354, the bill is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, pursuant to that resolution.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 210, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 562]

YEAS—216

Aderholt	Goode	Packard
Armey	Goodlatte	Pease
Bachus	Goodling	Peterson (PA)
Baker	Goss	Petri
Ballenger	Graham	Pickering
Barcia	Granger	Pitts
Barr	Green (WI)	Pombo
Barrett (NE)	Greenwood	Porter
Bartlett	Gutknecht	Portman
Barton	Hansen	Pryce (OH)
Bass	Hastert	Quinn
Bateman	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Biggett	Hayes	Ramstad
Bilbray	Hayworth	Regula
Bilirakis	Hefley	Reynolds
Bliley	Herger	Riley
Blunt	Hill (MT)	Rogan
Boehler	Hilleary	Rogers
Boehner	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Ros-Lehtinen
Bono	Horn	Roukema
Brady (TX)	Hostettler	Royce
Bryant	Houghton	Ryan (WI)
Burr	Hunter	Ryun (KS)
Burton	Hutchinson	Salmon
Buyer	Hyde	Sanford
Callahan	Isakson	Saxton
Calvert	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Camp	Jenkins	Sessions
Canady	Johnson (CT)	Shadegg
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Castle	Jones (NC)	Shays
Chabot	Kasich	Sherwood
Chambliss	Kelly	Shimkus
Coble	King (NY)	Shuster
Coburn	Kingston	Simpson
Collins	Knollenberg	Skeen
Combest	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Cook	Kuykendall	Smith (NJ)
Cooksey	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Cox	Largent	Souder
Crane	Latham	Spence
Cubin	LaTourette	Stearns
Cunningham	Lazio	Stump
Davis (VA)	Leach	Sununu
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Sweeney
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Talent
DeMint	Linder	Tauzin
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Taylor (NC)
Dickey	Lucas (KY)	Terry
Doolittle	Lucas (OK)	Thomas
Dreier	Manzullo	Thornberry
Dunn	McCollum	Thune
Ehlers	McCrery	Tiahrt
Ehrlich	McHugh	Toomey
Emerson	McInnis	Trafficant
English	McIntosh	Upton
Everett	McIntyre	Vitter
Ewing	McKeon	Walden
Fletcher	Metcalf	Walsh
Foley	Mica	Wamp
Fossella	Miller (FL)	Watkins
Fowler	Miller, Gary	Watts (OK)
Franks (NJ)	Moran (KS)	Weldon (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Myrick	Weller
Galleghy	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Ganske	Ney	Wicker
Gekas	Northup	Wilson
Gibbons	Norwood	Wise
Gilchrest	Nussle	Wolf
Gillmor	Ose	Young (AK)
Gilman	Oxley	Young (FL)

NAYS—210

Abercrombie	Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)
Ackerman	Brown (FL)	DeFazio
Allen	Brown (OH)	DeGette
Andrews	Campbell	Delahunt
Archer	Capps	DeLauro
Baird	Capuano	Deutsch
Baldacci	Cardin	Dicks
Baldwin	Carson	Dingell
Barrett (WI)	Chenoweth-Hage	Dixon
Becerra	Clay	Doggett
Bentsen	Clayton	Dooley
Berkley	Clement	Doyle
Berman	Clyburn	Duncan
Berry	Condit	Edwards
Bishop	Conyers	Engel
Blagojevich	Costello	Eshoo
Blumenauer	Coyne	Etheridge
Bonior	Cramer	Evans
Borski	Crowley	Farr
Boswell	Cummings	Fattah
Boucher	Danner	Filner
Boyd	Davis (FL)	Forbes

Ford	Markey	Roybal-Allard
Frank (MA)	Martinez	Rush
Frost	Mascara	Sabo
Gejdenson	Matsui	Sanchez
Gephardt	McCarthy (MO)	Sanders
Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)	Sandlin
Gordon	McDermott	Sawyer
Green (TX)	McGovern	Schaffer
Gutierrez	McKinney	Schakowsky
Hall (OH)	McNulty	Scott
Hall (TX)	Meehan	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Sherman
Hill (IN)	Meeks (NY)	Shows
Hilliard	Menendez	Sisisky
Hinchey	Millender	Skelton
Hinojosa	McDonald	Slaughter
Hoeffel	Miller, George	Smith (WA)
Holden	Minge	Snyder
Holt	Mink	Spratt
Hooley	Moakley	Stabenow
Hoyer	Mollohan	Stark
Inslee	Moore	Stenholm
Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)	Strickland
Jackson-Lee	Morella	Stupak
(TX)	Nadler	Tancredo
Jefferson	Napolitano	Tanner
John	Neal	Tauscher
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
Jones (OH)	Obey	Thompson (CA)
Kanjorski	Olver	Thompson (MS)
Kaptur	Ortiz	Thurman
Kennedy	Owens	Tierney
Kildee	Pallone	Towns
Kind (WI)	Pascarell	Turner
Klecza	Pastor	Udall (CO)
Klink	Paul	Udall (NM)
Kucinich	Payne	Velazquez
LaFalce	Pelosi	Vento
Lampson	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Lantos	Phelps	Waters
Larson	Pickett	Watt (NC)
Lee	Pomeroy	Waxman
Levin	Price (NC)	Weiner
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Wexler
Lipinski	Reyes	Weygand
Lofgren	Rivers	Woolsey
Lowey	Rodriguez	Wu
Luther	Roemer	Wynn
Maloney (CT)	Rothman	

NOT VOTING—8

Bereuter	Maloney (NY)	Scarborough
Hulshof	Murtha	Weldon (PA)
Kilpatrick	Rahall	

□ 1819

Mr. PASCARELL and Mr. BERMAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

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 official business in the 15th Congressional District of Michigan, I was unable to record my votes for rollcall nos. 559, 560, 561, and 562 considered today. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 559, an amendment offered by Mr. MARK UDALL to H.R. 2389, the County Schools Funding Revitalization Act, "no" on rollcall No. 560, final passage of H.R. 2389, "no" on rollcall No. 561, H.Res. 353, providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, and "no" on rollcall No. 562, H.R. 3194, District of Columbia Appropriations Act for FY 2000.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 872

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 872. My name was added by mistake instead of that of my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1300

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1300.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING BILLS TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES ON TOMORROW

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 353, I rise to announce the following suspensions to be considered tomorrow:

H. Con. Res. 214; and
H.R. 1693.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2891

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2891.

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

There was no objection.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND AUSTRALIA CONCERNING TECHNOLOGY FOR SEPARATION OF ISOTOPE OF URANIUM BY LASER EXCITATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the United States of America and Australia Concerning Technology for the Separation of Isotopes of Uranium by Laser Excitation,

with accompanying annexes and agreed minute. I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Agreement, and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the Agreement. (In accordance with section 123 of the Act, as amended by title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277), a classified annex to the NPAS, prepared by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information, will be submitted to the Congress separately.) The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, which includes a summary of the provisions of the Agreement and the views of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, is also enclosed.

A U.S. company and an Australian company have entered into a contract jointly to develop and evaluate the commercial potential of a particular uranium enrichment process (known as the "SILEX" process) invented by the Australian company. If the commercial viability of the process is demonstrated, the U.S. company may adopt it to enrich uranium for sale to U.S. and foreign utilities for use as reactor fuel.

Research on and development of the new enrichment process may require transfer from the United States to Australia of technology controlled by the United States as sensitive nuclear technology or Restricted Data. Australia exercises similar controls on the transfer of such technology outside Australia. There is currently in force an Agreement Between the United States of America and Australia Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, signed at Canberra July 5, 1979 (the "1979 Agreement"). However, the 1979 Agreement does not permit transfers of sensitive nuclear technology and Restricted Data between the parties unless specifically provided for by an amendment or by a separate agreement.

Accordingly, the United States and Australia have negotiated, as a complement to the 1979 Agreement, a specialized agreement for peaceful nuclear cooperation to provide the necessary legal basis for transfers of the relevant technology between the two countries for peaceful purposes.

The proposed Agreement provides for cooperation between the parties and authorized persons within their respective jurisdictions in research on and development of the SILEX process (the particular process for the separation of isotopes of uranium by laser excitation). The Agreement permits the transfer for peaceful purposes from Australia to the United States and from the United States to Australia, subject to the nonproliferation conditions and controls set forth in the

Agreement of Restricted Data, sensitive nuclear technology, sensitive nuclear facilities, and major critical components of such facilities, to the extent that these relate to the SILEX technology.

The nonproliferation conditions and controls required by the Agreement are the standard conditions and controls required by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (NNPA), for all new U.S. agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation. These include safeguards, a guarantee of no explosive or military use, a guarantee of adequate physical protection, and rights to approve re-transfers, enrichment, reprocessing, other alterations in form or content, and storage. The Agreement contains additional detailed provisions for the protection of sensitive nuclear technology, Restricted Data, sensitive nuclear facilities, and major critical components of such facilities transferred pursuant to it.

Material, facilities, and technology subject to the Agreement may not be used to produce highly enriched uranium without further agreement of the parties.

The Agreement also provides that cooperation under it within the territory of Australia will be limited to research on and development of SILEX technology, and will not be for the purpose of constructing a uranium enrichment facility in Australia unless provided for by an amendment to the Agreement. The United States would treat any such amendment as a new agreement pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act, including the requirement for congressional review.

Australia is in the forefront of nations supporting international efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries. It is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and has an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for the application of full-scope safeguards to its nuclear program. It subscribes to the Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) Guidelines, which set forth standards for the responsible export of nuclear commodities for peaceful use, and to the Zangger (NPT Exporters) Committee Guidelines, which oblige members to require the application of IAEA safeguards on nuclear exports to nonnuclear weapon states. In addition, Australia is a party to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, whereby it has agreed to apply international standards of physical protection to the storage and transport of nuclear material under its jurisdiction or control.

The proposed Agreement with Australia has been negotiated in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation, foreign policy, and commercial interests of the United States.

A consideration in interagency deliberations on the Agreement was the potential consequences of the Agreement for U.S. military needs. If SILEX technology is successfully developed and becomes operational, then all material produced by and through this technology would be precluded from use in the U.S. nuclear weapons and naval nuclear propulsion programs. Furthermore, all other military uses of this material, such as tritium production and material testing, would also not be possible because of the assurances given to the Government of Australia. Yet, to ensure the enduring ability of the United States to meet its common defense and security needs, the United States must maintain its military nuclear capabilities. Recognizing this requirement and the restrictions being placed on the SILEX technology, the Department of Energy will monitor closely the development of SILEX but ensure that alternative uranium enrichment technologies are available to meet the requirements for national security.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed Agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the Agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

Because this Agreement meets all applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, for agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation, I am transmitting it to the Congress without exempting it from any requirement contained in section 123 a. of that Act. This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and House International Relations Committee as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 b., the 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 3, 1999.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-154)

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 3064, the FY 2000 District of Columbia and Departments of Labor,

Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies appropriations bill.

I am vetoing H.R. 3064 because the bill, including the offsets section, is deeply flawed. It includes a misguided 0.97 percent across-the-board reduction that will hurt everything from national defense to education and environmental programs. The legislation also contains crippling cuts in key education, labor, and health priorities and undermines our capacity to manage these programs effectively. The enrolled bill delays the availability of \$10.9 billion for the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, and other important health and social services programs, resulting in delays in important medical research and health services to low-income Americans. The bill is clearly unacceptable. I have submitted a budget that would fund these priorities without spending the Social Security surplus, and I am committed to working with the Congress to identify acceptable offsets for additional spending for programs that are important to all Americans.

The bill also fails to fulfill the bipartisan commitment to raise student achievement by authorizing and financing class size reduction. It does not guarantee any continued funding for the 29,000 teachers hired with FY 1999 funds, or the additional 8,000 teachers to be hired under my FY 2000 proposal. Moreover, the bill language turns the program into a virtual block grant that could be spent on vouchers and other unspecified activities. In addition, the bill fails to fund my proposed investments in teacher quality by not funding Troops to Teachers (\$18 million) and by cutting \$35 million from my request for Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants. These programs would bring more highly qualified teachers into the schools, especially in high-poverty, high-need school districts.

The bill cuts \$189 million from my request for Title I Education for the Disadvantaged, resulting in 300,000 fewer children in low-income communities receiving needed services. The bill also fails to improve accountability or help States turn around the lowest-performing schools because it does not include my proposal to set aside 2.5 percent for these purposes. Additionally, the bill provides only \$300 million for 21st Century Community Learning Centers, only half my \$600 million request. At this level, the conference report would deny afterschool services to more than 400,000 students.

The bill provides only \$180 million for GEAR UP, \$60 million below my request, to help disadvantaged students prepare for college beginning in the seventh grade. This level would serve nearly 131,000 fewer low-income students. In addition, the bill does not adequately fund my Hispanic Education Agenda. It provides no funds for the Adult Education English as a Second Language/Civics Initiative to help

limited English proficient adults learn English and gain life skills necessary for successful citizenship and civic participation. The bill underfunds programs designed to improve educational outcomes for Hispanic and other minority students, including Bilingual Education, the High School Equivalency Program (HEP), the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP), and the Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities program.

The bill underfunds Education Technology programs, including distance learning and community technology centers. In particular, the bill provides only \$10 million to community based technology centers, \$55 million below my request. My request would provide access to technology in 300 additional low-income communities. The bill provides \$75 million for education research, \$34 million less than my request, and includes no funding for the Department of Education's share of large-scale joint research with the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health on early learning in reading and mathematics, teacher preparation, and technology applications.

The bill does not fund the \$53 million I requested to provide job finding assistance to 241,000 unemployment insurance claimants. This means that these claimants will remain unemployed longer, costing more in benefit payments. The bill also provides only \$140 million of my \$199 million request to expand service to job seekers at One-Stop centers as recently authorized in the bipartisan Workforce Investment Act. The bill funds \$120 million of the \$149 million requested for efforts to improve access to One-Stops as well as continued support for electronic labor exchange and labor market information. It funds only \$20 million of the \$50 million requested for work incentive grants to help integrate employment services for persons with disabilities into the mainstream One-Stop system.

The bill also does not provide funding for Right Track Partnerships (RTP). I requested \$75 million for this new competitive grant program. Designed to help address youth violence, RTP would become part of the multi-agency Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative, expanding it to include a focus on out-of-school youth.

The bill provides \$33 million less than my request for labor law enforcement agencies, denying or reducing initiatives to ensure workplace safety, address domestic child labor abuses, encourage equal pay, implement new health law, and promote family leave. In particular, the bill provides an inadequate level of funding for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, cutting it by \$18 million, or 5 percent below my request.

The bill also fails to provide adequate funding for the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB). The bill funds ILAB at \$50 million, \$26 million below my request. The bill would pre-

vent ILAB from carrying out my proposal to work through the International Labor Organization to help developing countries establish core labor standards, an essential step towards leveling the playing field for American workers.

The bill's funding level for the Bureau of Labor Statistics is \$11 million less than my request. The enrolled bill denies three important increases that would: (1) improve the Producer Price Index, which measures wholesale prices; (2) improve measures of labor productivity in the service sector; and, (3) improve the Employment Cost Index, used to help set wage levels and guide anti-inflation policy. It also denies funding for a study of racial discrimination in labor markets.

The bill denies my request for \$10 million to fund AgNet, even though the Senate included report language that supports AgNet in concept. AgNet, an Internet-based labor exchange, would facilitate the recruitment of agricultural workers by growers and the movement of agricultural workers to areas with employment needs.

The bill would cut the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) by \$209 million below FY 1999 and \$680 million below my request. The SSBG serves some of the most vulnerable families, providing child protection and child welfare services for millions of children. In addition, the failure to provide the Senate's level of \$2 billion in advance appropriations for the Child Care and Development Block Grant would mean 220,000 fewer children receiving child care assistance in FY 2001. The bill also fails to fund my National Family Caregiver Support program, which would provide urgently needed assistance in FY 2001. The bill also fails to fund my National Family Caregiver Support program, which would provide urgently needed assistance to 250,000 families caring for older relatives.

By funding the Title X Family Planning program at last year's level, family planning clinics would be unable to extend comprehensive reproductive health care services to an additional 500,000 clients who are neither Medicaid-eligible nor insured. The bill also fails to fund the Health Care Access for the Uninsured Initiative, which would enable the development of integrated systems of care and address service gaps within these systems.

The bill fails to fully fund several of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) critical public health programs, including:

Childhood immunizations (–\$44 million), so that approximately 300,000 children may not receive the full complement of recommended childhood vaccinations;

Infectious diseases (–\$36 million), which will impair CDC's ability to investigate outbreaks of diseases such as the West Nile virus in New York;

Domestic HIV prevention (–\$4 million);

Race and health demonstrations (–\$5 million), which will impair better un-

derstanding of how to reduce racial disparities in health; and,

Health statistics (–\$10 million) for key data collection activities such as the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey and health information on racial and ethnic population groups.

The Congress has failed to fund any of the \$59 million increase I requested for the Mental Health Block Grant, which would diminish States' capacity to serve the mentally ill.

In addition, the Congress has underfunded my request for the Substance Abuse Block Grant by \$30 million, and has underfunded other substance abuse treatment grants by a total of \$45 million. These reductions would widen the treatment gap in FY 2000 and jeopardize the Federal Government's ability to meet the National Drug Control Strategy performance target to reduce the drug treatment gap by 50 percent by FY 2007.

The bill provides only half of the \$40 million requested for graduate education at Children's Hospitals, which play an essential role in educating the Nation's physicians, training 25 percent of pediatricians and over half of many pediatric subspecialists.

The bill underfunds the Congressional Black Caucus' AIDS Initiative in the Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund by \$15 million, thereby reducing current efforts to prevent the spread of HIV. By not fully funding this program, the scope of HIV/AIDS prevention, education, and outreach activities available to slow the spread of HIV/AIDS in minority communities will be more limited.

The bill fails to fund Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) program management adequately. These reductions would severely impede HCFA's ability to ensure the quality of nursing home care through the Nursing Home Initiative. The bill does not adequately fund the request for Medicare+Choice user fees. This decrease would force HCFA to scale back the National Medicare Education Campaign. The Congress has not passed the proposed user fees totaling \$194.5 million that could free up resources under the discretionary caps for education and other priorities.

The bill includes a provision that would prevent funds from being used to administer the Medicare+Choice Competitive Pricing Demonstration Project in Kansas and Arizona. These demonstrations which are supported by MEDPAC and other independent health policy experts, were passed by the Congress as part of the Balanced Budget Act in order to provide valuable information regarding the use of competitive pricing methodologies in Medicare. The information that we could learn from these demonstrations is particularly relevant as we consider the important task of reforming Medicare.

The bill contains a highly objectionable provision that would delay the implementation of HHS' final Organ Procurement and Transplantation rule for

90 days. This rule, which was strongly validated by an Institute of Medicine report, provides a more equitable system of treatment for over 63,000 Americans waiting for an organ transplant; its implementation would likely prevent the deaths of hundreds of Americans. Since almost 5,000 people die each year waiting for an organ transplant, we must be allowed to move forward on this issue and implement the rule without further delay.

The bill does not provide any of the \$9.5 million I requested for HHS' Office of the General Counsel and Departmental Appeals Board to handle legal advice, regulations review, and litigation support, and to conduct hearings and issue decisions on nursing home enforcement cases as part of my Nursing Home Initiative. This would increase the backlog of nursing home appeals and impair Federal oversight of nursing home quality and safety standards. A reduction in funds for enforcement is inconsistent with the concerns that the GAO and the Congress have raised about this issue.

The bill cuts funds to counter bioterrorism. It funds less than half my request for CDC's stockpile, limiting the amount of vaccines, antibiotics, and other medical supplies that can be stockpiled to deploy in the event of a chemical or biological attack. In addition, the bill does not include \$13.4 million for critical FDA expedited regulatory review/approval of pharmaceuticals to combat chemical and biological agent weapons.

The bill provides full funding of \$350 million in FY 2002 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. However, the bill provides only \$10 million of the \$20 million requested for the digital transition initiative in FY 2000. This funding is required to help the public broadcasting system meet the Federal deadline to establish digital broadcasting capability by May 1, 2003.

The enrolled bill delays the availability of \$10.9 billion of funding until September 29, 2000. While modest levels of delayed obligations could potentially be sustained without hurting the affected programs, the levels in the enrolled bill are excessive, resulting in delays in NIH research grants, delays in CDC immunizations for children, and delays in the delivery of health services to low income Americans through community health centers and rural health clinics.

The bill also seriously underfunds critical Departmental management activities in the Departments of Labor and Education and the Social Security Administration (SSA). For Education, these reductions would hamstring efforts to replace the Department's accounting system and undermine the new Performance-Based Organization's plans to streamline and modernize student aid computer systems. Reductions to the Department of Labor (DOL) would undercut the agency's ability to comply with the requirements of the Clinger-Cohen and Computer Security

Acts, adjudicate contested claims in several of its benefits programs, and examine and update the 1996 study on Family and Medical Leave policies. For SSA, the reductions would result in significantly longer waiting times for disability applicants and millions of individuals who visit SSA field offices.

In adopting an across-the-board reduction, the Congress has abdicated its responsibility to make tough choices. Governing is about making choices and selecting priorities that will serve the national interest. By choosing an across-the-board cut, the Congress has failed to meet that responsibility.

This across-the-board cut would result in indiscriminate reductions in important areas such as education, the environment, and law enforcement. In addition, this cut would have an adverse impact on certain national security programs. The indiscriminate nature of the cut would require a reduction of over \$700 million for military personnel, which would require the military services to make cuts in recruiting and lose up to 48,000 military personnel.

In adopting this cost-saving technique, the Congress is asserting that it will not have to dip into the Social Security surplus. However, this cut does not eliminate the need to dip into the Social Security surplus.

For these reasons, this across-the-board cut is not acceptable.

In addition to the specific program cuts and the 0.97 percent across-the-board reduction, the bill contains a \$121 million reduction in salaries and expenses for the agencies funded by this bill, exacerbating the problems caused by the bill's underfunding of critical Departmental management activities. If, for example, the \$121 million reduction were allocated proportionately across all agencies funded in the Labor/HHS/Education bill, HHS would have to absorb an approximately \$55 million reduction to its salaries and expenses accounts, Labor would be cut by about \$14 million, Education by about \$5 million, and SSA by some \$45 million. This would dramatically affect the delivery of essential human services and education programs and the protection of employees in the workplace.

With respect to the District of Columbia component of the bill, I am pleased that the majority and minority in the Congress were able to come together to pass a version of the District of Columbia Appropriations Bill that I would sign if presented to me separately and as it is currently constructed. While I continue to object to remaining riders, some of the highly objectionable provisions that would have intruded upon local citizens' right to make decisions about local matters have been modified from previous versions of the bill. That is a fair compromise. We will continue to strenuously urge the Congress to keep such riders off of the FY 2001 D.C. Appropriations Bill.

I commend the Congress for providing the Federal funds I requested for the District of Columbia. The bill includes essential funding for District Courts and Corrections and the D.C. Offender Supervision Agency and provides requested funds for a new tuition assistance program for District of Columbia residents. The bill also includes funding to promote the adoption of children in the District's foster care system, to support the Children's National Medical Center, to assist the Metropolitan Police Department in eliminating open-air drug trafficking in the District, and for drug testing and treatment, among other programs. However, I continue to object to remaining riders that violate the principles of home rule.

I look forward to working with the Congress to craft an appropriations bill that I can support, and to passage of one that will facilitate our shared objectives.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 3, 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill will be printed as a House document.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President and the bill be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1845

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENTS OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO THE SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-442) on the resolution (H. Res. 356) waiving requirements of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WHEN ONE READS THE PRESIDENT'S SUBMITTAL ON STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SECURITY, THE NUMBERS DO NOT ADD UP

(Mr. OSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to highlight the President's submittal to the House on strengthening Social Security, the Medicare Act of 1999.

I will caution again all the Members here, and those who are not, that they need to read this plan because this plan, in fact, does request and require a 2½ percent reduction in discretionary outlays.

This is not Republicans; this is the President of the United States who is suggesting this.

Now I would just like to remind everyone that we are having a dickens of a time negotiating a 1 percent reduction in discretionary outlays, and the President is suggesting that his plan to save Social Security is based on a 2½ percent reduction in discretionary outlays.

I urge Members to read this plan. The numbers do not add up. The numbers do not add up, Mr. Speaker. Please read the plan.

ROLL-CALL VOTES ON THE PASSAGE OF THE
ORIGINAL 1935 SOCIAL SECURITY ACT
CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE—LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS

In response to numerous requests for information on the Senate and House roll-call votes on the original 1935 Social Security Act (H.R. 7260/P.L. 74-271), we have compiled this packet. The Social Security Act was signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on August 14, 1935. The following roll-call votes were taken on the measure:

House—April 19, 1935: *Yeas*: 372 (288 Democrat; 77 Republican; 7 Independent); *Nays*: 33 (13 Democrat; 18 Republican; 2 Independent); *Answering Present*: 2 (2 Republican); *Not Voting*: 25 (18 Democrat; 6 Republican; 1 Independent).

Senate—June 19, 1935: *Yeas*: 77 (60 Democrat; 15 Republican; 2 Independent); *Nays*: 6 (1 Democrat; 5 Republican); *Not Voting*: 12 (8 Democrat; 4 Republican).

In 1935, there were only 48 states, since Alaska and Hawaii were not admitted to the Union until 1958 and 1959, respectively. So, the Senate had 96 seats in 1935, according to Stephen G. Christianson's *Facts About the Congress* [New York, H.W. Wilson, 1996], 339). Also, "[t]he current House size of 435 Members . . . was established in 1911," according to CRS Report 95-971, *House of Representatives: Setting the Size at 435*, by David C. Huckabee. Thus, 95 of the eligible 96 Senators and 432 of the eligible 435 Representatives participated in the bill's roll-call votes. The roll-call vote charts following this page, which are organized by chamber, are arranged alphabetically by last names, then, where necessary, by first names. Party and state information is provided for all Members, and district information is also given for each Representative.

The original House and Senate roll-call votes can be found on p. 6069-70 and p. 9650, respectively, in the 1935 edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Copies of bound volumes of the RECORD may be available for use at the nearest federal depository library. Addresses of the closest depository libraries can often be obtained: through a local library; from the office of Depository Services of the U.S. Government Printing Office, (202) 512-1119; or at the following Internet address: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/dpos/adpos003.html.

Information Research Division.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLETCHER). 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.

ADDITIONAL ALL-CARGO SERVICE TO CHINA

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in April of this year the United States and the People's Republic of China signed a new civil aviation agreement. In addition to doubling the number of scheduled flights between the two countries, the agreement allows one additional carrier from each country to serve the U.S.-China market beginning in the year 2001.

Currently, three U.S. and three Chinese carriers have the authority to serve the U.S.-China market. The Department of Transportation will soon grant an additional U.S. carrier the right to fly directly to China.

China is the largest market in the world, as we all know, and holds great trading potential for the United States.

All-cargo carriers that provide time-sensitive express service play an important role in promoting trade opportunities for U.S. companies large and small. Express all-cargo carriers are able to connect every business and residence in the United States every day to China. Unfortunately, of the three U.S. carriers allowed to fly directly to China, Federal Express is the only all-cargo carrier serving the market. For this reason, United Parcel Service is now applying to the Department of Transportation for the right to fly directly to China.

United Parcel Service has served the nations of Asia since 1988 and already operates an extensive ground network in China. By applying for the right to fly directly to China, United Parcel Service hopes to expand its Chinese service by using United Parcel Service jet aircraft. United Parcel Service would also provide needed competition in the all-cargo express market.

As the only all-cargo U.S. carrier, Federal Express now enjoys a monopoly advantage in the Chinese market. Allowing another all-cargo carrier like United Parcel Service into the vast China market would provide U.S. consumers and exporters with increased access in competitive service.

More importantly, United Parcel Service would help meet the growing demand for air cargo service. Even with Federal Express in the market, roughly 60 percent of the cargo that is transported between the United States and China is carried on third-country carriers. In other words, foreign carriers benefit the most from the growing trade between the United States and China. This just is not right.

However, if United Parcel Service is allowed to fly directly to China, then a U.S. carrier would be able to benefit from the growing demand for cargo

service between the United States and China.

This would, in turn, benefit the U.S. economy and U.S. workers. In fact, a recent study found that for every 40 additional international packages delivered by United Parcel Service each day, a new job is created at United Parcel.

Let me run that by once again. A recent study found that for every 40 additional international packages delivered by United Parcel Service each day, a new American job is created at United Parcel Service.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would like to strongly urge the Department of Transportation to grant United Parcel Service the right to serve China. Awarding that right to United Parcel Service will bring competition to the marketplace, provide much needed service in the air cargo market, and provide substantial economic benefits to the United States and its citizens.

INVESTIGATING WACO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Speaker, as we continue in this body with the day-to-day debate over next year's budget, I would like to take a moment to help refocus our attention on an issue that demands the attention and the action of Congress, an issue that is not necessarily pleasant to deal with but one that we must deal with, and that is the role of the Federal law enforcement and the military in the Waco tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an article written by George Nourse, who is a sheriff of Canyon County in my State of Idaho. This article is about the outstanding and relentless work of the Texas Rangers in seeking justice in the Waco tragedy and is appropriately entitled, quote, "Spin is Not an Investigation," end quote.

Mr. Speaker, I will read only a portion of this article and would submit the remainder of the article to be included in the RECORD.

It is imperative that we investigate what went wrong in Waco and that we consider the view of those who know how to do it right, the many dedicated and honest law enforcement officials throughout this great country. In commenting on how Washington works when it comes to investigations, Sheriff Nourse, in his article, profoundly states, quote, "Washington does not investigate. It spins. The spin in Waco was to demonize the people who were killed. The Feds killed more people at Waco than all the school violence and wacko shootings added together over the last 6 years. Seventeen of the 24 Waco children were under the age of 10. Think about it."

He wrote, "The terror! The pain and confusion those young children went

through before they died. However, the media bought Washington's spin, plain and simple," end quote.

Sheriff Nourse contrasts the Federal spin with the real investigation by the Texas Rangers in pointing out the following: He said, "The investigation by the Texas Rangers is not spin. A dozen spent rifle cartridges preferred by sharpshooters, as well as the FBI and ATF, were found in a house near the Davidians' compound that was occupied by Federal agents during that stand-off. Both agencies denied firing a single round during that stand-off that followed the initial attack."

Mr. Speaker, Sheriff Nourse also asked the puzzling question that every single county sheriff must grapple with. He wrote, "The question that really bothers me is how did the Federal Government take over such an operation? And why the total absence of local law enforcement on the scene? And what was the local sheriff doing while all of this was going on?"

Sheriff Nourse continued, "I have never been told this part of the story and it deeply worries me. I know what my position would be here in Canyon County and I am more than a little concerned as to what that might lead to."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Sheriff Nourse, who has himself participated in numerous law enforcement activities, makes an observation that dumbfounds us all. States Nourse, "Think about it. Law enforcement officers shooting fully automatic weapons at a building knowing there are 24 small children inside. That is not law enforcement," the sheriff writes. "It is an act of war at its worst."

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to join me in seeking hearings on this tragic epic in American history. We must get to the bottom of why the Federal Government waived the Posse Comitatus Act and involved the military in this domestic law enforcement action. This is a decision that could only have been made at the very top levels of government and we must find out who exactly made that decision at that top level.

Outstanding Americans such as Sheriff Nourse are demanding answers to these questions. We must join him. Let us not make this same tragic mistake, as Federal law enforcement, by spinning instead of conducting real bona fide investigations.

THE SHINING STAR: SPIN IS NOT AN INVESTIGATION!

(By Sheriff George Nourse)

Janet Reno's Whacky War on Waco is back in the news. And Washington D.C. is gearing up to give it a second coat of whitewash.

Democrat Henry Waxman is leading the defense, saying the Republicans just overlooked the evidence that the F.B.I. shot incendiary devices into the Davidians' compound. It was not a cover-up? This, of course, conflicts with Janet Reno's statement that the F.B.I. assured her no incendiary devices were used.

Washington doesn't investigate. It spins! The spin in Waco was to demonize the people

who were killed. (Demonizing people was the tactic used to justify the killing of innocent people as witches in our early history.) The feds killed more people at Waco than all the school violence and wacko shootings added together over the last six years. Seventeen of the 24 Waco children were under the age of ten. Think about it! The terror! The screaming and confusion those people went through before they died. Compare how the national news media beat us over the head with all the lurid details of Columbine, and the absence of such details at Waco. The media bought Washington's spin, plain and simple.

My hat is off to the chief of the Texas Rangers. After 6 years the truth about the Waco War may come out. But don't bet on it; the Washington spin machine is hard at work.

The investigation by the Texas Rangers is not spin! A dozen spent rifle cartridges preferred by sharpshooters, as well as the F.B.I. and A.T.F., were found in a house near the Davidians' compound that was occupied by federal agents during the stand-off. Both agencies denied firing a single round during the stand-off that followed the initial attack.

The reason I call it the "Waco War" is because the mentality used by the A.T.F. and F.B.I. was identical to the mentality used in fighting a war. They certainly were not there to solve a social problem in the sense local law enforcement applies. The question that really bothers me is, How did the federal government take over such an operation? And, Why the total absence of local law enforcement on the scene? What was the local sheriff doing while all of this was going on?

I have never been told this part of the story, and it deeply worries me. I know what my position would be here in Canyon County. And I'm more than a little concerned as to what that might lead to.

Think about it! Law enforcement officers shooting fully automatic weapons at a building, knowing there are 24 small children inside. This is not law enforcement! It is an act of war at its worst.

Reflect on what happened in the local law enforcement agency involved with Rodney King: officers caught on video hitting King with night sticks. King was high on P.C.P., and led officers on a high-speed chase that threatened the lives of anyone in his path. King wasn't killed. In fact, he wasn't even hospitalized.

Result? King got \$1,000,000; two police officers went to prison; and the police chief got fired. Compare this to Waco, and you come up with a huge credibility gap.

If the American people are counting on Detective Janet Reno for answers on Waco, they should know by now she can't detect a giraffe in a band of sheep! It's all a spin!

□ 1900

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

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio 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 Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING THE LIFE OF WALTER PAYTON

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a tremendous American, a great individual who was known perhaps best for being an outstanding football player. I guess he was, indeed, an outstanding football player, Walter Payton, who broke every record, set every record at the position which he played.

Chicago is a great football town. For many years, our football fortunes were not where we wanted them to be. There was not much to cheer about. There was not much to bring the people out. But then, from a small historically black college came Walter Payton, a college that not many people necessarily knew about, had heard about, Jackson State. Here comes a young man with the grace and finesse of a wizard, one who could sneak and weave through lines no matter what the linemen looked like.

While Walter set all of these records and we talk about his greatness as an athlete, if one ever had an opportunity to interact with him, to see him up close, to know the man, to talk with him, to understand him, then one saw much more than an athlete. One saw much more than a football player. One saw a role model. One saw a humanness that existed. One saw just a good solid human being. Walter was well coached and was ready for the National Football League when he came.

I always felt a tremendous sense of pride in his accomplishments because I, too, attended one of the historically black colleges or universities. We were in the same conference, and I must confess that Jackson State usually beat the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff more than we beat them.

But also in that conference was Alcorn University, Grambling, Southern, Texas Southern, Prairie View, sometimes Wiley College, sometimes Bishop, sometimes Mississippi Valley.

The real point is this is an opportunity to highlight the contributions of historically black colleges and universities, not only academically, not only athletically, but in a total sense of what they meant.

Walter died needing an organ transplant. This is also an opportunity to urge all Americans who are able to participate in organ donation programs to help give and sustain life to those who might need an organ, especially if ours is no longer going to be useful to us.

So, Walter, even in your death, you win out victorious because you raised the question, you raised an issue, and you helped America understand the need for a program, an organ donation program and policies which will assure that, when people need organs, they are in fact available. You will be in the other Hall of Fame. Rest easy.

RECENT TRIP TO CUBA BY ILLINOIS GOVERNOR GEORGE RYAN

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words, just a few, about Mr. Ryan, the Governor of Illinois, and his recent 5-day propaganda junket to Cuba.

I know that Mr. Ryan was motivated by large business interests which hope to profit from deals with the Cuban dictatorship, but that does not excuse his conduct.

Mr. Ryan displayed a pathetic lack of sensitivity and common sense that history will record as constituting a great disservice to the freedom loving people of Illinois.

For example, Mr. Ryan knows that there is a system of medical as well as of tourism apartheid in Cuba. He was specifically made aware of the case of a 2-year-old Cuban child, Christian Prieto, who fell from the second story of a building some months ago and was denied medical treatment at the CIMEQ hospital in Havana, a hospital with the necessary facilities to treat the child's severe neurological injuries, because the child is Cuban and his parents are not tourists with dollars or high ranking officials of the Cuban dictatorship. Only they have access to the CIMEQ, tourists with dollars or members of the regime's hierarchy.

Yet, after bringing up the case of this 2-year-old Cuban child, Mr. Ryan just accepted the hysterical explanations of the case brought forth by Castro.

Mr. Ryan refused to acknowledge the medical and tourism apartheid that the Cuban people have to suffer. In fact, Mr. Ryan demonstrated cold-hearted cynicism when, after referring to hospitals that he visited in Cuba as not meeting conditions that would make them certifiable anywhere in the United States, and knowing that Cubans are denied adequate medical care in that country because it is only available to tourists with dollars and the family of high government officials, Mr. Ryan nonetheless referred to Castro's health care system as an inspirational model for the entire Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Ryan demonstrated another trait, cowardice, when he delivered a speech at the University of Havana. His written prepared remarks included various eloquent quotes from Abraham Lincoln about human dignity and freedom. The Cuban dictator, however, unexpectedly showed up to listen to the speech and sat in the front row. Ryan then proceeded to omit the calls for human rights. But, oh, yes, he did reiterate his brave call in front of Castro for an end to the cruel U.S. embargo on the Castro regime.

Notice how Castro refers himself now to the Ryan speech. Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues want to learn the truth with regard to anything that Castro says, look for the opposite of what he says.

So what does Castro say now about Ryan? "Governor Ryan is a man of firm character, a man of frankness." Castro says that Ryan "gave a great speech, it is nothing like the speeches we are used to hearing, it was without arrogance or superiority, he said rational things, and he was greatly applauded."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is shameful that an elected official from the United States of America be held in such high regard by this hemisphere's last decrepit dictator.

Nevertheless, despite what Castro now says of Ryan, the Cuban dictator did not fail to embarrass Ryan while the Governor was in Cuba. When Ryan gave Castro a letter asking for the release of Cuba's four best known political prisoners, Castro publicly joked that he would put the letter in the same stack with the hundreds of other letters that he has received asking for the release of those four dissidents.

Castro ridiculed Ryan, but Ryan simply responded by continuing to ridicule himself, repeatedly calling for the number one foreign policy and economic objective of the Cuban dictator, the unilateral lifting of U.S. sanctions with absolutely no conditions, no call for the release of political prisoners in exchange for lifting sanctions, no call for the legalization of political parties or labor unions or the press, there was no call for free elections in exchange for lifting U.S. sanctions from Mr. Ryan.

No, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what business deal Ryan is seeking from Castro for himself or for a family member, but have no doubt that seeking a business deal for himself or a family member he is.

Also have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that, when the Cuban people are free, they will refer Mr. Ryan to make certain that his Cuban business dreams remain unfulfilled.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO WALTER PAYTON

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

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Speaker, as a native Chicagoan and a pro football fan and a devoted and lifelong Chicago Bears fan, I rise today to pay tribute to Walter Payton, who died Monday at the age of 45.

Different sports heroes define different generations. For my generation, Walter Payton was the Chicago Bears.

Walter Payton will long be remembered, Mr. Speaker, as a player who rewrote football's record books. He is the National Football League's all-time leading rusher. He ran the ball more times than anybody else in history. On a day in November, in 1977, against the Minnesota Vikings, he set the record for the most yards in a single game, rushing for an amazing 275 yards.

But though these records of achievement on the football field endure, the history of Walter Payton that will be written in books will never compete with the history written deep in the hearts of his fans, for Walter Payton's records are merely the product of his remarkable character and drive.

Walter Payton made football history because of his will and his legendary determination. During his 13 seasons for the Chicago Bears, he missed only one football game, in his rookie year, because of a twisted ankle. In that game, he said he could have played, but his coaches kept him on the sidelines. This is remarkable considering the position he played and the punishment running backs in the NFL must withstand.

Mike Ditka, his former coach with the Chicago Bears, was fond of talking about Payton's unique style of running. There were bigger, faster, and more elusive runners, but Payton was the best running back he ever saw. Payton attacked would-be tacklers, he never ran out of bounds, and was always reaching for the extra yard.

This way of running the ball made him a natural for fans in a city like Chicago that prides itself on its work ethic. As Don Pierson wrote in yesterday's Chicago Tribune, "He captured the soul of a city with work habits and results that made steelworkers and ditchdiggers proud."

But the special thing about Walter Payton was not the 16,726 rushing yards he accumulated in his career. It is the way he lived his life and the kind of person he was. Several of Walter's teammates have, since his passing, talked about Walter Payton's favorite saying, "tomorrow is promised to no one". He played football that way. The way he played was a metaphor for the way he lived, with energy and with enthusiasm. Payton's style of running was aggressive and punishing. He blended a no-holds-barred style with the agility of a ballet dancer.

One Chicago sportswriter said his style was a "combination soul train and freight train." But the name sweetness was not based solely on his style of play. It was based on his personality.

He had an infectious smile and warmth that reached out through the television sets. As a fan, one just knew that here was a guy who was as likable a person as he was a player. That is why, I believe, the people of Chicago were so touched, first by his illness and then by his passing.

When Walter announced his illness, when Chicago saw a man who was so

much a part of the life of the city confronting the reality of his condition, we all felt his sorrow. I, like I suspect most Bears' fans, never knew Walter Payton. But his passing has left us, his fans, with a profound sense of loss.

For those of us who are Walter Payton fans, we have to remind ourselves that life is filled with the bitter and the sweet. For me, I find peace in the belief that good people go to heaven. It is nice knowing that today heaven is where sweetness is.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Walter Payton, number 34 for the Chicago Bears. The tragic, and all too early, end to his life on Monday cannot obscure his greatness, not only as a football player, but as a person. He holds eight NFL records, from career rushing yards to number of 1,000 yard rushing seasons to yards gained in a game. He holds 28 Bears records. But the Bears often had great individuals. Walter Payton meant so much more to the team than just individual statistics.

I had the privilege of going to the 1963 NFL Championship game in Chicago where the Bears beat the New York Giants 14–10. Unfortunately, that would be the last time any of us would see the Bears in the playoffs until Walter Payton arrived. And he carried the Bears with his work ethic, determination, and relentless pursuit of excellence. Sometimes it seemed that he was the only weapon the Bears had. But, finally, he led the Bears back to the top in Super Bowl XX. Over the time that Walter Payton played, Chicago saw a renaissance in its sports teams—the White Sox and the Cubs were in the playoffs and Michael Jordan was on his way to taking the Bulls to the top. But Walter Payton was the first and the brightest and the Bears owned Chicago because of him.

More importantly, Walter Payton made his mark off the football field in a way that few athletes do. In truth, he gave back to Chicago more than Chicago could ever have given him. He coached high school basketball, read to children in a literacy program, and made significant charitable contributions during and after his NFL career, including through the Walter Payton Foundation, which funds educational programs and helps abused and neglected children. He was a successful businessman, always into new ventures, from his restaurants to an Indy car racing team.

And clearly, he was a successful father and husband. When his daughter Brittney and wife Connie accepted the Life Award for him at the Arete Courage in Sports awards less than 2 weeks ago and when his son Jarrett addressed the media yesterday, you could see the same poise in them as we saw in Walter. I never had the opportunity to meet Walter Payton personally. But like most Chicagoans, I felt like I somehow knew him, that he was one of us. And we were all better off for that.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, although it saddens my heart to stand here before Congress today, it is an honor to pay tribute to one of the greatest football players in the history of the National Football League. Walter Payton, a giant of a man, died November 1, 1999 at the young age of 45. He is survived by his wife Connie, two children Jarrett and Brittney, his mother Alyne, brother Eddie, and a sister Pam.

There is a saying that states, "Big things come in small packages." This holds true for

Walter. Hailing from Columbia, MS, Walter did not play organized football until the tenth grade. It was in Columbia, where he began to amaze everyone who saw him play. In 1970, Walter attended Jackson State University where he began his assault on NCAA history by becoming the all time leading scorer, a distinction which earned him a fourth place finish in the Heisman Trophy race in 1974. In 1975, Payton was selected by the Chicago Bears as the fourth selection overall. From that point, Payton began a career that would include many awards, including his externalized place of honor at the Pro Football Hall of Fame in Canon, OH.

The people who were fortunate enough to see him play were entertained at every level. Whether it was a run, block, kick, pass, or a reception, Walter gave the crowd everything at 100 percent. His running style earned him the nickname "Sweetness." To see him punish would-be tacklers was definitely a delight. He was a total player, involving himself in every aspect of the game. He was unselfish in his play and always put the team first. It was this unselfish attitude that fueled the Chicago Bears to a Super Bowl Championship in 1985. A fitting award for a well deserving athlete. In 1987, Payton left the game to pursue other goals. He left the game, but not after setting many records including the all time leading rushing record of 16,276 yards. A record that still stands strong to this day.

After football, Payton became as dedicated to being an effective businessman as he was to being an effective football player. He became heavily involved in auto racing, both as a driver and owner. This led him to many business interests and holdings including an attempt to become the first African-American owner of a NFL franchise. In a world where diversity is expanding and new arenas are being opened for people of color, it is refreshing to know that Walter attempted every day to venture into different markets that were not so accessible before. I had the pleasure of meeting Walter in my office here in Washington. Walter exemplified the same passion and fire for his business as he did for the game of football.

After his final game, Payton was quoted as saying he played because it was fun and that he loved to play. Mr. Speaker, the next time we see a football game where a player dives over the heap for the extra yard or goal line or when a player breaks free from the pack and high steps into an end zone, let's take a moment and remember who introduced these moves to us, let's take a moment and remember Walter Payton.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, Walter Payton was my hero and my friend. I never met a man with more heart for the game of football or for people. He wore a perpetual smile. That's what I'll never forget about Walter. He touched my life. I pointed to him when ascribing role models for my boys. And if my three sons have the same zest for life, love for people, and positive outlook on the future, I will be one proud father.

I will greatly miss Walter but I will never forget him. He changed football; he changed the record books; he changed the Bears; he changed Chicago; he changed me. I'm a better man and the world is a better place because of him. I hope the same will be said of me.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, above all else, the death of Walter Payton yesterday calls to mind a simple word: Courage.

Nothing I can say could do justice to the man who brought so much joy and class to the City of Chicago for over a decade. On the field, though he often said he "was not the fastest, not the strongest, not the biggest," Walter Payton was truly a giant. For 13 years he ran roughshod over the NFL, shattering records and defenses along the way. A quick perusal of his statistics reveal a career nothing short of legendary.

For the first several years of his career, he was the lone high-point of many woeful seasons at Soldier Field. Week after week, he racked up the yards . . . while the Bears racked up the losses. That never seemed to effect him on the field. His hard running, his ferocious blocking, and his indomitable spirit never waned during the lean years of the Chicago Bears. Those years solidified his place in football history as the class act who left it all on the field, even in a hopeless game playing for a mediocre team during a disappointing season.

But it was Walter Payton the man—more than the football player—who truly touched the lives of the American people, and especially those of us lucky enough to have lived in and around Chicago, IL, during his career. His old coach, Mike Ditka, said yesterday that "Sweetness" was not a nickname describing Payton's playing, but the way he treated other people. His commitment to his family and friends, to children in the Chicago area, and his deep faith were all evident in his day-to-day life.

Earlier this year, Payton learned of the liver disease which would eventually take his life. Even as it became clear his health was slipping from him, Sweetness again rose to the occasion, never losing hope, and in fact, by all accounts, growing in his religious faith, displaying all the courage and class we had grown to expect from him. Just as he did during those losing seasons early in his career, his courage reaffirmed Lawrence of Arabia's great lesson, that "There could be no honor in a sure success, but much might be wrested from a sure defeat." Facing the most tragic defeat of his life against the most daunting opponent, Walter Payton was the personification of courage, and that is why we honor him here.

Payton once wrote, in a "practice" retirement speech to the City of Chicago and his fans, "If I've done anything that has helped your lives, please use it." It is his courage—even in the face of sure defeat—that I hope will be Walter Payton's legacy to the world, and we certainly should use it.

I recall that courage was defined by a World War II bomber-pilot as, "The guy who was afraid . . . but went in anyway." Whether a defensive lineman twice his size or the debilitating disease which finally tackled him the other afternoon, Walter Payton never failed to drop his head, lower his shoulder, and drive through for a few more yards. We will truly miss him.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, we lost one of football's all-time greatest players and a great American—Walter Payton, who lived in my district and touched the lives of so many on and off the field. After announcing earlier this year, he was battling a liver disease, which later turned into cancer, Walter fought the good fight and kept the faith until the end.

Between 1975 and 1987 there were three givens in Chicago: The wind was blowing off

the Lake, the Cubs were not in the World Series, and Walter Payton No. 34, also known as "Sweetness" for his silky smooth moves, was in the backfield for the Bears.

Inducted into the Hall of Fame in 1993, Walter Payton carried the ball more often (3,838 attempts), for more yards (16,726), than anyone who has ever played the game. There is no question, Walter Payton was the best at taking the ball and running with it. Against Minnesota in 1977, he carried 40 times for 275 yards, a National Football League (NFL) single game record.

It's not that Walter Payton is the all-time leading rusher and holds 28 NFL and Bears records and could throw the most punishing block on the biggest defensive linebackers that made him a great person. Walter Payton was a great man because of his commitment to his family and faith. Being a family man and active in his community, he was regularly seen at St. Viator High School sporting events supporting his son. In addition, Payton volunteered to help coach the boys' basketball teams at Hoffman Estates High School in 1993–1994.

Walter Payton's quiet attitude of giving earned him a spot in the Arlington Heights Hall of Fame in 1988 and 4 years earlier a one-block stretch of downtown Arlington Heights was named Payton Run. Walter Payton owned businesses in my district, two nightclubs in Schaumburg—Studebaker's and Thirty Four's—ran Walter Payton Power Equipment in Streamwood and headquartered his corporate offices in Hoffman Estates. He was also active in several charities and helped whenever and wherever he could in the community. Even though he denied it, he was an all around role model to which every pro-athlete or average "Joe" should aspire.

Quite simply, Walter Payton was a great citizen, on and off the field, who will be forever remembered as a champion. His former coach Mike Ditka once remarked to his players in training camp, "If everyone came to camp in as good of shape as Walter we'd have a good team". He had a superior training ritual. In his 13-year career, he played in pain and missed only one game. Ditka when he came to coach the Bears said "Walter Payton is my idol." Have you ever heard a coach say that about a player? I think a quote that sums up Walter Payton's life was from Coach Ditka when he said, "It's sad to me (Walter's death) because he had a lot greater impact on me than I had on him. He was the best player I've ever seen. And probably one of the best people I've ever met".

Having lost a daughter to cancer 2 years ago myself, I understand the pain the Payton family is feeling in their loss. I can only assure them that in time, the family will be reunited and what a joyous occasion it will be for the Payton family.

Walter never gave up hope in his fight. It is for that spirit that people everywhere will remember him forever.

WOMEN BORN INTO A WORLD OF VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, during the 5 minutes that I deliver this

speech, 33 new lives will begin, 17 males and 16 females. They enter a world on the brink of the 21st century and where possibilities are limitless.

Of the 16 females born during this speech, at least two will be the victim of rape or attempted rape, one of whom will be violated before she reaches the age of 18, five will be the victim of abuse by an intimate partner, and one will be stalked. She will join the ranks of the 1 million women who have been stalked this year. This is the world that these new lives are being brought into.

As a former rape crisis counselor, I know firsthand the devastation caused by this type of violence. I have been in the emergency room when a raped woman has come in to be treated. I have seen the fear, the shock in these victims who have been so horribly violated. In 1998, forcible rape ranked third for violent crimes reported to law enforcement officials, but that number may be grossly underestimated because, according to the Justice Department, only one-third of all rapes are reported to the authorities.

Over the last 2 years, as I worked to develop stronger antistalking legislation, I have met with the victims of stalking and heard of the damage brought on their lives because of the constant threat from a stalker.

My legislation, which was marked up earlier this week in the Committee on the Judiciary, expands and broadens the definition of stalking to include interstate commerce.

□ 1915

This would include e-mail, telephone, and other forms of interstate communications as a means of stalking. In addition, it also expands the definition of immediate family to include persons who regularly reside with the victim.

During the hearing on this bill, one stalking victim testified about her experiences with cyberstalking. This woman was stalked by three people she had contacted a year earlier to answer an ad for a children's book newsgroup. They were located in New York and claimed to be a literary agency looking for new authors. She called them, sent her proposal, and was asked for money for a reading fee. However, real agents do not charge for reading, editing or other fees. Later, she learned from other on-line writers that this so-called agency was a well-known on-line problem. When writers who actually paid this agency money came to her for help, she contacted the New York attorney general, who opened an investigation. Her stalking came as a retaliation for her part in that investigation.

Stalking comes in all forms. It is not only a physical crime; it is also a psychological crime. For this victim, the psychological harassment ranged from prank phone calls to libelous messages about her being posted on the Internet. Physical threats came, too, for the victim, her family, and her lawyer. In an

attempt to end this harassment and protect themselves, this victim and her husband moved to another State. Once there, they took their name off public records and directories and they have an unlisted phone number. However, this, too, proved futile. The stalking has continued.

Just today alone, approximately 2,750 women will join this tragic sorority of women who have been stalked. Stalking takes many forms. Unfortunately, in this age of technology it has the ability to take on a nameless and faceless electronic form, where the perpetrator has the ability to invade every aspect of life.

I look forward to seeing this legislation come before the House. Violence against women happens in many ways, physical and mental, by strangers and intimates. In this, these crimes share a common bond. And please listen to this: as I leave the House floor this evening, at the end of my 5-minute speech here, one more woman will have been raped.

It is my hope that as a governing body and as a society we will be able to address and work to eliminate these horrible acts of violence. In doing so, we will make this world a safer and a kinder place for those 33 new lives born these last 5 minutes.

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

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

BRING U.S. FUGITIVES HOME TO FACE JUSTICE

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 2-year anniversary of the murder of Sheila Bellush in my Congressional District in Sarasota, Florida. The alleged killer, Jose Luis Del Toro, fled to Mexico, and U.S. authorities spent almost 2 years trying to get him back. I am very pleased and relieved to report that Del Toro was extradited back to the United States on July 12 of this year to stand trial for murder. Even though it was a big relief to get Del Toro back in Sarasota, it was a big disappointment to have been forced by the Mexican government to give assurances that he would not be subject to the death penalty.

Our local prosecutors have dealt with this problem of international flight to avoid prosecution more frequently than the Justice Department wants to admit. The Departments of Justice and State claim that they do not have statistics on extradition cases, even though both Departments play a key role in the extradition process. If statistics were available, I suspect that

the total unresolved cases or denied requests might surpass those that were eventually resolved like Del Toro's.

There is no doubt that when individuals flee across the border, they succeed in evading justice in varying degrees. In the Del Toro case, the suspect was spared the threat of the death penalty. The same can be said of Charles Bradley Price, one of two suspects in the 1997 Oregon killings who murdered two people for "the thrill of it" and then fled to Mexico. When Martin Pang fled from Seattle, Washington, to Brazil in 1995, after setting a fire that killed four firefighters, Brazil would only allow the U.S. to try Pang for arson and not for the four deaths. Francisco Medina is wanted for the murders of at least 17 people in New York, but he is living the high life out of reach in the Dominican Republic. Convicted murderer Ira Einhorn has already extradition for over 18 years now and continues to live comfortably in France. Samuel Sheinbein, who is responsible for a brutal murder only a few miles from here, will walk free from Israel when he is only 33 years old.

Unfortunately, these horrible examples only scratch the surface of this problem. It is our responsibility as Federal legislators to do what we can do to improve our odds of getting these suspects back so our local prosecutors can do their jobs without their hands tied behind their backs. Preventing criminals from escaping justice should be a priority of U.S. foreign policy.

That is why I am here today to introduce the International Extradition Enforcement Act. This bill will hold foreign nations accountable for their level of cooperation with our crime-fighting efforts by placing their foreign assistance in jeopardy if they harbor U.S. fugitives. It will require the administration to produce an annual report on extradition, including the total number of pending extradition cases per country and the details of each case. This report will then be used by the administration to assess the level of cooperation for each country on extradition, and uncooperative countries could lose their foreign aid. My legislation would give the administration the ability to waive this provision if the President deems it to be in the national interest. But Congress would also have the ability to overturn the waiver with a vote.

There are also additional criminal provisions provided in this legislation. This bill would increase the maximum sentence under Federal guidelines for flight to avoid prosecution from 5 years to a maximum of 15 years. And it will make the act of transferring anything of value to someone with the intent to assist that person in resisting extradition to the United States a criminal act subject to a maximum of 10 years in prison.

Dealing with extradition cases such as Jose Luis Del Toro has been one of the most frustrating things I have faced as a Member of Congress. I

learned through the process that the victims, their families, State and local law enforcement and our prosecutors, and even Members of Congress, are helpless to do anything other than to draw attention to their cause.

And the fate of justice lies in the hands of a foreign entity, which often may have no legitimate interest in this case. This is just plain wrong. This is not justice. Every country is entitled to its sovereignty, but when the U.S. is providing a nation with millions or billions of dollars in U.S. aid, I believe we have a right to expect and demand cooperation with law enforcement efforts.

I hope that Congress will pass the International Extradition Enforcement Act next year to improve international cooperation with U.S. law enforcement. We need to ensure that criminals cannot find a safe haven anywhere in the world.

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

(Mr. GOSS 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 Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

TRIBUTE TO WALTER PAYTON

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, although it saddens my heart to stand here before Congress today, it is an honor to pay tribute to one of the greatest football players in the history of the National Football League. Walter Payton, a giant of a man, died November 1, 1999, at the young age of 45. He is survived by his wife, Connie; two children, Jarrett and Brittney; and by his mother, Alyne; a brother, Eddie; and a sister, Pam.

There is a saying that big things come in small packages. This holds true for Walter. Hailing from Columbia, Mississippi, Walter did not play organized football until the 10th grade. It was in Columbia where he began to amaze all who saw him play. In 1970, Walter attended Jackson State University where he began his assault on the NCAA history, becoming the all-time leading scorer, earning a fourth place finish in the Heisman Trophy race in 1974.

I might add that I had the opportunity to see Walter in his many games at Jackson State University. He was, indeed, a breath of fresh air for black college football.

In 1975, Payton was selected by the Chicago Bears as the fourth selection overall. From that point on, Payton began a career that would include many accolades, including his place of honor in Canton, Ohio, at the Pro Football Hall of Fame.

For those who saw him play, you were entertained at every level. Whether it was a run, block, kick, pass or reception, Walter gave you everything at 100 percent. His running style deemed him the nickname "Sweetness," because to see him punish would-be tacklers was definitely a delight. He was a total player, involving himself in every aspect of the game. He was unselfish in his play and always put the team first. It was this unselfish attitude that fueled the Chicago Bears to a Super Bowl Championship in 1985, a fitting award for a well-deserving athlete. In 1987, Payton left the game to pursue other goals. He left the game, but not until setting many records, including the all-time leading rushing record of 16,276 yards, a record that still stands strong to this day.

After his final game, Payton was quoted as saying he played because it was fun, and that he loved to play. Mr. Speaker, the next time we see a football game where a player dives over the pile for the extra yard or a goal line, or when a player breaks free from the pack and high-steps into the end zone, let us take a moment and remember who introduced it to us. Let us take a moment and remember Walter Payton.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE WITH THE PEOPLE'S MONEY

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, there is a constant debate around here in Washington as to what to do with the people's money, and it seems that very often, too often as a matter of fact, there is a dismissal of the notion that the American people deserve tax relief. Right now Congress and the White House are negotiating the appropriations bills that essentially are supposed to prioritize how the American Government spends its money.

Now, Congress has done a great job, I believe, in bringing forward and passing out bills that establish priorities, like strengthening national defense, and trying to stop the raid on Social Security for the first time in years; strengthening education and trying to empower parents, as opposed to just enhancing the bureaucracies and defending the status quo and, in essence, failing our kids. And some important programs, like protecting our environment and giving our military the money and the sources they need to defend our country. But somehow, when it comes to tax relief, it becomes a taboo subject.

We constantly hear, well, the American people do not want tax cuts, so

some claim; or we are giving a tax cut to people who do not deserve it. Well, I would just urge Members here to understand that there are millions of hard-working Americans, and I know this because where I come from, in Staten Island and Brooklyn, I know that there are people working every single day, 6, 7 days a week, sometimes the parents are working two or three jobs, the father is a fireman who works at night, the mother is a teacher who works during the day, and they are juggling responsibilities, who is going to watch the kids, and they just want to put a little money aside to buy a washing machine or to buy the kids' clothes for school, or to save a little money for their education or perhaps a great treat like going away on vacation. But somehow, when we have the opportunity to send some of the money back to them, there are those here who say, oh no, they do not deserve it.

Well, I suggest strongly that we stand for tax relief for the American people. Yes, we should fund the priorities for the American Government and the American people; we should fund things like our defense and education and protecting our environment, and keeping our hands off Social Security and protecting and strengthening Medicare.

□ 1930

But why can we not cut taxes? For years I heard when I was not in Congress that, well, we are facing a deficit and we cannot afford to cut taxes. Now we hear, well, we are going to face a surplus and we cannot afford to cut taxes. Well, if we cannot do it when we have a deficit and we cannot do it when we have a surplus, when can we?

I suggest that we put our faith in the American people, put our faith in their spirit and their ingenuity and their creativity to go out there and provide incentives to work hard, put a little more money in savings, put a little more money back in investment not only in themselves and their family but in their neighborhoods in this country.

Just look at Erie County in upstate New York. A 12-year incumbent who ran on a platform of he was going to spend more and more of the people's money, as opposed to the Republican candidate who said, you know what, you work too hard. I am going to run primarily on one issue. I am going to run on a 30 percent tax cut. Well, no surprise. He won handily.

I again submit to the Members of this body, and I believe I speak for the vast majority of Americans, is the American people deserve tax relief. If we truly believe in the notions of personal freedom and individual liberty and if we want to instill in our children a sense that if they work hard in this country and they go to school and do the right thing and work and do the right thing in their community and they are able to give back and invest not only in themselves but again in

their community and their family, that they will benefit and our country will be richer and better for it.

But, instead, we are constantly bargained by those who say, huh-uh, you do not know how to spend your money wisely, the American people.

In fact, we hear about these bills that come through and they are vetoed, as another one was vetoed today by the White House, and we heard recently the litany of reasons why. Why? Because it does not spend enough money.

Well, where is that money coming from? The cherry trees here in Washington only bloom once a year. They do not bloom every day with money. I would just hope that the people of reason and common sense would understand that the American people work too hard for their money. They deserve more of it back.

TRIBUTE TO FAMILY AND LOVED ONES OF EGYPTAIR FLIGHT 990

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, this evening I stand before my colleagues with a heavy heart in the wake of the EgyptAir Flight 990 tragedy. The unsettling news of the plane crash struck a particular cord within me, as several of the passengers on that flight were in some way connected to my home district in Baltimore.

Arthur and Marie Simermeyer were both active and upstanding seniors who were citizens of my home district and were on that plane. They volunteered at the Sacred Heart Roman Catholic Church in Glyndon and were described by family and friends as having a kind and giving nature that was surpassed only by their love of life even in their elder years.

These were people who made positive contributions to the community and helped keep the neighborly spirit, which can sometimes be rare, very much alive among those who knew them. Yes, this tragedy was indeed a major loss. But the Simermeyers were special people who gave to a special location.

We also had some students that were killed in the EgyptAir flight. They were exchange students from Egypt. As I thought of the situation over in my head repeatedly, I searched for an answer, a positive amidst the sea of disaster and despair, any silver lining that would help me and others feeling the pain of this tragedy pass this deep and dark cloud. Then I realized that, just as there is a lesson in everything, there is something that we all can take away from this unfortunate occurrence.

We can all at some point identify with the loss of a loved one, a friend, or a dear community member. Still, just as we here in the United States grieve over the death of those Americans on

Flight 990, we must remember those teenagers returning home and show our support to the Egyptian communities that mourn their deaths as well.

This is an important opportunity for the strength and support from one person to another to transcend ethnic, racial, and national boundaries. This is the time where we must come together across international lines and show our sympathy and compassion as we all share in the unexplainable loss of good and innocent people.

Just as pain knows no color, country, or social class, support, compassion, and comfort should not know the difference between nations, either. Just as we mourn the loss of the Simermeyers and the other passengers on that flight, our hearts and prayers are also with the families and friends of those Egyptians who also perished in this tragedy.

We must seize this opportunity before us and learn the lesson that we must all come together to help each other cope with the results of disaster.

As I close, I feel compelled to focus on the newly developed friendship between a Baltimore teen, Shantell Rose, and Walaa Zeid of Egypt. The two had been inseparable as they lived, studied, shopped, and played together for 2 weeks as a part of the exchange program. At the end of this precious time, Shantell stated that, as they parted, they said, "I love you." In describing this experience, she said that they had started a relationship that will last for decades and cross continents.

I say to Shantell Rose, other students, and to all the loved ones of those that have departed us in this tragedy that the journey of life takes us through many times of happiness and sadness. We remember the happy times as the most loved and enriching experiences of all. Although the sad times do not outwardly appear to benefit us, they are, in reality, what builds strength and character in all of us.

Remember that our relationships will still last decades and the new relationships that Americans and Egyptian families will make will continue across the continents. These relationships will build your strength and character and allow you to say these simple words: Do not cry for me, for the time we shared will always be.

THE CUBA PROGRAM: TORTURING OF AMERICAN POW'S BY CASTRO AGENTS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) for convening tomorrow's hearing on the Committee on International Relations on "The Cuba Program: The Torturing of American POWs by Castro Agents," and for his ongoing leadership and commitment to veterans' issues.

This issue is particularly important to me for various reasons. But, more importantly, as I read through the accounts of what our men and women in uniform have endured through this century of war, I think of my husband, Dexter Lehtinen, who served in the special forces in Vietnam and was injured in combat. He was relatively fortunate, but so many of his colleagues were not.

The Geneva Convention prohibits "violence to life and person, in particular murders of all kinds, mutilation, cruel treatment and torture" and "outrages upon personal dignity, in particular humiliating and degrading treatment."

This is exactly what took place in a prison camp in North Vietnam known as "The Zoo," seen here in a declassified photo, the site where 19 of our U.S. military officers were tortured.

During the period of August 1967 to August 1968, 19 of our courageous servicemen were psychologically tortured, some brutally beaten, by interrogators assessed to be Cuban agents working under orders from Hanoi and Havana.

Described by some to be a psychological experiment, the goals of The Cuba Program, as the torture project has been labeled by our Defense Department and by our intelligence agencies, has been described in different ways as an attempt to test interrogation methods, to obtain absolute compliance and submission to captor demands, or ultimately to be used as a propaganda tool by the international Communist effort, as Mike Bengé will elaborate upon during tomorrow's congressional hearing.

Some POWs were tortured and then instructed to write a series of questions and answers given to them by their interrogators. These scripts on most occasions included statements declaring that the United States was waging an illegal, immoral, and unjust war. Prisoners were tortured, again some psychologically and others physically, to ensure cooperation in appearances they were forced to make before visiting dignitaries. Refusal to comply with the captors' commands usually meant that Fidel, Chico, and Poncho, as the torturers were called by the POWs, would be called in for intense beatings of the prisoners.

The ruthless nature of the interrogators and the severity of their actions led prisoners such as Captain Raymond Vohden, Colonel Jack Bomar, and Lieutenant Carpenter to question how human beings could so brutally batter another human being.

Captain Vohden and Colonel Bomar will offer compelling and detailed testimony to us tomorrow, describing the heinous acts committed against them by Cuban agents at The Zoo, acts which are in direct violation of the Geneva Convention on Prisoners of War.

Survivors of The Cuba Program have been eager to identify and trace the Cuban agents who systematically interrogated them and tortured their fel-

low Americans. Yet, despite their efforts, a successful resolution of this matter has not been achieved. We hope that tomorrow's hearing will be the first of many steps aimed at changing that outcome.

The first is to get leads that could take us closer to an identification of the Cuban torturers.

Our second goal is to provide the basis for an ensuing interagency investigation of the new evidence that has been uncovered, including a search for pertinent data and sources previously unavailable under the Cold War parameters.

We want our State Department, the CIA, the FBI, INS, and the Defense Intelligence Agency to coordinate a comprehensive approach to this case.

Lastly, this hearing will begin to establish the foundation for future action against the torturers. On a broader scale, this investigation will serve to highlight the brutal nature of the Castro regime and the historic and ongoing threat that it poses to the American people.

Ultimately, our hope is that tomorrow's hearing will serve to honor those POWs, and I will show my colleagues a poster that has their picture, 9 of the 19 who were involved in The Cuba Program. We hope that tomorrow's hearing will serve to honor these POWs, who were willing to give life and limb so that we may all be free. We will honor them by finding out the truth about Castro's participation in Vietnam known as The Cuba Program.

CURRENT EVENTS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today in a hearing before the full Committee on Resources we discussed the President's proposal to lock up some 40 million acres of our national forests.

I am sure this sounds good to some. But what it mainly will do is drive up prices on houses and everything else that is made from wood, and it will destroy jobs.

So if my colleagues want to hurt poor and working people by driving up prices and destroying jobs, then they should support this proposal to lock up our national forests.

In the 1980s, the Congress passed what was then thought to be a very strong environmental statement that we should not cut more than 80 percent of the new growth in our national forests.

Today we have reduced logging down to less than one-seventh, less than 14 percent of the new growth. Today we are not even cutting half the number of dead and dying trees each year.

This is causing so much fuel buildup that the Forest Service tells us now that 39 million acres are in great risk of burning. Actually, we need to cut some trees to have healthy forests. And

we are not even coming close to doing that.

Today, in my part of the country, the Forest Service says that only .02 percent of the trees in the Cherokee National Forest is being harvested annually, two-tenths of one percent. Yet, the July-August issue of the Sierra Club magazine said that the Cherokee is being logged at a "furious pace."

Much of the environmental movement has been taken over by extremists. Some are putting out very false or very distorted or very exaggerated information because they know they have to scare people to keep their big contributions coming in. Many of these environmental extremists are wealthy or upper-income people who simply do not realize how much some of what they advocate hurts the poor and working people.

Also, some of this environmental extremism is financed by extremely big business because they know the stringent rules and regulations and red tape about the environment drives the small farmers and small businesses out. Thus, the big guys have less bothersome competition to deal with.

Which brings me to my second topic, the Kyoto agreement.

□ 1945

I read in one of the nonpartisan congressional publications this week that the administration knows it cannot get the Senate to ratify the Kyoto Agreement, so it is trying to get it enacted through the back door. This report said that Federal agencies hope to build big business support for Kyoto by giving favorable treatment on regulations, contracts and so forth to businesses that will voluntarily comply in advance. Then they believe these big businesses would then lobby the Senate for the agreement in order to force everyone else to comply.

Many people around the world and some rich socialists in this country think it is unfair that with just 5 percent of the world's population, the U.S. consumes about 25 percent of the world's goods. This is really what was behind the Kyoto Agreement. The administration was apparently so eager to say that an agreement had been reached that it approved a very bad deal. The Senate passed a resolution 95-0 saying that if an agreement was reached in Kyoto, it should apply to all countries and should not harm the U.S. economy. This agreement exempts 129 of 173 countries including China and Mexico. The Global Climate Information Project says: "So while the U.S. cuts energy use by more than 30 percent, most U.N. countries get a free ride. Because U.S. energy prices will rise, American products could be more expensive at home and less competitive overseas. That will slow down our economic growth and cost American jobs. All for a treaty that will produce little or no environmental benefit."

One thing it would do for sure is speed up the transfer of wealth and

jobs from this Nation to underdeveloped countries. Unless we want to make our constituents' jobs even less secure and force them to cut their energy use by 30 percent or more, we had better oppose the Kyoto Agreement.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in talking about big business and big money in politics and government today, let me briefly mention campaign finance reform. This administration has done more to get around or flout or violate our campaign finance laws than any in history. Over 90 people pled the fifth or even fled the country to avoid testifying in the various campaign finance investigations. It is ironic that some of the leaders who are the loudest in support of campaign finance reform are some of the biggest violators of our present campaign finance laws.

What people should think about, Mr. Speaker, is that when the Federal Government was small, we did not have all this trouble with big money influencing politics and political decisions. If we really want to remove the influence of big money and big business in government today, then the best way to do so is to downsize the Federal Government and decrease its costs. Big government liberals who always say they are for the little guy have done more to help extremely big business than any conservative ever dreamed of doing. It is no accident that the bigger our Federal Government has become, the harder it has become for small businesses and small farmers to survive, and the more the gap between the rich and the poor has grown.

SALUTE TO WBSL DJ DR. BOB LEE: MAKING A DIFFERENCE IN THE LIVES OF YOUNG PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about Dr. Bob Lee of WBSL, a man that is really making a difference. When young people hear his name and when they come in contact with him, they get excited. He has been with WBSL for 20 years doing this. I think that the board of education and people that are in education should really take note of the fact that this man has the way to motivate young people, to get them to get up in the morning and go to school and, of course, he has been doing this and doing it so well.

So being as he is doing it so well, it seems to me that educators some way or another should sit down with him, have a summit and talk about how he is able to get the young people involved in a positive kind of way. When I think about the things that he is doing, it bothers me that we do not highlight it enough, because when something negative is going on, we readily will talk about it. When something bad is going on, we will get it throughout the city,

get it throughout the town in no time flat. But when something positive is going on, we have difficulty getting that message around.

Dr. Bob Lee is doing something positive. Of course, when you have a high dropout rate, he is able to go into those areas, talk to the kids, motivate them and get them to return to school. When they are not doing well in school, he is able to sort of talk to them and sort of get them involved in a very positive kind of way, get them to know how important it is to do their homework. So if he is able to do this on such a small scale, it seems to me that we should be able to capitalize on his skills throughout this Nation.

I am hoping that those that are in education are listening tonight, that will be able to go and to sit down with him and to find out how he is doing it and, of course, encourage him to do more. I think that one way to do that would be to expand it by funding the program of some sort and to be able to get the word out to people.

I would like to say tonight, I salute Dr. Bob Lee for the outstanding work that he is doing. I have watched him on various talk shows when he has been on to talk about how he feels about working with young people and how important he thinks it is. Just recently, we had a toy gun turn-in drive and Dr. Bob Lee got involved in that. Of course, we were having trouble on getting the media, but when he got involved in it, of course, people began to respond, because they recognized the fact that it is a very serious issue. And toy guns, as you know, is something that we need to deal with, because many of our young people are getting killed because of toy guns.

In my own district, we have had several youngsters to be killed because they had a toy gun. We have had youngsters to be shot. But Dr. Bob Lee has been working with us in terms of getting this message out to adults, letting them know that toy guns is something that you should not buy for your son or your daughter. I think that this is the kind of message that we have to send, because even the police department, they are saying that toy guns are very dangerous because they are saying that if it looks like a gun, as far as they are concerned, it is a gun. And I think that we do not expect them to stop and interview somebody as to whether or not the gun is real. If it looks like a gun, as far as the police department is concerned, it is a gun.

I want to thank Dr. Bob Lee and all those people out there helping to make certain that we get the message across to people that toy guns are not something that our young people should have and that people should not purchase them for them. It is not the kind of toy that you want to give. Give an educational toy, give something that is going to bring about life, give something that is going to encourage people to be able to grow and to develop, not to give them something that they will

probably get killed because they have it.

I would like to salute him tonight and to say, Dr. Bob Lee, we applaud you for the outstanding job that you are doing on behalf of the young people in this Nation and we hope that you will be able to continue to expand it as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. BIGGERT addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. METCALF 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 Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATIVE AGEN- DA HELD HOSTAGE BY DO-NOTH- ING/DO-WRONG REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are joining me tonight because we really want to make the point before this Congress adjourns for the recess over the next couple of weeks that it really has been a very unproductive session because of the Republican leadership's lack of an agenda, or perhaps because they have the wrong agenda. Many of us know that at some point over the next week or perhaps 2 weeks when the appropriations bills are finally completed that the Congress will adjourn, probably until sometime in January. But this has been a terribly unproductive session.

The Democrats want Congress to get to work on the real priorities for middle-class families, priorities the Republican leadership has once again ignored in favor of the needs of special interests. Democrats want to get the job done this year. We do not want to wait until the next year, the next session of Congress, and have another year of unfinished business, because that is simply unacceptable. Democrats still believe that we can get action on an agenda that matters. I wanted to talk briefly if I could, to mention some of the major priorities that the Democrats have put forward in this Congress

that the Republicans have either refused to act on or have sent off to conference between the Senate and the House where they have essentially been buried because the conference has never met or in some cases the conferees have not even been appointed.

What we have done to sort of highlight the number of important issues, if you will, that are part of the Democratic agenda that have not been addressed by the Republican leadership is to put some of those major issues, if you will, on tombstones to sort of highlight the fact that they are resting in peace rather than being accomplished in this session of the Congress. I just want to point to a few of them and then I would like to yield to some of my colleagues to talk a little more about some of these issues.

The first one and the most important for me is the Patients' Bill of Rights. That was killed by the GOP, in this year, 1999. I think you may know that today, the Republicans finally appointed conferees on the Patients' Bill of Rights, but there has been no indication that the conference is actually going to meet and we have had this one basically hanging around for several years, where the Republicans fooled around, tried to load down the Patients' Bill of Rights with whatever kind of poison pills, if you will, imaginable to make sure that it never passed, and then when it finally did pass over their protests a few weeks ago, they are still stalling by either not appointing the conferees or having the conference actually not meet.

The Patients' Bill of Rights is in my opinion the most important legislative priority, the one that my constituents talk about the most, because they are worried that if they are in an HMO or a managed care organization, that oftentimes they cannot get quality care or they cannot get the kind of care they want because they are denied an operation, they are denied a particular procedure, they are denied a length of stay in the hospital, because basically the insurance company decides that they should not get it.

The other priority, and this one is just as important, the other priority that the Republicans have buried, again resting in peace, is the Medicare drug benefit. The President in his State of the Union address earlier in this year basically pointed out that the cost of prescription drugs for seniors is skyrocketing, many of them cannot afford it, many of them do not have prescription drug coverage as part of certain Medicare, even if they do have it in some cases if they are in an HMO or part of their MediGap insurance, and so far the Republicans have refused to even address this one at all. Democrats keep talking about it as an important priority for America's seniors. It is not being addressed by the Republican Congress.

Another one, I hate to even mention this in the context of a tombstone because we know in fact that many

Americans, including young Americans, have actually been killed because of the neglect to deal with gun safety issues. Mr. Speaker, several months ago we tried here on the floor of the House of Representatives to pass gun safety legislation. We were able to get a few things passed, but essentially because of the Republican inaction, the major priorities are still not addressed, and certainly nothing has been done in conference to address the gun safety issue. Every day that goes by, we hear about more Americans being killed, more Americans being maimed, and yet the gun safety issue remains unaddressed, killed by the GOP in 1999. It is resting in peace as well.

And then also, a major issue which again has been hanging around here for several years, the Democrats have demanded campaign finance reform. We know that our constituents want it, the editorial writers talk about campaign finance reform because we know that what is happening now is that so much soft money, corporate money, if you will, not individual money, is being used either to finance campaigns through the political parties or through independent expenditures, that the reality is that the campaign finance system has fallen apart, and there is no accountability, no disclosure anymore of the soft money that is being used. Well, we passed the Shays-Meehan bill finally a couple of months ago but again there has been no conference, there has been no action between the House and the Senate by the Republican majority.

There are a few more issues, and I am not going to go into all of them, but I did want to mention a few more if I could. Very important, the President a couple of years ago talked about the need to have Federal dollars go back to school districts to hire 100,000 new teachers in the elementary grades in order to try to reduce class size, because we know that if you reduce class size, it has a real beneficial impact on students', in the younger years in particular, ability to learn. We know that in this Congress again the Republicans are willing to provide some money for education but not to give back to the town specifically to hire more teachers. Again, I hear from my own constituents how important that is. Not addressed by this Republican Congress. That one rests in peace as well.

And finally, the Republicans have made a lot of noise about how they want to give tax breaks, but the tax breaks are all for wealthy individuals. They passed a trillion-dollar, almost a trillion-dollar tax break, primarily for wealthy people, for the corporations, for special interests, but we as Democrats are saying, look, we need tax relief but we would like it to be targeted tax relief, that helps the average working person, that is actually used, if you will, to allow people to send their kids to college, to help with their education, higher education expenses, to provide, if you will, for day care in

some cases through tax credits or tax deductions. But, no, the Republicans insist on the trillion-dollar tax break plan primarily for the wealthy and the special interests. They will not provide the targeted tax relief that will help working families and the average American. That again is resting in peace, killed by the GOP leadership, the GOP Congress in this year, 1999.

Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to poke fun at this issue, I think these issues are very important, they are part of the Democratic agenda, they would be, I think, a part of the Republican agenda if only they would understand that this is what the American people want. But the Republican leadership refuses to address the concerns of the American people and instead they just want to pull their own priorities, their own agenda, which is primarily a major tax break, if you will, for wealthy Americans and for the large corporate interests.

I would like to yield now, if I could, to some of my colleagues to talk a little more about this do-nothing Congress and this Congress that with the Republicans in charge essentially has the wrong agenda. I yield now to the gentleman from New York.

□ 2000

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE). I also want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) as well as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for this evening's address. Few have done as much to express the frustration that we are feeling on this side of the aisle as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) has so readily done on a weekly and daily basis here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage and my disappointment as a freshman Member of this House with the actions, or should I say, the inaction of this body.

Mr. Speaker, we are more than two-thirds of the way through this session, and the Republican-led Congress has had no major accomplishments. This is despite the efforts from within their own party and by Democrats, working together, to pass meaningful HMO reform, school construction legislation, and even a minimum wage bill. Instead, the Republican leadership has been playing games with the budget, giving tax cuts to the wealthiest 1 percent of the people in this country and their special interest friends, blocking meaningful attempts at gun safety legislation and taking money away from class size reduction and new teacher initiatives.

As a freshman, I arrived last January prepared for action, and believed that with GOP promises of less partisanship that we could all work together to help the American people. Yet the last 10 months have been partisan and without any intelligible agenda. Instead, the special interests and their whims have

dominated, leaving the American people out in the cold.

Rather than passing a meaningful tax bill, complete with estate tax and marriage penalty changes and modest tax cuts, the Republican leadership pushed through a tax package that benefited only the wealthy and corporate special interests, almost \$1 trillion to the wealthiest in this country. In fact, if you are not in the top 1 percent of wage earners, the tax cuts would not mean anything to you, or very, very little. Now, maybe all the constituents in Republican districts make that kind of money, but the working class people in districts like mine do not.

Why not provide a family of four living in a place like New York City, a high cost place like New York City, in the Bronx, in Queens, in my district, earning \$40,000 annually, some tax relief? What is wrong with that? Well, it is probably because they will not be contributing to the Republican leadership's political action committee this year, or next year.

What about our Patients' Bill of Rights? We finally voted today on a motion to go to conference on the bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights. It has been 4 weeks since the House passed by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 275 to 151 the Norwood-Dingell bill. The Senate appointed conferees back on October 15, and yet it is only today, November 2, that the House GOP leadership is finally bringing up a motion to go to conference. As far as I can see, this delay strategy by the GOP leadership is their attempt to stop the momentum that was obtained by very strong bipartisan vote in favor of the Norwood-Dingell HMO reform bill.

Mr. Speaker, why are we stopping what Members of your party want, what the American people overwhelmingly want? Why are we stopping it? We cannot even get on the runway or get off the charts a prescription drug bill to reduce the cost of prescription drugs to our senior population.

Let me tell you a story that I heard recently. I received a letter from two constituents, Mr. and Mrs. Done and Gertrude Schwartz of Long Island City in Queens. He is 89 and she is 84 years of age. Recently he went to have a prescription filled for his wife. He bought 100 tablets of Prilosec, an extremely popular drug among our seniors. It cost him \$394.89, \$394 for 100 tablets of a vitally needed prescription.

People are making life and death decisions as to whether they will pay the rent, buy needed groceries, or skip a day of taking a needed prescription drug, or simply not buying the prescription drug at all, and we are here in Congress doing nothing, as far as I can see, to help them.

Then there is the budget debacle. We are 34 days into a new fiscal year, and still we do not have a budget. What is the Republican solution? To send the exact same D.C. appropriations bill that we have seen vetoed twice to the

floor again today, without removing the riders that caused the vetoes in the first place. It makes absolutely no sense to me.

The Republican leadership did not even bring to the floor the labor-HHS appropriations bill for a debate. They went straight to conference without any Democrats represented at all at any point in time.

But, having said all I have said, it is education that is most troubling to me. We passed ED-FLEX, which impacts the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, before we even considered ESEA reauthorization. Then the Republican breakup of ESEA into pieces, passing the flawed Teacher Empowerment Act, and I want you to know this was not supported by one, not one teachers organization, we just passed a dramatically underfunded Title I bill.

When crafting tax packages the Republican majority will not even consider adding school construction assistance, even though our deteriorating school infrastructure and classroom overcrowding is a national crisis.

Then we have Social Security. Republicans say they want to save Social Security. Well, we will just go back to history a little bit here. Back in 1935, in the early thirties, nearly 40 percent of Americans were dying in poverty. It was a Democratic-led Congress and a Democratic President who signed into law the current Social Security system, this despite fierce opposition from the Republican Party. In fact, all but one Republican in the House voted for a motion to recommit Title II of the bill to conference, and would have thereby struck the Social Security Act and killed Social Security as we know it today, only one Republican in that entire conference.

Now we are to expect that the Republicans are going to protect and save Social Security, something they never wanted in the first place. In fact, let me just show you some of the comments made by majority leader DICK ARMEY when he ran for Congress proposing to abolish the Social Security system.

"Ultra-conservative economics professor DICK ARMEY, who has based his campaign on his support for the abolishment of Social Security, the Federal minimum wage law, the corporate income tax and the Federal aid to education." That is from United Press International, October 31, 1984.

Again we see Mr. ARMEY in 1984 said that Social Security was "a bad retirement and a rotten trick on the American people." He continued, "I think we are going to have to bite the bullet on Social Security and phase it out over a period of time."

See, that is the Republican side of this issue. They never wanted it in the first place. I do not see how we can expect them to save it.

Mr. Speaker, the American people do not want this. They do not want a partisan Congress living up to its do-nothing billing. I urge you to work with the

President and the Democratic leadership to craft budget bills we can all support. I implore you to let the majority rule and move the bipartisan Norwood-Dingell bill on to the President unchanged.

Finally, I want to invite you to come to my district and tell the students that are being taught in closets, in hallways, tell the children in kindergarten classes with 60 kids and two teachers, tell those children, going to school in buildings that are still burning coal, that they do not need to have school modernization provisions added to any tax bill.

Now, I know there are very decent people on the Republican side of the aisle. I have had the pleasure to work with so many of them in this, my first term in Congress, and I can call many of them my friends. But I am not giving up on the rest of you either. But we need to work together. We need to end the partisanship and do what is right for the American people, and do what is right for the American people today, not tomorrow, not next week, not next year.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman from New York for the statements that he made. Essentially the gentleman is pointing out what we have been saying, which is that here we are, I guess it is over a month since October 1, which was when the new fiscal year was supposed to begin, and we are just basically staying here while we watch the Republicans try in some fashion to put together a budget. But it is virtually impossible for them to do so, because essentially their priorities are off base.

Unfortunately, while we wait here, they do not move on this agenda, which we think is important, the Patients' Bill of Rights, trying to come up with a Medicare drug benefit, the education initiatives that the gentleman mentioned.

I just wanted to point out very briefly, because I would like to introduce another one of my colleagues, this is from a summary that was put together today that when Speaker HASTERT started the year he made three promises in regards to the budget. One, he said that the Republican Congress would pass the budget on time, stay within the spending caps, and do it all without spending Social Security.

They have failed on each one of these counts.

Mr. HOLT. Strike three.

Mr. PALLONE. Exactly, strike three. We are now four weeks past the budget deadline, which was October 1. It is now November 3rd. Even the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, said this morning, and this is from The Los Angeles times, that the Republicans had not stayed within the budget caps, and both the Congressional Budget Office and the OMB have reached the same conclusion, that Republicans are spending as much as \$17 billion into the Social Security surplus. None of these

promises have been kept, and we are still here.

I yield to my colleague from my neighboring district in New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), and I am pleased to be here with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and my colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

You know, when the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and I and the other freshmen Members of Congress in both parties arrived here, we thought perhaps there would be less partisanship than we had seen in the preceding years here in Congress. As the gentleman may recall, the previous Speaker left following a less than stellar performance in the last election, and we find now, unfortunately, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) was saying, that partisanship did not depart with the previous Speaker.

We end up with important legislation that the public wants, and the gentleman has been through it with your tombstone illustrations, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) has repeated these. These are things that people want, Americans of both parties, Republicans and Democrats, and, in fact, I would say many of the moderate Democrats with whom we serve here in the House of Representatives and many of the moderate Republicans with whom we serve here in the House of Representatives. But the leadership that controls the agenda of the House will not let these come up.

We are, by most accounts, nearly done with the first session of Congress and the leadership is now preparing to adjourn for the year without having done these things that the Americans say are important, that I hear about in my district in New Jersey: Campaign finance reform, gun safety. You know, they think maybe the public will not notice that we have not dealt with gun safety because they scheduled it so the votes would occur in the middle of the night, but my constituents notice that it has not been dealt with.

The Patients' Bill of Rights. Well, yes, we passed it by a large majority here in the House, but the leadership, again, who control the schedule of these things, weeks later are only beginning to get around to the conference that would be necessary for this to actually become law.

□ 2015

A Medicare prescription drug benefit, nowhere to be seen; the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, not ready yet; school construction, school construction assistance, that so many school districts in urban areas, in fast-growing suburban areas, really all over the country need, and the smaller class size and more teachers, more well-trained teachers, nowhere; paying our obligation to the United Nations, I hear about that from my constituents, not done.

Among all these priorities left untouched is social security, so let me touch on that for a minute. Protecting social security I think should be our first priority. The President, in his State of the Union addresses this year and the previous year said, save social security first.

Protecting social security is so important to me that the first bill I brought to a vote here on the floor of the House of Representatives was the social security and Medicare Lockbox Act of 1999. This bill would have preserved social security and Medicare. It would have forced us to deal with this issue.

The first speech that I gave on the floor of the House even before that was about the need to protect social security. I even voted for the bipartisan lockbox legislation to preserve social security, which did eventually pass the House, but really went nowhere because the leadership was too busy concocting an \$800 billion tax cut.

So throughout the past several months I have served on the bipartisan Social Security Task Force. I must say that preparing for the retirement of the baby boom generation looms as one of the Nation's challenges. I am very disappointed by the lack of commitment in finding a long-term solution.

When social security was passed in 1935, as my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) points out, to be old was usually to be destitute. Social security has changed that. Social security has worked. People in the U.S. believe that it is of fundamental value to help workers save for retirement.

But the leadership has not shored up social security. Instead, like magicians engaging in misdirection, they have instead accused the Democrats in the press and in paid political advertisements that we, we in the minority, are spending social security.

Not only have they not gotten around to this central problem, but they spent so much of this year developing this exorbitant scheme to spend money that we do not even have and may never have; in other words, a scheme that would in fact take us into spending social security funds.

In fact, they are already spending social security funds by virtue of the fact that they have failed to complete the appropriations for the current fiscal year by the end of the month of September, as they had promised and as is expected. So in fact they are spending at last year's rate, which means they are exceeding this year's caps.

So what are we going to do about social security? Social security pays benefits to more than 4.7 million disabled workers. Because about 25 to 30 percent of today's 20-year-olds will become disabled sometime before retirement, the protection provided by the SSDI program is extremely important.

Today nearly every wage-earner now pays into the social security system. We have to assure them that this is a

sound investment. We do not have to ask a retiree if social security is a good program, they know it is. They want it preserved. We need to reassure the younger workers that this is such a good program for them. Younger workers are skeptical.

The fact remains that few of today's young workers are likely to have enough personal savings or private pension benefits to support themselves in the appropriate style after their retirement. Like the current generation of elderly, they will be heavily dependent on social security. It is incumbent on us to deal with that.

Social security is the most successful program of government in the United States in the 21st century. We must not forget that it provides vitally important protections for American seniors. The majority of workers have no pension coverage other than social security, and more than 60 percent of seniors depend on social security for the bulk of their livelihood.

This is just one of the many priorities that this Congress has failed to deal with in this session, which is rapidly approaching the close. I do not know what more we can do except say, as my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and others of us have said night after night, these are important issues, let us deal with them. Let us deal with them in a bipartisan manner. What more can we do?

Mr. PALLONE. We can only do what we are doing now, which is to speak out and tell our colleagues and tell the American people what is really going on here. What is really going on here, again, is the wrong agenda. The only agenda that I see that the Republican leadership has is tax cuts for wealthy Americans and for corporations and special interests.

Every proposal that the gentleman and our other colleagues here tonight have put forward as part of the Democratic agenda, and I hesitate to even call it a Democratic agenda, because as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) said, it is really the American people's agenda. It should be a bipartisan agenda, and we even have some colleagues on the Republican side who have supported some of these initiatives, like the Patients' Bill of Rights.

But the Republican leadership, because they are so dependent, if you will, on special interests, refuse to let any of these bills come up; or if they come up, they basically try to load them up with all kinds of poison pills or kill them in conference, use all kind of procedural techniques to kill them.

I appreciate the fact that the gentleman did bring up the social security again, because I know, when I am back in my district in New Jersey, I know they have those radio ads on basically accusing the gentleman of using the social security surplus, which is a total lie.

In fact, what they have done is what they accuse the gentleman of, which is,

they have spent \$17 billion into the social security surplus already. That comes from the Congressional Budget Office and the OMB. How could it be more clear? I have never in my entire life seen a political party or leadership actually put on ad accusing their opponents of doing what it is documented they are doing themselves.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, it is what magicians learn in their early courses of misdirection. If they have their hand in the cookie jar, point to the other person and accuse them of engaging in thievery or lockpicking, or whatever it is that they are accusing us of.

It is preposterous, insulting, and insulting to the American people.

Mr. PALLONE. It really is insulting, I agree with the gentleman. I appreciate that he brought that out.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate him for putting together this special order now. I also thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT). I really appreciate the gentlemen. They are new Members, and they bring a lot of enthusiasm to the job, and a good, practical approach to government. We really need that in this body at times.

I think it is very unfair how the Republican majority are running ads against the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) on spending social security, yet he is the person who came up with the social security lockbox idea so that we cannot spend social security; the gentleman is absolutely right, like the cookie jar thing where they point at you while they are sticking their hand in the cookie jar, taking \$17 billion from the social security surplus to try to pay for this faltering budget that they have put forward.

All the colleagues who join us here were here in November, and quite frankly, the Republican-led Congress has done very little. They have passed 13 appropriation bills, knowing five of them are going to be vetoed. So the appropriation bills languish, and the needs of the American people. And the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is right, it is not a Democratic agenda, but the needs of the American people are not being met, are not being met at all.

The Republicans have spent a year trying to convince the American people that they need this \$792 billion tax cut, which would benefit the wealthiest Americans. But America saw through that. They said, put the money to pay the debt and strengthen social security. Do not give this money in a tax break. Do not raid our social security. They rejected it.

Did they understand that? No. Look at this, Congress Daily, Wednesday, November 3: "Hastert Pledges New Tax Cut Push." It is here. He is going to push another tax cut.

How is he going to pay for it? We do not have enough money to pay for the current appropriation bills. There is \$17 billion taken out of social security to pay for the current budget, and we are not even done with it. While they are spending that, now they want another new tax cut push. This is Congress Daily, nothing we made up. This is what we get every day. Sure enough, they are going to push another big tax break to benefit the wealthy.

How are we going to pay for it? Back to raiding social security? Why do they not accept the gentleman's proposal and do a lockbox? Why do they not take those false ads off the air and thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for putting on the lockbox, for saving the social security surplus so the Republicans cannot use it for tax breaks.

Mr. Speaker, as we take a look at it, they have had the wrong priorities. They have tried to use gimmicks to pass the budget. I remember about 6 months ago, as we got toward the October 1 deadline, they came up with this great idea, let us call it the 13th month, the 13th month. We all know there are 12 months in the calendar, but they want to create a 13th month. That way they can stay within the budget caps by creating this fictitious 13th month. Sometime, somewhere, we have to pay for that 13th month.

So I am proud of Democrats standing up and saying, we are not going to accept that gimmick. Take away the 13th month.

Then they said, let us declare everything an emergency, everything we do not have money for. If we declare an emergency, we do not have to stay within the budget caps. Let us declare an emergency things like the Census. We have to count the American people. It is in our Constitution for over 200 years. Every 10 years we count the American people. It is 2000, the 2000 budget, and we have to count the American people.

Well, we will declare that an emergency. That way we can spend money, spend the social security trust fund and not have to declare it as part of our budget.

My colleagues are right, this GOP Congress is really the do-wrong Congress, not do-nothing. What they do, they do it wrong. It is a do-wrong Congress, instead of listening to the American people and working on the programs that would cost very little and really would improve the lives of the American people, like a real Patients' Bill of Rights, so Americans and their doctors would make medical decisions, and not the insurance companies and HMOs; like increasing the minimum wage, since we have this robust economy. Why cannot those who are struggling to get by enjoy the strong national economy by increasing the minimum wage?

Or how about 100,000 more teachers, 100,000 more teachers, and we can have smaller class sizes, so students who are

most at risk can get a helping hand to learn, so we can bring some discipline back into the classroom? Why not?

Why not, I would ask, Mr. Speaker, why should we not enforce all the gun laws that are on the books, and do background checks on every commercial sale of a gun, even those at gun shows? Let us treat everyone the same. No more excuses, no more exceptions. We should be working for the American people.

Unfortunately, the Republican-led Congress has the same old song: more tax breaks here for the wealthy and more tax on government.

What America wants us to do, they want a Congress that will work for them, like the plans that the Democrats are fighting for: 100,000 teachers that we need for smaller classrooms; 50,000 more police officers in the Cops II program that we have all fought for, and we see it works across this great Nation; a real Patients' Bill of Rights.

We need to protect our environment, and we have to provide prescription drug coverage for our seniors. That is not asking too much. We can pay for it, and it is paid for without busting the budget or raiding social security.

We have talked about HMO reform and a real Patients' Bill of Rights. We passed it here by an overwhelming bipartisan vote, 275 to 151. So what do we do today? Appoint conferees. Who appoints conferees? The Speaker. Who are the Republican members of the conferees that were voted on today? Not the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), who is the sponsor of the bill; not the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE), who knows something about medical stuff; or the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Why? Because they all voted for a Patients' Bill of Rights. They are doctors. Who did they appoint? They put on people, some of these 151, the people who voted against the bill. Tell me, are we going to get a real Patients' Bill of Rights when the conferees who work out the difference all voted against the bill? We do not have one Republican member who voted for it on that conferee; another gimmick, another gimmick. These guys vote for gimmicks instead of reality and practical government, and try to move the effort forward.

Look, we ran the bill and they lost. Accept it. What happens when we have a conference? The major sponsors of the legislation are the conferees, not those who are going to vote for special interests; in this case, the insurance companies. I cannot believe they do this stuff.

When we talk about the Patients' Bill of Rights, the medical needs of the American people, I want to share one story. I just got a call in today. I am not quite sure how I can help the individual.

□ 2030

In my hometown in Menominee, in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, this

gentleman owns a small business, been going great guns, been expanding and doing well, an employer. He has full-time benefits for his employees and health insurance for his employees and their families. He was telling me he has 90 employees. It used to cost him \$17,000 to \$19,000 to pay for health insurance.

Unfortunately, one of his employees, their wife had open heart surgery. So they had to renew their insurance.

The insurance company says, not going to cover you anymore. You have a claim against us.

No, we did not have a claim.

Yes, you did. One of your employees, their spouse had open heart surgery. We will insure you but it will now cost you \$49,000 a month.

One claim, 90 employees. It used to be \$17,000 to \$19,000 a month. Because of this one claim, open heart surgery, it is now \$49,000. That is more than triple the premium went up because of this.

So in our Patients' Bill of Rights, what we say, let us enforce these rights, and there is a carryover provision. So if your coverage gets dropped by the insurance companies, you can stay with that doctor and continue care.

What happens to the lady who just has open heart surgery and the company can no longer afford the extortion by the insurance companies and has to drop the insurance? How does she get her follow-up care? How does she do it without bankrupting that family?

So I think the Democratic Party or the American people have the right agenda. They want us to do things that will keep us within the budget. They want us to do things that affect their everyday life.

I do not know about my colleagues but after the debacle of the Republicans before with the \$792 billion tax break, no one in my district was pounding on my door saying give me the tax break. Every time they heard about it, they pounded on my door and said do not give the tax break. Put money in Social Security. Put money in Medicare. Give us some prescription drug coverage, and if there is \$3 trillion, is it not time we pay down that debt?

The American people know what they want. They know what they need. And they said, you know, geez, you guys had a good start with 100,000 teachers last year. We have about 30,000. Can you get the other 70,000 in there, because we do want the smaller class sizes, whether it is New York or upper Michigan or New Jersey, and they are not having students out in the hallways because classes are expanding. Right now, in this country we have more people in K through 12 education than ever before in our Nation's history, but we are not helping them out. We are not helping them out.

Why not the 50,000 police officers? Why not? Crime is going down. Everything is going well. Now you stop, you throw in the towel and say we do not

have to do anything else to fight crime; let us get rid of the cops? It just does not make any sense to me whatsoever.

What we have seen is a Republican-led Congress, all kinds of gimmicks, an agenda that has been rejected by the American people. That is why I call it the do-wrong-thing Congress.

We have done some things. It has all been wrong. The American public rejects it. The people who we have talked to reject it. They just need a little helping hand from government. So I am pleased that they have spoken up and we will continue to speak up for the American people through these special orders.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for allowing us some time to come down and join him here tonight, and my good friend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT). I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), tell them to pull those ads and put the truth on TV. The gentleman is the one who did the lockbox for the Social Security trust fund, not raiding it, and of course the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) who does well with New York and the conditions there in trying to educate the children in a big metropolitan area where they have overcrowded classrooms, and even up in my northern district, northern Michigan district, we do not have the size of New York but we still have students being taught out in those temporary trailers.

I think it has been 15 or 20 years now. The temporary trailers are still there falling apart. We certainly do need help with more teachers and a bond proposal to help school construction.

I appreciate the opportunity. That is what I am hearing from my constituents. I wish we could work in a bipartisan manner like on the Patients' Bill of Rights and then do not give us a gimmick in appointing conferees who all voted against us and then say we are going to give a fair conference on Patients' Bill of Rights. It does not make sense to me.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), particularly when he points out the gimmicks that are being used by the Republican leadership because that is what it is all about. They have the wrong agenda and they want to do whatever they can to block the right agenda, which is the legislation we put forth.

I was talking to some of my colleagues, even some of my Republican colleagues at lunch today, and I found out, and I do not know that it is true in New Jersey but there apparently are a number of State legislatures where they have rules that the conferees have to be the people who supported and voted for the bill, and it is not even allowed under the rules of certain legislatures in certain States to appoint conferees who did not support the bill.

It makes sense, if one thinks about it. By saying that they are going to ap-

point conferees that actually did not support the bill, they are basically sending the signal that this conference is not going to allow the provisions of the bill to be upheld, and that is the signal that they are sending.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, for 200 years this body has operated most of the time in a bipartisan, courteous way. As my colleague was saying a moment ago, if the Speaker's party lost on a vote, the Speaker said, well, we gave it a good shot. We made our best case. The other side won. That is the way representative government works, and the Speaker would appoint people who would see that the best legislation came out of that vote.

Mr. STUPAK. Which reflects the wishes of the House, not their personal agenda or the agenda of special interests but the will of the House. Let the will of the House prevail in this conference report, in this conference committee. Also, if one takes a look at the rules of the House, they do not say it is mandated but they certainly suggest that the sponsoring people of the legislation, the bulk of them would be conferees, should be conferees. They do everything but say they must be the conferees.

I think it just adds to the poison atmosphere we see around here, and again just another gimmick to defeat things that the American people are demanding.

The conference report no one sees that, conference committee, so we can kill it right there and nothing ever happens. We do not have to worry about real reform. It is just ridiculous.

Mr. HOLT. The American people are not interested in gotcha strategies within the internal politics of this body. They want legislation that deals with issues that they deal with at home, that they talk about at their kitchen tables.

We have just been through a long list of those that could have and should have been dealt with in the past 10 months.

Mr. PALLONE. I agree, and I appreciate the gentleman bringing it to our attention.

Let me now yield, if I can, to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) who has joined us.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join the distinguished group of Members from New Jersey and New York and Michigan who have been here speaking about these issues, and to bring a Massachusetts point of view to some of what is being said.

Here we are, we are almost finished with the 1999 congressional session. We have five major budgets yet to go. We are only 5 weeks late. Some of the States have been later than that but we are very likely going to be done in a couple of weeks and maybe even some are saying within one week. Yet this

has been really a strange session.

Legislative bodies usually try to do the things that meet the popular will, but the Republican leadership of this Congress, in 1999, does not even try to deal with issues that the largest number of Americans say again and again that they want done. For the first time in 30 years, we have the prospect for modest and growing surpluses. We have the money to do those most important things that people really want done, and yet the Republican leadership has refused to bring forward a bill that would extend the Social Security system so that the next generation would have the same opportunity to have the Social Security system for them that my generation has and will have secure for them.

The same leadership, the same Republican leadership, has refused to extend the life of the overall Medicare program that has been such a boon for our senior citizens in making certain that they could have quality health care that they can afford. It is clear, as has already been said from the way they have set up the conference committee on the Patients' Bill of Rights, that they really do not intend to pass a patients' bill of rights that would take the medical treatment decisions for every American family away from insurance executives and accountants and give those treatment decisions back to doctors where they belong.

The same Republican leadership has refused to add even a modest prescription drug benefit to the Medicare program. We have millions of senior citizens who are paying \$200 or \$300 for prescription drugs. Well, maybe not millions but we have a lot of senior citizens who are paying \$200 and \$300 a month for their prescription drugs and they really cannot afford it.

By the way, we have seen the spectacle of this House passing a campaign finance reform bill in a matter of just a few weeks, with the votes of dozens of Republican members who courageously refused to follow their leadership in weakening that legislation; only to see the bill killed in the other body, in the Senate. There simply is not going to be any campaign finance reform this year or in this 106th Congress and very likely in this century along the way.

Why? Well, just as an example, it should not surprise anybody out here in the watching audience that drug companies steadfastly oppose the creation of a prescription drug benefit to the Medicare system because they are making great profits off drug prescriptions for senior citizens, and those end up substantially being paid by the government. They are making great profits and, oh, by the way, it should not surprise people that of the 10 largest corporate contributors to Republican leadership political action committees, that a majority of those are themselves the drug companies.

So then we have among those other things that have not been done this year, there is a proposal to increase the

minimum wage by \$1 over 2 years. We have had an unprecedented good economy, growth in our economy over an 8-year period. We have the lowest unemployment rate in decades. We have people working at minimum wage who deserve to see some benefit for their work, and only get to see that benefit if there is an increase in the minimum wage.

By the way, 80 percent of Americans favored an increase in the minimum wage. Just as similar numbers favor a Patients' Bill of Rights and favor the prescription drug benefit for senior citizens to be added to our Medicare program and favor the extension of our overall Medicare program so that the life of that program will go beyond the year 2015, which is now the time when it will go bankrupt.

Well, the extension of the Social Security system for the next generation, all of those things are favored by 75 percent or 80 percent of Americans, and even 67 percent of Republicans favor the minimum wage bill, a bill that we could pass in a clean way in a day. The Republican leadership is going to allow to come to this floor only a bill, only a bill, that carries with it about \$70 billion of tax breaks for the 1 percent of Americans who make over \$300,000 a year.

Now, they are going to hold a simple minimum wage increase, a \$1 wage increase, for the lowest income workers in this country. They are going to hold that bill hostage to a huge tax reduction for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, who are the people who contribute mostly to political campaigns, to their own political PAC campaigns and such. So all of these things are interconnected. Many people do understand how interconnected, why we get the legislation that we get; why we do not get the bills that the gentleman has shown so graphically, the rest in pieces.

The campaign finance is a pretty critical question in these.

□ 2045

The influence of money in the passage of legislation, in what legislation comes up before us, and what is allowed to be debated, and what ends up being passed by this Congress in this 106th Congress is a critically important matter until we can get campaign finance reform to pass through here and not be juggled between the two branches and killed by the one branch, and maybe next year it will end up being killed by this branch, and it is passed by the Senate or something.

It is critical that we do something about campaign finance reform, or we are going to continue to see this musical chairs process by which those bills that the Americans by the largest numbers say they want us to do because those are important to them in their daily lives, those bills are not going to be handled this year or next year and the second year of this session.

So I am very happy to join with the gentlemen that have been here tonight. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) has shown such leadership in bringing to the attention of the American people these kinds of ironies in how we are functioning, what we are not doing, what we should be doing, what the American people want us to do that is not getting done. I am very happy to add a Massachusetts view to what has already been said.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER). There were two points that he raised that I just wanted to mention briefly, because I think we only have a few minutes left. But he brought out the fact that the Republicans have not even looked at the long-term solvency of Social Security and Medicare, in other words, this debate that we have discussed tonight and we have had about whether or not the Republican appropriation bills and their budget actually spend the Social Security surplus. We know that it has about \$17 billion that has come from this Social Security surplus in order to pay for their budget.

But that is really a minor issue compared to the fact that, over the long-term, we need to address the financing of Social Security and Medicare for future generations.

President Clinton has actually put forth proposals in both of those areas, primarily by saying that whatever surplus is generated through general revenues over the next 10 years, a good amount of that be used to shore up Social Security and Medicare for long-term purposes. The Republicans have not even looked at that. That is an agenda they have not even touched. The bottom line is it is going to come home to roost at some point.

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, it should come home to roost. But the reason they have not touched it is a very deliberate reason. As has already been discussed here this evening, they opposed the creation of Social Security. They opposed virtually to a person the creation of Medicare 30 years ago. Of course, earlier this year, they rammed through the Congress very quickly and then, because it was not very popular out in the general populace, sort of backed away from it, but they ran through a huge, a huge tax reduction using every penny of the projected surpluses while not a penny of those had yet been produced, but only were projections, but used every penny of it that would have been necessary, very deliberately used every penny of it that would have been necessary if there ever was a possibility of extending Social Security and Medicare for the generations to come. It was a very deliberate, a very cynical kind of a move. They have done that, and they will do it again, because they never were in favor

of Social Security or Medicare in the first place.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, that is a very good point. The other thing the gentleman mentioned, I just wanted to briefly say, is about the prices of prescription drugs and the need for a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

I just wanted to mention that today Families U.S.A. came out with a report that really documents very well the problem of high drug prices and the fact that so many senior citizens, they say 35 percent of Medicare beneficiaries, 14 million people, have absolutely no coverage for prescription drugs. The 65 percent that do have some coverage, it is limited. Increasingly, because of deductibles, co-payments, caps on the amount that is provided under the prescription drug coverage, they see a decline in their ability to obtain prescription drugs and increase costs out-of-pocket.

So this is, again, the issue of a Medicare prescription drug benefit is not pie in the sky. This is responding, as the Democrats have, to real needs, to concerns that people express to us every day; and, yet, the Republicans refuse to acknowledge it and refuse to act on it.

So I want to thank the gentleman again. I think we have run out of time, but I do want to say that we are going to continue to be here over the next week or two, before this House adjourns for the recess, to point out that the Republican leadership has the wrong agenda. They are not addressing the real priority of the American people. We are going to keep pressing that those priorities be addressed.

UPDATE ON SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, tonight what we would like to talk about is an updating for the American public about, not only what is happening currently in Washington, D.C., but to give people an understanding about why Republicans are standing up essentially on several themes.

One is Social Security, people's retirement. The future of people's retirement should not be taken to fund the government. Social Security should be used for that which it was intended, and that is to be put aside for people's future retirement like myself. I have paid in 27 years into Social Security, 27 years, both my wife and I, and we want to make sure Social Security is there.

Second thought process, we must continue to balance the budget. By balancing the budget in Washington, D.C., and not spending Social Security, we will make sure that government has to look internally for its needs to prioritize, to provide those things that the government has to do. It has given lots of money, and it needs to set prior-

ities and make tough decisions just like people out in the States do, people who have families, people who run small businesses, people who work for corporations.

The last thing is no means no. Mr. President, we are not going to spend Social Security. One hundred percent is larger than 60 percent.

Lastly, that we want the government to do those things that the American public has done for many years, and that is look internally, set priorities, and try and meet those obligations and needs that one has.

Today, also, I am joined by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), one of my fellow members of the Republican conference, and I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me, and I appreciate the fact that he has organized this time, Mr. Speaker, to go directly to the American people. Indeed, following, as we do, our colleagues from the left, I think it is important, even as much as we would like to set this up with a very positive dynamic, we are also compelled by the instant revisionism of the left to address a couple of their arguments.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, as we hear the ferocity of the denial of what has gone on for so many years on the left, as the folks stepped up to the plate tonight, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to set the record straight.

First and foremost, the fact is, before the gentleman from Texas and I came to the Congress of the United States, for 40 years the Social Security surplus was routinely spent on pet programs of the left. Indeed, so much money was spent that the country was taken further into debt.

We heard all the name calling about the notion that Americans keeping more of their hard-earned money was somehow unpopular. Mr. Speaker, what is really unpopular on the left, sadly, is a failure to step up and recognize fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about is a 1 percent solution. There is a success we can already celebrate. The budgeters, the folks who take care of all the numbers, have done some studying. They tell us for this fiscal year, fiscal year 1999, for the first time since 1960, for the first time since Dwight Eisenhower was ensconced in the big White House at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, this Congress balanced the budget, and did so using none of the Social Security surplus and, also, we might add, generated a surplus over and above the Social Security funds to the tune of \$1 billion.

That is cause not only for celebration, Mr. Speaker, it is cause to signal our commitment. Now that we have done that, we dare not go back and to hear the charges from the left.

Let me offer what any computer student knows, what most folks understand here in the United States, one of

the oldest games in the world, and, sadly, one of the first casualties in dealing in debate with the left, one of the first casualties of such debate is truth.

When one sends the folks in the budget office a set of false assumptions and one says, assuming the following things, then what does one see? The folks who crunch those numbers are honor bound to say, well, making those assumptions, we expect X, Y, and Z.

In the popular vernacular, Mr. Speaker, that comes down to garbage in, garbage out. My friends who preceded us here on this floor involved in the instant revisionism were offering a clear example of that.

I mentioned just a minute ago the 1 percent solution. Mr. Speaker, I hold here a shiny new penny, made, no doubt, with Arizona copper. What we are saying through this appropriations process, through what the media calls the battle of the budget is as follows: Cannot we step up and save one penny out of every dollar given the massive waste, fraud, and abuse fraught on the American people by Washington, D.C., cannot we save one penny out of every dollar to save Social Security?

An example is as follows here with this chart, which graphically demonstrates what has transpired. It is entitled, Mr. Speaker, "Mr. Clinton goes to Africa." My colleagues may remember the trip in the news, a few positive policy notions discussed there.

But what was disturbing about the trip, Mr. Speaker, was the President took along 1,300 people. Included in his entourage were some Members of this body, the mayor of Denver, Colorado, and others. Mr. Speaker, what is compelling is the cost of that trip was almost \$43 million, including an entourage of 1,300 folks.

Now, under our modest proposal, the 1 percent solution, saving a penny out of every dollar, what would have happened was that 13 members of this 1,300 member delegation would have had to stay home. Maybe the mayor of Denver had concerns he could have better added in Colorado within the environs of the city limits of Denver. Maybe 12 other folks could have stayed home. I believe Mrs. Curry, the White House secretary for the President, was also on the trip. Maybe she could have tended to things back here.

But all we are saying is this is not a draconian cut. My goodness. If anything, it is somewhat modest. But this demonstrates the waste. Let me point out to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Speaker, and others who join us, understand, the 1,300 people in this entourage did not, I repeat, did not include the security personnel that every American understands a President, given these trying times, needs both at home and abroad.

We are not talking about secret service. We are not talking about a security entourage over and above that. We are talking about 1,300 people. You combine this number of folks with

other trips to China and Chile, and you are looking at a bill of close to \$70 million.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, just to prove the gentleman's point, the President just today has vetoed the bill that was known as H.R. 3064 for Labor, Health and Human Services and the District of Columbia.

Today, and I will quote from what the President has sent to the House of Representatives, "I am vetoing H.R. 3064 because the bill, including the off-set section, is deeply flawed. It includes a misguided .97 percent across-the-board reduction that will hurt everything from national defense to education and environmental programs. The legislation also contains crippling cuts."

Well, what we have done in the Congress is we have tried to make sure that government was fully funded. An example of this in this bill, since the time that I have been a Member of Congress, former Speaker Newt Gingrich said it should be a national priority that this Republican Congress would double biomedical research over 5 years. We are now in the very midst of that. In fact, the Republican bill increased funding for the National Institutes of Health by 15 percent, that was in 1999, and 14 percent for the new year's budget.

□ 2100

The President asked for \$15.9 billion, and we gave him \$17.9 billion. That is \$2 billion more.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, would my friend please repeat those numbers, because I think it is important; and it is something, given the many curious mathematics of Washington, D.C., and the failure of both accountancy and accountability at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Would my colleague repeat those numbers. That is actually an increase, is it not?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it is a huge increase in some of the most fundamental things that are important for biomedical research and things that we are doing, funding in Washington, D.C., to solve medical problems of Americans that would be open then for the world.

What we did is we increased it \$2 billion. Yet the President has said it is misguided. When we asked, after fully funding and more than funding this, the President said it is misguided to ask for a .97 percent of the budget to be looked at internally.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, what we are talking about here, we need to point out facts are stubborn things. And the chart, basically, sums it up right here.

In terms of spending, we see what is going on here. We are just simply talking about reducing spending, realizing savings of 1 cent, 1 cent on every discretionary dollar. My colleague from Texas pointed out the fact, and again, facts are stubborn things despite what some of this town call spin, others

would more properly label as propaganda, how can you spend \$2 billion additionally funding priorities and at the same time be accused of irresponsibility.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues remind me of George Orwell's seminal book "1984" where the mythical republic of Oceania embraced slogans such as "Ignorance is strength." "War is peace." Now we are hearing in this town that fully funding, and then some, is a draconian cut. It just does not add up.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, could it not really be that what has happened is that the priorities that we have had to establish, in other words, "no" means no, no, we are not going to keep spending more and more and more; and, no, we are not going to spend one penny of Social Security, we mean we have to make tough decisions here in Washington, D.C., set priorities, determine what money will be spent on, is it not probably that it is too tough a decision for evidently some people to make?

Let me give my colleagues an example. When asked if there was absolutely no waste in his department, Is there no waste in your department, Bruce Babbitt responded, You got it exactly right, no waste in my department.

The Deputy Attorney General Eric Holder, when asked about the administration's position on, we should not reduce at all the size of the Federal budget, Eric Holder said, That would be my view.

When Joe Lockhart, the President's spokesman, has talked about whether it is okay to spend Social Security, is it dipping into Social Security, should that not be a choice, he said, Listen, if you look at the budget that Congress has produced over the last 15 or 20 years, they have every year dipped into that.

And there is more. The more is, when Secretary of Education Riley was asked about how much money would be given to his department he said, The Republican plan slashes critical resources and schools well below the President's request.

And yet, we gave them our education budget, the Republican budget, \$88 million more than what the President was allowing for or asking.

So, in fact, what we are doing is we are making tough decisions. And they want more and more and more.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is ironic that the Education Secretary, the man who is in charge of teaching children math, misunderstands the fact that when our budget is over the President's that we are slashing education. I think there is certainly a math deficiency there. Maybe we should have an investigation of that in itself. I know the Clinton administration loves studies. I am sure they would want to fund it. But it would also be a waste of money, so I am being sarcastic.

I wanted to point out to my colleagues that the Lockhart quote, the

White House spokesman, when he said, yeah, Congress should go ahead and spend the Social Security funds because they have done it for 20 years, well, there are a lot of things that have been going on for 20 years in this town that we are slowly putting a stop to.

Now, the three of us wanted to put a stop to it really quickly in 1994 when we became the majority, but we could not. So it is kind of like stopping a runaway train. You just got to go slowly. You just cannot stop these things suddenly.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) has the same quote, basically, from the Democrat leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) saying, just take a little bit out of Social Security.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for his comments.

Two points. Number one, again, in the vernacular of this town, which some folks who are onlookers call spin, or should properly call spin propaganda, there is also something known as message discipline. And our colleague from Texas recites not only the statements of the White House press secretary but several cabinet officials involved in message discipline, to use the vernacular of the city.

How unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that they cannot be involved in fiscal discipline, stepping up with us with a 1 percent solution. A penny saved out of every dollar of discretionary spending goes a long way toward protecting the Social Security Trust Fund. It is summed up like this: a penny saved is retirement secured.

My colleague from Georgia alluded to this. This was 2 weeks ago, October 24 of this year, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the House minority leader, appeared on this week on ABC. The question was, "What's the problem with spending the Social Security Trust Fund? You've been doing it for years," which sounds to me like a set-up question just as an average citizen in addition to a Member of Congress. But here is what the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) said: "I understand. But there is a feeling now that since we have a surplus and since we got to get ready for the baby-boomers," and this is the key clause, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, "that we really ought to try to spend as little of it as possible, none if possible. We really ought to spend as little of it as possible."

This is not rocket science, Mr. Speaker. What you see are two very different visions of government. We believe to help Americans realize the limitless nature of their dreams, we should put limits on wasteful spending in Washington. The other side says, let us never put limits on spending. There is always more and more and more to be spent, and they engage in dubious mathematics and spin.

The President of the United States stood here in January of this year and

talked about putting Social Security first and then had the audacity to say let us save 62 percent of the Social Security surplus. Now, a quick check of math, Mr. Speaker, indicates that that evening he was prepared to spend 38 percent of it on other priorities. And that is the operative factor: spend, spend, spend, spend some more.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it sounds like to me that it is another example where the truth is held hostage in Washington, D.C., where we have gotten so much into spinning the message that we have forgotten what the truth is.

I would like to go back to the President's letter to the House today upon why he vetoed the bill and then, perhaps, to give the facts of the case.

The President, on page 8 of the veto, says, "This across-the-board cut would result in indiscriminate reductions in important areas such as education, the environment, and law enforcement." In addition, this cut would have an adverse impact on certain national security programs. The indiscriminate nature of the cut would require a reduction of over \$700 million for military personnel, which would require the military services to make cuts in recruiting and lose up to 48,000 military personnel.

Let us now do a fact check. A fact check says, despite the 1 percent that we are asking this administration to look internally for efficiency for them to save the money, Congress has appropriated, that is, the Republican Congress has appropriated more money to critical areas of the Government than President Clinton ever requested.

For example, in defense the President requested \$263.3 billion. After the 1 percent savings that we are after, we appropriated \$265.1 billion. That is \$1.8 billion above what the President even requested.

For education, the President requested \$34.71 billion. After the 1 percent savings, we appropriated \$34.8 billion. That is \$90 million above what the President's request was.

For crime, the President requested \$2.854 billion for State and local law enforcement assistance, which includes his COPS programs. After the 1 percent savings that we are after, we appropriated more than \$397 million more than the President requested.

And yet, if we look at what the President is saying is that, if he has to make this 1 percent savings within the administration, they will have to take the loss of up to 48,000 military personnel. We are talking about we fully funded above what the President ever even asked for, and he is still going to have to cut.

So it makes us wonder what is the truth and why should it be held hostage in Washington.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, what I find ironic is, frankly, these numbers are staggering to me as a conservative, as a Republican. I think

that, in many cases, we as a Republican party spend too much money. But I understand we have got to work through the process, we have got to have 218 votes, we have got to have 51 votes in the Senate, we have got to have a bill that the White House will sign. So we, reluctantly sometimes, have to spend more money than our constituencies want us to spend.

But when the Democrats vote no on the appropriations bills because we do not spend enough and then say they do not want to take it out of Social Security, we want to say, okay, I give up. This is some kind of game. Clue me in. What is the missing element here?

The money that my colleague is talking about spending comes out of Social Security. And yet they say they do not want to spend it.

Of course, now the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) says go ahead and spend it. Joe Lockhart, the AL GORE spokesperson and administration spokesperson, says go ahead and spend it. And AL GORE's own budget, which he is tooting around the country talking about, spends lots of Social Security money.

I think that is maybe where the hope is that, perhaps because of the presidential year, the Vice President will come to his senses. But the reality is Al Gore is very much in favor of us spending Social Security money. We have got to put a stop to this.

I do not know, I guess this is maybe being an alpha male, you raid your grandmother's trust fund so you can go around telling your friends, I wear opaque shirts, or whatever the color is that alpha males are supposed to wear. I do not keep up with these kind of subliminal things outside the Beltway.

But the reality is, here is a guy running for President who wants to spend Social Security money and is fighting our budget because our budget does not spend enough money.

What we are saying to the Vice President is, hey, look, all we are saying is take a penny out of the dollar. That is all you got to do is take one cent and then you do not have to spend any of the money out of Social Security. Cut out some of the waste.

My colleague talked about Secretary Babbitt saying there was no waste in the Department of Interior, and you may have already mentioned this about the \$30 million duck-breeding island in Hawaii. The Department of Interior has bought a \$30 million island for ducks to breed on in Hawaii.

I was a honeymooning duck, I might want to go to Hawaii myself if I could fly over there. But the problem is only 10 ducks took them up on the offer.

□ 2115

So now at a cost of \$3 million per duck, we have got an island. As the majority leader says, that is a lot of quackery.

Mr. SESSIONS. The gentleman from Georgia is suggesting that the money that has been appropriated is more

than what the President asked for in this bill that he vetoed. We have wisely provided it for not only the National Institutes of Health but \$88 million more for education, and yet the President and the administration refuses to find one penny of taking out waste, fraud and abuse which we know is rampant, and the administration is even unwilling to look at the \$30 million. Yet I know at Glacier National Park this year, the administration put a million-dollar toilet that took 800 trips from a helicopter to place this outhouse at 7,000 feet. It is incredible. One would think that they could utilize some common sense just like what is done at my table, I am sure at your tables, where you have to make decisions just on one penny out of a dollar.

Mr. HAYWORTH. It is amazing the efforts which the left will employ to avoid common sense savings. I was especially surprised and sadly disheartened at the comments of my fellow Arizonan the Secretary of Interior, our one-time governor Mr. Babbitt to now say that there is no waste in that department. I would simply refer the Secretary to a finding made just a few years ago, in my first term in the Congress of the United States when I was privileged to serve on the Committee on Resources and we had the Interior Department's accountant, in Washington, we give accountants fancy names, the Inspector General was there, that is the accountant who takes care of all the books, conducts the audit, and sitting alongside him at that point in time was the director of the National Park Service. The accountant, the Inspector General for the Interior Department, reported to our committee that for that fiscal year, the National Park Service could not account for over \$70 million in funds authorized and appropriated to be spent by the National Park Service. They could not account for it.

Mr. Speaker, we have the crown jewels of the Park Service in Arizona, the Grand Canyon, Canyon de Chelly, a variety of amazing sites of natural splendor. We depend on the Park Service to be good stewards of those national treasures. But is it too much to ask the Park Service and other Washington bureaucrats here to also be good stewards of the treasure of the American people, the tax money they send here year in and year out? And so, Mr. Speaker, I would invite my fellow Arizonan to take a very close look, mindful of that report of a few years ago. Certainly there is savings of one cent on every dollar spent, because I know a whole lot of Arizonans who sit down every Sunday with their newspaper and start to clip coupons, because they need to save 50 cents on a box of cereal. This is something that is not foreign. This is something that we do not need any highfalutin economics for. It is just common sense. We can do better.

I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman from Arizona holds up the penny. I have got

a dollar here. All we are saying is find a penny. You know about clipping that 50 cents off on the Special-K or the corn flakes made by Kellogg's versus buying the house brand which always is cheaper but not always up to the taste quality. It is not just a matter of having to do it, it is also a matter of wanting to do it, because it is stupid not to. That is the way Americans buy things. We are a country of hardworking, middle-class people. If we can buy gas for \$1.12 a gallon, we are going to drive two blocks past the \$1.15 a gallon station because we can save the three cents per gallon. If we can buy our clothes cheaper when they are on sale, we are going to wait until the suits go on sale before we buy one. If we go to a restaurant, and I know the gentlemen here are both fathers. When was the last time you bought steak? You always are buying chicken and the first thing your eyes go to in the restaurant is the right side of the menu where the prices are, and then you work your way back to what the food items are you can buy for that price. For the people who have to decide between buying a new piece of furniture or a new dress or probably not buying either because the dryer breaks or you need a new set of tires on your car, or if you are a runner, buying jogging shoes when they are discontinued because they have been marked down 50 percent, if you go to Wal-Mart every Saturday or Sunday to buy anything from shampoo to cleaning fluid for your car or anything else, this is what we are saying, this is all we are talking about, finding that one penny on the dollar.

All over America, it is easy to do, from Maine to Miami to San Francisco. But somehow in this little 50-mile radius of an area of Washington, D.C., and not even that, really just maybe about a five-mile radius in the inner city here of government, it is impossible.

Mr. SESSIONS. We are talking about the things that happen back home. We are talking about decisions that families have to make. Sometimes you sacrifice, perhaps for a child. Sometimes you might sacrifice for a parent. But I would like to give some examples about how Washington, D.C. can make some tough decisions. It started with taking control of the House of Representatives that Republicans did in 1995. I would like to give some information about that.

Since 1995, the legislative branch funding has produced a savings of \$1.2 billion below the trend line. In other words, if you had put the trend line of where it was headed from 30 years' worth of Democrat control, we have now reduced that \$1.2 billion. This year, for the year 2000, legislative appropriations is \$124 million below the current year. That is a 4.8 percent reduction. That means from 1999 to year 2000, the legislative branch, which is run by Republicans, has reduced their budget 4.8 percent. The legislative branch has downsized by 4,380 employees since 1995. That is a 16 percent reduction. We have cut the number of

printed daily congressional books by 8,200 copies. We have cut the number of House committee staffs by one-third. We have privatized the House barber shop and beauty shops and custodial care and the parking lot and transferred the House post office to the U.S. Postal Service. We have done things that made sense in Washington, D.C. But those were things that were underneath our own control. That was because we were able to make the hard decisions. That is what we are doing now. That is why Members of Congress, at least Republicans, said we believe that it is so important not to spend Social Security that Members of Congress should take a 1 percent cut in pay next year. Lo and behold, what happens? It gets to the President, wholly unacceptable. So the things that take place every single day back home, somehow is just not acceptable, will not cut it up here.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, we are all about the same age, born in the 1950s, raised in the 1960s. Just describing my home, and I know the gentleman from Texas, he may not know this, but I was actually born in Brazos County, Texas, and the gentleman from Arizona and I found out today we have cotton and a lot of other crops in common, and the folks back home live in a world totally different from the spending other people's money philosophy of Washington, D.C.

I was raised in Athens, Georgia, on Plum Nelly Road, plumb out of the city and nelly in the county. In that house, 215 Plum Nelly Road, Ann and Al Kingston did not let children leave the room with the light on. If you left the light on, dad would let you know you were wasting money. We did not pay the power company extra money by leaving a light on in an unoccupied room. If you left the water on when you were brushing your teeth, not after you finished brushing but during the act of brushing your teeth, you were also called to the mat for a little dialogue, and sometimes that dialogue was not always verbal.

Now, you washed your own car. My little sister Jean who had two older sisters, she did not know there were such things as new clothes until she got to be a teenager and was on a clothing allowance. She wore hand-me-downs. That is just the way we were raised. I will never forget walking to the Beachwood Shopping Center from my house with Jimbo Ray, we would pick up Coca-Cola bottles on the way because they were 2 and 3 cent return bottles. We were frugal but it was not because we were poor, it was just that was the culture. You did not waste money. That is the way people did in Arizona and Texas and California and all over. And somehow they come to Washington and forget that whole value system. It is bizarre. Because I know lots of good people in government, Democrats and Republicans.

Yet one of the absurd things, the Pentagon lost two \$850,000 tugboats. They lost one \$1 million missile launcher. Now, I ask my colleagues, has anybody seen the missile launcher? Who has got it? Come on, fess up.

Somebody has got to have it. It just goes on and on and on. A contractor for the Pentagon paid \$714 for an electric bell that was only worth \$46. It is absurd. We pay \$8.5 million to 26,000 dead people for food stamps. Hey, why do we not start paying the money to live people, and we might have less of a need for health care if we start feeding live people. But can you imagine \$8.5 million worth of food stamps to dead people? It is unbelievable. And it only happens in Washington, D.C. It does not happen in large businesses, it does not happen in small businesses, it does not happen in Georgia, it does not happen in Arizona, it does not happen in Texas, it does not happen with my family, with your family, with my neighbor's family down the street and turn the corner and go up one, it does not happen in that household, but here in Washington, D.C., it is the rule and not the exception.

Mr. SESSIONS. We were talking about Bruce Babbitt, saying that there was not a penny that he could find in his department. Yet we go back just 4 months to August 11, 1999, and here is the headline out of the Washington Times. Junkets Found in Wildlife Service. Trips to Brazil and Japan to promote a logo cost \$26,000. This is very similar to the number of people that this President takes when he travels around the world. We are not saying you cannot travel. We are saying reduce what you are doing. This is \$26,000. Here is what it says:

A U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's employee spent \$17,600 to travel from Brazil and Japan, including two junkets to promote the use of the sport fish logo, according to documents found by the Washington Times.

What we found out is that a gentleman made four trips to Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo, Brazil in 13 months at a cost of \$9,084, according to the travel vouchers. And the director of the institute where they went said there is absolutely no reasonable justification for using the money to travel to these places. Here is what he said. His voucher stated that it was for the purpose of encouraging these manufacturers that he was going to meet with to use the sport fish logo on sport fishing equipment imported into the United States. In other words, he spent \$26,000 to travel outside the country so that we could provide information so that our consumers in this country would want to see that sport fish logo. And yet the Secretary says he cannot find a penny.

What really happened here after the Government Accounting Office did this investigation? Mr. Gordon said his organization requested vouchers from other employees after receiving information from agency workers of financial irregularities. "This doesn't surprise me. I find that this is consistent with what we found in our organization." The GAO finds this every single day. Yet the administration refuses to find just one penny on their own and take action about it.

□ 2130

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would say to my friend from Texas, I am indebted to him for pointing this out, and for my colleague from Georgia, who I think used a term that is all too revealing about the mind set of Washington and the wasteful spending therein and what transpires. The phrase is "other people's money."

Some folks in this town come to view the Federal Treasury as one big piece of pie, or, perhaps more appropriately, as the ultimate lottery winnings of all times, equating with trillions of dollars, rather than realizing this money belongs to the American people we are entrusted with.

While my friends talk about the accountability, we are also indebted to our colleague the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), who serves on the Committee on Education and the Work Force, who has gone back and done some checking, because our good friend, the former Governor of South Carolina, the Secretary of Education, Mr. Riley, has also said that there can be no reductions.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) points out that the Education Department cannot account for \$120 billion of taxpayer money. Today, more than 7 months after the March audit deadline, the Department of Education still cannot produce the required paperwork to allow their financial works to be audited by the GAO. In other words, they cannot even supply the information, and they cannot use the excuse that the dog ate the homework.

The Department of Education is the only Federal department that has not been audited for fiscal year 1998. The Department of Education is responsible for distributing \$120 billion a year in education spending, \$35 billion in appropriated funds and approximately an \$85 billion loan portfolio. Unfortunately, they do not know where the money is going.

Mr. Speaker, is it too much to ask for accountability? Is it too much to say based on the fact that the figures are incomplete, that apparently our friends in the Department of Education do not know where the funds are going, could they not at least take the modest step of trying to find one penny in savings out of these \$120 billion?

I see we are joined by our colleague from South Carolina, who has helped to make a difference from the low country, who must hear with interest the comments of the former Governor of South Carolina, the current Secretary of Education, about this topic, the out and out refusal of the administration to join with us to find savings of one penny on every dollar. I yield to my friend.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for doing so. I was sitting in my office catching up on paperwork and saw you over here and heard what you are talking about, which is this notion is it or is it not impossible to cut

one cent out of every dollar spent in Washington? And the answer is a resounding yes based on what I hear from folks back home in South Carolina, and the answer is a resounding yes, in that if we are ever going to get serious about limiting the size of government, about limiting its growth, you have to establish precedent with this idea of a penny on the dollar. I think it is a great idea, and it is something that has got to happen.

One of the things that I think is interesting was I am on the Committee on International Relations, and I remember looking at a GAO report that talked about surplus properties within the inventory of State Department. As you know, we have got embassies around the globe.

Well, they had a surplus list of properties, and I remember in looking at this list, for instance, the State Department had a \$90 million residence in Japan that was surplus. In Buenos Aires, the ambassador's residence down there is a \$20 million home. You look at this, the State Department just got through selling the residence in Bermuda for I think it was \$12 million or \$14 million. You look at the amount of money that is out there, and, again, this was a GAO report that said you guys have too much in inventory, you might want to consider a little bit simpler accommodation. A \$90 million residence in Tokyo is probably a bit much. It is not necessary to have that to do the job that has to be done.

So, one, there is a lot of fluff in the system, based on the inventory according to the Government Accounting Office.

The second thing that is interesting is this week we had a hearing on our policy with North Korea, and there is a new Government Accounting Office study that shows that over \$365 million has been spent by the American taxpayer in food aid to North Korea. Never mind the fact that North Korea is testing missiles over Japan and basically disrupting the neighborhood, but you look at \$365 million in food aid, the whole point of the GAO study was they could not quantify where the food was going.

So you have somebody that has declared themselves an enemy of the United States taxpayer, who at the same time is getting over \$300 million worth of food aid that the Government Accounting Office says we cannot account for. We do not know if it is going to feed the army or if it is going to feed starving people in Northern Korea.

Mr. SESSIONS. If the gentleman would yield, what we are talking about tonight is waste, fraud and abuse. We are challenging the President to find a way within this administration to find one penny's worth of saving, without spending Social Security, and balancing the budget, and that is what we are asking the President to do.

I would like to go back and give a history of what 30 years of Congressional overspending does. What it does

is very clearly seen on this chart. For those of you who might be a few feet away, the lower part here is deficits. This is spending too much money. This part that is on the right is the surplus.

For 30 years, from 1970, when we first put a man on the moon was when we began ending surpluses in this government. For 30 years we have run deficits, and, for the first time, now, we have had 3 years worth of surpluses.

But we Republicans recognize that we should not with a straight face say that the work is done, because we recognize that what has happened is we are operating under rules that even today allow Social Security to be raided and to be used for regular government spending.

Since 1984, \$638 billion that was given by people for their retirement, taken by this government, has been spent. So what we are trying to do is to say now that we are at zero in 1999. For the first time in 39 years, Republicans did not spend a penny of Social Security.

We are trying to challenge the President now to say Mr. President, let us put it in writing. Let us have an agreement that we will not spend the Social Security. We provided the President millions of dollars more in many areas as a result of us making tough decisions, but we have had to prioritize. We are going to keep challenging this President and keep showing ways, which there is plenty ways.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I think it is important to say that this is not the President alone, this is the Vice President. Indeed, Mr. GORE's entire proposed budget spends all of the surplus that you are talking about. It goes right through the operating surplus and then goes right into the Social Security surplus. So, you know, this is not a problem that necessarily ends with the Clinton administration should the baton be passed on to the Vice President, because the vice president is very much in favor of spending the surplus.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Or, if my friend would yield, given the rather considerable electoral difficulties that this Vice President is encountering, we should point out that our former colleague in the other body, former Senator Bradley, would not end this either.

Indeed, we should point out that the Washington Post, not exactly a bastion of conservative values, the Washington Post in work done in part by reporter C.C. Connelly pointed out 2 weeks ago that the campaign promises of Messrs. Bradley and GORE alone would require all of the surplus funds, including Social Security.

It boils down to a very simple choice, Mr. Speaker: If you want to empower the culture of spending and having Washington take more and more and more of your family's budget to spend on the national budget, well, the standard to follow on the left is pretty clear. It is offered unapologetically by their 2 presidential candidates. If, however, you believe the money you earn and

the sacrifices that my colleague from Georgia pointed out as a common notion of light, if you believe for too long you have been asked to sacrifice so that Washington can allegedly do more, and we need to reverse that, as we have done with common sense priorities in this House, and make sure that Washington saves so your family can have more, then, Mr. Speaker, we should invite the American people to join with us to be understandably wary of the bill of goods offered by the left and to point out again the comments of the minority leader of this House, who now tends to hedge and says on national television, "Well, we ought to try to spend as little of the Social Security surplus as possible."

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is a very simple notion: A penny saved, one penny, out of every discretionary dollar spent, one penny saved, is retirement secured.

Mr. SESSIONS. Is it not interesting that as we go about telling the American public that it is their retirement, it is a savings that is for their future, and as we play this scenario out, that all of a sudden we are at zero, and now what we are trying to do is to fight the President, who says we should not spend any Social Security. He wants us to spend more and more and more. And even though this government is at \$1.8 trillion, that he cannot find one penny. He will not even accept the challenge. He will not even accept the challenge to find one penny out of a dollar. And yet routinely in our family, and I am sure my colleagues, that happens every day.

It happens in small businesses. It happens all across this country, where families and small businesses and even large businesses have to do this. Exxon is one-eighteenth the size of this government, and yet every single year they make tough decisions where they reinvigorate themselves.

I would suggest to you, and I have done this, that when I lost weight, I not only became healthier, but more efficient and things worked better. If this government looked inwardly to itself to take off the bloated fat that is in the bureaucracy, to exercise a little bit, to have to go and do something that it has never done, then I would suggest to you that we would have better employees also.

Can you imagine an employee who may have been with the government for 30 years, never being challenged to have to look for a better way to do his job or her job? Can you imagine the employees that still do have a sense of financial integrity with them, now, for the first time, being able to come to their bosses in the government and say, "I think we should accept this challenge. I think I have found a way," we called it in my company an idea forum, "a good idea. Here is what I think we can do to run ourself more efficiently and to be prepared to meet whatever our mission statement is."

For the first time, Republicans challenged the administration openly, put

our paycheck on the line to take a 1 percent pay cut, challenged the government to simply find what it could to eliminate waste, fraud and abuse to find the savings, and the President, our leader, was unwilling to accept this from the get-go.

Unilaterally he said, it is not something I wanted to engage in. Bruce Babbitt, there is no waste, fraud and abuse here. Can you imagine the disappointment on the faces of Federal employees when they came to work and found out that those good ideas that they could be presenting, those good ideas maybe that they had been trying to get up the ladder for a long time, can you imagine now that they were rejected by the President?

Mr. SANFORD. You mentioned the idea again of a penny on a dollar. Again, one of the committees that I serve on is the Committee on International Relations. It was interesting, we had an amendment last year that dealt with a number of these international study organizations that we fund indirectly through the foreign aid bill.

□ 2145

One of them was the Bureau for International Expositions. Another was the International Lead and Zinc Study Group. Another was the International Rubber Organization. Another was the International Vine and Wine. There are a lot of strange organizations out there that we fund. The idea that there is not a penny worth of waste in maybe some of these studies.

For that matter, we had another amendment that looked at three foundations. There are a lot of foundations around the country are privately funded. They go out there in the marketplace, they compete for funds. Yet, there are three Cold War era foundations that are still funded through the Federal government, and compete with a foundation in any one of the 435 congressional districts for funding.

So we went and said, you cannot have your cake and eat it too, except for in Washington. You cannot be funded through the Federal government and also compete in the private marketplace for research dollars.

A lot of the research topics were bizarre. I remember one of the studies was to identify the causes of premarital sex in Southeast Asia. Call me old-fashioned on this, but I think it has a lot to do with simple attraction. But anyway, there were these bizarre studies. I do not know that there would not be a penny worth of savings out there in one of these studies, much less the overall organizations that were being funded that were, again, offering the research for the studies themselves.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, I am on the spending end on that particular Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs, with the foreign aid bill.

If we follow the Clinton travel thing, \$42.8 million, taking 1,300 Federal em-

ployees to Africa, and \$8.8 million to go into China, and \$10.5 million to go into Chile.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman tell me the Africa number again?

Mr. KINGSTON. That was \$42.8. The gentleman from Texas has a chart on what we are talking about here, just to show the absurdity of this, 1,300 employees who went.

Mr. SANFORD. To me, it would not matter whether it was Africa or whether it was Chile or whether it was Australia or Great Britain, but the notion that there is not a penny worth of savings on one of those trips is just absurd to me.

Mr. KINGSTON. Five hundred people went to China. I do not know why we need five hundred advisors. These are Federal employees, and there are also private citizens who go who allegedly pay back the money.

I called the General Accounting Office, the accountability people in Washington, and I said, how many of the private citizens paid back their money? They said, well, you would have to ask the State Department. The State Department would have to get it from the White House, and we will never find out the answer to that.

If we look at the chart here, tell me, 13 of those people could not have stayed home? That is all we are talking about, 1 percent, 13 of them have to stay home. I would say the mayor of Denver, I know Colorado is very important to our African policy, but if it is the case, why cannot the people in Colorado pay for the mayor of Denver to go on this junket?

That is not even the expensive part. When Vice President GORE and President Clinton travel, the expensive part is the promises they make. In 1993, they promised \$1 billion to Russia. In 1999, they urged the International Monetary Fund to release \$4.5 billion in aid to Russia, one of the most corrupt countries in the world right now, and \$400 million promised to the Ukraine, and then another \$5 billion through the International Monetary Fund, and \$1.8 billion to close Chernobyl, another \$2 billion promised in 1995 by Clinton to Poland.

He promised \$260 million to South Africa. He promised them \$650 million, and do they not have the largest diamond reserves in the world, and we are going to pay \$650 million for infrastructure development? To Costa Rica he promised \$2.2 billion to extend the Caribbean Basin initiative, which the gentleman and I both know has absolutely decimated the textile industry in the Southeast United States, basically taken all of our jobs out of South Carolina and Georgia and put them in the Caribbean. He promised \$360 billion to train soldiers in Bosnia, even though we have already spent \$12 billion in the Balkans. It just goes on and on and on.

When the President travels, yes, it is expensive for his entourage, but it is even more expensive to hear what he promises to people.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If I can just make the point, I thank my colleagues from Georgia and from South Carolina, and our other good friend who serves on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) put pen to paper and started to estimate all the promises in the last 7-plus years.

Mr. Speaker, and I am glad the Speaker is seated, there are \$22 billion in promises of American funds to foreign governments on the road, and Mr. Speaker, we ought to issue this travel advisory, the President again, following Veterans Day, November 11, I believe November 12, is scheduled to make another trip to Europe.

Mr. Speaker, we should ask the President to uncharacteristically restrain the price of his promises. We do not need finger wagging or redefinition of the word "is," we need old fashioned fiscal discipline. We invite the President and the administration and our friends on the left to join us in that process.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues tonight who have joined me, the gentleman from Georgia, the gentleman from Arizona, the gentleman from South Carolina, for having what I think is a very interesting talk about a way that we can ask this president and challenge this president to save one penny.

We know what happened, today the President vetoed the bill because he wants more and more and more and more spending. He wants less accountability, and the worst part is that what it means is it would be spending our Nation's future social security.

Republicans will not allow this to happen. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) will not allow a bill that places social security in danger. I thank the gentlemen.

AMERICA'S EDUCATION CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I am again here to talk about the education crisis and the failure of our elected decision-makers to respond to that crisis.

I have been asked by people, why do you continue to come back and talk about the same subject? Well, I do that because the American people have made it quite clear in poll after poll and focus group after focus group that education is their number one priority.

No matter how we approach it, and I know ABC has now a series on it, because of the fact that they have recognized and want to pay tribute to the fact that continually the American people say education and the problems related to education should receive the highest priority when it comes to government assistance and the attention of our decision-makers in the Nation.

A poll was recently taken for the State of Ohio, and it came up 90 per-

cent of the people said education is the number one priority. No matter how we approach the problem in this democracy, the people speak with one voice, that they understand what the most important priority is.

What is amazing, what I cannot comprehend, is why in this democracy elected officials do not respond to that clearly-designated priority. How many times do the American people have to say it? How many ways do they have to say it? Well, there are some people who say we are responding to the priority, and I want to talk about that mistaken assumption.

I think that there is a lot of activity, a lot of rhetoric, related to education as a result of understanding that the general public, the overwhelming majority of the American people, want some action of great significance on education. Instead of acting, there is a lot of rhetoric. There is a lot of posturing.

I think we might call education the most trivialized priority in the history of political dialogue in this country. Education is the most trivialized priority. That is the response of a collective elected official community.

Too many of our elected officials are like the group of whales that were documented recently. There was a documentary where a group of whales were filmed beneath the ocean tossing a bloody baby seal around as sort of a game. I suppose eventually they ate the seal, but they tossed it around for a long time, and played with it. When we look at what is happening with education, the political functionaries who have the power to do something of great significance, the Governors, the mayors, the Congressmen, the White House, everybody seems to be willing to toss the bloody baby seal, instead of dealing with the problem.

Now, there are some of these whales, and whales come in many species, some whales are truly without vision. They do not understand how to deal with the problem. Some whales do not care. They understand the problem. They do not care about the public school system. Public education in America is like a baby seal bleeding and they do not care whether it bleeds to death or not. They do not care how long they play with it. They really do not intend to do anything about it.

Then there are some other whales that are too cautious, too frightened. They understand the problem but they do not dare venture out and talk about a real solution to the problem. So the bleeding baby seal keeps dying, and we keep tossing him about, but nothing is happening of great significance.

The public school system needs to be saved. We need to do it with some kind of activity comparable to the kind of activity exhibited by Thomas Jefferson when he decided he would purchase a territory which was larger than the United States at that time, it was a big, significant action; or when they decided to build the transcontinental railroad.

The transcontinental railroad was built not by private industry, as most people think, it was built by the government subsidy. The government hired private companies to do it, but the money came from the taxpayers. The initiative came from the government. The transcontinental railroad which linked the East and the West Coast was a monumental undertaking.

The Morrill Act, the Morrill Act which established land grant colleges in every State, it took Morrill a long time to get the idea across, but finally he did. That was a huge undertaking which transformed the American education system in very important ways. Especially, it gave to the agricultural industry a scientific engineering base that has made agriculture in America something that no other Nation has ever been able to get close to, agricultural production in America.

We have undertaken the Marshall Plan. The Marshall Plan was no small, trivialized step toward the rebuilding of Europe. It took billions of dollars. If we look at the Marshall Plan dollars in terms of today's dollars, it was fantastic.

Somebody could have been sitting in the corner saying, look, we cannot solve the problem of the revitalization of the European economies by throwing money at it. Let us not do it. Europe would have probably gone Communist in a few years if they had not moved in a dramatic fashion with an overwhelming amount of aid.

So we know how it is done. There is an American way of approaching the problem if we really want to solve it. But when it comes to education, we seem to think that the American public will soon get tired. There is no issue, there is no phenomenon which maintains and holds onto the attention of the American public indefinitely. There is always the hope that it will go away, that the concern will cease.

I hope not. That is why I make the trip here as often as I can to remind the voters that they are right, and the elected officials and their failure to respond places them in a situation where they are wrong. The American people are right. The American voters, they are right. Their common sense is on target. Do not give up. Do not stop demanding.

At the focus groups when they call you on the phone, keep saying, we want government to provide some significant assistance to education. We want to go on in some overwhelming way and deal with the problem, instead of playing games with it.

There are a lot of things that are happening in the area of education which we have to look at. It is such a complex problem until, like the blind men feeling the elephant, you can get a part of it and tell the truth. If you feel the trunk, you may describe the elephant one way. If you feel the tail, you describe him another way.

It is a complex problem, education. I do not want to belittle any aspect of

the problem. They all deserve attention. We have to deal with reading, we have to deal with science laboratories, we have to deal with libraries, we have to deal with certification of teachers, we have to deal with standards, testing, and most of all we need to deal with what I call the opportunities to learn.

We have had some great strides in the establishment of new curriculum standards. We have had some great strides in the area of testing. It is the area of opportunities to learn which seems to be the area where we lose vision, and that is the most important area of all.

The opportunity to learn involves what are you going to do. The question is, what are you going to do to make certain that the students in the schools have what they need to deal with the curriculum that we have established and to be able to pass the tests that we are establishing.

I have served on the Committee on Education and Labor, and what is called now the Committee on Education and the Workforce. I have served on that for the entire time I have been in Congress.

On the occasion of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Assistance Act 5 years ago we had a great debate about this whole matter of establishing curriculum standards and establishing testing standards.

□ 2200

We were, in the case of a group of Democrats on the committee, afraid that if you established curriculum standards that are national, although States have the freedom to deal with their own standards but they do not have to be dragged into it, but if you established models that are replicated State by State and then you established the testing standards and that became some national testing standards that were going to be used all over the country, if you did all of that, there is a danger that you could ruin the lives of youngsters by having these high-stakes tests circulating all over and determining who gets pigeon holed for the time that they are in school and college or for determining their ability to get a job.

There were a number of reasons why we were afraid of testing, but those of us who were afraid of a national testing policy to accompany a national set of curriculum standards agreed that we would accept national testing standards and national curriculum standards if you also had a national opportunity to learn standards. Opportunity to learn standards was the third set of standards. We called it a troika for education reform. And after many weeks of debate, finally we got that passed into the legislation. It was added to the legislation. Of course, Democrats were in control of the House at the time. We had the majority and we were able to prevail, and the oppor-

tunities to learn standards are included with the curriculum standards and the testing standards.

The problem now is that our schools are not going forward. We are not getting results, because we have eliminated a part of the troika. Actually, in a back-room deal, the Committee on Appropriations which had no authority to do it but all parties agreed, the administration agreed, both parties agreed, they took out the opportunity to learn standards, and we are zooming forward with the curriculum standards and with the testing standards.

Every State, every local education agency is now dealing with ways to tell the students that you have to measure up to certain standards. The curriculum is going to be tougher, but what the States and local education agencies are not willing to deal with is we are also going to provide you with the opportunities to learn; that what you need, we are going to provide you with whatever you need in order to be able to measure up to these standards; pass the tests. We are going to provide you with decent buildings, decent libraries. We are going to provide you with laboratories. We are going to provide you with necessary books. We are going to provide you with teachers who are able to teach what they are assigned to teach in the classrooms, certified, competent teachers. Those are the things we backed away from.

In New York, you have a new set of tests. All students have to pass certain regents tests. Otherwise, they do not get any type of paper. There was a time when you get what you call a general diploma which said you were sitting in the seats when you were in high school and you attended, you met certain minimal standards, so here is a general high school diploma. That is being eliminated. You have to pass certain tests.

I have no problem with the tests. I have no problem with the curriculum standards, if only we can add some opportunity to learn standards. We do not want children who have to sit in classrooms that are still threatened with asbestos. We do not want children to have to sit in classrooms that have the pollution from coal-burning furnaces. We do not want children who have to sit in overcrowded classrooms where there are too many in there.

We do not want children who have to eat lunch at 10:00 in the morning because the school has twice as many students as it was built for. In order to cycle them through the lunchroom, you have to have three different lunch periods or four different lunch periods. The first lunch period has to begin at 10:00. The last one ends at 1:30 or 2:00. So the children who eat last are very hungry excessively and the children who eat first are being force fed after they have already had breakfast.

We do not want these atrocities to go on. You have to deal with opportunities to learn by guaranteeing the right kinds of facilities and the right kinds

of materials and conditions. If you take New York as a case study, and I think that whenever I talk about New York I later on get comments that are e-mailed or faxed or come over the telephone where people indicate that it is not unique to New York.

You have got similar problems in many other places. There are other places where children have to eat lunch at 10:00 in the morning, I found out. There are numerous places where the overcrowding has reached a point where it is almost impossible to conduct classes. Even after the trailers are added and the kids have to walk through the snow to get to the rest-room from the trailers, or even after you add trailers in order to bring down the class size, the conditions still continue to be detrimental to learning. It is not just New York. It is not just big cities. The reason we keep getting the polls which show that the American people want education to be treated seriously, as a high priority item from all over the country, is because the situation does exist in most parts of the country; but New York is a good case study.

Whatever I discuss with respect to New York is applicable elsewhere in the country. I got a letter from some people who were working very hard in New York about some of the comments that I have made previously. In essence, a very respected retired judge, Thomas Russell Jones, who is a retired judge who works very hard to try to improve education, he is the president of an organization that he and his wife established called the Children's Times. The Children's Times continues to work away at the problems.

To carry my analogy of the ocean a little further, they are not whales tossing a bloody baby seal. They are people who desperately at the bottom of the sea are searching for pearls, polishing those pearls and trying to in every small way do something significant to help improve education. I applaud all of the efforts, no matter how small they are, to try to come to grips with problems related to our educational system.

I don't mean to say that those people are not serious. I am talking about public officials with power, Members of Congress, governors, mayors, people with power are the whales who are playing with the bloody seal.

We can do far more, and I suppose what Judge Jones was saying to me is that he would like to see me stop talking so much and do more. I agree with the judge's comments in the letter he wrote.

He says of my October speech, he criticizes me for not proposing any real solutions. He must not have listened to the very end because I always propose solutions. The solutions that I propose are not small ones, however. They are not nickel and dime solutions. They are solutions that are worthy of government action, certainly Federal Government action, but I will just quote a little from Judge Jones' letter.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OWENS, your October 12 speech to the House of Representatives as the designee of the Democratic minority informs the American people about a number of problems with education. You inform us that 81 percent of the American people favor placing computers in the classrooms of all public schools. You inform us that students in our country are going to have to seek jobs in a world where if one cannot use computers and use them effectively there is little hope for them to make a decent living. You have said that, quote, "black parents do not have any faith left in the public school system. They have given up hope." The Children's Times' directors agree with your findings and conclusions. We congratulate you for focusing attention on the findings of the Washington Post poll released on September 5, 1999, which reports that the American people place the immediate improvement of public schools at the top of their agenda year after year. Your statement, however, does not present any concrete, practical proposals to guarantee a modern education to 1.1 million children who attend public schools in New York City. The Children's Times petitions you to address the critical deficiencies in the elementary schools of New York City with respect of computer equipment in the classrooms and the effective closing of libraries in all public schools. I respectfully request that you publicly endorse the statement of United States Senator Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts delivered to the U.S. Senate on July 29, where he reported that the teacher shortage has forced many school districts to hire uncertified teachers or ask certified teachers to teach outside their area of expertise. Each year more than 50,000 underprepared teachers enter the classrooms. One in four new teachers do not meet standard certification requirements. Twelve percent of new teachers have had no teacher training. Students in inner city schools have only a 50 percent chance of being taught by a qualified science or math teacher.

I agree with all of these observations by Judge Jones and his son David Jones, who as the head of the Community Service Society some years ago was responsible for a survey which showed that in two-thirds of the schools in the city, those schools that were serving Hispanic and African American children, practically all the teachers who were teaching science and math had not majored in math and science in college.

So, Judge Jones, you have laid out several different aspects of the problem. I will not belittle any of them. Everything that you point out is correct. I applaud the Children's Times for staying on the case, but listen carefully. I do propose solutions. I propose solutions at all levels. On several previous occasions I said that New York City had part of the solution to the problem in its hands. New York City had a \$2 billion surplus last year. Their budget had \$2 billion left over after they met all city obligations, and the city could have moved to begin to deal with some of these problems without Federal assistance.

New York State had a \$2 billion surplus last year and New York State not only did not do anything about the problem, when the State assembly and the State Senate finally reached agreement that they would appropriate \$500 million of that \$2 billion for school re-

pairs, the governor of the State vetoed that part of the budget. He would not use \$500 million out of the \$2 billion for school repairs all across the State.

So these problems deserve attention, and I am a Member of Congress and am here to represent my constituency at the Federal level. The Federal Government must lead the way because that is where most of the money is.

All taxes are local. All the money in Washington came from the local level, and we should not flinch or hesitate to send some of that money back to deal with basic problems like the public school system.

I also received a letter from Mrs. Jones, Bertha Jones, Judge Jones's wife, who is a secretary of the Children's Times, at a later date, and she is talking about our libraries. The Children's Times Associates has launched a campaign to reestablish functioning libraries in the elementary schools of the City of New York.

The facts, the New York State Department of Education Division of Library Development, the State agency which supervises public school libraries throughout the State, informed the Children's Times Associates by a written memorandum dated August 23, 1999, that 550 elementary schools out of a total of 672 schools report a shortage of 550 certified librarians.

The memorandum adds that many public school libraries are presently staffed by teachers who have no library or technological training, or by para-professionals who lack expertise of any kind. I would not say para-professionals lack expertise of any kind, but certainly they are not qualified to run school libraries.

The United States Department of Education statistics reported recently that the New York City School System has hired fewer than one library media specialist for every 1,042 students. Library media specialists are trained to provide local media and telecommunications materials and access to experts whose advice and instructions teach children how to prepare classwork and homework on their own.

The Children's Times Associates predict that if children do not learn to read and do basic arithmetic by the fourth grade, they will be playing a losing game of catch-up for the rest of their academic lives, which may not be very long.

When libraries are reestablished in all elementary schools in New York City, under the supervision of library media specialists, in compliance with the New York State education law and the commissioner's regulations, 533,695 students will have access to the instructions and technology they need to work for their livelihoods as adults in 2000 and beyond, and that is signed by Bertha Jones, the secretary of the Children's Times Associates.

□ 2215

Again, as a former public librarian, my profession is library science, I have

a master's degree in library science, I wholeheartedly agree that this is a very devastating report of a blind spot in the public school system.

Libraries have always had to fight to exist in elementary schools. It looks as if we are losing that battle in New York City. Nothing is more important than what goes on with respect to libraries and the processes that children learn there about how to learn on their own, how to use the great fountain of knowledge that exists to take care of their own needs and to facilitate ways to educate themselves. Nothing is more important than encouraging youngsters also to do as much reading as possible.

I wholeheartedly agree with Mrs. Jones. I talk a lot about computers. I talk a lot about the need to bring our students to the level where they can run a cyber civilization, where they can deal with the fact that the world is now being more and more digitalized. It is not computer literacy, it is computer competence. The ability to work with imagination dealing with computers and web sites and the whole telecommunications revolution requires very well educated people. I have talked a great deal about that.

But do not misunderstand me. I know that begins with reading. Nobody learns how to deal with the information technology if they do not know how to read, if they do not know basic arithmetic. It all begins with the basics, and I do not want to ever appear to have down played that.

In response to the Children's Times Crusade to provide libraries for the schools in New York City, let me say that I have joined with my colleague in the Senate, JACK REED, and Senator JACK REED was a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce when we passed the last Elementary and Secondary Assistance Act, and we placed in that act the opportunity to learn standards.

So he knows very well that one of the things we have to do if we are going to improve education in America is to go beyond curriculum standards, go beyond national testing, and deal with providing opportunities to learn.

So Senator REED has already introduced a bill, and I have introduced the same bill, companion piece October 4, a few weeks ago, which provides for amending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, to provide up-to-date school library media resources and well-trained professionally certified school library specialists for elementary schools and secondary schools and for other purposes. This bill's number is H.R. 3008, H.R. 3008 in the House. The companion Senate bill is S. 1262. Now, I have just recently put out a Dear Colleague letter asking all of my colleagues to join me on this particular piece of legislation.

Going beyond the statistics which Mrs. Jones cited for New York City, let us talk about the whole country. Looking at libraries in the whole country,

we are talking about almost one-third of the U.S. public schools lack a full-time school library media specialist.

The national average is one library media specialist to every 591 students in American elementary and secondary schools. The ratio of students to school library media specialists varies widely from one school library specialist for every 287 public school students in Montana to one library media specialist for every 942 public school students in California.

A 12-State U.S. study found that funding for school library materials annually vary from \$15 to \$58,874 for elementary school libraries and \$155 to \$100,810 for secondary school libraries. In other words, the funding for some elementary school libraries as low as \$15. For others, for some high school libraries as low as \$155, this funding for school library materials. But in some schools, it was as high as \$58,874 in some elementary schools and as high as \$100,810 in some secondary schools.

So the disparity is obviously there. It is one of the problems which the Federal role in education has always sought to address, the great disparity between the richest districts and the poorest districts.

Reading further in terms of the findings that make this school library bill important, the median per pupil expenditure by school library media centers in America in the 1995-1996 school year was \$6.73 for elementary schools. The per pupil expenditure, the median was \$6.73 for elementary schools, that is all, and \$7.30 for middle schools, \$6.25 for senior high schools. In a Nation which is enjoying unprecedented prosperity, we can do better.

Mr. Speaker, I will not read further from this Dear Colleague letter, but I include for the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 3, 1999.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Almost one-third of U.S. public schools lack a full-time school library media specialist. The national average is one library media specialist to every 591 students in American elementary and secondary schools.

The ratio of students to school library media specialists varies widely: from one school library specialist for every 287 public school students in Montana to one library media specialist for every 942 public school students in California.

A 12-state U.S. study found that funding for school library materials annually varied from \$15 to \$58,874 for elementary school libraries and \$155 to \$100,810 for secondary school libraries.

The median per pupil expenditure by school library media centers in America in the 1995-1996 school year was \$6.73 for elementary schools, \$7.30 for middle schools, and \$6.27 for senior high schools.

School libraries have become the heart of the learning experience for students being prepared to enter the Twenty-First Century, the age of almost unlimited information access available at a touch. But many of those children will not be ready for the demands of the third millennium if something is not done to make access to that information equally available to every student in America. As the numbers above show, there is a lot to be done to make that a reality.

That is why I have introduced a bill that will provide the technology and the expertise to all elementary and secondary public schools across the country. H.R. 3008, The Elementary and Secondary School Library Media Resources, Training, and Advanced Technology Assistance Act, which is a companion bill to S. 1262 introduced by Senator Jack Reed, will provide funding for media resources for elementary and secondary school libraries as well as well-trained, certified library specialists for students. Through the establishment of the School Library Access Program, these resources will be available to students during regular school hours, during after-school hours in the evenings, on weekends, and during school breaks. Schools with the greatest need will receive priority funding consideration, as will local educational agencies with a high level of community support, coordinated services, and non-school hour activities for students.

The bill has been endorsed by the American Library Association and retired New York State Supreme Court Justice Thomas Russell Jones, now Chair of the Advisory Committee for CHILDREN'S TIMES Associates.

If the quality of America's future leaders is as important to you as it is to me, please join me in being a cosponsor of the Elementary and Secondary School Library Media Resources, Training, and Advanced Technology Assistance Act. Together, we can help to shape an even stronger, more vibrant nation and maintain America's cutting leadership in the field of information technology. Please contact Beverly Gallimore in my office by Monday, November 15, at 5-6231 to be a cosponsor.

Sincerely yours,

MAJOR R. OWENS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to congratulate the Children's Times and what they are doing in New York City. As I have just illustrated, the problem is not a New York City problem only. The case history of New York City is relevant for numerous local school districts across the country. New York State is a good case study, though, in many ways. We are having a problem that many other States have faced. We have a problem. We are attacking that problem in a new way. Many other States have done the same thing.

The political situation is such that the whales who play with the baby seals do not play with all the seals in the same way. The whales provide to let some seals go free while others bleed and die. In numerous States, one has drastic unevenness between the funding for certain schools. Some States like New York, the difference may be between \$17,000 or \$18,000 per pupil funding compared to they say \$8,000 in New York City. But in New York City, there are 32 school districts. Within the city, the funding for some school districts is as low as \$3,000 per pupil, which means that some districts in the city are getting far more than they should be receiving.

When one averages it all out, it is going to be \$8,000 to \$9,000 per pupil. That is another problem I am going to deal with in a minute. But in numerous States, rural schools and big city schools face the same problem of not being funded equally with State aid.

In New York City, the problem has been a serious one for a long time.

They have many devices that result in some parts of the State getting greater aid per pupil than others. One of the archaic and most devastating devices is the hold-harmless formula where no school district gets less money one year than it got way back 20 years ago.

Each year, the hold-harmless formula says that, no matter what happens, you do not get less. That means that, if the school district gets a reduction in the number of pupil they are going to be receiving as the district, the same amount of money they received when the pupils were much higher, the amount per pupil will go for that reason.

There are many other devices used to produce a result where New York City per-pupil expenditure is about between \$450 to \$500 less than the per-pupil expenditure average in the rest of the State.

A group called the Campaign for Fiscal Equity has brought a new court suit. We have had a few suits over the last 30, 40 years where court actions, litigation has attempted to try to correct this problem of unequal funding throughout the State.

The new one has been launched by the Campaign for Fiscal Equity. I want to congratulate the Campaign for Fiscal Equity. They are doing something about the problem. The trouble is that what they are doing, as noble and as necessary as it may be, it is still dealing with how are we going to, in a fairer way, divide up the pie that exists already.

I say the pie that exists already is grossly inadequate. We must address both problems, how to divide it up so that you do have equitable funding. But the biggest problem at this point is also how do we use the resources of this Nation in a more creative way, in a more generous way to deal with the problem of funding for schools.

Campaign for Fiscal Equity is suing the State. The trial is under way now in Federal court. In the past, these battles have been fought out in State court because the State has primary responsibility for education in New York State, as is the case in most States.

But the campaign for Fiscal Equity is arguing on the basis of a violation of civil rights, unequal protection under the law. This is going to be a landmark case.

What they are also using now that they did not have before is a definition of what an adequate education is. The State has always in the past argued that, even though one school district may get far more money from the State than another get per pupil, the State is only responsible for doing an adequate job; and that the student receiving the lower amount of money is still getting enough money to provide an adequate education.

How does one define adequate education? Well, prompted by the Federal Government, prompted by our legislation, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the States have moved to

define adequate education. They have established standards. Now we can hold the State to its own standards.

The State of New York has established some curriculum standards. The State of New York has established testing standards. They have said no student in this State will receive a high school diploma unless they measure up to certain standards. They must pass the test to a certain level. So we have a way to measure what is an adequate education.

The next question is: If this is your definition of an adequate education, what does one need, what kinds of materials, what kinds of facilities, what kinds of teachers do you need in order to meet that standard, in order to provide that adequate education.

You cannot play with it anymore. If you are saying that every student has to pass a math test at a certain level, you cannot continue to provide uncertified math teachers in junior high school and high school who did not major in math. Nobody, no matter how smart they are, is going to be able to adequately teach math in junior high school and high school if they did not really major in math in college.

You cannot pretend you are doing that if you are saying that every student, before they get any kind of diploma must meet certain math standards. You provide the teachers who can produce that.

You cannot say that, if you say that every student must meet certain science standards, display certain kinds of knowledge with respect to science, if you do not provide any laboratories in the high schools, if you do not provide adequate laboratories in the high school to deal with what you are going to have on your test.

As I said before, great strides are being made in the establishment of curriculum standards. Great strides are being made, and a lot of this is being driven by elected officials, politicians in testing. We want to hold everybody accountable. I am sorry not everybody. We want to hold students accountable. We do not want to hold the school system accountable. We do not want to hold the State accountable for funding. We do not want to hold the city accountable and say that you should not have neglected to spend some part of your \$2 billion surplus on education. We want to hold students accountable. Everybody is focusing on the student and dumping the load, the burden of changing the education standards and system on the students.

New York City recently, and this is an article that appeared in the New York Times yesterday, New York's new curriculum guides set up standards grade by grade. In an effort to help parents hold schools accountable for what children learn or do not learn, the New York City school systems has produced a series of guides to what every child should know from kindergarten through 12th grade. Wonderful.

The guides being distributed to teachers and parents beginning today

decree that a fifth grader multiply with speed and accuracy, understand exponents, write a report using three sources of information, and know how to punctuate with quotation marks, commas, and colons.

□ 2230

"A kindergartner should be able to count to 10 and tell a story using letters, drawings, scribbles, and gestures."

I do not know enough to know whether those are reasonable standards or not, but I applaud some kinds of standards.

The school's chancellor, Rudy Crew, said yesterday that the new guides are intended to be so clear and so simple that all parents can understand these guidelines and became partners in their children's education. He said that they would give parents the tools to hold schools responsible for what their children learn and whether they learn it.

Dr. Crew said the pamphlets, one for every grade, are intended to at least implicitly establish a common curriculum. Although he talked about ensuring that children throughout the city are learning the same thing every day, every week, every month, he cannot ensure that; but the guides do set goals like "write daily for extended periods," but not specific content. They do not list books that all children in one grade should read or math problems that they all do. But for the first time there is a consistent framework of student achievement across the whole system regardless of the borough, the district, or the classroom, Dr. Crew said.

"In the last few years," again New York is not alone, and I am reading from a New York Times article which appeared yesterday, November 2. "In the last few years, many states, including California, New York, and Virginia, have tried to take a stronger hand in dictating curriculum after years of giving schools and districts control. Indeed, Dr. Crew, at a news conference at the Board of Education Headquarters in Brooklyn, said that New York City is actually entering the game rather late, a decade after the movement to tie curriculum and standards together actually began in California and other states.

"The project was also clearly intended to fend off lawsuits, one has already been filed, challenging Dr. Crew's plan to end the automatic promotion of failing students. In New York, Florida, and other states parents have argued that it is unfair and even illegal to hold back children if they have not been clearly told what is expected of them and if the curriculum does not reflect the standards.

"In June, thousands of children in New York City were held back based on test scores alone, setting off a lawsuit by some parents who contended that other factors like attendance and classroom work should be considered. Until now, Dr. Crew said yesterday, cur-

riculum was set by a combination of state and city standards, which he criticized as too vague, as well as standards of the textbook publishers.

"Because this is the first year of our new promotional policy, it is very, very important that parents understand what is acceptable grade level work said Judith Rizzo for instruction."

And on and on it goes.

Everybody is in harmony with establishment of these standards. The questions that are not being considered in this article are, what are we going to do to make certain that you have the teachers, the materials, the libraries, the science laboratories which allow the children to measure up to these standards?

Diane Ravitch, an old colleague of ours here in Washington, has certainly pinpointed one the problems. Diane Ravitch, in this same article, says, "the new goals would only be effective if teachers were trained to use them and tests were designed to measure them.

"The board released guides covering English and math in kindergarten through grade 8 yesterday and will add grades 9 through 12 shortly, the officials said. It also plans to issue social studies and science guides. The officials said the guides will be sent home with students in time for parent-teacher conferences this month and will be available in several languages."

I applaud the work of the Board of Education and Dr. Rudy Crew in coming to grips with the need for curriculum guides. Now we can take the curriculum guides and create another column, a column next to each set of measurements for the curriculum standards, and lay out what is needed in order to meet that standard.

If you are teaching science, then we can ask the question, does the school have science laboratories? We can ask the question, does the school, if you want children to read at a certain level and be able to write reports, do they have a library, can they get access to books and be able to be stimulated to read more and learn how to write reports? On and on you can go.

Once you have established standards and curriculum, now you certainly have tests which are serious. Because if children do not pass the test, they are not going to make the next grade.

No social promotion is a policy that everybody has jumped on board. It is a great wonderful policy, no social promotion. We will have a problem with no social promotion because one of the things that happens is you increase the over-crowding in schools. The schools that are already overcrowded are going to be even more crowded. Classrooms are going to be even more crowded if you do not have social promotion, and you will have to deal with that problem.

But the other problem is too often the primary determinant as to whether a youngster is promoted or not is the test. And the test, as administered by

the New York City Board of Education last spring, as scored by the firm that they hired to do it, the tests had 20,000 youngsters labeled as being not eligible to move on to the next grade because they made mistakes.

In the computation of the test scores they made mistakes. And large numbers of children had to sit through summer schools in hot buildings that had no air conditioning. They had to go through torture of summer schools when they had not failed, they had passed, and the blunders of the bureaucracy had placed them in this situation.

So it is a high-stakes game. These tests determine what happens grade by grade, and these tests are going to determine what happens in the life of the students that have to go through it. If we are going to have these standards, the Campaign for Fiscal Equity, Incorporated, that has the trial going at Federal courts is on target. If you are going to have these standards, then you have to provide the resources starting with the provision of State aid to the City of New York at the same level per pupil that you have provide to the rest of the State.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the article that appeared in the New York Times, November 2, 1999, "New York's New Curriculum Guides Set Up Standards."

[From the New York Times, Nov. 2, 1999]

NEW YORK'S NEW CURRICULUM GUIDES SET UP STANDARDS, GRADE BY GRADE

(By Anemona Hartocollis)

In an effort to help parents hold schools accountable for what children learn—or don't learn—the New York City school system has produced a series of guides to what every child should know from kindergarten through 12th grade.

The guides, being distributed to teachers and parents beginning today, decree that a fifth grader multiply with speed and accuracy, understand exponents, write a report using three sources of information and know how to punctuate with quotation marks, commas and colons. A kindergartner should be able to count to 10 and tell a story using letters, drawing, scribbles and gestures.

Schools Chancellor Rudy Crew said yesterday that the new guides are intended to be so clear and simple that all parents can understand them and become partners in their children's education. He said that they would give parents a tool to hold schools responsible for what their children learn, and whether they learn it.

Dr. Crew said the pamphlets—one for every grade—are intended to at least implicitly establish a common curriculum. Although he talked about ensuring that children throughout the city are learning the same thing every day, every week, every month, the guides set goals, like "write daily for extended periods," but not specific content. They do not list books that all children in one grade should read or math problems that they all should do.

"For the first time, there is a consistent framework for student achievement across the system, regardless of the borough, the district or the classroom," Dr. Crew said.

In the last few years, many states, including California, New York and Virginia, have tried to take a stronger hand in dictating curriculum, after years of giving schools and

districts control. Indeed, Dr. Crew, at a news conference at Board of Education headquarters in Brooklyn, said that New York City is actually entering the game rather late, a decade after the movement to tie curriculum and standards together actually began in California and other states.

The project was also clearly intended to fend off lawsuits—one has already been filed—challenging Dr. Crew's plan to end the automatic promotion of failing students.

In New York, Florida and other states, parents have argued that it is unfair and even illegal to hold back children if they have not been clearly told what is expected of them, and if the curriculum does not reflect the standards. In June, thousands of children were held back based on test scores alone, setting off a lawsuit by some parents who contended that other factors, like attendance and classroom work, should be considered.

Until now, Dr. Crew said yesterday, curriculum was set by a combination of state and city standards, which he criticized as too vague, as well as standards of the textbook publishers.

"Because this is the first year of our new promotional policy, it is very, very, very important that parents understand what is acceptable grade-level work," said Judith Rizzo, deputy chancellor for instruction.

Randi Weingarten, president of the United Federation of Teachers, said the idea was "terrific," but that the union believes it will not be complete until the school system has a "much more thorough and really core curriculum." The union is working on such a curriculum, to be unveiled next school-year.

But some parents said yesterday that the learning standards were too vague to be useful and feared that the pamphlets would be used to blame children and parents if students did not measure up.

Sylvia Wertheimer, the mother of a fifth grader at Public School 41 in Greenwich Village and an assistant district attorney in Manhattan, said the goals articulated in the pamphlets sounded just like the goals that her school already uses in its report cards. She also fretted that teachers and administrators would be defensive if she tried to use such standards to confront them about their shortcomings.

"More gibberish," she said. "I feel like they want the parents to do everything, whatever deficiencies children have. Why don't they just teach them?"

Diane Ravitch, an education historian, said the new goals would only be effective if teachers were trained to use them, and tests were designed to measure them. "Al Shanker always used to say, 'Does it count?'" Dr. Ravitch said, referring to the former president of the American Federation of Teachers.

Despite his vision of 1,200 schools doing the same thing at the same time, Dr. Crew's plan would not be as regimented as, say, the French school system, where if it is 10 a.m., children everywhere are learning "Phèdre" by Racine.

Neither Dr. Crew nor his aides were able to explain how they would enforce the new learning standards in a system as complex as New York City's, where local districts and schools have historically enjoyed a high degree of autonomy.

For each grade, the new guides describe how the standards will be used to determine whether children go on to the next grade or are held back, and warn that no decision will be made based on one factor alone, like a test score.

The board released guides covering English and math in kindergarten through grade 8 yesterday and will add grades 9 through 12 shortly, officials said. It also plans to issue

social studies and science guides. Officials said the guides would be sent home with students in time for parent-teacher conferences this month, and will be available in several languages.

The Campaign for Fiscal Equity is a noble attempt, I said, to deal with the fact that the amount of resources available are not being distributed appropriately. A lot of the activity and energy that has been put forth surrounding education in this House of Representatives for the past few years has dealt with the same problem of no new resources; let us argue about how we use what we have.

One of the big issues that was on the floor of this House a few weeks ago related to the passage of the title I funding out of the committee that I serve on was, shall we take what exists already, title I funding, nearly \$8 billion for the whole Nation, shall we take that and change the original target.

The original target for that funding under the original law was that the poorest children in America needed the most help. The school districts where the poorest children resided were not capable of giving the kind of help that they should give, and the Federal Government intervened, just as the Federal Government intervened before in school lunch programs to make sure that every child gets nutritional care in terms of food, and a number of other ways the Federal Government has over the years intervened.

By the way, it even intervenes in the case of highways. We have a national highway system which is fantastic because the Federal Government intervened to provide a highway system. So when we have had needs, the Federal Government has intervened.

A lot of people say, well, there is nothing in the Constitution that makes the Federal Government responsible for education. There is also nothing in the Constitution that makes the Federal Government responsible for railroads, but we built the transcontinental railroad. There is nothing that says the Federal Government is responsible for highways, and yet we spent billions of dollars for a highway system. And recently we authorized \$218 billion over a 6-year period to continue to build and refine our highway system.

So the Federal Government, under Lyndon Johnson, decided to intervene and provide education for those schools that need it most. Title I funding is for the poorest schools and the poorest youngsters. The formula for title I is driven by poverty. The measurement for poverty is the number of youngsters who qualify for free school lunches provided by the Federal Government.

We have had situations where the intent of the law, the target population, has been circumvented. Too many districts that did not have poor children were going to receive title I funds, or only had only had a tiny amount. We dealt with that when the law was reauthorized 5 years ago, tightened it up.

But then we had a situation where they wanted to define which schools are eligible to have schoolwide programs. And when you determine who is eligible to have a schoolwide program instead of focusing on individual children, we had a figure of the number of percentage of children who are poor as a factor to decide whether or not they could have a schoolwide program.

If you had 75 percent of the children who were poor, then we could have a schoolwide program that did not have to focus on individual children, but the whole school could benefit from the dollars that the title I program provided.

It started out at 75 percent. Then it was reduced to 50 percent. One of the battles we had a few weeks ago on the floor was the fact that the present majority, Republican majority, decided they wanted to reduce that further to 40 percent. One of the members on the Committee on Education, Republican majority member, also even wanted to go to 25 percent.

Well, if a school qualifies with only 25 percent poverty, you could see how you then have to cover more schools. And many of those schools, with only 25 percent of the children being poor, would absorb dollars and help fewer poor children. So you could describe it accurately as the Robin-Hood-in-reverse approach. Instead of appropriating more money if you want to reach more children, we were going to take money from the poorer children and give it to the children who were better off and the schools that were better off, circumventing and undercutting the intent of the law.

Well, that is going forward. On the floor of this House there was an amendment offered to keep it at 50 percent, where it is now, and that amendment lost. So the legislation that went to the other body contains in it the 40 percent figure. And probably if the Republican majority had their way, they would eliminate any percentage, because they came on the floor shortly after the title I bill was passed with another bill called the Straight A's act.

The Straight A's act says, let us give all money related to education to the governors and the States and let the governors decide how to spend the money, and they probably certainly will not use any 50 percent formula.

The history of the States is that they operate in a way which satisfies the most powerful elements in the State, and poor people are seldom the most powerful elements in the State political arena.

Right now you have large numbers of States that have surplus funds for welfare. They are not providing the funds that they should for day-care and for other kinds of services to welfare recipients, even though it is Federal money. They have saved it in various ways, and they are supposed to provide that money to help train and provide jobs for welfare recipients and day-care services.

New York State is a place where there is a tremendous need, large waiting list for day-care services. There is a surplus now, and the governor and the State have moved so slowly, until you have a surplus but large numbers of unserved families who want day-care and need day-care and cannot get it.

The likelihood is that, the more discretion you give to the State, the fewer poor people would get service. History has demonstrated that the States will not take care of the poor. The Robin Hood approach is to not provide more money but to spread it out.

We have a situation in New York City where the number of poor children drive the formula, determine the amount of money that comes into New York City. New York City is composed of five counties; and in the distribution of money in the counties, we found that the children in some counties were getting far more of the title I funds than others. And we corrected that 5 years ago by changing the formula to make it similar to the formula that applies to the rest of the Nation.

□ 2245

The formula says that money must come to New York City by county, so that the poorest county, the county with the largest number of poor children, Brooklyn, found that it was getting far less money than it should get if you use the straight formula as was used in the rest of the Nation. So we had a battle and we had forces lined up to challenge that and try to fight again for the pile, the limited pile, how to divide that was going to become a fight. I hope that that fight does not materialize.

I would like to join all my colleagues in New York State, certainly from New York City and take a look at how we can deal with the fact that the city as a whole and the State as a whole does not get the kind of funding from education that it should be receiving per student. We should have a unified effort to try to bring in more funds instead of dividing up the pile. The Robin Hood approach at the local level is no more desirable than the Robin Hood approach at the Federal level. We do not want to have title I formulas distorted. We do not want to have favoritism in the bureaucracy determining that children who are poor in one part of the city will get far more than they deserve while other children are robbed of their fair share of title I funding. We want to deal with that. There are many positive solutions that we can go forward with while we are waiting for reelection by the levels of government that have real power. The Federal Government, State government, governors should stop playing games. I go back to the analogy of the bleeding baby seal. We should stop tossing the bleeding baby seal about and having fun with it, pretending we are going to do something about education while the bleeding baby seal dies. We should do big things to deal with a monumental

problem. Education is a monumental problem. It requires a big solution, a big approach.

I understand there are some candidates running for President who say that it is the duty of the Federal Government to deal with big problems with big solutions. The Marshall plan is one example I told you. The Transcontinental Railroad, the Morrill Act which established land grant colleges, the GI bill which provided education for all GIs after World War II. We have numerous examples of how we have dealt with big problems with big solutions.

I want to close by reading a letter I sent to the President to appeal to him to offer leadership in this area. I think that as I have said many times, there are many components of the problem of education reform, many components. They are all important. But the king-pin component is what are you going to do about facilities, what are you going to do about the infrastructure, how are you going to send a message to all the students that we really care about public education by letting them see the highly visible changes that we can make to improve education? I wrote this letter to President Clinton on October 13, and I want to read parts of it. First I am going to read a part which does not relate to education but relates to my great appreciation of President Clinton because I think we need to re-establish a perspective on the man we are dealing with. I do not agree with all the people who seem to say that he has no legacy. I think he has a legacy already, but I would like to see the legacy improved upon.

"Dear President Clinton:

"Let me begin with an expression of my deeply felt admiration of your leadership in a period cluttered with many more political perils than most citizens have realized. Your leadership has been the vital defense against an unprecedented right wing assault on the unique institutions and programs which extend the benefits of our democracy down to the ordinary men and women of our Nation. When all others were traumatized by the Republican blitzkrieg, your maneuvers held their forces in check. Despite the petty problems highlighted by the partisan impeachment effort, Mr. President, you have already established firmly an impressive legacy. For many millions, you already have the unwavering loyalty and heartfelt appreciation that you deserve. You have preserved the conscience of the country. That is a legacy that historians will eventually be compelled to acknowledge.

"But, Mr. President, there is one more vital request we must make on your unique ability to fuse the practical with the idealistic. Now is the time for you to crystallize, solidify, concretize your legacy as the Education President with actions that will catapult our Nation forward. I strongly advise, urge and plead, Mr. President,

that you launch an omnibus, cyber-civilization education program to guarantee the brainpower and leadership needed for our present and for the expanding future digitalized economy and high-tech world.

"At the heart of such a comprehensive initiative, we must set the all-important revitalization of the physical infrastructure of America's schools. These necessary brick and mortar creations will long endure not only as highly visible symbols of your overwhelming commitment to education but they will serve also as practical vehicles for the delivery of the kind of high-tech education required in the 21st century. To the working families who depend on public schools, it would be a resounding message that a vital segment of our Nation's children have not been abandoned.

"The message will also state that we are willing to make an overwhelming investment in a workforce which will help to guarantee the viability of Social Security. We are willing to make an investment in a massive student pool that provides the military with the recruits needed to operate a high-tech defense system. We are willing to make an overwhelming investment in a massive body that can produce the full range of geniuses, scientists, engineers, administrators, managers, technicians, mechanics, et cetera, necessary to launch and maintain a cyber-civilization.

"In other words, Mr. President, it is of vital importance that you carry your own movement to a highly visible apex. Please consider the fact that it is not by accident that the most brilliant American President, Thomas Jefferson, chose a message for his tombstone which only noted that he was the founder of the University of Virginia. If there had been no first model State university established by Jefferson, there would have later been no Morrill Act to establish land grant colleges in every State.

"The America of the year 2000 requires from you, Mr. President, a comparable pioneering act to guarantee its brainpower leadership in the world."

Mr. Speaker, I submit the entirety of this letter for the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 13, 1999.

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: Let me begin with an expression of my deeply felt admiration of your leadership in a period cluttered with many more political perils than most citizens have realized. Your leadership has been the vital defense against an unprecedented right wing assault on the unique institutions and programs which extend the benefits of our democracy down to the ordinary men and women of our nation. When all others were traumatized by Newt Gingrich's blitzkrieg your maneuvers held his forces in check. Despite the petty problems highlighted by the partisan impeachment, Mr. President, you have already firmly established an impressive legacy. From many millions you already have the unwavering loy-

alty and heartfelt appreciation that you deserve. You have preserved the conscience of the country. That is a legacy that historians will eventually be compelled to acknowledge.

But, Mr. President, there is one more vital request we must make on your unique ability to fuse the practical with the idealistic. Now is the time for you to crystallize, solidify, concertize your legacy as the Education President with actions that will catapult our nation forward. I strongly advise, urge and plead that you launch an Omnibus CYBER-CIVILIZATION Education program to guarantee the brainpower and leadership needed for our present and expanding future digitalized economy and hi-tech world.

At the heart of such a comprehensive initiative we must set the all important revitalization of the physical infrastructure of America's schools. These necessary brick and mortar creations will long endure not only as highly visible symbols of your overwhelming commitment to education; they will also serve as practical vehicles for the delivery of the kind of hi-tech education required in the 21st Century. To the working families who depend on public schools it would be a resounding message that a vital segment of our nation's children have not been abandoned.

The message will also state that we are willing to make an overwhelming investment: in a workforce which will help to guarantee the viability of Social Security; in a massive student pool that provides the military with the recruits able to operate a high-tech defense system; in a massive body that can produce the full range of geniuses, scientists, engineers, administrators, managers, technicians, mechanics, etc. necessary to launch and maintain a global Cyber-Civilization.

All of the most brilliant and visionary education achievements of your administration may be merged and focused through these vital physical edifices: The NET-Day movement for the volunteer wiring of schools; The Technology Literacy Legislation; the Community Technology Centers; the Distance Learning pilot projects; and the widely celebrated and appreciated E-Rate for telecommunications. The lifting of standards, the improvement in school curriculums and the support for smaller class sizes are also initiatives that require the additional classrooms and expanded libraries and laboratories that school modernization will bring.

In other words, Mr. President, it is of vital importance that you carry your own movement to an ultimate highly visible apex. Please consider the fact that it is not by accident that the most brilliant American President, Thomas Jefferson, chose a message for his tombstone which only noted that he was the founder of the University of Virginia. If there had been no first model state university established by Jefferson, there would have later been no Morrill Act to establish land-grant colleges in every state.

The America of the Year 2000 requires from you a comparable pioneering act to guarantee its brainpower leadership in the world. You have the opportunity to bequeath a new system for public education. Highly developed human resources are clearly the key to power and prosperity in the century to come. To minimize the crippling waste of human potential there must be a broad sweeping public school system forever striving toward education excellence. The kingpin for the education improvement effort, the temples for the promotion of excellence are our school buildings.

Mr. President, an adequate and landmark modernization and construction program requires that we move beyond HR 1660, the Rangel Ways and Means payment of the in-

terest on school bonds (3.7 billion over a five year period). For New York and numerous other states which require that voters approve all borrowing for school construction, this legislation will provide zero funding. I strongly urge that you revamp your position and support HR 3071, my bill which provides direct funding at a level commensurate with the magnitude of the problem of school wiring, security, safety, modernization and construction (110 Billion dollars over a ten year period).

On a trip to New York more than a year ago, as your guest aboard Air Force One, I had the privilege of chatting with you about education issues and problems. When you asked my opinion of the growing endorsement of vouchers among African American parents, I replied that our public school reforms were moving too slowly and sometimes even lurching backwards with the results that large numbers of parents have lost hope.

Mr. President, the trip was much too short and when we ended our brief exchange you invited me to forward a more thorough statement of views and vision on the education challenge. Although I have had the pleasure of speaking to you in group meetings since that discussion, I have not until now attempted to offer a thorough summary of my position on the need for an overwhelming campaign to greatly improve public education in America. A massive school construction initiative must be placed at the core of this campaign for a CYBER-CIVILIZATION Education Program.

Sincerely Yours,

MAJOR R. OWENS,
Member of Congress.

CONVICTED MURDERER SEEKS EXECUTIVE CLEMENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago I was moved by an article that I read about an individual by the name of Leonard Peltier. Mr. Peltier is currently in the penitentiary, Federal penitentiary, for the assassination of two FBI agents. He has been in prison for 25 years.

I need to be fair to all of my colleagues here and give you some disclosures. First of all, I used to be a police officer. As a result of being a police officer, over the years and especially during the time of my tenure as a police officer, I developed a very close relationship with agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Over the years, I have also developed a great deal of respect for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. But I must also tell my colleagues that over these years I have also had an opportunity to carefully scrutinize the Federal Bureau of Investigation, because, you see, I think it is a very important agency for our country. But I think the integrity of the agency is also very, very important.

In the past, I have been very critical of the Federal Bureau of Investigation when they messed up. I can give you an excellent example, Ruby Ridge. The agents involved at Ruby Ridge in my opinion should have been immediately

terminated. What happened at Ruby Ridge I will not repeat this evening but I will tell you that the command officer from the Federal Bureau of Investigation was not terminated, in fact the command officer was put on a paid leave of absence for 1 or 2 years and retired and received in my opinion no punishment at all.

I am also looking with a very careful eye at the Federal Bureau of Investigation's role at the Waco, Texas goof-up. That, too, is a very tragic situation in the history of our country, and I think unfortunately, there will be revealed within the report about the incident at Waco, Texas, that the Federal Bureau of Investigation misstated their role, understated their contribution, so to speak, or their involvement in the situation at Waco, Texas.

So I am not necessarily in lockstep with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. But I can tell you, when I look at all of the law enforcement agencies I have seen over the years, and as a former law enforcement officer, I have had the opportunity to be involved with many of them, at the very highest, when you look at the picture as an average, the Federal Bureau of Investigation comes out at the very top. And I think it is incumbent, Mr. Speaker, colleagues, of every one of us when we see an attack launched against the Federal Bureau of Investigation that is launched without justification, or when we see an action being taken against the Federal Bureau of Investigation without justification, we have a commitment to step forward and say something about it.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my comments, I saw an article the other day about this individual. This gentleman's name is Leonard Peltier. I saw today in fact an article in the USA Today. The article is Indians, FBI Face Off in Washington. First of all, I am not sure why the author of the USA Today article uses the word Indians in a broad or general descriptive form. In my particular district, which is the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado, we have the Indian tribal lands, and I have yet to hear from any of the leaders of those Indian tribes, of which I work with very closely on projects such as the Animus LaPlata, the kind of appeal that may be suggested by all Indians as a result of this particular article. It is my opinion that the Native American involvement in this case is limited. And it is also my opinion that if you sit down with the average Native American in this country and you look at the facts of this case, that there will be very few Native Americans who would step forward and say that this particular convict is a political prisoner.

I think this is a stage being set by the defense attorneys for this convict. Actually using the word convict is somewhat gentle. He is not a convict, he is a murderer, and he is a cold-blooded murderer. He killed two FBI agents in cold blood. Now, 25 years ago,

as one defense attorney would suggest, is something that enough time has passed by that perhaps he has served his time for this violent and horrible crime. I will quote exactly from the USA Today.

Peltier, that is the convict, the murderer that I am talking about, has been in prison as long as anyone responsible for similar crimes should be in, attorney Carl Nadler says. Can you believe this? Let me repeat what this defense attorney says. Peltier has been in prison as long as anyone responsible for similar crimes should be in prison. What he is suggesting is that 25 years is enough time for somebody to serve that goes out and in cold blood assassinates two officers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Well, I stand here tonight, colleagues, in deep disagreement with this defense attorney. And I urge that all of my colleagues on the floor take time to review what is going on in the month of November in regard to this case. Now, why have I suggested the month of November? Well, apparently this murderer's defense team has put together a little political show and tell, and they call November the month of publicity or the month to get reprieve for this convicted murderer. What I mean by that, it is this month that they are submitting papers to the President of the United States requesting that clemency be granted to Leonard Peltier, a convicted murderer.

A couple of days ago, I read an open letter. This open letter is a joint letter authored by the Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association located in New Rochelle, New York and the Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation located in Quantico, Virginia. The above organizations, which are professional, nongovernmental associations, represent over 20,000 active duty and former FBI agents. I was so moved by this letter that I ask my colleagues to follow me closely this evening as I read verbatim that open letter to the American people.

As many of you know, I do not often read from notes when I speak from this podium, but I am going to be very careful this evening that I read this letter verbatim, because I think it is important that every one of us in this room have a clear understanding of the facts of this case before Peltier's defense attorney arrives here in Washington, D.C., sets up this political show and tell, and tries to convince through propaganda that for some reason this convicted murderer deserves clemency from the President of the United States.

We should not take this lightly. We had a very difficult situation about 1 month ago when clemency was given to the Puerto Rican terrorists.

□ 2300

As I pointed out from this House floor, you can look right up in the roof of this fine room and you can see the

bullet hole, or I could walk over here to this desk drawer and show you the bullet holes through that desk from the Puerto Rican terrorists who entered this floor many years ago firing weapons.

Well, this case is somewhat similar, except in this case we know, we have the person who conducted two savage, cold blooded murders on these FBI agents.

Let me begin the letter.

June 26, 1975, was a hot, dusty Thursday on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in Southwestern South Dakota when two FBI agents arrived from their office in Rapid City. It was about noon when Special Agents Ronald A. Williams, age 27, and Jack R. Coler, age 28, pulled into the Jumping Bull compound area of the remote reservation seeking to arrest a young man in connection with the recent abduction and assault of two young ranchers.

Observing their suspect Peltier's vehicle, the agents pursued it. Unknown to Special Agent Coler and Special Agent Williams, one of the three men in the vehicle was Leonard Peltier, a violent man with a violent past. He was a fugitive, wanted for attempted murder of an off duty Milwaukee police officer.

Knowing that the two vehicles pursuing him were occupied by FBI agents and believing they were seeking to arrest him on that attempted murder case, Peltier and his associates abruptly stopped their vehicle and began firing rifles at the agents. Surprised by the sudden violence, outmanned, outgunned, and at an extreme tactical disadvantage, Coler and Williams were both wounded and defenseless within minutes.

Coler sustained a severe wound, the force of the bullet nearly tearing his right arm off. Williams, wounded in the left shoulder and the right foot, removed his shirt during the hail of incoming rifle fire, and fashioned a tourniquet around the arm of Coler, who had by then fallen unconscious.

Agents Coler and Williams were then at the mercy of Leonard Peltier and his associates. But there was to be no mercy for these fine young law enforcement officers.

Not satisfied with the terrible injuries that they had inflicted, Peltier and the two other men walked down the hill towards the ambushed agents. Three shots were fired from Peltier's rifle. Williams, kneeling and apparently surrendering, was shot in the face directly through his out extended shielding handled. He died instantly. Coler, who was still unconscious, was shot twice in the head at close-range. He died instantly from those shots.

The crime scene examination testified to the brutality of the ambush. Coler and Williams had little chance to defend themselves. They had fired only five shots. In contrast, over 125 bullet holes were found in into the car.

Following the murder, Peltier fled the reservation. In November 1975 an Oregon state trooper stopped a recreational vehicle in which Peltier was hiding. Peltier fired at the trooper and escaped. Coler, the FBI agent who had been assassinated earlier on, his revolver which was stolen when he was murdered, was found in a paper bag under the front seat of the recreational vehicle. Peltier's thumb print was on that bag.

When arrested later in Canada by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Peltier remarked that had he known the Royal Canadian Mounted Police officers were there to arrest him, he would have blown them out of their shoes. These are not the comments of an innocent man and they portray the true

character and the violent nature of Leonard Peltier.

In April 1977 a jury convicted Peltier of the murders of those two FBI agents, Coler and Williams. A judge sentenced him to two consecutive life sentences. While incarcerated in the Lompoc, California, Federal prison, and, with outside assistance, Peltier shot his way out of jail using a smuggled rifle to make his escape. Several days later, after assaulting a rancher and stealing a pick up, Peltier was captured. He was tried and convicted of escape and of being a felon in possession of a firearm.

Peltier has since appealed his various convictions numerous times. Each time the Federal courts have upheld earlier legal decisions. The United States Supreme Court has twice denied Peltier review without comment.

The record is clear: There were no new facts. There are no new facts. The old facts have not changed, and Peltier is guilty as charged.

Several times on national television Peltier has admitted to firing at the two agents. In his most recent public interview, Peltier has even reluctantly conceded what he had previously denied, that he had in fact gone down to where the agents were executed. Still, he openly states that he feels no guilt, no remorse, nor even any regret for the murders.

Leonard Peltier has lived a life of crime. He has earned and deserves a lifetime of incarceration. Leonard Peltier is a murderer without compassion or feeling towards his fellow man. In turn, he deserves no compassion.

Mr. President, there is no justification for relieving Leonard Peltier from his punishment. Our judicial system has spoken in this case again, again, and again. Leonard Peltier is a vicious, violent and cowardly criminal that hides behind legitimate native American issues. Leonard Peltier was never a leader in the Native American community. He is simply a brute, thug and murderer with no respect, no regard for human life. Our citizens, on and off the reservations, must be protected from predators like Peltier.

Mr. President, since Leonard Peltier could not fool the Federal courts, he is now trying to fool you, to fool the public. He is shading and hiding the facts and playing on sympathy. He and his advocates want to confuse the fact of his guilt with matters completely extraneous to that fact. Do not let him get away with it, Mr. President. Sympathy is appropriate only for dead heroes and surviving families. Do not let their sacrifice be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, that was somewhat of a lengthy letter, but as you can tell, it is a subject that should be dear to every one of our hearts in this room, to the heart of every American out there that believes in law and justice, to every law enforcement family out there that currently has someone in law enforcement or has had a member of their family in law enforcement.

□ 2310

If we let, if we let this kind of violent assassin out of prison after serving only 24 years, it will in my opinion be a crippling blow to the message that we need to send to the law enforcement in this country.

That message really is fairly simple. That is that you work as a law enforcement officer to provide, as your duty, peace and justice in our system, and that when peace and justice are at-

tacked in our system, our system has a price, it has a consequence, it has a punishment. It is the only way we can uphold the integrity of our system of law enforcement is to have a zero tolerance or a limited tolerance of any type of direct attack against our system of peace and justice.

The assassination of two Federal Bureau of Investigation agents, no matter how many years ago, is a direct attack against the legal and justice process in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join with me in attempting to be persuasive with the President of the United States and the American public in saying how important it is that this political charade being put on by the defense attorneys for this convicted assassin, that this kind of show be stopped, that this kind of show be denied their goal. Their goal, of course, is to let this convicted assassin walk the streets of America again.

Do not let him hide under the shield of being a Native American. That is a disgrace to the Native Americans. Do not pull Native Americans down to the level of this convicted killer. Do not affiliate this convicted killer with the Native Americans in this country. That is an insult, in my opinion, if we do.

Do not forget the facts of the case. Just so that I can remind the Members, let me go through the facts again in a little briefer form than the letter.

Two FBI agents were assassinated. They attempted to pursue a vehicle which contained this suspect, at the time suspect, now a convicted killer, Leonard Peltier. They were wounded. They were disarmed by the wounds that they had. In other words, they could not fight back. They didn't have any weapons left to fight back with. They were not physically capable. One the FBI agents was unconscious. The other FBI agent was rendering first aid to the unconscious FBI agent.

This convicted killer, who by the way was a fugitive from justice for the attempted assassination of an off-duty police officer in Milwaukee, walked up to these two FBI agents and executed them in cold blood. He was later stopped in a recreational vehicle. In that vehicle they found one of the deceased agent's pistols in a paper bag. That bag had evidence, Peltier's fingerprints on it.

Peltier was captured in Canada. He was convicted of two counts of murder for these FBI agents. He escaped from the Federal prison. Do not let people tell us this guy is a nonviolent guy. He was in Federal prison and he shot his way out of Federal prison. Think of the last time since the John Dillinger days or Bonnie and Clyde and so on that somebody shot their way out of the Federal prison. That is who this individual is.

Now today, now today he is in front of the American people, in front of the President of the United States, asking for mercy. Look, 25 years ago may

seem like a long time to some, but it has been a real long time for the families of those young FBI agents that were assassinated in cold blood.

In conclusion on this particular issue, Mr. Speaker, let me ask for Members' support in standing up strong for the law enforcement community of the country, in standing up strong for the families and the agents and professionals of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in standing up strong for the concept of peace and justice within the boundaries of our country.

Let us all have our voice heard, that in the United States of America, if you assassinate a police officer, or, just as soon, two Federal Bureau of Investigation officers, you will pay a price and we will stick with the punishment that we deal out. We are not a bunch of pussies. Do not come back to us and think you are going to get a free walk 25 years later after that kind of action.

If we fail to do this, if we fail to do this, we are sending the wrong message out there and we are crippling justice and peace in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to do an update on a couple of other subjects this evening while I have the opportunity to visit with the Members.

As Members will recall, about 2 or 3 weeks ago, maybe a month ago, there is a museum in New York City called the Brooklyn Art Museum. The Brooklyn Art Museum, it was discovered, with taxpayer dollars, with taxpayer dollars, was sponsoring an art exhibit that depicted, among other things, a portrait of the Virgin Mary, which is one of the holiest symbols of the Catholic religion throughout the world and of Christianity throughout the world, this art museum was allowing in this art exhibit, with taxpayer dollars, this portrait of the Virgin Mary with elephant dung, as they say, crap, as I say, thrown all over the portrait. Can Members imagine that?

How long do Members think that type of art exhibit would have been tolerated or should have been tolerated in this country at taxpayer dollars if it was an exhibit of Martin Luther King, for example, or if it were an exhibit of an outstanding Jewish rabbi, for example, or if it were an exhibit of some other outstanding leader that meant so much to a religious organization anywhere in this world? They would not put up with that.

But for some reason, there seems to be some justification out there by some people that an attack on Christianity should be separated from an attack, say, on Martin Luther King, or an attack on the image of a Jewish rabbi, and so on and so forth.

What happened is that the mayor of New York City, Mayor Rudy Giuliani, I think had some guts. He stood up and he said, we are drawing the line. That has gone too far. There is a strong freedom of expression in this country. There is a First Amendment in this country, but there is a balance that we have in this country.

Just the same as under the freedom of speech we do not allow individuals to go into a theater and yell "fire, fire, fire," we do not allow that. That is not a violation of your First Amendment rights, but we do not allow you to go into a theater and do that. We draw a line. This thing is not *carte blanche*, this First Amendment, to do anything that you feel like doing, especially when you do it with taxpayer dollars.

The mayor came under heavy criticism by the very elite that were dealing with the Brooklyn Art Museum, the board of directors, who I think were acting very pompous in somehow defending this disgraceful work of art, not a work of art that is just controversial, that brings up lots of discussion, but a work of art that hit at the very integrity of a large religious group throughout the world, that was the maximum type of insult that you could throw at that particular religion, and did it with American taxpayer dollars.

Why do I keep bringing up the fact of American taxpayer dollars? Because therein lies the distinction as to whether or not this is an issue under the First Amendment of our Constitution.

Under our Constitution, frankly, had the United States taxpayer dollars not been used to fund this portrait of the Virgin Mary of which dung was thrown all over it, had taxpayer dollars not been used, I am afraid to say that this would have been probably protected, or would have been protected under the First Amendment. We can tolerate that.

It is horrible, and I cannot imagine, for example, why the First Lady, Hillary Clinton, stood up for this thing. She said, however, in her comments that while she would not go see it, but she certainly stood up for the right to go around and exhibit this with taxpayer dollars.

I understand where some would say it is a First Amendment right if there is not taxpayer dollars being used, although I can tell the Members that the press in this country and the liberal left in this country would not have stood for 2 seconds if it were Martin Luther King or a Jewish rabbi or some other celebrated figure being treated in that fashion. But the key here is taxpayer dollars.

□ 2320

The point here is very clear, and I think the citizens of this country, Mr. Speaker, I think we need to go out and ask our constituents, do the citizens of this country really think it is a justified and constitutionally protected right under the Constitution to fund this kind of art with taxpayer dollars or should this type of art be denied the access of taxpayer dollars and allowed to be funded in society with private dollars?

Remember that my objection tonight, and the mayor of New York City's objection to this art, was not

that the art should not be shown. Now, it is disgraceful. Do not get me wrong. I do not condone this kind of art, but there is a constitutionally protected right to show this art without taxpayer dollars. That argument has some legitimacy but that was not the debate that is being carried forward here.

What the mayor said, what I said and, Mr. Speaker, what I think most of our constituents believe is that this kind of art, i.e., the Virgin Mary with dung splashed all over her, with taxpayer dollars, has gone over that line. You draw a line. You have gone over that line. Do not use taxpayer dollars.

The Brooklyn Art Museum in New York, they could easily fund this through other monies. They just want to try and make an issue. What they want to do is open that door so that taxpayers in this country will have to pay out of their hard-earned dollars, will have to use those taxpayer dollars, to let the so-called art community, especially the elite of the Brooklyn Art Museum, fund anything they would like, no matter how offensive, no matter how derogatory it is. That is wrong. This art museum knows that it is wrong.

Well, there has been a new step, a new report to update you on, and that is that a Federal court judge this week actually came out and said that the art museum has a right to use taxpayer dollars to exhibit this type of art, i.e. the Virgin Mary with dung thrown all over her in very obviously a disgraceful fashion intended to be as derogatory as possible, not only towards Christianity but towards one of the most important symbols of Christianity.

I am telling you, Federal judge, you made a mistake. You are wrong. There is not a constitutionally protected provision that says you can use taxpayer dollars in this country to fund that kind of art. Why do you not use some common sense? Why do you have to offend the people of Christianity? Why do you do an all-out attack? You would not do it with Martin Luther King and the black community. You would not do it in the Jewish community with some rabbi of theirs. You would not do it with some other type of religious entity or important entity in this country with their leader.

Why are you doing this? Why do you decide to use taxpayer dollars to offend every Christian in the world? It is wrong. You have got a temporary victory from this Federal judge but in the end I think the mayor of New York City, one, had a lot of guts to do what he did and, number two, I think he is going to prevail.

I also think that the general opinion in this country is, look, that kind of art, as violent and as horrible and as disgraceful as it is, is protected but not with the use of taxpayer dollars.

Our constituents, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe, are in any way about to buy the argument that we ought to take the tax dollars out of their paycheck every week and put a percentage

of that towards the funding of this kind of art.

THE FALL OF THE BERLIN WALL

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening we have covered two topics so far. The first topic is the attempted request, well, not the attempted request but the actual request by an assassin, by a convicted murderer of two Federal Bureau of Investigation officers, Leonard Peltier, the convict is submitting to the President of the United States for clemency. I am in hopes with my colleagues that they join me in urging the President to deny that.

The second issue that we have discussed tonight is the Brooklyn Art Museum and the fact that they use taxpayer dollars to fund an art exhibit of the Virgin Mary, a portrait of the Virgin Mary, with elephant dung or elephant crap thrown all over the face of the Virgin Mary.

The third topic, however, is kind of we are changing engines here. I want to talk about, instead of the negative implications of a convicted assassin asking our President to let him walk from prison, get-out-of-jail-free card, instead of talking about the Brooklyn Art Museum and the prima donnas who want to use your taxpayer dollars to fund that kind of obscene art, I want to shift to an accomplishment of this country. Actually it is an accomplishment that should be celebrated, it was celebrated throughout the world, and a lot of credit of this accomplishment goes to the people throughout the world.

When people look back to the accomplishments of this century, they are going to look at one accomplishment which will stand out for many, many centuries to come, and that is the fall of the Berlin Wall. Recently, I had the opportunity to watch the tape on Ronald Reagan. Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of us to watch it. It is put out by the Public Broadcasting System, PBS, on the presidency of Ronald Reagan and it talked about Reagan's great leadership, and I will again disclose that I am a strong admirer of President Reagan, about the difficult transition period he went through in taking this country through a buildup in arms, a buildup in military defense, in order to accomplish a build-down; that how President Reagan, throughout his entire life had one goal, and that is to bring down the destructive society of Communism.

It was interesting the pressure he went through, even within our own boundaries of this great country, about his concept of how to bring down that Berlin Wall.

Now many of those critics, some of who sit on this floor, some of who sit in other chambers of political leadership throughout this country, who criticized President Reagan, we can now look back and see what a feat. Not just with President Reagan but what a feat President Reagan and what a role he played in bringing down that Berlin Wall.

Now, why do I bring it up today? Because in one week, on November 9, on November 9, will be the tenth anniversary of bringing that wall down. Whenever I see pictures of that wall in the history books or I see it in some other type of periodical, I think of President Ronald Reagan standing there and saying, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear that wall down."

□ 2330

What a fascinating time of history and how neat it is that we were able to bring that down. Look at what has happened since. Look at what has happened in Germany. Look at what has happened in Europe. Look at what happened to communism.

Now, there are some tough times still ahead for the countries of Russia and so on. There is a lot of peace and justice that needs to be brought into the country of Russia.

As my colleagues know, one of the big failures of the society today in Russia, in my opinion, is the failure of their justice system, the mob over there. But the fact is, despite all of these painful headaches and this long journey towards capitalism and freedom, it will arrive. It will come to the station. Some people think it is late. But it will arrive at the station due in a large part to the leadership of this country and large part due to the leadership throughout the free world 10 years ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues have not had an opportunity, I would urge them to take a look at this week's Newsweek. I did. It has an article in there, excellent article written by Newsweek, about the Berlin Wall. I would like to go through. What it did is it picked up some of the conversations during those few critical days of the fall of the Berlin wall. It brings out some of the conversations as reflected by memos written at the time between the President of the United States, George Bush, and the German Chancellor Kohl. I will like to repeat some of those because I think they are pretty fascinating.

This is a conversation that took place between West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl and President George Bush. October 23, 1989, just a little over 10 years ago, 9:02 in the morning. Tens of thousands of East Germans flee via Hungary. Others seek sanctuary in the West German embassy and the Prague. Demonstrators calling for freedom take to the streets of major German cities. Kohl phones Bush to describe the situation, and here is how the conversation took place.

Kohl: The changes in east Germany are quite dramatic. None of us can give a prognosis. There is enormous unrest among the population. Things will become incalculable if there are no reforms. My interest is not to see so many flee Germany because the consequences there would be a disaster.

I am also concerned about the media coverage that, crudely speaking, holds

that Germans are now committed in their discussions about reunification and that they are less interested in the West. This is absolute nonsense. Without a strong NATO, none of these developments in the Warsaw Pact would have occurred.

President Bush in response: I could not agree more. We are trying to react very cautiously and carefully to change in East Germany. We are getting criticism in the Congress from liberal Democrats that we ought to be doing more to foster change, but I am not going to go so fast as to be reckless.

November 10, 1989, 3:29 in the afternoon. The previous night the world had watched transfixed as the East Germans stormed the wall.

Kohl to President Bush: I have just arrived from Berlin. It is like witnessing an enormous fair. It has the atmosphere of a festival. The frontiers are absolutely open. At certain points, they are literally taking down the wall and building new check points. This is a dramatic thing, a historic hour. Without the United States, this day would not have been possible. Tell your people that.

President Bush: First, let me say how great is our respect for the way West Germany has handled all of this. I want to see our people continue to avoid especially hot rhetoric that might, by mistake, cause a problem.

Kohl to the President: Thank you. Give my best to Barbara. Tell her that I intend to send sausages for Christmas.

November 17, 1989, 7:55 in the morning. Bush and Kohl discussed the Soviet reaction. They are concerned that Moscow, which still has 390,000 troops in East Germany may panic.

Kohl: I had a long conversation with Gorbachev. Of course the Soviets are concerned. I told Gorbachev that if East German leader Egon Krenz does not carry out reforms, the system will fail.

President Bush: It is important that the Germans see that they have the support and the sympathy of their allies. In spite of congressional posturing, the United States will stay calm and support reforms. The excitement in the United States runs the risk of forcing unforeseen action in the U.S.S.R. or East Germany. We will not be making statements about unification or setting any timetables. We will not exacerbate the problem by having the President of the United States posturing on the Berlin Wall.

February 13, 1990, 1:49 in the afternoon. The East German regime has agreed to free elections in March and Kohl has just returned from a visit to Moscow. Both he and Bush are worried that Gorbachev will demand a neutral Germany as a price for unification.

Kohl to the President: The situation continues to be dramatic. Between January 1 and today, 80,000 have come to the West from the East. That is why I suggested a monetary union and an

economic community. We will have to urge the government that comes in after March 18 to go through with these.

Let me say a few words about my talks in Moscow. Gorbachev was very relaxed. But the problems he faces are enormous, nationalities, the food supply situation, and I do not see a light at the end of the tunnel yet. We also discussed that the two German states should be working together with the four powers, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the U.S.S.R. I told Gorbachev again that neutralization of Germany is out of the question.

Bush: Did he acquiesce or just listen? How did he react?

Kohl: My impression is that this is a subject about which they want to negotiate but that we can win that point.

March 20th, 1990, 8:31 in the morning. In the March elections, the East Germans overwhelmingly support reunification and democratic change by voting for a coalition of parties led by Kohl's Christian Democrats.

Bush to Kohl: Helmut, you are a hell of a campaigner.

Kohl: Thank you. The results are very important for the NATO question.

Bush: Helmut, your firm stand on a united Germany remaining a full member of NATO is great. We need to continue holding firm. This is vitally important for European security and stability and for the United States.

May 30, 1990, 7:34 in the morning. Gorbachev is due in Washington for his first visit since the fall of the wall. Bush and Kohl discuss that agenda.

Bush to Kohl: I am getting ready for Gorbachev's big visit.

Kohl: That is why I am calling. One thing that is very important for Gorbachev to understand is that, irrespective of the developments, we will stand side by side. And one sign of this cooperation are the links between us by the future membership of the united Germany and NATO without any limitations. You should make this clear to him, but in a friendly way. A second point, we can find a sensible economic arrangement with him. He needs help very much. He should also know that we had no intention of profiting from his weakness.

Bush: I will assure him that we are side by side. We want him to come out feeling that he has had a good summit.

July 17, 1990, 8:48 in the morning. Kohl briefs Bush on his most recent visit to Moscow.

Kohl: George, first of all, Gorbachev is in excellent shape. He is aware of his special situation and of his responsibilities. And he is aware he has to act quickly to get through pluralism to change society and to get through the necessary legislation by the end of this year.

□ 2340

"I told him there would be no chance to receive western aid if he does not get these reforms through. We also discussed extensively his determination

to pursue the modernization of his country. He said something I had never heard before. He told me his grandfather was tortured and imprisoned under Stalin. His wife said her grandfather was liquidated under Stalin. It is remarkable."

One other interesting thing. We talked about German-U.S. relationships in our one-on-one. I told him that this relationship was of great importance, and I told him that if the Soviets tried to undermine it, this would affect German relationships with the USSR. His reply will be of interest to you. He said that they learned a lesson, that it was wrong to try to make the United States withdraw from Europe, and that they had not succeeded in this in the past.

Finally, he impresses me as a man who knows himself well and who has a sense of self-irony. He has burned all his bridges behind him. He cannot go back and he must be successful.

August 3, 1990, 9:56 in the morning, nearly a year after the Wall falls, East and West Germany are officially reunited.

Bush: "Helmut, I am in a meeting with members of our Congress and I am calling on this historic day to wish you well."

Kohl: "Things are going very, very well. I am in Berlin. There were one million people here last night at the very spot where the Wall used to stand and where President Reagan called on Mr. Gorbachev to open this gate. Words cannot describe the feeling. American presidents from Harry Truman all the way up to our friend George Bush made this possible."

The Berlin Wall did not come down in a day. It did not come down in a season. What is interesting about these conversations that I just related to you is it is kind of symbolic of the effort that our country made to see that communism fell and that the non-free people of this world were able to enjoy freedom as we have enjoyed our entire life. But it was not without a price.

President Reagan went on a massive military buildup. His concept to build up in order to build down turned out to be correct. But during this massive buildup, he received a lot of criticism. Frankly, the Russians were worried about President Reagan.

I reviewed this tape from Public Broadcasting, and I hope my colleagues take time to take a look at it, it is fascinating. Whether you are Republican or Democrat, this time period sets aside those partisanship contests to take a look at the biggest threat to the world, and that was communism and how this president, President Reagan, really took us right to the brink and the Russians blinked and the Russians disarmed and the Russians allowed that Wall to be taken down.

They pulled out of Hungary. They pulled out of Poland. And today in our history, most of the countries in this world enjoy the freedom that we enjoy as Americans. In 100 years from now, it

is my prediction that every country in the world will have some form of capitalism, that the days of communism, even the days of socialism will be days long past. It gives us a lot to be proud of in America.

Colleagues, I know that as United States congressmen we are privileged to be up here to represent what I think is the finest country in the history of the world. And the reason that we came out of this so well, the reason that we have stood strong for such a long time is that we understood America does not have to apologize for being free. America owes nobody in this world an apology for standing up for the abused people of this world.

But the United States of America owes no apology to anybody in this world for strength that we maintain with our defense. Because we understand that if we do not have a strong defense, if we are not the toughest kid on the block, we are going to be in a lot of fights.

I forget the source of the quote. I think it was back in the early days of the country, Jefferson, maybe Washington, who said, "the best way to avoid a war is to be prepared for war."

The best way to protect freedom is to be strong. Every generation will be tested. Freedom will always come with a price and a cost. But in the end, if we pay that cost, if we stand up strong, as this country has done in the past, if we have great leaders like Ronald Reagan and many of the other great leaders this country has had, we can look to the next generation and we can say to that next generation, you too will enjoy a lifetime in the greatest country in the history of the world.

As you can tell from my remarks, I am proud to be an American. And so are every one of you. Next week I hope all of us take just a few minutes outside of our busy schedules and I hope we try and convince our constituents to take a few minutes out of their busy schedules and think of those days 10 years ago when that awful, terrible wall began to crumble. Think of those days when President Reagan stood up there, broad-shouldered, looking them right in the eye and said, Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall. Open up this gate.

Take a few moments next week on this tenth anniversary to think of the joy and the excitement and the happiness of those individuals in Germany who now were able to go across that border without being shot, without having to sneak through at night trying to get through the barbed wire.

I can remember 15, 20 years ago, even longer than that, when I was young about reading the Reader's Digest. It seemed to me that twice a year the Reader's Digest would carry a story in there about somebody in East Germany who had that taste of freedom, who wanted to live in a free world, who wanted a Democratic society. They would risk and their family would risk everything they had to get across that Wall.

I remember reading in a study of history when our American planes and our allies went into Germany and past the Wall to bring those in the Berlin airlift. What a great accomplishment that was.

And now, less than 10 years ago, whoever imagined that that horrible Wall would crumble as quickly as it did? You know, it was not a very strong structure. It did not stand up for very long, too long, but not very long. And that credit goes to the American leadership and the leadership of our allies in this world.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by just recapping the three things that I discussed this evening.

First of all, I beg my colleagues in here to carefully watch what is going on with this request for clemency by a convicted assassin of two agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This man, Leonard Peltier, will be requesting through a political horse and pony show with the President clemency to let him walk as a free man. He has got a very sharp defense team. But do not let that shield all of us from the fact that in cold blood he killed two FBI agents.

This man should never see the outside of a jail cell for as long as he lives. I hope many of my colleagues will join me in that effort in attempting to convince the President or help persuade the President to ignore that request.

Second of all, let me point out that to you, Brooklyn Art Museum, you are wrong. You will not be able to continue to defy, I think, the taxpayers of this country by using taxpayer dollars to fund your art exhibit of the Virgin Mary with dung slapped all over her. I hope at some point you prima donnas who serve on the board of directors at that Brooklyn Art Museum, I hope really seriously you have a moment to look in the mirror when nobody else is around and you ask yourselves the question, is it right?

□ 2350

Does what we did make me feel good? Have I completed my duty as a trustee of the Brooklyn art museum? Would I have done this to the great leader Martin Luther King? Would I have done this to a great leader in the Jewish community? Would I have done this to a great leader in the Buddhist community? Or should I just pick on Christianity and use taxpayer dollars to do it? The taste of art has gone too far when you use taxpayer dollars for that kind of effort. It is not a protected right in my opinion under the first amendment.

Finally, the day of celebration next week as we are running around this floor, we ought to take a few minutes and just remember what a great day in our history it was to see that Berlin Wall fall, to see those people in East Germany taste freedom, many of them for the first time in their entire life, and to see through the great leadership of the United States of America, through the response of the citizens of

the United States of America, through the strength of the military forces of the United States of America, we brought the taste of freedom to millions and millions of people, and we will as the United States of America preserve the taste of freedom for many centuries to come.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS). The Chair must remind all Members to direct remarks in debate to the Chair and not to other persons in the second person.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 3194. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon is amendment to the bill (H.R. 3194) "An Act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BYRD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 75, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. MCINNIS), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-443) on the resolution (H. Res. 358) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3196, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. MCINNIS), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-444) on the resolution (H.

Res. 359) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3196) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION AGREEING TO CONFERENCE REQUESTED BY SENATE ON H.R. 3194, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. MCINNIS), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-445) on the resolution (H. Res. 360) agreeing to the conference requested by the Senate on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3194) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 3:30 p.m. on account of official business.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a family medical matter.

Mr. BEREUTER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 12:00 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. HULSHOF (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

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. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHOWS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, for 5 minutes today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DIAZ-BALART) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FOSSELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BASS, for 5 minutes, November 9.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, November 5.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, today and November 4 and November 8.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, November 4.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 440. An act to provide support for certain institutes and schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

S. 1844. An Act to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide for an alternative penalty procedure with respect to compliance with requirement for a State disbursement unit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of "Capitol Builder: The Shorthand Journals of Captain Montgomery C. Meigs, 1853-1861"; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of "The United States Capitol: A Chronicle of Construction, Design, and Politics"; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

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.

H.R. 974. An act to establish a program to afford high school graduates from the District of Columbia the benefits of in-State tuition at State colleges and universities outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

BILLS 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, bills of the House of the following title:

On November 2, 1999:

H.R. 2303. To direct the Librarian of Congress to prepare the history of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3064. Making appropriations for the District of Columbia, and for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 4, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5133. A letter from the the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 686(a); (H. Doc. No. 106-153); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5134. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Albuquerque Operations Office, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Nuclear Explosive and Weapons Surety Program [AL 452.1A] received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5135. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Albuquerque Operations Office, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety of Nuclear Explosive Operations [AL 452.2A] received October 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5136. A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report on direct spending or receipts legislation within seven days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

5137. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting Federal Family Education Loan Program and William D. Ford Federal District Loan Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5138. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the Institutional Eligibility Under the Higher Education Act of 1965, as Amended and Student Assistance General Provisions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5139. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on the nondisclosure of safeguards information for the quarter ending September 30, 1999, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2167(e); to the Committee on Commerce.

5140. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 1999 Biennial Report on the Scientific and Clinical Status of Organ Transplantation; to the Committee on Commerce.

5141. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the Netherlands for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00-20), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

5142. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with United Kingdom [Transmittal No. DTC 123-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

5143. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Italy [Transmittal No. DTC 120-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5144. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the Netherlands [Transmittal No. DTC 122-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5145. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 112-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5146. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 129-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5147. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Luxembourg, France [Transmittal No. DTC 127-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5148. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 114-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5149. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina [Transmittal No. DTC 100-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5150. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the United Kingdom [Transmittal No. DTC 92-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5151. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Greece [Transmittal No. DTC 34-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

5152. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 87-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5153. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Technical Assistance agreement with Brazil [Transmittal No. DTC 25-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5154. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Turkey [Transmittal No. DTC 8-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5155. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Luxembourg [Transmittal No. DTC 128-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5156. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 130-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5157. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Technical Assistance agreement with Greece [Transmittal No. DTC 118-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5158. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the Republic of Korea [Transmittal No. DTC 102-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5159. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the United Arab Emirates [Transmittal No. DTC 111-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5160. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with South Africa and Canada [Transmittal No. DTC 113-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

5161. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Turkey [Transmittal No. DTC 137-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

5162. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Canada [Transmittal No. DTC 145-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5163. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with the United Kingdom [Transmittal No. DTC 117-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

5164. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with the Netherlands [Transmittal No. DTC 105-99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

5165. A letter from the the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the A-76/Fair Act Inventory; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5166. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting reports on vacancies in Senate confirmed positions; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5167. A letter from the Executive Office of the President, United States Trade Representative, transmitting the inventory of

commercial activities; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5168. A letter from the Independent Counsel, transmitting the Consolidated Annual Report on Audit and Investigative Activities and Management Control Systems, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

5169. A letter from the Office of the Independent Counsel, transmitting the report from the Independent Counsel Ralph I. Lancaster, Jr., pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

5170. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 990304063-9063-01; I.D. 092499L] received November 1, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

5171. 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; Greenland Turbot in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 990304063-9063-01; I.D. 091399A] received November 1, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

5172. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for New York [Docket No. 981014259-8312-02; I.D. 101999A] received November 1, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

5173. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Acting Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes to Permit Payment of Patent and Trademark Office Fees by Credit Card [Docket No. 991008272-9272-01] (RIN: 0651-AB07) received October 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5174. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; El Paso, TX [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-26] received November 1, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5175. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct tax liability [Rev. Proc. 99-41] received November 1, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 2634. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to registration requirements for practitioners who dispense narcotic drugs in schedule IV or V for maintenance treatment or detoxification treat-

ment; with an amendment (Rept. 106-441, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 356. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 106-442). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 358. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-443). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 359. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3196) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-444). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 360. Resolution agreeing to the conference requested by the Senate on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3194) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-445). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged. H.R. 2634 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. 2634. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than November 3, 1999.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PORTER, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. TOOMEY):

H.R. 3206. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide prospectively for personalized retirement security through personal retirement savings accounts to allow for more control by individuals over their Social Security retirement income, to amend such title and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to protect Social Security surpluses, and to provide other reforms relating to benefits under such title II; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. COSTELLO):

H.R. 3207. A bill to authorize research, development, and demonstration activities

under section 311 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 for fiscal years 2000 through 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Science, 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. BLAGOJEVICH (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 3208. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to improve the way the Consumer Product Safety Commission handles defective products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BLAGOJEVICH:

H.R. 3209. A bill to provide grants to law enforcement agencies to purchase firearms needed to perform law enforcement duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 3210. A bill to enhance protections against fraud in the offering of financial assistance for college education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HILLIARD:

H.R. 3211. A bill to provide incentive for United States corporations to invest in developing nations to provide debt relief to poor, emerging, and developing nations, to provide a method of repayment of moneys owed to the United States, and to provide for the reduction of the deficit; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. GOSS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 3212. A bill to provide for increased cooperation on extradition efforts between the United States and foreign governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Banking and Financial Services, 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. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MICA, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H.R. 3213. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to extend the authorization for the drug-free workplace program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ (for himself and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 3214. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Center for Social Work Research; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SISISKY (for himself, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. BATEMAN):

H.R. 3215. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow penalty-free distributions from qualified retirement plans of individuals residing in Presidentially declared disaster areas and to allow relief from

certain limitations on the deductibility of casualty losses sustained in such disaster areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. KANJORSKI):

H.R. 3216. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide that geographic reclassifications of hospitals from one urban area to another urban area do not result in lower wage indexes in the urban area in which the hospital was originally classified; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.J. Res. 75. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself, Mr. FROST, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BALDACCIO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. HOLT, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KIND, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LARSON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUTHER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MAS-CARA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. LEE):

H. Res. 357. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to youth violence; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 125: Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 270: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 274: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 303: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 408: Mr. OXLEY and Mr. SCHAFER.

H.R. 443: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 568: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 583: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 598: Mr. TOOMEY.

H.R. 641: Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 750: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 783: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. TOOMEY.

H.R. 797: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 809: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 1083: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 1085: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FORD, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 1093: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1168: Mr. TAUZIN and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 1187: Mr. SUNUNU.

H.R. 1215: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1221: Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 1228: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1260: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1275: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CARSON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1371: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1388: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 1445: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1592: Mr. NUSSLE and Mr. ROHR-ABACHER.

H.R. 1622: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1625: Mr. HOFFFEL and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 1667: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1732: Ms. CARSON, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 1771: Mr. ISAKSON and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1775: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1832: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1838: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2000: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 2021: Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 2059: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 2162: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 2241: Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 2319: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2499: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 2538: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. FORD, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GOSS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. COYNE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PICKERING, Ms. DUNN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2543: Mr. FROST and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 2551: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2554: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 2631: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 2644: Mr. FILNER and Mr. OBEY.

H.R. 2655: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 2722: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2738: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 2749: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2814: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2882: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 2888: Mr. HORN.

H.R. 2895: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 2966: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. COBURN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr.

MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 2969: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 3044: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3058: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 3073: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 3076: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 3087: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 3088: Mr. COBURN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. LARGENT.

H.R. 3091: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MINGE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 3110: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3115: Mr. SPRATT and Mr. DEMINT.

H.R. 3139: Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3142: Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 3143: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3144: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. KIND, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 3150: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3170: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. SCHAFER.

H.R. 3193: Mr. REYES.

H.J. Res. 55: Mr. BLILEY.

H.J. Res. 56: Mr. HOUGHTON.

H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. STEARNS.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. INSLEE.

H. Con. Res. 200: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H. Con. Res. 205: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. FROST, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H. Con. Res. 206: Mr. ENGEL and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H. Con. Res. 209: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. LEE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H. Con. Res. 212: Mr. HAYES, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. HANSEN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BE-REUTER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TALENT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. RILEY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. ISAKSON.

H. Con. Res. 218: Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TALENT, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H. Res. 298: Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. GOODE.

H. Res. 325: Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 340: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. ENGEL.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 872: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 1300: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 1832: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 2891: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1999

No. 153

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. 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, giver of every good gift for our growth as Your people, we ask for health and strength only that we may serve You. You alone know what is good for us. Therefore, grant us only what is best for us. We have no other purpose than to spend our days seeking and doing Your will.

We acknowledge our utter dependence on You. All that we have and are we have received from You. You sustain us day by day and moment by moment. We deliberately empty our minds and our hearts of anything that does not glorify You. We release to You any pride, self-serving attitudes, or willfulness that may have been harbored in our hearts. We ask You to take from us anything that makes it difficult not only to love but to like certain people. May our relationships reflect Your initiative, love, and forgiveness.

We commit to You the work of this day. Fill this Chamber with Your presence and each Senator with Your power so that whatever is planned or proposed may bring our Nation closer to Your righteousness in every aspect of our society. You are our Lord and Savior. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable WAYNE ALLARD, a Senator from the State of Colorado, 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 PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, today the Senate will resume consideration of the CBI/African trade bill. Amendments to the bill are expected to be offered during the postcloture debate, and therefore Senators can expect votes throughout the day. The Senate may also begin consideration of the conference report to accompany the financial services modernization bill during today's session of the Senate. It is hoped the Senate can complete action on the African trade bill and the financial services conference report by tomorrow's session. It is also still possible an agreement can be reached regarding the bankruptcy reform bill so the Senate can consider that legislation prior to the impending adjournment.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due for its second reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will now read the bill for the second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1883) to provide for the application of measures to foreign persons who transfer to Iran certain goods, services or technology, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings on this bill at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 434, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa.

Pending:

Lott (for Roth/Moynihan) amendment No. 2325, in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, 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. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2360

(Purpose: To establish trade negotiating objectives for the United States for the next round of World Trade Organization negotiations that enhance the competitiveness of the United States agriculture, spur economic growth, increase farm income, and produce full employment in the United States agricultural sector)

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S13729

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY, proposes an amendment numbered 2360.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ AGRICULTURE TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES AND CONSULTATIONS WITH CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) United States agriculture contributes positively to the United States balance of trade and United States agricultural exports support in excess of 1,000,000 United States jobs;

(2) United States agriculture competes successfully worldwide despite the fact that United States producers are at a competitive disadvantage because of the trade distorting support and subsidy practices of other countries and despite the fact that significant tariff and nontariff barriers exist to United States exports; and

(3) a successful conclusion of the next round of World Trade Organization negotiations is critically important to the United States agricultural sector.

(b) OBJECTIVES.—The agricultural trade negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to the World Trade Organization negotiations include—

(1) immediately eliminating all export subsidies worldwide while maintaining bona fide food aid and preserving United States market development and export credit programs that allow the United States to compete with other foreign export promotion efforts;

(2) leveling the playing field for United States producers of agricultural products by eliminating blue box subsidies and disciplining domestic supports in a way that forces producers to face world prices on all production in excess of domestic food security needs while allowing the preservation of non-trade distorting programs to support family farms and rural communities;

(3) disciplining state trading enterprises by insisting on transparency and banning discriminatory pricing practices that amount to de facto export subsidies so that the enterprises do not (except in cases of bona fide food aid) sell in foreign markets at prices below domestic market prices or prices below the full costs of acquiring and delivering agricultural products to the foreign markets;

(4) insisting that the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Accord agreed to in the Uruguay Round applies to new technologies, including biotechnology, and clarifying that labeling requirements to allow consumers to make choices regarding biotechnology products or other regulatory requirements cannot be used as disguised barriers to trade;

(5) increasing opportunities for United States exports of agricultural products by first reducing tariff and nontariff barriers to trade to the same or lower levels than exist in the United States and then eliminating barriers, such as—

(A) restrictive or trade distorting practices that adversely impact perishable or cyclical products;

(B) restrictive rules in the administration of tariff-rate quotas; and

(C) unjustified sanitary and phytosanitary restrictions or other unjustified technical barriers to agricultural trade;

(6) encouraging government policies that avoid price-depressing surpluses; and

(7) strengthening dispute settlement procedures so that countries cannot maintain unjustified restrictions on United States exports in contravention of their commitments.

(c) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—

(1) CONSULTATION BEFORE OFFER MADE.—Before the United States Trade Representative negotiates a trade agreement that would reduce tariffs on agricultural products or require a change in United States agricultural law, the United States Trade Representative shall consult with the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) CONSULTATION BEFORE AGREEMENT INITIALED.—Not less than 48 hours before initialing an agreement relating to agricultural trade negotiated under the auspices of the World Trade Organization, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely with the committees referred to in paragraph (1) regarding—

(A) the details of the agreement;

(B) the potential impact of the agreement on United States agricultural producers; and

(C) any changes in United States law necessary to implement the agreement.

(3) NO SECRET SIDE DEALS.—Any agreement or other understanding (whether verbal or in writing) that relates to agricultural trade that is not disclosed to the Congress before legislation implementing a trade agreement is introduced in either house of Congress shall not be considered to be part of the agreement approved by Congress and shall have no force and effect under United States law or in any dispute settlement body.

(d) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) reaching a successful agreement on agriculture should be the top priority of United States negotiators; and

(2) if the primary competitors of the United States do not reduce their trade distorting domestic supports and export subsidies in accordance with the negotiating objectives expressed in this section, the United States should increase its support and subsidy levels to level the playing field in order to improve United States farm income and to encourage United States competitors to eliminate export subsidies and domestic supports that are harmful to United States farmers and ranchers.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the amendment Senator GRASSLEY and I are offering is to set the negotiating objectives for agriculture for our trade negotiators at the next round of trade talks. I don't think anybody in this Chamber appreciates any more than the current occupant of the chair how serious the crisis in agriculture is in our part of the country. We have seen what I call a triple whammy to American agricultural producers: bad prices, bad weather, and bad policy. That triple whammy has threatened literally tens of thousands of farm families.

Certainly, in my State, where we had a special crisis team at USDA analyze the circumstances when the Secretary of Agriculture was coming to North Dakota a year ago, that team said that if something dramatic did not happen in the next 2 years, we would lose 30 percent—and perhaps more—of the

farm families in North Dakota. That is how serious the circumstances are.

I will put up a couple of charts to demonstrate the problem we face.

The key determinant to farm income is farm prices. Farm prices, as this chart shows, are at a 53-year low in real terms. This chart depicts wheat and barley prices from 1946 to 1999, and it shows these prices in constant dollars. So we are comparing apples to apples. What one can see is that prices have had a long-term downward trend over this 53-year period, with one major interruption that occurred back in the 1970s. I think we all recall those times, when we saw a tremendous spike in virtually all commodity prices. But over the long term, when we compare on a fair basis, what we see is constantly declining prices, and we see now the lowest prices in 53 years in real terms. That is why we see so many serious concerns in farm country about what the future holds.

This chart represents a little different way of looking at what faces our producers because this looks at not only the prices farmers receive—that is the red line—but also what the farmers are paying for the inputs to produce their crops. This looks at over a 10-year period. One can see that the prices farmers are paying for their inputs have escalated rather dramatically during this 10-year period. That is not true about the prices farmers are receiving. Those prices peaked at the time we were discussing the last farm bill, in 1996.

It was very interesting that, at the time we were told farmers were going to have a remarkable situation—they were faced with what we were told at the time was permanently high farm prices because of export demand—those permanently high prices lasted about 90 days. That was just about the time we were passing the last farm bill. After that, prices collapsed and collapsed on a continuous basis. We have had nothing but one way for prices, and that is down, down, down. That is the reason we have seen a collapse of farm income.

This chart is another way of looking at what is happening. This shows a comparison of the prices farmers receive—the red line—to the cost of their production, which is the green line. This is for wheat. Wheat is the dominant commodity in my State. You can see the cost of production is about \$5 a bushel. But ever since the last farm bill passed, we have been well below the cost of production. In fact, now we are down to about \$2.50, \$2.60, \$2.70 a bushel, depending on the day and market conditions at the time—far below the cost of production. This is what is undermining financial security for American producers.

It is not just wheat. If I had put up the chart on corn, or barley, or on virtually any commodity, one would see the same pattern. It is not just in crops; it is also in livestock. Last year, we saw hogs go down to 8 cents a

pound. It costs 40 cents a pound to produce a hog. So this combination of high input costs for farmers yet low prices for what they sell has put farmers in a cost/price squeeze. That squeeze is getting tighter and tighter. It is eliminating farm income.

That is why this next round of trade talks is so critically important because, very frankly, we have been playing a losing hand in agriculture. I think anybody who has really studied the matter understands that our chief competitors—the Europeans—are outspending us, outthrusting us, and, as a result, they are winning markets all across the world that were once ours.

If we just pierce the veil here and look below the surface, I think what we see is very revealing. This shows what Europe has been doing in terms of agricultural support over the last 3 years; that is the red box. That is what Europe is spending per year, the average for the last 3 years. The blue box is what the United States is spending under the last farm bill. You can see that the disparity is enormous. The Europeans are spending \$44 billion a year, on average; the United States, under the terms of the last farm bill, is spending \$6 billion a year—a 7-to-1 disparity.

It is very hard to be successful or to have a level playing field when the opponents are outspending you 7-to-1. We would never permit this in a military confrontation. Why we permit it in a trade confrontation eludes me. It is a guaranteed path to disaster. That is precisely what has happened.

If we look at this in a somewhat different way, if we look at it in terms of export subsidy for agricultural commodities, and we look at various regions of the world, we see another interesting picture emerge. This shows in the last year for which we have full figures, 1996, who was doing what with respect to agricultural trade subsidy. There are our European friends again. They are the blue hunk of the pie; 83.5 percent of all world agricultural export subsidy belongs to the Europeans. Here is the U.S. share, at 1.4 percent, this little piece of the pie right here.

I know a lot of my colleagues think we are spending too much on agriculture. I hear it all the time from some of our colleagues from more urban areas.

I say to them that you have to look at what is happening in the rest of the world. You have to look at what our competitors are doing. If you look at what our competitors are doing, it is dramatic and it is clear.

Here are the Europeans. Nearly 84 percent of all world agricultural export subsidy is accounted for by the Europeans. The United States is 1.4 percent.

These aren't KENT CONRAD's figures. These aren't the figures from the Governor of North Dakota. These aren't figures from the agriculture commissioner of North Dakota. These are the statistics from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. They show Europe is out-

spending us on agricultural export subsidies by 60 to 1. How are you going to win a fight when you are outgunned 60 to 1? This is totally unfair to our farmers. They don't have a level playing field from which to compete. They have a playing field that is totally distorted. We have to change this playing field. We have to level it out. We have to make it possible for our farmers to compete fairly.

We are willing to compete against anybody at any time. But it is not fair to say to our farmers: You go out there and take on the French and German farmers, and while you are at it, take on the French and German Governments as well. That isn't a fair fight.

We shouldn't abandon our farmers to that kind of circumstance. But that is precisely what we have done because in the last farm bill we cut our support to producers in half. Under the previous farm bill, we were spending, on average, \$10 billion a year to support our producers in the face of the competition from the Europeans who were spending \$50 billion a year during that period.

What did we decide to do? Did we decide to level the playing field? No. We engaged in unilateral disarmament on the pretext that if we cut somehow we would set a good example for the Europeans and they would follow right along.

Guess what. We cut our support in half for agricultural producers under the new farm bill, down to \$5 billion a year on average. What did the Europeans do? Did they follow suit? Did they take our "good example"? I put that in quotes, our "good example." No. The Europeans kept right on spending.

Do you know why? Because they have a strategy and they have a plan. Their strategy and plan is to dominate world agricultural trade. They are doing it the old-fashioned way. They are buying these markets.

I have spent a good deal of time talking to the European negotiators. What they have shared with me is as clear as it can be. They have said to me: Senator, we believe we are in a trade war with the United States on agriculture. We believe at some point there will be a cease-fire in this trade war. We believe there will be a cease-fire in place, and we want to occupy the high ground. The high ground in this contest is world market share. That is exactly the strategy and plan of our European friends.

They have said to me: You know, Senator, we have much higher levels of support in our country than you have in yours, and we believe in all of these negotiations instead of leveling the playing field, and instead of closing the gap, that we will be able to secure equal percentage reductions in the level of support on both sides.

If you think about it, they have much higher levels of support in Europe, as I have demonstrated, than we do in this country. They seek to get

equal percentage reductions from those unequal bases leaving Europe always on top. That is their strategy. That is their plan. Oh, how well it is working.

In the last trade talks, although the levels of support were dramatically uneven, was there any closing of the gap? Not at all, not any closing of the gap. They didn't come down. We didn't go up. Both of us did not engage in a pattern and practice that would narrow the differences. Instead, what they won were equal percentage reductions from those unequal bases maintaining European dominance.

If we let that happen again, shame on us, because we will be consigning our farmers to the dustbin of financial failure. There is no other way this can come out. That is going to be the absolute assured result if we come back with another failed negotiation.

Some people blame our negotiators. I personally do not. I blame us because we have sent unarmed negotiators to the negotiations.

In my previous job, mostly what I did was negotiate. One thing I learned very early on in my previous life was that you don't win in negotiation unless you have leverage. You have to have leverage in order to prevail in a negotiation.

Our negotiators have no leverage. What leverage do they conceivably have when we send them in there and the other side is outgunning us on export subsidies 60 to 1? How are they going to win a negotiation with that sort of fact? How are they going to win when Europe has 84 percent of the world's export subsidy and we have 1.4 percent? How are we possibly going to prevail in that kind of negotiating climate? I say there is very little chance that we are.

That is why I have introduced the FITEA bill, Farm Income and Trade Equity Act, to try to level the playing field, to rearm our negotiators to give us a chance to prevail in these negotiations.

That bill is gaining steam. It has gotten broad support in my own home State of North Dakota. I believe it is going to get even greater support around the country.

Earlier this week, I went to meet in Baltimore with the State presidents of the National Farmers Union. I gave them an outline of the FITEA plan. I hope they will endorse it.

The national rural electric service areas have before them at their regional meetings opportunities to endorse the FITEA plan. It has already been endorsed by eight or nine of the national rural electric service areas.

We have to give our negotiators leverage. But at the same time we have to also give them instructions. We have to tell them what their negotiating objectives are in this next round of trade talks. It is our responsibility. We can't leave it to the President. Certainly, it is his obligation as well. But Congress has a role to play. I believe we ought to take the opportunity to send a clear

message to our trade ambassador and her assistants as to what their negotiating objectives are with respect to agriculture.

That is what we have before us in the amendment offered on a bipartisan basis by Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa and myself. Senator GRASSLEY and I serve on both the Agriculture Committee and the Finance Committee. We have a special responsibility. We have taken it seriously. That is why we have come forward with a set of negotiating objectives for our trade ambassador in this next round of trade talks.

This amendment sets out seven principal negotiating objectives for agriculture:

No. 1, we should insist on the immediate elimination of all export subsidy programs worldwide. The elimination of all export subsidies worldwide should be the negotiating objective.

No. 2, we should insist that the European Union and others adopt domestic farm policies that force their producers to face world market prices at the margin so they do not produce more than is needed for their own domestic markets.

It is one thing for a country to adopt domestic policy that supports higher prices to meet domestic demand. It is quite another thing for them to have higher prices domestically and, therefore, develop greater production than they need for the domestic market and then dump that surplus on the world market at fire sale prices depressing prices for everyone.

Objective No. 2 is to insist that the E.U. and others adopt domestic farm policies that force their producers to face world prices at the margin.

No. 3, we should insist that State trading enterprises, such as the Canadian Wheat Board, are disciplined so that their actions are transparent and so they do not provide de facto export subsidies.

Sometimes we fool ourselves with our own rhetoric around here. We talk about free markets. Many are strong supporters of free markets. In agriculture, there are no free markets. We can see, through what the Europeans are doing and spending to buy these markets, that we are not dealing in a free-market circumstance in world agricultural trade.

We are certainly not dealing with it with respect to our neighbors to the north in Canada. There, individual farmers don't market their commodities; they have a wheat board that markets for them. A very significant portion of production goes to the wheat board, and they market on behalf of all of their farmers. Does anyone think that gives them all kinds of opportunities to play games in world markets? Absolutely, because the prices they charge are not transparent. Anyone can learn our prices any minute of any day by going to the Chicago Board of Trade and seeing what commodities are selling for. Try to find out what our friends to the north are selling for.

They don't have a transparent market. They are not advertising their prices, except to the major buyers in the world. The few times we have a glimpse of what they are doing, we find they go to buyers before other countries and say: Whatever the United States is selling for, we are selling for 5 cents less a bushel. That is what they are doing in order to take markets that have traditionally been ours. We have to wake up and smell the coffee.

No. 4, we should insist on the use of sound science when it comes to sanitary and phytosanitary restrictions. Too often, these are hidden protectionist trade barriers. On genetically modified organisms, we should insist foreign markets be open to our products, but obviously we can't force consumers to buy what they don't want. We have to give consumers the ability to make an informed choice on whether they want to buy these products without letting inflammatory labels be used as hidden trade barriers.

No. 5, we should insist our trading partners immediately reduce their tariffs on our agricultural exports to levels no higher than ours, and then further reduce these barriers on a cooperative and comprehensive basis.

No. 6, we should seek cooperative agricultural policies to avoid price-depressing surpluses or food shortages. My own long-term view for agriculture is, we desperately need to have among the major producers a common set-aside policy, a common conservation reserve policy, and a common food reserve policy.

No. 7, we should strengthen disputes settlement and enforce existing commitments. The United States honors its international obligations, but all too often our trading partners refuse to live up to their commitments and use the dispute settlement process to delay our efforts to call them to account. That is totally unacceptable, and we need to send that message very clearly.

These are the seven principles we believe we should send as an instruction to our trade ambassador. We should say very clearly that we believe these are the things they need to accomplish in this next round of trade talks. I also think we should say: Don't bring back under any circumstances equal percentage reductions in support from these unequal bases. Don't do that. That way lies permanent inferiority in the position of world agricultural trade. If we want to fritter away our long-term dominance, that is the path for such a result.

I urge my colleagues to give very careful consideration to this amendment. Senator GRASSLEY and I have worked in a bipartisan way in consultation with other colleagues. We believe these are the appropriate negotiating objectives for our trade representatives in the agricultural sector.

Let me end where I began. American agriculture is in crisis. We desperately need a victory in the next round of trade talks, and we need it soon. Our

farmers simply cannot survive year after year in a circumstance in which our major competition outspends us 7-1 on domestic support and 60-1 on export subsidies.

I believe our farmers can compete against any producer anywhere in the world but they have to have a level playing field. They have to have a country that is fighting for them when our chief competitors are fighting for their producers at every set of trade talks.

I hope very much our colleagues will support this amendment that lays out clear negotiating objectives for our trade representatives in this next round of trade talks. I believe this amendment is a first step in that process. I urge my colleagues to support it. I welcome cosponsorship, as I know Senator GRASSLEY would, from other Members who are concerned about these issues.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. If my colleague will yield for a question, I don't intend to take the floor.

After the Conrad amendment is disposed of, is it the intention of the chairman to have votes?

Mr. ROTH. I am going to ask unanimous consent to set aside this amendment. Senator GRASSLEY desires the opportunity to comment. I think we will stack votes as we did yesterday. It would be in order for another amendment to be raised.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I need to go to a markup.

Mr. ROTH. We will be ready in a minute for another amendment.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, if I could say to my friend from Minnesota, if he has 5 minutes, he can start.

Mr. ROTH. In the meantime, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside this amendment. As I said, Senator GRASSLEY, the cosponsor of this legislation, desires the opportunity to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask unanimous consent that Senator ENZI and Senator ASHCROFT be listed as original cosponsors of the Conrad-Grassley amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, if I might comment on the remarks of my friend from North Dakota regarding the Seattle ministerial conference which begins at the end of this month. There is no wide agreement on what the next round of negotiations will address. However, there is no doubt that agriculture will be one of the matters addressed in the next round. There is much disagreement in other areas.

The idea of our setting some negotiating objectives is a good idea, in my view, and I think the chairman agrees.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I share that opinion. There is no question but it is appropriate for Congress to help set these objectives.

I say to my distinguished colleague from North Dakota, I agree very much

about the need to develop a level playing field. One of my concerns is the fact our markets are the most open markets in the world. That obviously includes agriculture. The purpose of these negotiations should be to lower them in such a way that everyone is on an even playing field. I am very sympathetic to what the Senator is proposing.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I am sure the chairman will agree, and I cannot doubt that my friend from North Dakota will agree, it would be much better if the President were to go to Seattle with the traditional trade negotiating authority other Presidents have had. This President does not. It is not for the lack of the Finance Committee trying to give it to him. There has been a real breakdown at both ends of the avenue, as it were. The White House has let small political considerations enter into their calculations. We are not unknown to such failings ourselves.

But the fact is, at the end of the 20th century the President of the United States does not have the negotiating authority he has had, in essence, for 65 years—since the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934. The more, then, ought we try to speak to the coming negotiations in the manner suggested; the more, then, should we get this legislation passed else the President might decide not to go at all.

Mr. ROTH. I think that would be a very serious setback. Let me comment on fast track. As the Senator said, our committee, of course, has acted on that. I regret the President does not have this authority. I have to say I do not think negotiations can be effective until the President obtains it. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. It is an elemental fact in international relations that most countries have a unitary legislative/executive branch, such that if the Prime Minister of Great Britain sends his Foreign Secretary to negotiate, that Foreign Secretary represents a majority in the House of Commons. Any agreement they reach will be ratified.

That is not the case with us. The world discovered this in 1919 when the Treaty of Versailles, negotiated by President Wilson, was not ratified in this Chamber. That sank in over the next 20 years. So we have been giving the President this authority so his representatives can say: If I make an agreement, we will keep the agreement.

Absent that, I do not know what will come. I think I am correct—I take the liberty of asking my able assistant, Dr. Podoff—we have never had a multilateral GATT or WTO negotiation without the President having traditional negotiating authority, have we, to complete the negotiations? No.

This, sir, would be the first time—the first time. That is not an experiment I think we should be running, but perhaps we can make up for it in time. In the meantime, I welcome the thoughts

of my friend, our colleague on the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their consideration. They have been most patient in listening to me today and on the Finance Committee as I have talked about these issues. I appreciate, too, they believe, as I do, it is appropriate for us to lay out negotiating objectives for our trade representatives for this next round. I hope very much our colleagues will support this amendment. I think it is important to send a signal as to what we expect our trade representatives to focus on in the agricultural sector.

Again, I thank our chairman and our ranking member very much for their assistance this morning. I note my cosponsor, Senator GRASSLEY, is held up in committee. He would very much like to speak on this amendment before it is finally considered. So I appreciate the consideration of the chairman and ranking member with respect to providing time for him as well.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I rise in support of an amendment I am sponsoring with Senator CONRAD to establish trade negotiating objectives for the new round of multilateral trade negotiations the United States will help launch in about four weeks with 133 other WTO member nations in Seattle.

The principles contained in this amendment are important because the upcoming negotiations in agriculture are so vital to our farm economy, and vital to the United States.

The last multilateral trade round, the Uruguay Round, established, for the first time, multilateral rules on market access, export subsidies, and domestic support for agriculture.

But as significant as the Uruguay Round was for agriculture, it was only a first step. Much remains to be done. Agricultural tariffs in industrial countries still average more than 40 percent, compared with tariffs of 5 to 10 percent in manufactured goods.

The average world agricultural tariff is 56 percent. In the United States, it is 3 percent. But tariffs for some agricultural products reach 200 percent or more.

Export subsidies are still far too high, and distort trade in third-country markets.

Producer subsidy equivalents, which measure assistance to producers in terms of the value of transfers to farmers generated by agricultural policy, are also far higher in the European Union than in the United States.

These transfers are paid either by consumers or by taxpayers in the form of market price support, direct payments, or other support.

The Producer subsidy equivalent for all agricultural products in the EU has averaged around 45 percent.

In the United States, the producer subsidy equivalent is only 16 percent.

So-called "Blue Box" spending is also out of control. This is the trade-distorting spending that was authorized in the Uruguay Round.

Currently, the United States has no programs that fall within the Blue Box. But the European Union maintains huge trade-distorting subsidy payments.

We should finally admit that the Blue Box is a mistake, and eliminate it completely.

State trading enterprises allow some countries to undercut United States exports into third markets and restrict imports.

And the principle of sound science is being thwarted with regard to bio-engineered products, to the great detriment of our farm economy.

We need to address all of these issues in the upcoming WTO negotiations.

But we also need to make certain that when we negotiate with our trading partners, that the deal we finally implement is the one that was actually negotiated, and not a different agreement that was changed later through secret understanding or side arrangement.

This is an important principle of international law. It is also a basic principle of equity and fairness.

Only after the WTO Agreement was signed into law did some of us in the Senate learn for the first time that there was more to the Uruguay Round agreement than we originally thought, due to secret side agreements.

This must not happen again.

The amendment I am offering with Senator CONRAD will insure that this practice will end.

The only trade deal that should be enforced is the one the parties actually negotiated.

I strongly urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, so that we can get this new round of trade negotiations off to the best possible start.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, am I correct, then, the understanding is before a final vote on this amendment, Senator GRASSLEY will be speaking and right now I will go forward with my amendment? Is that correct?

Mr. President, before I send this amendment to the desk, I want to emphasize one issue that this amendment does not speak to directly but which is very much on my mind. There is an (A) and a (B) part to this issue.

The (A) part is the economic convulsion in agriculture that has taken place all across our land, and certainly in our State of Minnesota. I also hasten to add there is no question in my mind that if we do not change the course of policy, we are going to lose a whole generation of producers.

The (B) part of what I want to say before going forward with this amendment is that I have, for at least the last 6 weeks, if not longer, been involved in what I would almost have to describe as a ferocious fight to have

the opportunity to bring an amendment to the floor that speaks to at least part of what is going on with this crisis in agriculture. No one amendment is the be-all or end-all. But one amendment would deal with all the mergers that are taking place and the ways in which these conglomerates are driving out family farmers across the land, the whole problem of concentration of power in the food industry, in agriculture.

Other colleagues from agricultural States such as Minnesota have other ideas, but the point is that we want an opportunity to bring an amendment to the floor that speaks to what is going on in agriculture. I thought we would have the opportunity to do that on this trade bill. We have been clotured out. Last week, we were successful in blocking cloture. Now we have been clotured out, with the understanding this will happen on the bankruptcy bill.

I want to express my skepticism on the floor of the Senate today as to whether or not that bankruptcy bill will be brought to the floor and whether or not we will have that opportunity. I want to express some indignation in advance if, in fact, we end up closing out this part of our session and going home without having had any debate, further debate about agriculture, and any effort whatsoever to alleviate the pain and misery in the countryside. I think it should be a top priority for us.

Over the next several days, whatever period we are dealing with, I am going to continue to fight to get this amendment out there. My understanding is we have an agreement that there will be an amendment on agriculture that will be part of the debate we will have when the bankruptcy bill comes to the floor, along with minimum wage, along with East Timor. That is the commitment that has been made. I certainly hope we will see that commitment carried out.

AMENDMENT NO. 2487

(Purpose: To condition trade benefits for Caribbean countries on compliance with internationally recognized labor rights)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only filed amendments may be called up. Does the Senator have a filed amendment?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am sorry, the amendment has been filed. I do not need to send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Which number is the amendment?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Since I did not know it had been filed, I will speak on the amendment.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Is it 2487?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, 2487 is the number.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, might I just slip over and make sure we have the right amendment?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I apologize. I did not know the amendment had been filed.

When I talk about labor rights, my colleague from New York is very familiar with the ILO. This is his fine work. What we are talking about is the right of association, the right to organize and bargain collectively, the prohibition on the use of any form of coerced or compulsory labor, some kind of international minimum wage for the employment of children age 15, and acceptable working conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. . ENCOURAGING TRADE AND INVESTMENT MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL TO BOTH THE UNITED STATES AND CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES.

(a) CONDITIONING OF TRADE BENEFITS ON COMPLIANCE WITH INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED LABOR RIGHTS.—None of the benefits provided to beneficiary countries under the CBTEA shall be made available before the Secretary of Labor has made a determination pursuant to paragraph (b) of the following:

(1) The beneficiary country does not engage in significant violations of internationally recognized human rights and the Secretary of State agrees with this determination; and

(2)(A) The beneficiary country is providing for effective enforcement of internationally recognized worker rights throughout the country (including in export processing zones) as determined under paragraph (b), including the core labor standards enumerated in the appropriate treaties of the International Labor Organization, and including—

(i) the right of association;

(ii) the right to organize and bargain collectively;

(iii) a prohibition on the use of any form of coerced or compulsory labor;

(iv) the international minimum age for the employment of children (age 15); and

(v) acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health.

(B) The government of the beneficiary country ensures that the Secretary of Labor, the head of the national labor agency of the government of that country, and the head of the Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers (ORIT) each has access to all appropriate records and other information of all business enterprises in the country.

(b) DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED WORKER RIGHTS.—

(1) DETERMINATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of carrying out paragraph (a)(2), the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the individuals described in clause (B) and pursuant to the procedures described in clause (C), shall determine whether or not each beneficiary country is providing for effective enforcement of internationally recognized worker rights throughout the country (including in export processing zones).

(B) INDIVIDUALS DESCRIBED.—The individuals described in this clause are the head of the national labor agency of the government of the beneficiary country in question and the head of the Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers (ORIT).

(C) PUBLIC COMMENT.—Not later than 90 days before the Secretary of Labor makes a determination that a country is in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (a)(2), the Secretary shall publish notice in the Federal Register and an opportunity for

public comment. The Secretary shall take into consideration the comments received in making a determination under such paragraph (a)(2).

(2) CONTINUING COMPLIANCE.—In the case of a country for which the Secretary of Labor has made an initial determination under subparagraph (1) that the country is in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (a)(2), the Secretary, in consultation with the individuals described in subparagraph (1), shall, not less than once every 3 years thereafter, conduct a review and make a determination with respect to that country to ensure continuing compliance with the requirements of paragraph (a)(2). The Secretary shall submit the determination to Congress.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and on an annual basis thereafter, the Secretary of Labor shall prepare and submit to Congress a report containing—

(A) a description of each determination made under this paragraph during the preceding year;

(B) a description of the position taken by each of the individuals described in subparagraph (1)(B) with respect to each such determination; and

(C) a report on the public comments received pursuant to subparagraph (1)(C).

(c) ADDITIONAL ENFORCEMENT.—A citizen of the United States shall have a cause of action in the United States district court in the district in which the citizen resides or in any other appropriate district to seek compliance with the standards set forth under this section with respect to any CBTEA beneficiary country, including a cause of action in an appropriate United States district court for other appropriate equitable relief. In addition to any other relief sought in such an action, a citizen may seek the value of any damages caused by the failure of a country or company to comply.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, this amendment would provide for mutually beneficial trade between the United States and Caribbean countries by actually rewarding countries that comply with internationally recognized core labor rights with increased access to U.S. markets for certain textile goods.

That is what this should be about. We ought to reward countries that are willing to comply with internationally recognized core labor rights with increased access to the U.S. market.

This amendment provides for enforceable standards—let me emphasize this. I say to my colleagues, and I know they believe me, I am an internationalist. I very much want to see expanded trade. I very much want to see expanded relations with other countries. The question is the terms of trade, and I am especially focused on the need to have enforceable labor standards.

Under this amendment, before any of the benefits of the CBI trade bill can go into effect, the Secretary of Labor will have to determine a CBI country is providing for enforcement of the core ILO labor rights. That is what this amendment does.

The Secretary will make this determination after consulting with labor people from the region and after consideration of public comments. But the Secretary of Labor will make the determination to make sure the country

with which we have trade relations is providing for the enforcement of the ILO core labor rights. I want to make sure these standards are enforceable. U.S. citizens will also have a private right of action in district courts to enforce these provisions.

The alternatives in the CBI Parity bill are unenforceable. That is my dissent from this legislation. The CBI Parity bill merely includes labor rights as an eligibility criterion which can only be enforced by the administration. But the administration already enforces the GSP program and has never, not one time, suspended a CBI country, despite their terrible labor rights records.

Later on, I will provide, from my point of view, too much by way of documentation. That is to say, the number of petitions that have been filed with the USTR under the GSP program. Every single time the petition has been withdrawn. There has been no real response.

If the administration will not use its GSP leverage to improve labor rights in these countries, why would we expect them to use an eligibility criterion? The ILO is not an option because it does not have the enforcement power. I want to make sure there are some enforceable labor standards that will apply to this CBI trade agreement.

Some examples of GSP workers' rights cases accepted for review against major CBI countries are as follows:

Costa Rica, 1993, right of association, right to organize and bargain collectively, acceptable working conditions, petition withdrawn. That is the outcome.

Dominican Republic, 1989-1991, right of association, right to organize and bargain collectively—these are core labor rights—forced labor, child labor, review terminated in 1991 due to introduction of "labor code reform."

El Salvador, 1990-1994, right of association, right to organize and bargain collectively, review terminated.

Guatemala, 1992-1997, right of association, right to organize and bargain collectively, again, review terminated.

The list goes on.

What we want to do is parallel to what Senator FEINGOLD has done in his HOPE for Africa bill. That is, we want to apply some enforceable labor standards. We want to reward countries that comply with internationally recognized core labor rights. In this amendment, we call for the Secretary of Labor to determine whether or not a CBI country is providing for the enforcement of ILO core labor rights. Why wouldn't we want to do that in a piece of trade legislation? When will we?

Supporters of CBI parity complain that NAFTA-like benefits will help Caribbean workers. I have heard that argument made over and over. I want to read from a report that came out in October of 1999: "Six years of NAFTA: A review from inside the maquiladoras."

This 1999 report on the Mexican maquiladoras shows wages and conditions have actually deteriorated since passage of NAFTA. This was a joint effort between the Comité Fronterizo de Obreras and the American Friends Service Committee. I will quote from relevant sections of the report, "Six years of NAFTA: A review from inside the maquiladoras":

In Mexican manufacturing, real wages have fallen by more than 20 percent since 1994. It is not only that real wages have remained stagnant overall, failing to keep pace with inflation, but wage levels have also come under attack wherever they are over the threshold considered competitive by the maquiladoras.

One sees over and over, in going through this report, wage levels dropping, basic violations of the people to organize, and failure to enforce child labor standards. When I hear about NAFTA-like benefits, I have to question whether or not this is the future.

I will speak about the CBI countries and what I call the race to the bottom. The CBI countries with the fastest export growth to the United States have also experienced the steepest decline in wages in the region. Over the last 10 years, textile and apparel imports from Honduras exploded by a whopping 2,523 percent. Yet from the 10 years spanning 1985 to 1996, wages of Honduran workers declined by 59 percent.

I will repeat this since we are talking about the benefits for the workers in these countries. I am not making an argument that we should have enforceable labor standards because I only care about workers in our country. I do care about workers in our country, and I do worry that the message we're sending to workers in our country, if we do not have enforceable labor standards in this agreement, is: If you dare to organize and bargain collectively to get a better wage and a better standard of living for yourselves and your families, then these companies will just go to the Caribbean countries.

That is part of the message. Let me tell you why I think it is the message. This is a list of approximate apparel wages around the world. In the United States, the average is \$8.42. Do my colleagues know what it is in Colombia? Seventy to 80 cents; Dominican Republic, 69 cents; El Salvador, 59 cents; Guatemala, somewhere between 37 to 50 cents; Haiti, 30 cents; Honduras, 43 cents; Nicaragua, 23 cents.

I am worried that not only is the message to workers in our country: Look, we will just go to these countries where we can pay 23 or 40 cents an hour; you cannot compete with them so you dare not call for better wages and working conditions.

I am also worried the message we're sending to these countries is: Yes, there is going to be economic expansion and there is going to be more trade, but the only way you can get the foreign investment is if you agree to work for less than 50 cents an hour.

Again, I will give some figures. CBI countries with the fastest export

growth to the United States have also experienced the sharpest decline in wages in the region. Maybe my colleagues can explain to me why this is the case.

Over the last 10 years, in Honduras: Apparel imports from Honduras exploded 2,523 percent. Yet for the same 10 years, the wages in Honduras declined by 59 percent.

In El Salvador: Apparel exports to the United States have increased 2,512 percent, while wages have decreased 27 percent.

In contrast, Jamaica's export growth has been less impressive, culminating in an actual 17 percent decline over the past year. One explanation is that Jamaica's high rate of unionization has ensured that workers' wages have increased.

So here is the message. May I simply say to my colleagues why enforceable IOL standards are important: The basic right to be able to organize and not wind up in prison; the basic right to be able to bargain collectively and not wind up in prison. It is because if we do not have enforceable labor standards—and we do not in this trade legislation right now, and this amendment puts enforceable labor standards into this legislation—then we are saying to workers in our States: You had better not ask for more by way of wages. You had better not be too assertive for yourselves or your families because we'll just go to these CBI countries and we'll pay 50 cents an hour or less.

What it says to the workers in these countries—and I just gave you some aggregate data—is: By the way, we're not going to guarantee your right to organize. We're not going to guarantee any fair labor standards. We're not going to guarantee any IOL standards that will be enforceable. Therefore, the only way you get the investment is if you're willing to work under sweatshop conditions.

As a matter of fact, in the CBI countries, their growth in exports to our country has been unbelievable—dramatic growth—but the wages have declined. The only country where that has not happened is Jamaica, which is a country where there has been unionization. So the message is: You don't get the trade, you don't get the investment, if you dare to unionize.

I say to colleagues, there are many articles, many testimonies, and there is a GAO report which shows that workers' rights have not been respected and are not respected in Central America, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic. I do not think my colleagues are going to argue with me on this. It seems the evidence is irrefutable on that point.

Without this amendment, the CBI Parity bill is going to help defeat unionizing drives in our textile plants and American workers will compete with Caribbean apparel workers who are willing to work for 30 cents an hour—23 cents an hour actually in Nicaragua, 80 cents an hour in Colombia. The United States apparel workers

make, on the average, \$8.42, which is not a lot of money.

There is a bitter irony: Many of these workers in U.S. textile plants are actually immigrants from these very same countries. A large number of them are poor, they barely make a living wage, they are women, they are minorities. Without this amendment, the CBI parity bill will merely encourage United States corporations to set up sweatshops in the Caribbean. My amendment is an anti-sweatshop amendment.

To summarize, there ought to be enforceable labor standards. There are not any in this trade bill. Without enforceable labor standards, we are not on the side of human rights, we are not on the side of people in the CBI countries wanting to organize and to be able to do well for their families, and we are not on the side of wage earners in our country who are going to lose their jobs to workers in Honduras who work for 40 cents an hour.

We ought to at least have enforceable IOL standards. That is exactly what this amendment speaks to.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks and tell him that he finds no difference of view among the managers of this legislation. We have a managers' amendment to address it.

The large issue, sir, that has emerged in the context of the World Trade Organization is the relevance of the international labor conventions negotiated under the auspices of the International Labor Organization, which began here in Washington in 1919. The first were adopted at the Pan-American Union Building. The Offices of the ILO itself were provided by then-Assistant Secretary of the Navy Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The problem is, at the time, these trade treaties—they were trade treaties—were designed to say, just as the Senator has said: If you, country X, have a minimum wage, and country Y does not, country Y will have trade advantages which will end up with employment in the original country. So do it together—improve labor standards together by means of international labor treaties. It is a principle.

We did not, until now, have any transparency. There was no inspection—a new idea, a post-World War II idea—an important key idea. There was no ranking, no reporting. We are getting there. The International Labor Organization, in 1998, issued this wonderful document: "ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work." And there they are, the four basic principles. We have a lot to do in this regard, but we have begun.

So I congratulate the Senator. He is going to speak later and longer.

I know the Senator from Montana, under some pressure of time, would

like to speak now, as I understand it, on the most agreeable subject of why this is an important bill and why he voted for it in the Finance Committee.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, before yielding to the Senator from Montana—I will be pleased to accommodate him—my understanding is that before we come to a final vote, there will be an opportunity for further discussion of this amendment. There are some additional comments I want to make, especially in response to the very helpful comments of the Senator.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. We understand that.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, like many of my colleagues, I was very disappointed last week when it appeared that we would not have a chance to act on this very important piece of legislation. I was disappointed for several reasons.

First, because there's a lot more at stake here than the four basic elements of this bill: CBI, Africa Trade, TAA and GSP. All four are important, and I will say a few words about each one of them.

But even more important is the signal that we send now. At the end of this month, the United States will host the World Trade Organization ministerial meeting in Seattle. The WTO writes and enforces the rules governing some \$6 trillion in international trade. Delegations from over 130 nations will come participate in the meeting. They will launch a new global round of negotiations aimed at expanding trade.

All of those delegations will have a common concern: Does the United States still intend to lead the world on trade? They will look at the way we deal with the trade bill before us as an indication of how they should answer that question.

The signals we have sent them recently are not encouraging.

First, we have failed to pass legislation granting negotiating authority to the U.S. Trade Representative. This undercuts our ability to persuade other nations to offer concessions, since we are not in a position to make credible offers.

Second, the United States has not put forward the kind of visionary, far-reaching proposals needed at the onset of trade talks. Rather than leading the way forward, we seem to have adopted another strategy: offend the fewest number of people as possible.

While we send these weak signals, other countries have moved into the breach to advance their own interests. The European Union and Japan mounted campaigns to paint us as foot-draggers on trade. They say that our proposals for trade negotiations are too narrow to allow for any real bargaining. They claim that they want to talk about the full range of trade

issues, while we want to pull major portions of the trade system off the table.

We know what they are really up to. They want to undercut the talks and make them drag on for years. That way they can avoid living up to their responsibilities on agriculture. Unfortunately, a number of countries are persuaded by the picture of America's trade policy that Europe and Japan are painting.

This bill is the only opportunity the Senate will have before the Seattle meetings to show where America stands. It is vitally important that we pass this legislation to demonstrate our commitment to free market principles, and to open, fair trading system.

Mr. President, I filed two amendments to the bill, both of them trade-related. Both of them are on issues which are extremely important to Americans. I was very disappointed that we were locked out of discussing them last week.

One of the amendments allowed for tariff cuts on environmental goods as part of a global agreement in the WTO. The measure has the support of both business and environmental groups. This is a rare instance where both sides of the trade-environment debate agree on something. It's a shame that the Senate cannot move forward on something so sensible.

The second amendment concerned agricultural subsidies. American farmers are the most productive in the world. But they're being frozen out of foreign markets by European and Japanese subsidies. I filed an amendment that would fight back by funding our Export Enhancement Program.

This amendment required the Secretary of Agriculture to target at least two billion dollars in Export Enhancement Program funds into the EU's most sensitive markets if they fail to eliminate their export subsidies by 2003. It's time to start fighting fire with fire. This "GATT trigger" should provide leverage in the next round of the WTO in reducing grossly distorted barriers to agricultural trade.

In addition to these amendments, Mr. President, I also filed a resolution in the form of an amendment about another important trade issue: telecommunications. It calls on the Administration to continue to pursue efforts to open the Japanese telecommunications market. This is another example of how Japan must shoulder its responsibilities as a major trading nation. It cannot benefit from access to foreign markets unless it offers access to its home market. It's simply a question of fairness.

Mr. President, I voted against cloture last week because I objected to the way the Majority Leader handled the bill. I was denied the ability to do what the people of Montana sent me here to do: debate and pass legislation. But I support the bill itself. I support each of its

elements—the Caribbean Basin Initiative, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, and the renewal of both Trade Adjustment Assistance and the Generalized System of Preferences.

CARIBBEAN BASIN PARITY INITIATIVE (CBI)

I have long supported efforts to extend additional tariffs preferences to the Caribbean Basin. But with conditions. The benefits should be conditioned on the beneficiary countries' trade policies, their participation and cooperation in the Free Trade Area of the Americas ("FTAA") initiative, and other factors. This trade bill is substantially similar to the version I supported in the 105th Congress with some reservation.

I see a flaw in this bill, however, and would like to work to repair it. The bill suggests criteria the President can use when deciding whether to grant CBI benefits. It is a long list of about a dozen items. Criteria like Intellectual Property Rights. Investment protections. Counter-narcotics. Each one is important. The bill should make these criteria mandatory.

In particular, I believe that the President should be required to certify that CBI beneficiaries respect worker rights, both as a matter of law and in practice. We can't maintain domestic support for open trade here at home unless our programs take core labor standards into account.

We want to help our Caribbean neighbors compete effectively in the U.S. market. But we don't want them to compete with U.S. firms by denying their own citizens fundamental worker rights.

It only seems reasonable that as we help the economic development of these nations, we also help them enforce the laws already on their books. The majority of these countries already have the power and only need the will to ensure that their citizens see the benefits of enhanced trade—decent wages, decent hours and a decent life.

Overall, I believe that CBI parity is the right thing to do—if it does what it is intended to do. That is lift the people of the hurricane devastated countries out of poverty and ensure them a better way of life.

I also believe that the United States must lead by example. Sensitivity to labor and environment must play a role in our trade decisions and actions around the world.

It's tragic that partisan politics keeps the United States Senate from taking these actions.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

I have the same concerns about labor in terms of the African Growth and Opportunity portion of the bill. But I supported the Chairman's mark, which included a provision requiring U.S. fabric for apparel products produced in eligible sub-Saharan African countries.

Developing markets is in the best interest of us all. And the trade bill would help Africa move in that direction. But this bill is about more than trade. It is about hope.

It is about bringing the struggling nations of sub-Saharan Africa into our democratic system. It is about establishing stability and a framework wherein the citizens of these nations can enjoy the fruits of prosperity. It is about building a bridge between the United States and Africa that will be a model for all nations.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

The third part of the bill renews the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. We cannot expect to maintain a domestic consensus on trade if we fail to assist those who are adversely affected. For 37 years, this program helped Americans adjust to the forces of globalization.

I would like to acknowledge Senator MOYNIHAN, who originated this program, in another demonstration of his wisdom and foresight. I have seen the effects of this program in Montana. The renewal of Trade Adjustment Assistance translates to 330 Montana employees impacted and approximately \$44 million in gross annual sales preserved.

This legislation is long overdue. TAA authorization expired on June 30. There are families who are displaced in the world economy, and they are living off this transitional benefit—200,000 eligible workers.

While we delay, certified firms anxiously await funding. This is fundamentally unfair—especially for employees of firms fighting import competition that is beyond their control. They cannot afford to wait while TAA is caught up in the annual battle for funding as the "perennial bargaining chip" for other trade proposals. That's just ineffective government. It's time to pass this legislation.

GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

Finally, let me say a word about GSP renewal. This is the fourth part of the trade bill. This is also a question of effective government. Over the years, the program has lapsed periodically when renewal legislation was delayed. Like TAA, the latest lapse occurred on June 30. Four months later, we still haven't acted on its renewal.

Who gets hurt? Not just foreign companies. A lot of American firms get hurt. That includes both American importers and exporters. A lot of the American firms produce abroad and then export to the United States. Much of this is internal company trade. That's the reality of today's global economy.

When GSP lapses, these companies are suddenly required to deposit import duties into an account. Customs holds the money until renewal legislation is signed. Eventually the companies get their money back. But they don't know how long renewal legislation will take. So they don't how much they'll have to set aside, or how long the money will be in escrow.

How can we expect businesses to operate efficiently under such conditions? These cycles of GSP lapsing and then being renewed represent government at

its worst. We have a responsibility to provide business and consumers with a consistent, predictable set of rules. We need to fix this GSP lapse as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, a lot of effort, a lot of thought, a lot of time has gone into this bill. Much time has also gone into formulating amendments. It was a great disappointment to see this effort unravel over partisan politics. We have a second chance this week. Let's not squander the opportunity. We can and should work together to pass this bill.

We were elected to this body to pass legislation not to bicker. Let's do what the people sent us here to do.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise briefly to express the wish that every Member of the Senate will have heard, or will have read, the remarks of the Senator from Montana. There speaks the American voice. I trust it will be heard. Thanks to him, it will prevail.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to address the African Growth and Opportunity Act and to discuss two amendments I hope to offer. I would like to begin by thanking the chairman and the ranking member of the committee for their good work on this bill. Anyone who has spent time in Africa knows the poverty and environmental problems inherent on that continent. The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, I believe, is the most hopeful vehicle for positive change that has come about. It opens the door to trade, investment, economic growth, and a higher quality of life for people of African nations. It will give Africans options and new abilities to build economically, to develop, to improve opportunities for trade worldwide, and to build new businesses on African and Caribbean soil.

Sub-Saharan Africa is a market of some 700 million people. Yet less than 1 percent of our Nation's total trade is currently conducted with nations of this region. Expanding trade with this emerging market will help keep America competitive with Europe and Asia, who are already expanding their markets in the African nations. As the nations of sub-Saharan Africa reform their economies to spur economic growth, U.S. exporters will have access to new and larger markets for their products. This, in the long run, creates and sustains American jobs.

Just as important, this legislation contains provisions to support and encourage democracy and human rights in sub-Saharan Africa. A country is not eligible for trade and investment benefits if it engages in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights and does not respect basic labor rights, such as the right to organize and bargain, the right of association, and acceptable working conditions.

Now, I recognize that those rights aren't as strong and enforceable as some might want. Nonetheless, they are the basic rights that are inherent in virtually every trade bill.

Finally, as President Clinton noted, deepening our economic ties with these nations will also strengthen our cooperative efforts to address a host of transnational threats, such as environmental degradation, infectious disease, and illicit drug trafficking. I had intended to offer an amendment to address any potential impact this legislation might have on the domestic apparel industry of our Nation. The amendment I would have introduced would have created a tax credit of 30 percent for the first \$12,300 in the first year of employment, rising to 50 percent over 5 years for domestic garment and sewn manufacturers who hire a worker who is at or below the poverty line in this country. For an individual, that is \$8,240; for a family of four, it is \$16,700.

However, both the chairman and the ranking member of the Finance Committee have made it clear they don't believe tax credit amendments should be offered to this legislation, and I respect that. The offset we also had in mind, it turns out, has been utilized. However, the amendment has been scored. I will not offer this domestic textile worker tax credit amendment on this bill, though my intention is to offer it as a separate bill with an offset at a later time.

I think this legislation would provide real incentive for domestic manufacturers to keep jobs in the United States, to hire American workers, and to keep them on the job. Moreover, by targeting the benefits to employees who, before being hired, are living at or below the poverty line, the amendment would also help move families off of welfare and public assistance and provide them good jobs in which they can support themselves and their families.

My second amendment addresses the need for the United States to remain in the forefront of the fight against HIV/AIDS in Africa.

Mr. President, this bill inadvertently threatens to undermine the fight against AIDS in Africa. Approximately 34 million people, if you can believe it, in sub-Saharan Africa—that is the equivalent of the population of the State of California—are or have been infected with AIDS or HIV. And 11.5 million people of those infected have died—11.5 million people. These fatalities comprise 83 percent of the world's total HIV/AIDS-related death. Eighty-three percent of the death from AIDS in the world are in the sub-Saharan African countries. So the impact of AIDS in Africa is huge. It continues to be a major threat to the well-being of the entire African Continent. Frankly, it even threatens the well-being of this legislation if it is left unaddressed.

Unfortunately, this legislation carries with it intellectual property rights for the American pharmaceutical com-

panies which prevent the licensing, manufacture, and sale of cheaper generic AIDS drugs. That is a practice known as "compulsory licensing."

Without compulsory licensing, a practice fully consistent with international law, the vast majority of HIV/AIDS patients in Africa could not afford the more expensive drugs from American pharmaceutical companies and, thus, more will suffer and die simply without treatment. AIDS drugs in this country literally cost several hundred dollars a month. They must be taken several times a day regularly, and they often necessitate other drugs to ward off serious side effects of AIDS-reducing drugs.

The amendment I have authored, which is cosponsored by Senator FEINGOLD, on which we have worked with the staff on both sides, and which we believe will be acceptable to both sides, draws on a provision in Senator FEINGOLD's HOPE for Africa bill. It allows the countries of sub-Saharan Africa to pursue compulsory licensing by preventing the U.S. Government from enforcing one specific U.S. intellectual property right that, when implemented, would prevent the license, manufacture, and sale of generic AIDS drugs in Africa.

For those of my colleagues who may be concerned that this amendment may undermine wider intellectual property rights, this amendment acknowledges the World Trade Organization's agreement on trade-related aspects of intellectual property and that that is the presumptive legal standard for intellectual property rights.

The WTO, however, allows countries flexibility in addressing public health concerns, and the compulsory licensing process under this amendment is consistent with the WTO's balancing of intellectual property rights with the moral obligation to meet public health emergencies such as the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Africa.

When 11 million people die of a single disease, it certainly deserves and merits this kind of consideration.

In effect, this amendment will allow the countries of sub-Saharan Africa to continue to determine the availability of HIV/AIDS pharmaceuticals in their countries, and provide their people with more affordable HIV/AIDS drugs.

It is clearly in the national interest of the United States to prevent the further spread of HIV/AIDS in Africa, and I believe that this amendment is an important improvement to this legislation if we are to continue to assist the countries of the region to bring this deadly disease under control.

I am pleased to support the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Caribbean Basin Initiative because I believe they are both in the national interest of this country.

I thank both the chairman and the ranking member for their support of this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for

the amendment of the Senator from California to the African Growth and Opportunity Act. First, let me thank Senator FEINSTEIN for her leadership on this critical issue. This very provision is incorporated in my own HOPE for Africa bill, S. 1636, and I am especially pleased she is offering that language as an amendment to this bill today.

AGOA's aim is to strengthen economic ties between the United States and the diverse states of sub-Saharan Africa, fostering economic development and mutually beneficial growth. I think that we can all agree that this is a worthy goal. The disagreement is about how we get from here to there.

It is my belief that no U.S.-Africa trade bill will succeed unless it addresses the underlying context for growth and development in Africa. The United States needs to pass legislation that will help set the stage for a real economic partnership.

The Feinstein-Feingold amendment is a good start because it is impossible to address Africa's economic and social development problems without taking serious action to combat the region's HIV/AIDS epidemic.

In 1998, four out of every five HIV/AIDS-related deaths occurred in sub-Saharan Africa. In fact, HIV/AIDS kills over 5,000 Africans each day.

Common decency tells us that this is a humanitarian catastrophe. Basic logic also tells us that it is economically devastating.

AIDS attacks the most productive segment of society—the young adults who would otherwise be the engine in Africa's economy. And it leaves far too many children orphaned, preparing to take their place in society without the guidance and security that their parents would have provided.

And the health-care costs associated with AIDS are astronomical. Life-saving medications can cost \$12,000 per year—an impossible burden in countries where average per-capita annual income often barely exceed \$1,000.

How can the United States expect to find a strong economic partner in Africa if it ignores these facts?

This amendment does not hide from these realities. It approaches them head-on, by prohibiting U.S. funds from being used to change the intellectual property laws of African states.

That means that taxpayer dollars will not be spent to help pharmaceutical companies undermine the legal efforts of some African states to gain and retain access to lower cost pharmaceuticals.

It is important to be clear—this amendment does not allow African states to "get away with something." It explicitly refers to the legal means by which these countries are entitled to address their public health emergencies.

These legal methods, which are permitted under the agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property, or TRIPS, lower prices for consumers by creating competition in the

market for patented goods through a procedure called compulsory licensing. TRIPS is an agreement administered by the World Trade Organization.

Compulsory licensing does not ignore the rights of patent-holders. Pharmaceutical companies holding patents on HIV/AIDS drugs are paid a royalty under these arrangements.

This amendment simply prohibits the United States from spending money to undermine an entirely legal fight for survival that is being waged in Africa today.

It is legal. It is the right thing to do. And ultimately, it is in America's interest, as healthier African people will undoubtedly lead to healthier African economies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from California. She seeks to address a most critical problem, one that is unbelievable, as she pointed out, with 11 million a year dying from this disease.

We have been working. We expect to come together on an amendment that will be acceptable to both sides.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the chairman very much. I appreciate that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan has said numerous times that increased trade has raised the standard of living and the quality of life for almost all countries involved in trade, and especially the quality of life in our own country. Chairman Greenspan believes the No. 1 benefit of trade is not simply jobs but an enhanced standard of living. I can think of no more important enhancement to the standard of living of America's hardest pressed working families than to increase the minimum wage. Surely, it is appropriate to send a message on this legislation that increased trade must definitely mean a better quality of life for the working poor.

I had hoped to offer an amendment to this bill to raise the minimum wage. Regrettably, it was perhaps the only vehicle that was going to be left in this year of this particular session. But the majority leader's actions prevented me from doing that. This trade bill has been offered to enhance the standard of living for workers in Africa and the Caribbean. I am certainly in favor of that. But there are honest disagreements as to whether the proposal before us effectively does so.

While we express our concern for the workers in these nations, we cannot forget the workers in our own country. I believe the American people will hold this Congress responsible for refusing to address so many issues which are critical to our families and our communities, and the majority, I believe, has once again turned a deaf ear to the pleas of the American people for action. I regret this latest missed opportunity.

I take this opportunity as we are coming into the final days of this congressional year to express what I know has to be the frustration of about 12 million Americans who had hoped this Congress would have raised the minimum wage, or at least had the opportunity to debate this issue and discuss this issue and consider this issue during this past summer, or this past fall, or even prior to the time that we were going to go into recess. But we have been denied the opportunity to do so. Every legislative possibility has been excluded from us doing so up to this time, and even excluded on this piece of legislation.

I join with all of those who share this enormous frustration and a certain amount of disgust at the way this issue is being treated as we are moving into these final days.

We now have seen some modification or adjustment to prior positions of opposition to any increase in the minimum wage which had been expressed by the Republican leadership in the House and also in the Senate. Now, evidently, there is a bidding war in the House of Representatives—hopefully, it won't take place in the Senate, but certainly in the House of Representatives—about not what we can do for the working poor but how many additional tax breaks we can add on to the minimum wage when we consider it in the House of Representatives.

If we extend the minimum wage over a longer period of time, for some 3 years, actually the benefits that special interests would receive by the tax considerations, which in the House position would reach \$100 billion over 10 years, which isn't paid for, the only way you could assume they could be paid for would be out of Social Security because it is not paid for—and the bidding war wants to keep adding that until finally, evidently, the financial interests, which are the most opposed to any increase in the minimum wage, would finally say: All right, let's go ahead because the benefits we are going to receive so exceed and outweigh the modest increase in the increase in the minimum wage that it is worthwhile.

As we are coming to the end of this session, we are finding that this Senate refuses to address an issue which cries out for fairness and decency as the minimum wage slips further and further back for working families at the lower end of the economic ladder, who are in many instances doing such important work as teachers aides in the classrooms of this country, are doing important work in nursing homes and looking after the elderly people, or working in the great buildings of this country at nighttime in order to clean them so the American economy and efficiency can continue during the course of the day, that we have decided in this body evidently that we are going to leave this session granting ourselves a \$4,600 pay increase and denying a one dollar-an-hour pay increase for over 11

million of our fellow citizens who are working at the lower rung of the economic ladder. That is not right. That is not fair. That is wrong.

We ask ourselves: Why should this be the case? Certainly we have not heard those who have resisted us in bringing this matter to the floor make the economic argument that, well, this will mean an increase in the numbers of unemployed Americans. They haven't been willing to make that. They have made it at other times, and it was so totally refuted during the last increases in the minimum wage that they evidently are not prepared to come out and debate that issue.

The other argument, that it was going to be an inflator in terms of our general economy, has been refuted completely, as a practical matter. The last time we raised the minimum wage it was demonstrated effectively that there was virtually no increase in the cost of living. We are denied the opportunity of even hearing a well thought out argument for opposing the minimum wage. All we hear is the same, tired, old arguments that have been disproved time and time out.

What we see as a result is that without the increase in the minimum wage, there is a continued deterioration in the purchasing power of the minimum-wage workers. Even without the minimum wage, if we did not consider it until even 2000 or 2001, we would be back to \$4.80 an hour, close to the lowest point in the last 40 years of minimum wage, at a time of unprecedented economic prosperity for everyone except those at the lowest rung of the economic ladder.

We will not even debate the issue. If Members want to vote against it, they can do so, but why deny Members the opportunity to debate the issue and take the time on this particular measure? Members cannot make the argument that it will take a lot of time after what we have gone through in the past days where, effectively, from a parliamentary point of view, we were in a stalemate in the Senate without any amendments being even considered on the trade bill for a number of days.

We could have dealt with this issue in a matter of hours. We are certainly prepared to deal with this issue in a relatively short time period—a few hours if necessary. Obviously, the majority, the Republicans, retain their rights in terms of a very modest increase in the minimum wage, 50 cents next year and 50 cents the following year. That is too high for our Republican friends. We can debate that and at least have the Senate work its will. The position taken by the Republican leadership on the other side has been, if we are going to extend it, they will deny us the opportunity to bring the minimum wage up this year. If we bring it up at the end of the session, we will put it, effectively, well into next year and carry it on to the following year, which will extend it perhaps \$1.00 over 5 years.

Still, we will carry on the tax goodies which, over a 10-year period in the proposal recommended by the Republican leadership, will be \$100 billion in tax breaks for the special interests. That is what is happening. That is what is so unacceptable.

This morning, there was an excellent editorial in the Washington Post, and I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 3, 1999]

THE MINIMUM WAGE SQUEEZE

The minimum wage should be increased, and the increase should not become a political football. Unfortunately, there is more than a little risk that it will become a football in the remaining days of the session.

The wage, now \$5.15 an hour, was last increased in 1997. The president has proposed taking it up another dollar an hour: 50 cents next Jan. 1 and 50 cents a year thereafter. Republicans and some Democrats would spread the increase over an additional year. That's something reasonable people can disagree about. The wage ought not be allowed to lose ground to inflation, and perhaps in real terms ought to be a set higher than it has been in recent years, though the government powerfully supplements it with the earned-income tax credit, food stamps and other benefits.

The wage itself, however, has become almost a secondary issue. Those sponsoring a slower increase also want to use the bill as a vehicle for some of the tax cuts the president vetoed earlier in the year. Ostensibly, these are to make whole the smaller businesses that would have to pay the higher wage. But the data suggest that little of the benefit would go to such employers. These are costly cuts in the estate tax, tax treatment of pension set-asides, etc., that would mainly go to people of very high income. No provision is made to offset the costs, which tend to be understated in that early on they would be relatively low and only later begin to rise.

The president has rightly threatened, mainly on these fiscal grounds, to veto the bill. It may well be that the bill will have to include some tax relief to pass, but the relief should be targeted and paid for. The gatekeepers seek too heavy a toll. The price of a bill to help the working poor ought not be an indiscriminate tax cut for those at the very top of the economic mountain.

Mr. KENNEDY. This article reminds everyone how the interests of some of the hardest working Americans are being toyed with by the Republican leadership. They say maybe we will add a little more in terms of tax breaks if we consider the increase in the minimum wage.

This increase is a matter of enormous importance and consequence for the people receiving it. Sixty percent are women; over 75 percent of minimum wage workers heading up families are women. It is an issue in terms of children. It is a family issue. It is an issue relating to men and women of color since one-third of those who receive the minimum wage are men and women of color. It is a civil rights issue, a family issue, a children's issue, a women's issue. It is a fairness issue. Yet we are denied it.

How quickly this institution went ahead with a \$4,600-per-year increase

for their pay while denying this side the opportunity to vote on 50 cents an hour over each of the next two years for the minimum-wage worker, an increase of \$2,000 a year for people working at the lower end of the economic ladder. Yet, \$4,600 for the Members of Congress.

It is wrong to play with the life and the well-being of these workers. They are being toyed with by considering how much in additional tax breaks we will provide for special interests. That is what the bidding is that is going on. It is not the Congress or leadership acting in these workers' best interest.

What does \$2,000 mean to a minimum-wage family? The two increments, of 50 cents each, mean 7 months' of grocery. That means a lot to a family. It is 5 months of rent. It is 10 months of utilities. It is 18 months of tuition and fees at a 2-year college for a family of four living on the minimum wage.

While many parts of our country have experienced the economic boom, we have found another very important area of need for minimum-wage workers: Housing. In so many areas of this country, the housing costs have gone off the chart and are virtually out of the reach of the minimum-wage workers. The hours a minimum-wage worker would have to work in Boston for a one-room apartment—100 a week. It is absolutely impossible to understand why we are not dealing with this issue.

This chart/table shows what happened when we had the increase in the minimum wage in 1996 and 1997. The unemployment rates continued to go down. This is true in the industry that has expressed the greatest reservation about a minimum-wage increase, the restaurant industry. They have increased their total workers by 400,000 over the period since the last increase in the minimum wage. They are out here day in and day out trying to undermine and lobby against the increase in the minimum wage.

This is not just an issue in which Democrats are interested, although we are interested in and we are committed to it. I daresay if we had a vote on an increase in the minimum wage, the way we have identified it, we would get virtually every member of our party and perhaps a few courageous Republicans as well.

This is what Business Week says about the increase in the minimum wage:

Old myths die hard. Old economic theories die even harder . . . higher minimum wages are supposed to lead to fewer jobs. Not today. In a fast-growth, low-inflation economy, higher minimum wages raise income, not unemployment.

This is from Business Week—not a labor organization, although they would agree—from Business Week, which understands it. They have probably reviewed carefully what happened in the State of Oregon that now has the highest minimum wage with the largest growth rate in terms of reduction

of unemployment when they introduced the minimum wage. Why? Because people not working went into the labor market, it created more economic activity, and they paid more in taxes. The whole economy moved along together. We are glad to debate it if people want to dispute that.

What does this mean in people's lives?

Melissa Albis lives in North Adams, MA. She works for the local Burger King for \$5.25 an hour. She has five children all under 12. She is struggling to pay her \$550-a-month rent and is looking for less expensive housing because she fears she and her children will be evicted if she cannot earn more.

Cathi Zeman, 52 years old, works at the Rite Aid in Canonsburg, PA, a town near Pittsburgh. She earns \$5.68 an hour: Base pay of \$5.43, plus .25 for being a "key carrier." Her husband has a heart condition and is only able to work sporadically, so she is the primary earner in her family. An increase in minimum wage means a lot to Cathi.

Shirley Briggs is a senior citizen living near Williamstown, MA. Her husband passed away in 1982, and even though she has arthritis, she works for \$5.50 an hour to try to make ends meet. Even with supplement income and Social Security, she has trouble paying for medicine. "My income is not enough to live." Minimum wage means a lot to Shirley.

Dianne Mitchell testified in June 1998 that she made \$5.90 an hour at a laundry in Brockton, MA. For Dianne, with three daughters and a granddaughter, living on minimum wage is nerve-racking. She is "always juggling food and utilities," even having to choose one over the other. An increase in the minimum wage would give women like Dianne peace of mind—they could provide for their families.

Cordelia Bradley testified at a Senate forum last year she was working at a clothing chain store outside of Philadelphia. She and her son lived in a rented room for \$300 a month. She hoped to have her own apartment, but at the current minimum wage that goal was out of reach.

Kimberly Frazier, also from Philadelphia, testified she was a full-time child care aide earning \$5.20. A child care aide, how many times are we going to hear long speeches about children and looking out for children; children are our future; we need to do more caring for children. Kimberly Frazier is earning \$5.20 an hour as a full-time child care aide. With three children, her pay barely covers the bills for rent, food, utilities, and clothes for her children. For Kimberly and her family, a pay increase of \$1 an hour could make a real difference.

This is enormously important to individuals. Republicans want to see how little they can do for the workers, and how much, evidently, they can do for the corporations and special interests. You cannot look at the conduct of leadership in these last 4 weeks and not

understand that is what is happening. The workers are being nickled and dimed. This is absolutely unacceptable.

We are going to continue. The days are going down, the hours are going down, but we are resolute in our determination, and we are not going to have a bidding war out here on the floor of the Senate on this issue. We are not going to permit the toying with the lives of American workers who are playing by the rules, working 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, who want to provide for their children. They should not have to live in poverty in the United States of America. By denying us the opportunity to do something about this, the leadership, Republican leadership, is denying us a chance to deal with that issue, and it is fundamentally and basically wrong.

I will speak just briefly on another matter.

In passing the Norwood-Dingell bill, a large bipartisan majority in the House voted for strong patient protections against abuses by HMOs. Despite an extraordinary lobbying and disinformation campaign by the health insurance industry, the House approved the bill by a solid majority of 275 to 151. Mr. President, 68 Republicans as well as almost every Democrat in the House stood up for patients and stood up against industry pressure.

Now the insurance industry and its friends in the Republican leadership are at it again. Their emerging strategy is, once again, to delay and deny relief that American families need and that the House overwhelmingly approved. Every indication is that the intention of the Republican leadership is to see that this legislation, as it passed the House of Representatives, will not reach the President for his signature.

According to the Los Angeles Times, Senator LOTT's response to the passage of the House bill is that the House-Senate conferences on other legislation have a higher priority and resolving the differences on this bill will take some time.

According to the Baltimore Sun, Senator LOTT also indicated Congress might not have the time to work out differences or approve a final bill before it adjourns for the year. Senator NICKLES said the conference committee will probably not begin serious work until early next year.

I say: Why don't we consider the House bill—the bill that passed the House overwhelmingly with 68 Republicans—a bipartisan bill with Democrats and Republicans working together? Why don't we pass that in the Senate this afternoon? We could do that. I certainly urge that we go ahead and do that today. Every day we fail to pass the Patients' Bill of Rights, we are permitting insurance company accountants to make medical decisions that doctors and nurses and other trained medical personnel should have the opportunity to make. That is why the Patients' Bill of Rights is so important.

We believe that medical professionals, trained, dedicated and committed to their patients, should make those decisions, not accountants. This chart shows what we will see as long as we permit accountants to make health care decisions. We are going to see about 35,000 patients every single day will have needed care delayed. Specialty referrals will be denied to 35,000 patients. It may be that a child with cancer will see a pediatrician but doesn't get the necessary referral to see a pediatric oncologist. Mr. President, 31,000 patients are forced to change doctors every day; 18,000 are forced to change medication because the HMOs refused to reimburse the medicine their physician prescribed. The final result is that 59,000 Americans every day experience unnecessary added pain and suffering; 41,000 Americans see their conditions worsen every day that we fail to act.

We still have time to act in the final days of this session. Republicans are beginning to lay the groundwork for a failed conference. Comparing the Senate and House bills, Congressman BILL THOMAS says you don't see many crossbreeds between Chihuahuas and Great Danes walking around. That is quite a quote—we don't see many crossbreeds between Chihuahuas and Great Danes walking around.

I say, let's do what every health care professional organization in the United States has urged us to do, and pass the House bill. I am still waiting for the other side to list one major or minor health organization that supports their proposal: Zero, none, none. Every one of them—every doctors' organization, patients' organization, nursing organization, children's organization, women's health organization, consumer organization—supports our proposal.

Here is how Bruce Johnston of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce put it:

To see nothing come out of the conference is my hope. The best outcome is no outcome. But if the strategy of delay and denial ultimately breaks down, the Republican leadership once again has an alternative to try to weaken the House bill as much as possible.

As the Baltimore Sun reported:

The House majority whip suggested the Republican-dominated House conference would not fight vigorously for the House-approved measure in the conference committee. Mr. DeLay said, "Remember who controls the conference: the Speaker of the House."

That ought to give a lot of satisfaction to parents who are concerned about health care for their children. It ought to give a lot of satisfaction to the doctors who are trying to provide the best health care. This is what the House majority whip suggested: Remember who controls the conference: the Speaker of the House—unalterably opposed to the program.

The conference that produces legislation that looks like the Senate Republican bill will break faith with the American people, make a mockery of the overwhelming vote in the House of Representatives, and cause unneces-

sary suffering for millions of patients. Every day we delay in passing meaningful reforms means more patients will suffer and die.

Finally, I do not think, when we consider minimum wage and consider health, we have addressed these issues in the last few days. These are the matters about which most families are concerned. These are the issues they want addressed. The Republican leadership is considering what they will do on the bankruptcy issue. We have seen great economic prosperity. Do you know who is going bankrupt, by and large? It is the men and women who have lost out in the mergers, the supermergers that have brought extraordinary wealth and accumulation of wealth to individual stockholders. It is families who have had to pay increased costs for prescription drugs. It is women who are not receiving their alimony payments or women who are not getting child care support—there are some 400,000 of them. These are the individuals who are going into bankruptcy. Their needs should be protected.

We have to ask ourselves, if we are going to call bankruptcy up, why aren't we dealing with minimum wage? Why aren't we working on the Patients' Bill of Rights? Why are we not coming to grips with these issues, which are at the center of every working family's hopes and dreams.

In the months since the House passed the Norwood-Dingell bill and the Republican leadership has failed to allow a conference to proceed, 1 million patients have had needed care delayed; 1 million patients have been denied or delayed referral to a specialist; 940,000 patients have been forced to change doctors; more than 535,000 patients have been forced to change medication; Mr. President, 1.8 million patients have experienced added pain and suffering as a result of health plan abuses, and 1.2 million patients have seen their conditions worsen because of health plan abuses.

In the final days of this Congress, we can still take some important steps that will have a direct impact on the well-being of families who are at the lower end of the economic ladder. We can still take important steps that will have a direct impact on families who are faced with health care challenges. We can have a positive impact. We have had the hearings. We have had the debates. We have had the deliberations. All we need is to have the vote the way the House of Representatives had the vote. We can pass what has been a bipartisan bill in the House of Representatives in a matter of a few short hours.

The Republican leadership has waited a month since the House bill was passed to start this conference, effectively pushing action to next February at the earliest. Today is another litmus test of their intention with the appointment of House conferees. We expect those conferees to be stacked against meaningful reform.

We are prepared to participate in a fair conference, and we are willing to

enter into a reasonable compromise, but we are sending notice today that we will not tolerate a charade designed only to protect insurance company profits while patients continue to suffer. We will come back to this issue over and over until the American people prevail.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2408

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I would like to very much thank the chairman and manager of the bill for accepting amendment No. 2408, which I offered and was cosponsored by Senator DURBIN of Illinois, with regard to anticorruption efforts and the desire to do something about the fact that bribery is an important problem worldwide. It poisons the business environment and distorts the normal practices of the marketplace. Bribery undermines democracy and leads to a lower global economy, and when corruption goes unchecked, everybody loses.

To pass the U.S. trade package without addressing corruption simply doesn't make sense, particularly if the package claims to actually promote growth and opportunity in Africa. Of the 16 sub-Saharan African states rated in the Transparency International 1999 Corruption Perception Index, 12 ranked in the bottom half.

The amendment Senator DURBIN and I have offered expresses a sense of Congress that the United States should encourage the accession of sub-Saharan African companies to the OECD Convention combating bribery of foreign officials in international business transactions. The OECD Convention criminalizes bribery of foreign officials to influence or retain business. Some have had said OECD standards are too demanding for the developing economies of Africa. But if we are going to engage in a new economic partnership with Africa, I think we need to leave this double standard behind. Transparency, integrity, and the rule of law are as important in Mali and Botswana as they are right here at home.

Ever since Congress passed the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977, under the leadership of one of my predecessors, Senator William Proxmire of Wisconsin, we have shared a consensus in this country that economic relations depend upon a foundation of fair play. This amendment incorporates that reality in African trade regulations. This anticorruption amendment also sends an important signal. It tells sub-Saharan states that responsibilities come with benefits in any trade partnership. If this Congress is serious about engaging Africa economically, we have to

make these responsibilities crystal clear.

I, again, thank the Chair for accepting this amendment. I also commend Senator DURBIN, who has taken the lead—and I joined him—on another amendment having to do with this corruption issue. I am hopeful and optimistic that item will be accepted as well.

We have provided two different important provisions that will move forward with regard to the corruption problem in general and specifically with regard to the African nations.

AMENDMENT NO. 2409

(Purpose: To establish priorities for providing development assistance)

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, with regard to amendment No. 2409, I urge Members to look at the Statement of Policy in the text of the African Growth and Opportunity Act. In this section the bill asserts congressional support for a series of noble causes, such as supporting the development of civil societies and political freedom in the region, and focusing on countries committed to accountable government and the eradication of poverty.

But then those causes seem to disappear. The implication is that the United States plans to support for these worthy goals—goals that are in our own self-interest—through a series of limited trade benefits.

Nowhere does AGOA mention the role that development assistance plays in pursuing the very ends that it advocates—the eradication of poverty and the development of civil society.

This omission sends an alarming signal. It suggests that the United States may delude itself into thinking that trade alone will stimulate African development.

Trade alone cannot address the crippling effects of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, which has lowered life expectancies by as much as seventeen years in some African countries. Striking at the most productive segment of society—young adults—HIV/AIDS has dealt a brutal blow to African economic development, and has left a generation of orphans in its wake.

And trade alone will not provide sufficient access to education or to reproductive health services for African women—yet both elements are crucial to developing Africa's human resources.

This amendment expresses a sense of Congress that the HIV/AIDS epidemic and chronic food insecurity should be key priorities in U.S. assistance to Africa. It also prioritizes voluntary family planning services, including access to prenatal healthcare; education and vocational training, particularly for women; and programs designed to develop income-generating opportunities, such as micro-credit projects.

This amendment also mandates that the Development Fund for Africa be re-established for aid authorized specifically for African-related objectives. The DFA allows USAID more flexi-

bility in its Africa program. Perhaps most importantly, it is symbolic of U.S. commitment to African development.

In addition, my amendment requires USAID to submit a report to help the United States to get smarter about how it administers development assistance, and will ensure that our assistance fosters dynamic civil societies across the diverse nations of Africa.

This amendment sends an important signal. Even as the United States considers closer trade relations with sub-Saharan Africa, this country will not abandon its commitment to responsible and well-monitored development assistance.

Mr. President, I understand that a point of order is likely to be raised to this amendment. I understand the consequence of that. But I want to offer the amendment. I call up amendment No. 2409.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) proposes an amendment numbered 2409.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new title:

TITLE —DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES

SEC. 01. FINDINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In addition to drought and famine, the HIV/AIDS epidemic has caused countless deaths and untold suffering among the people of sub-Saharan Africa.

(2) The Food and Agricultural Organization estimates that 543,000,000 people, representing nearly 40 percent of the population of sub-Saharan Africa, are chronically undernourished.

(b) AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—Section 496(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293(a)(1)) is amended by striking "drought and famine" and inserting "drought, famine, and the HIV/AIDS epidemic".

SEC. 02. PRIVATE AND VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 496(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293(e)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) CAPACITY BUILDING.—In addition to assistance provided under subsection (h), the United States Agency for International Development shall provide capacity building assistance through participatory planning to private and voluntary organizations that are involved in providing assistance for sub-Saharan Africa under this chapter."

SEC. 03. TYPES OF ASSISTANCE.

Section 496(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4) PROHIBITION ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE.—Assistance under this section—

"(A) may not include military training or weapons; and

“(B) may not be obligated or expended for military training or the procurement of weapons.”.

SEC. 04. CRITICAL SECTORAL PRIORITIES.

(a) AGRICULTURE, FOOD SECURITY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—Section 496(i)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293(i)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, to read as follows:

“(1) AGRICULTURE, FOOD SECURITY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—”;

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in the heading, to read as follows:

“(A) AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY.—”;

(B) in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “agricultural production in ways” and inserting “food security by promoting agriculture policies”; and

(ii) by striking “, especially food production.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “agricultural production” and inserting “food security and sustainable resource use”.

(b) HEALTH.—Section 496(i)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293(i)(2)) is amended by striking “(including displaced children)” and inserting “(including displaced children and improving HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment programs)”.

(c) VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES.—Section 496(i)(3) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293(i)(3)) is amended by adding at the end before the period the following: “and access to prenatal healthcare”.

(d) EDUCATION.—Section 496(i)(4) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293(i)(4)) is amended by adding at the end before the period the following: “and vocational education, with particular emphasis on primary education and vocational education for women”.

(e) INCOME-GENERATING OPPORTUNITIES.—Section 496(i)(5) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293(i)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking “labor-intensive”; and

(2) by adding at the end before the period the following: “, including development of manufacturing and processing industries and microcredit projects”.

SEC. 05. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 496 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(p) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall, on a semi-annual basis, prepare and submit to Congress a report containing—

“(1) a description of how, and the extent to which, the Agency has consulted with nongovernmental organizations in sub-Saharan Africa regarding the use of amounts made available for sub-Saharan African countries under this chapter;

“(2) the extent to which the provision of such amounts has been successful in increasing food security and access to health and education services among the people of sub-Saharan Africa;

“(3) the extent to which the provision of such amounts has been successful in capacity building among local nongovernmental organizations; and

“(4) a description of how, and the extent to which, the provision of such amounts has furthered the goals of sustainable economic and agricultural development, gender equity, environmental protection, and respect for workers’ rights in sub-Saharan Africa.”.

SEC. 06. SEPARATE ACCOUNT FOR DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA.

Amounts appropriated to the Development Fund for Africa shall be appropriated to a separate account under the heading “Development Fund for Africa” and not to the ac-

count under the heading “Development Assistance”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I object to this amendment on the grounds that the Senator’s amendment is inconsistent with the unanimous consent setting the terms of this debate. I appreciate the distinguished Senator’s interest in this matter.

I make a point of order the amendment is not within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. It seems to me the appropriate place to debate this is in the context of the foreign operations appropriations bill or a foreign relations bill. For these reasons, I urge my friend to withdraw this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s point is well taken and the amendment falls.

Mr. FEINGOLD. In light of the concerns raised by the chairman, I will withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. ROTH. On the first matter dealing with the anticorruption, we are in agreement. I congratulate and thank the Senator for his leadership in this matter. Because of his interest, as well as others, we are including a specific anticorruption provision in the managers’ amendment.

I thank the distinguished Senator for his cooperation.

Mr. SPECTER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. 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. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Wellstone amendment be temporarily laid aside so that I may proceed with another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2347, AS MODIFIED

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I am sending an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator BYRD, Senator HATCH, Senator HOLLINGS, Senator HELMS, Senator SANTORUM, and myself relating to a private right of action. I ask it be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I am informed by the Parliamentarian the Senator can only call up an amendment that has been filed.

Mr. SPECTER. This amendment has been filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator have the number?

Mr. ROTH. I give the Senator permission to make modifications, if that is necessary.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, as I have discussed with the distinguished

chairman of the committee, it is amendment No. 2347. There have been two minor changes made which I have discussed with the distinguished chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair notifies the Senator it takes a unanimous consent to modify the amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment. The modifications are minor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

The amendment (No. 2347), as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new title:

TITLE —PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION FOR DUMPED AND SUBSIDIZED MERCHANDISE

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Unfair Foreign Competition Act of 1999”.

SEC. 02. PRIVATE ACTIONS FOR RELIEF FROM UNFAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION.

(a) ACTION FOR DUMPING VIOLATIONS.—Section 801 of the Act of September 8, 1916 (39 Stat. 798; 15 U.S.C. 72) is amended, as read as follows:

“SEC. 801. IMPORTATION OR SALE OF ARTICLES AT LESS THAN FOREIGN MARKET VALUE OR CONSTRUCTED VALUE.

“(a) PROHIBITION.—No person shall import into, or sell within, the United States an article manufactured or produced in a foreign country if—

“(1) the article is imported or sold within the United States at a United States price that is less than the foreign market value or constructed value of the article; and

“(2) the importation or sale—

“(A) causes or threatens to cause material injury to industry or labor in the United States; or

“(B) prevents, in whole or in part, the establishment or modernization of any industry in the United States.

“(b) CIVIL ACTION.—An interested party whose business or property is injured by reason of an importation or sale of an article in violation of this section may bring a civil action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia Circuit against any person who—

“(1) manufactures, produces, or exports the article; or

“(2) imports the article into the United States if the person is related to the manufacturer or exporter of the article.

“(c) RELIEF.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon an affirmative determination by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia Circuit in an action brought under subsection (b), the court shall issue an order that includes a description of the subject article in such detail as the court deems necessary and shall—

“(A) direct the Customs Service to assess an antidumping duty on the article covered by the determination in accordance with section 736(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673e); and

“(B) require the deposit of estimated antidumping duties pending liquidation of entries of the article at the same time as estimated normal customs duties on that article are deposited.

“(d) STANDARD OF PROOF.—

“(1) PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE.—The standard of proof in an action brought under subsection (b) is a preponderance of the evidence.

“(2) SHIFT OF BURDEN OF PROOF.—Upon—

“(A) a prima facie showing of the elements set forth in subsection (a), or

“(B) affirmative final determinations adverse to the defendant that are made by the administering authority and the United States International Trade Commission under section 735 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673d) relating to imports of the article in question for the country in which the manufacturer of the article is located,

the burden of proof in an action brought under subsection (b) shall be upon the defendant.

“(e) OTHER PARTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever, in an action brought under subsection (b), it appears to the court that justice requires that other parties be brought before the court, the court may cause them to be summoned, without regard to where they reside, and the subpoenas to that end may be served and enforced in any judicial district of the United States.

“(2) SERVICE ON DISTRICT DIRECTOR OF CUSTOMS SERVICE.—A foreign manufacturer, producer, or exporter that sells articles, or for whom articles are sold by another party in the United States, shall be treated as having appointed the District Director of the United States Customs Service for the port through which the article that is the subject of the action is commonly imported as the true and lawful agent of the manufacturer, producer, or exporter, and all lawful process may be served on the District Director in any action brought under subsection (b) against the manufacturer, producer, or exporter.

“(f) LIMITATION.—

“(1) STATUTE OF LIMITATION.—An action under subsection (b) shall be commenced not later than 4 years after the date on which the cause of action accrues.

“(2) SUSPENSION.—The 4-year period provided for in paragraph (1) shall be suspended—

“(A) while there is pending an administrative proceeding under subtitle B of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673 et seq.) relating to the article that is the subject of the action or an appeal of a final determination in such a proceeding; and

“(B) for 1 year thereafter.

“(g) NONCOMPLIANCE WITH COURT ORDER.—If a defendant in an action brought under subsection (b) fails to comply with any discovery order or other order or decree of the court, the court may—

“(1) enjoin the further importation into, or the sale or distribution within, the United States by the defendant of articles that are the same as, or similar to, the articles that are alleged in the action to have been sold or imported under the conditions described in subsection (a) until such time as the defendant complies with the order or decree; or

“(2) take any other action authorized by law or by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including entering judgment for the plaintiff.

“(h) CONFIDENTIALITY AND PRIVILEGED STATUS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the confidential or privileged status accorded by law to any documents, evidence, comments, or information shall be maintained in any action brought under subsection (b).

“(2) EXCEPTION.—In an action brought under subsection (b) the court may—

“(A) examine, in camera, any confidential or privileged material;

“(B) accept depositions, documents, affidavits, or other evidence under seal; and

“(C) disclose such material under such terms and conditions as the court may order.

“(i) EXPEDITION OF ACTION.—An action brought under subsection (b) shall be advanced on the docket and expedited in every way possible.

“(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ‘United States price’, ‘foreign market value’, ‘constructed value’, ‘subsidy’, ‘interested party’, and ‘material injury’, have the meanings given those terms under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.).

“(k) INTERVENTION BY THE UNITED STATES.—The court shall permit the United States to intervene in any action brought under subsection (b) as a matter of right. The United States shall have all the rights of a party to such action.

“(l) NULLIFICATION OF ORDER.—An order by a court under this section may be set aside by the President pursuant to section 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702).”

(b) ACTION FOR SUBSIDIES VIOLATIONS.—Title VIII of the Act of September 8, 1916 (39 Stat. 798; 15 U.S.C. 71 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 807. IMPORTATION OR SALE OF SUBSIDIZED ARTICLES.

“(a) PROHIBITION.—No person shall import into, or sell within, the United States an article manufactured or produced in a foreign country if—

“(1) the foreign country, any person who is a citizen or national of the foreign country, or a corporation, association, or other organization organized in the foreign country, is providing (directly or indirectly) a subsidy with respect to the manufacture, production, or exportation of the article; and

“(2) the importation or sale—

“(A) causes or threatens to cause material injury to industry or labor in the United States; or

“(B) prevents, in whole or in part, the establishment or modernization of any industry in the United States.

“(b) CIVIL ACTION.—An interested party whose business or property is injured by reason of the importation or sale of an article in violation of this section may bring a civil action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia Circuit against any person who—

“(1) manufactures, produces, or exports the article; or

“(2) imports the article into the United States if the person is related to the manufacturer, producer, or exporter of the article.

“(c) RELIEF.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon an affirmative determination by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia Circuit in an action brought under subsection (b), the court shall issue an order that includes a description of the subject article in such detail as the court deems necessary and shall—

“(A) direct the Customs Service to assess a countervailing duty on the article covered by the determination in accordance with section 706(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671e); and

“(B) require the deposit of estimated countervailing duties pending liquidation of entries of the article at the same time as estimated normal customs duties on that article are deposited.

“(d) STANDARD OF PROOF.—

“(1) PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE.—The standard of proof in an action filed under subsection (b) is a preponderance of the evidence.

“(2) SHIFT OF BURDEN OF PROOF.—Upon—

“(A) a prima facie showing of the elements set forth in subsection (a), or

“(B) affirmative final determinations adverse to the defendant that are made by the administering authority and the United States International Trade Commission under section 705 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671d) relating to imports of the article in question from the country in which the manufacturer of the article is located,

the burden of proof in an action brought under subsection (b) shall be upon the defendant.

“(e) OTHER PARTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever, in an action brought under subsection (b), it appears to the court that justice requires that other parties be brought before the court, the court may cause them to be summoned, without regard to where they reside, and the subpoenas to that end may be served and enforced in any judicial district of the United States.

“(2) SERVICE ON DISTRICT DIRECTOR OF CUSTOMS SERVICE.—A foreign manufacturer, producer, or exporter that sells articles, or for which articles are sold by another party in the United States, shall be treated as having appointed the District Director of the United States Customs Service for the port through which the article that is the subject of the action is commonly imported as the true and lawful agent of the manufacturer, producer, or exporter, and all lawful process may be served on the District Director in any action brought under subsection (b) against the manufacturer, producer, or exporter.

“(f) LIMITATION.—

“(1) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—An action under subsection (b) shall be commenced not later than 4 years after the date on which the cause of action accrues.

“(2) SUSPENSION.—The 4-year period provided for in paragraph (1) shall be suspended—

“(A) while there is pending an administrative proceeding under subtitle A of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) relating to the article that is the subject of the action or an appeal of a final determination in such a proceeding; and

“(B) for 1 year thereafter.

“(g) NONCOMPLIANCE WITH COURT ORDER.—If a defendant in an action brought under subsection (b) fails to comply with any discovery order or other order or decree of the court, the court may—

“(1) enjoin the further importation into, or the sale or distribution within, the United States by the defendant of articles that are the same as, or similar to, the articles that are alleged in the action to have been sold or imported under the conditions described in subsection (a) until such time as the defendant complies with the order or decree; or

“(2) take any other action authorized by law or by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including entering judgment for the plaintiff.

“(h) CONFIDENTIALITY AND PRIVILEGED STATUS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the confidential or privileged status accorded by law to any documents, evidence, comments, or information shall be maintained in any action brought under subsection (b).

“(2) EXCEPTION.—In an action brought under subsection (b) the court may—

“(A) examine, in camera, any confidential or privileged material;

“(B) accept depositions, documents, affidavits, or other evidence under seal; and

“(C) disclose such material under such terms and conditions as the court may order.

“(i) EXPEDITION OF ACTION.—An action brought under subsection (b) shall be advanced on the docket and expedited in every way possible.

“(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ‘subsidy’, ‘material injury’, and ‘interested party’ have the meanings given those terms under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.).

“(k) INTERVENTION BY THE UNITED STATES.—The court shall permit the United States to intervene in any action brought under subsection (b) as a matter of right.

The United States shall have all the rights of a party to such action.

“(1) NULLIFICATION OF ORDER.—An order by a court under this section may be set aside by the President pursuant to section 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702).”.

(c) ACTION FOR CUSTOMS FRAUD.—

(1) AMENDMENT OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE.—Chapter 95 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 1586. Private enforcement action for customs fraud

“(a) CIVIL ACTION.—An interested party whose business or property is injured by a fraudulent, grossly negligent, or negligent violation of section 592(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1592(a)) may bring a civil action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia Circuit, without respect to the amount in controversy.

“(b) RELIEF.—Upon proof by an interested party that the business or property of such interested party has been injured by a fraudulent, grossly negligent, or negligent violation of section 592(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, the interested party shall—

“(1)(A) be granted such equitable relief as may be appropriate, which may include an injunction against further importation into the United States of the merchandise in question; or

“(B) if injunctive relief cannot be timely provided or is otherwise inadequate, recover damages for the injuries sustained; and

“(2) recover the costs of suit, including reasonable attorney’s fees.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

“(1) INTERESTED PARTY.—The term ‘interested party’ means—

“(A) a manufacturer, producer, or wholesaler in the United States of like or competing merchandise; or

“(B) a trade or business association a majority of whose members manufacture, produce, or wholesale like merchandise or competing merchandise in the United States.

“(2) LIKE MERCHANDISE.—The term ‘like merchandise’ means merchandise that is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and users with, merchandise being imported into the United States in violation of section 592(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1592(a)).

“(3) COMPETING MERCHANDISE.—The term ‘competing merchandise’ means merchandise that competes with or is a substitute for merchandise being imported into the United States in violation of section 592(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1592(a)).

“(d) INTERVENTION BY THE UNITED STATES.—The court shall permit the United States to intervene in an action brought under this section, as a matter of right. The United States shall have all the rights of a party.

“(e) NULLIFICATION OF ORDER.—An order by a court under this section may be set aside by the President pursuant to section 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702).”.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 95 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“1586. Private enforcement action for customs fraud.”.

SEC. 103. AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 753 the following new section:

“SEC. 754. CONTINUED DUMPING AND SUBSIDY OFFSET.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Duties assessed pursuant to a countervailing duty order, an antidumping duty order, or a finding under the Antidumping Act of 1921 shall be distributed on an annual basis under this section to workers for damages sustained for loss of wages resulting from the loss of jobs, and to the affected domestic producers for qualifying expenditures. Such distribution shall be known as the ‘continued dumping and subsidy offset’.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

“(1) AFFECTED DOMESTIC PRODUCER.—The term ‘affected domestic producer’ means any manufacturer, producer, farmer, rancher, or worker representative (including associations of such persons) that—

“(A) was a petitioner or interested party in support of the petition with respect to which an antidumping duty order, a finding under the Antidumping Act of 1921, or a countervailing duty order has been entered, and

“(B) remains in operation.

Companies, businesses, or persons that have ceased the production of the product covered by the order or finding or who have been acquired by a company or business that is related to a company that opposed the investigation shall not be an affected domestic producer.

“(2) COMMISSIONER.—The term ‘Commissioner’ means the Commissioner of Customs.

“(3) COMMISSION.—The term ‘Commission’ means the United States International Trade Commission.

“(4) QUALIFYING EXPENDITURE.—The term ‘qualifying expenditure’ means an expenditure incurred after the issuance of the antidumping duty finding or order or countervailing duty order in any of the following categories:

“(A) Plant.

“(B) Equipment.

“(C) Research and development.

“(D) Personnel training.

“(E) Acquisition of technology.

“(F) Health care benefits to employees paid for by the employer.

“(G) Pension benefits to employees paid for by the employer.

“(H) Environmental equipment, training, or technology.

“(I) Acquisition of raw materials and other inputs.

“(J) Borrowed working capital or other funds needed to maintain production.

“(5) RELATED TO.—A company, business, or person shall be considered to be ‘related to’ another company, business, or person if—

“(A) the company, business, or person directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by the other company, business, or person,

“(B) a third party directly or indirectly controls both companies, businesses, or persons,

“(C) both companies, businesses, or persons directly or indirectly control a third party and there is reason to believe that the relationship causes the first company, business, or persons to act differently than a non-related party.

For purposes of this paragraph, a party shall be considered to directly or indirectly control another party if the party is legally or operationally in a position to exercise restraint or direction over the other party.

“(6) WORKERS.—The term ‘workers’ refers to persons who sustained damages for loss of wages resulting from loss of jobs. The Secretary of Labor shall determine eligibility for purposes of this section.

“(c) DISTRIBUTION PROCEDURES.—The Commissioner in consultation with the Secretary of Labor shall prescribe procedures for distribution of the continued dumping or sub-

sidies offset required by this section. Such distribution shall be made not later than 60 days after the first day of a fiscal year from duties assessed during the preceding fiscal year.

“(d) PARTIES ELIGIBLE FOR DISTRIBUTION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTIES ASSESSED.—

“(1) LIST OF WORKERS AND AFFECTED DOMESTIC PRODUCERS.—The Commission shall forward to the Commissioner within 60 days after the effective date of this section in the case of orders or findings in effect on such effective date, or in any other case, within 60 days after the date an antidumping or countervailing duty order or finding is issued, a list of petitioners and persons with respect to each order and finding and a list of persons that indicate support of the petition by letter or through questionnaire response. In those cases in which a determination of injury was not required or the Commission’s records do not permit an identification of those in support of a petition, the Commission shall consult with the administering authority to determine the identity of the petitioner and those domestic parties who have entered appearances during administrative reviews conducted by the administering authority under section 751.

“(2) PUBLICATION OF LIST; CERTIFICATION.—The Commissioner shall publish in the Federal Register at least 30 days before the distribution of a continued dumping and subsidy offset, a notice of intention to distribute the offset and the list of workers and affected domestic producers potentially eligible for the distribution based on the list obtained from the Commission under paragraph (1). The Commissioner shall request a certification from each potentially eligible affected domestic producer—

“(A) that the producer desires to receive a distribution;

“(B) that the producer is eligible to receive the distribution as an affected domestic producer; and

“(C) the qualifying expenditures incurred by the producer since the issuance of the order or finding for which distribution under this section has not previously been made.

“(3) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—The Commissioner in consultation with the Secretary of Labor shall distribute all funds (including all interest earned on the funds) from assessed duties received in the preceding fiscal year to workers and to the affected domestic producers based on the certifications described in paragraph (2). The distributions shall be made on a pro rata basis based on new and remaining qualifying expenditures.

“(e) SPECIAL ACCOUNTS.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENTS.—Within 14 days after the effective date of this section, with respect to antidumping duty orders and findings and countervailing duty orders in effect on the effective date of this section, and within 14 days after the date an antidumping duty order or finding or countervailing duty order issued after the effective date takes effect, the Commissioner shall establish in the Treasury of the United States a special account with respect to each such order or finding.

“(2) DEPOSITS INTO ACCOUNTS.—The Commissioner shall deposit into the special accounts, all antidumping or countervailing duties (including interest earned on such duties) that are assessed after the effective date of this section under the antidumping order or finding or the countervailing duty order with respect to which the account was established.

“(3) TIME AND MANNER OF DISTRIBUTIONS.—Consistent with the requirements of subsections (c) and (d), the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe the time and manner

in which distribution of the funds in a special account shall make.

"(4) TERMINATION.—A special account shall terminate after—

"(A) the order or finding with respect to which the account was established has terminated;

"(B) all entries relating to the order or finding are liquidated and duties assessed collected;

"(C) the Commissioner has provided notice and a final opportunity to obtain distribution pursuant to subsection (c); and

"(D) 90 days has elapsed from the date of the notice described in subparagraph (C).

Amounts not claimed within 90 days of the date of the notice described in subparagraph (C), shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by inserting the following new item after the item relating to section 753:

"Sec. 754. Continued dumping and subsidy offset."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to all antidumping and countervailing duty assessments made on or after October 1, 1996.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, as noted, there are two modifications to the amendment. They are minor modifications. One relates to the court which will have jurisdiction. Instead of the Court of International Trade, it will be the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. And the second is the striking of language citing anti-trust laws, which has been deleted to avoid any possible question as to whether this is a Finance Committee jurisdictional matter and appropriate amendment for this bill.

The essence of this bill is to provide a private right of action to damaged, injured parties when goods are imported into the United States which are dumped in violation of U.S. trade laws and in violation of international trade laws. Many American industries have been decimated as a result of this illegal practice, and the existing remedies are totally insufficient to provide adequate safeguards for the violation of these trade laws.

This bill does not deal with any issue of inappropriate consideration for domestic industries and is really not protectionist, as that term has been traditionally defined. The international trade laws are specific that the goods ought not to be sold in the United States at a lower price than they are sold in the country from which the exports are made and imported into the United States. Our trade laws in the United States preclude dumped goods from coming into this country. International trade laws preclude dumped goods.

This is an approach I have been advocating for more than 17 years now, with my initial bill having been introduced in the 97th Congress, S. 2167, on March 4, 1983. I followed up with similar legislation in the 98th Congress, S. 418 on February 3, 1983; in the 99th Congress, with S. 236; in the 100th Congress, with S. 361; in the 102d Congress, with S. 2508. The thrust has always been the same, that is to provide a private right

of action so injured parties could go into Federal court and secure redress on their legal rights because the proceedings through section 201, through the Department of Commerce, through the International Trade Commission, are so long that they are virtually ineffective.

If an injured party goes into the Federal court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is possible to get a temporary restraining order on affidavits within 5 days, then a prompt preliminary hearing and a preliminary injunction and prompt equitable proceedings for a permanent injunction.

The initial legislation, which was introduced back in 1982, called for injunctive relief. The pending amendment provides for a remedy of duties or tariffs equal to the amount of the dumping, the difference between what the product would be sold at in the United States compared to what the product is being sold at in the home country.

I have a list of antidumping duty orders in effect on March 1, 1999. I ask unanimous consent this list be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on the 5 pages which I am submitting, there are some 290 items which are being subjected to the antidumping orders as of March 1 of this year.

Some illustrative provisions: In Argentina, there is a dumping order on carbon steel; as to Bangladesh, a dumping order on cotton shop towels; Belgium, a dumping order on sugar; Canada, a dumping order on red raspberries; Chile, a dumping order on fresh cut flowers; China, a dumping order on garlic. So the list goes on and on and on.

When I testified at the hearing before the Finance Committee in favor of this bill, the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. CONRAD, made a comment that this kind of provision might well be applied to wheat and wheat farmers, where they are subjected to dumping from other countries. I suggest to my colleagues who are listening to this on C-SPAN, or to the staffs, that there is hardly a State—there may be no State—which is unaffected by dumping where goods come in from a foreign country and are sold in the United States at a price lower than they are being sold in the foreign country in violation of U.S. trade laws and in violation of international trade laws.

The remedy has been modified to provide for the duties or tariffs, as I have stated, in order to comply with GATT, because a question had arisen as to whether injunctive relief was appropriate under GATT. I frankly believe it is. But to avoid any problem, the relief has been modified to duties or tariffs.

The difficulty with the proceedings with the existing laws is the tremendous length of time which is taken. For an illustration, there was an anti-

dumping order issued as to salmon. It was initiated on July 10, 1997. The order was finally issued on July 30, 1998—time elapsed, 380 days.

A second illustrative case involved garlic from China, initiated on February 28, 1994; the order issued on November 16, 1994—200 days.

A third illustration, magnesium from Ukraine: Initiated April 26, 1994; the order issued May 12, 1995—360 days.

Hot rolled steel from Japan: The initiation of the action was October 27, 1998; the order issued on June 19, 1999. These are only illustrative of the enormous lapse in time.

Contrasted with what can happen in a court of equity, a temporary restraining order can be issued within 5 days on affidavits, prompt proceedings for preliminary injunctions, prompt proceedings for injunctive relief generally.

The difficulty with existing law is that the decisions are made based upon political considerations and foreign relations, and not based upon what is right for American industries who are being undersold by these dumped goods and have suffered a tremendous loss of employment.

My State, Pennsylvania, has been victimized by dumping for the past 2 decades. Two decades ago, the American steel industry employed some 500,000 individuals. Today that number has dwindled to 160,000, notwithstanding the fact that the American steel industry has spent some \$50 billion in modernizing.

Under existing laws, the executive branch has the authority to issue suspension agreements. One illustration of that was a suspension agreement issued on July 13 of this year when Secretary Daley announced the United States and Russia had reached agreements to reduce imports of steel. That was immediately followed by strenuous objections by a number of steel companies operating out of my State, Pennsylvania—Bethlehem Steel, LTV, National Steel Corporation, U.S. Steel Group—where they made strenuous objection to these suspension agreements which undermine the effectiveness and credibility of U.S. trade laws and a rule-based international trade system.

I recall, in 1984, a time when the American steel industry was especially hard hit by imports, dumped imports.

The International Trade Commission had issued an order 3-2 in favor of the position of American Steel. The President had the authority to overrule that decision. Senator Heinz and I then made the rounds and talked to International Trade Representative Brock who agreed that the International Trade Commission order in favor of American Steel should be upheld. We talked to Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige who similarly agreed. We then talked to Secretary of State George Shultz who disagreed, as did Secretary of Defense Weinberger, with Secretary of State Shultz putting it on

grounds of U.S. foreign policy and Secretary of Defense Weinberger putting it on grounds of U.S. defense policy.

When these matters are left to the executive branch, the executive branch inevitably does a balancing of what is happening in Russia, what is happening in Argentina, what is happening in Japan, what is happening in Korea.

It is certainly true that when the suspension agreements were entered into by Secretary Daley on July 13, 1999, the Russian economy was in a precarious state, but then so were certain

aspects of the economy of western Pennsylvania.

The thrust of taking the matter to the courts is that justice will be done in accordance with existing law, contrasted with what the desirability may be for U.S. foreign policy or for U.S. defense policy.

There is stated from time to time a reluctance to take matters to the court, but my own view, having had substantial practice in the Federal courts as well as the State courts, is that is where justice is done. If there is

a case that could be made to show there is a violation of U.S. trade laws and foreign trade laws on dumping, those legal principles will be administered by the courts. Where the wheat industry is being victimized by dumping or the steel industry is being victimized by dumping or the sugar industry is being victimized by dumping or the fresh cut flower industry is being victimized by dumping, justice will be done in the Federal courts.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

ANTIDUMPING DUTY ORDERS IN EFFECT ON MARCH 1, 1999

[Duty orders revoked by Sunset Review remain in effect until Jan. 1, 2000]

CASE NUM AND COUNTRY	PRODUCT	DAT INI
A-357-007 ARGENTINA	CARBON STEEL WIRE ROD	12/
A-357-405 ARGENTINA	BARBED WIRE AND BARBLESS WIRE STRAND	12/
A-357-802 ARGENTINA	L-WR WELDED CARBON STEEL PIPE & TUBE	06/
A-357-804 ARGENTINA	SILICON METAL	09/
A-357-809 ARGENTINA	LINE AND PRESSURE PIPE	07/
A-357-810 ARGENTINA	OIL COUNTRY TUBULAR GOODS	07/
A-831-801 ARMENIA	SOLID UREA	08/
A-602-803 AUSTRALIA	CORROSION-RESISTANT CARBON STEEL FLAT PRODUCTS	07/
A-832-801 AZERBAIJAN	SOLID UREA	08/
A-538-802 BANGLADESH	COTTON SHOP TOWELS	04/
A-822-801 BELARUS	SOLID UREA	08/
A-423-077 BELGIUM	SUGAR	08/
A-423-602 BELGIUM	INDUSTRIAL PHOSPHORIC ACID	12/
A-423-805 BELGIUM	CUT-TO-LENGTH CARBON STEEL PLATE	07/
A-351-503 BRAZIL	IRON CONSTRUCTION CASTINGS	06/
A-351-505 BRAZIL	MALLEABLE CAST IRON PIPE FITTINGS	08/
A-351-602 BRAZIL	CARBON STEEL BUTT-WELD PIPE FITTINGS	03/
A-351-603 BRAZIL	BRASS SHEET & STRIP	04/
A-351-605 BRAZIL	FROZEN CONCENTRATED ORANGE JUICE	06/
A-351-804 BRAZIL	INDUSTRIAL NITROCELLULOSE	10/
A-351-806 BRAZIL	SILICON METAL	09/
A-351-809 BRAZIL	CIRCULAR WELDED NON-ALLOY STEEL PIPE	10/
A-351-811 BRAZIL	HOT ROLLED LEAD/BISMUTH CARBON STEEL PRODUCTS	05/
A-351-817 BRAZIL	CUT-TO-LENGTH CARBON STEEL PLATE	07/
A-351-819 BRAZIL	STAINLESS STEEL WIRE ROD	01/
A-351-820 BRAZIL	FERROSILICON	02/
A-351-824 BRAZIL	SILICOMANGANESE	12/
A-351-825 BRAZIL	STAINLESS STEEL BAR	01/
A-351-826 BRAZIL	LINE AND PRESSURE PIPE	07/
A-122-047 CANADA	ELEMENTAL SULPHUR	02/
A-122-085 CANADA	SUGAR & SYRUP	04/
A-122-401 CANADA	RED RASPBERRIES	07/
A-122-503 CANADA	IRON CONSTRUCTION CASTINGS	06/
A-122-506 CANADA	OIL COUNTRY TUBULAR GOODS	08/
A-122-601 CANADA	BRASS SHEET & STRIP	04/
A-122-605 CANADA	COLOR PICTURE TUBES	12/
A-122-804 CANADA	NEW STEEL RAILS	10/
A-122-814 CANADA	PURE AND ALLOY MAGNESIUM	10/
A-122-822 CANADA	CORROSION-RESISTANT CARBON STEEL FLAT PRODUCTS	07/
A-122-823 CANADA	CUT-TO-LENGTH CARBON STEEL PLATE	07/
A-337-602 CHILE	FRESH CUT FLOWERS	06/
A-337-803 CHILE	FRESH ATLANTIC SALMON	07/
A-337-804 CHILE	PRESERVED MUSHROOMS	02/
A-570-001 CHINA PRC	POTASSIUM PERMANGANATE	03/
A-570-002 CHINA PRC	CHLOROPICRIN	05/
A-570-003 CHINA PRC	COTTON SHOP TOWELS	09/
A-570-007 CHINA PRC	BARIUM CHLORIDE	11/
A-570-101 CHINA PRC	GREIG POLYESTER COTTON PRINT CLOTH	09/
A-570-501 CHINA PRC	NATURAL BRISTLE PAINT BRUSHES & BRUSH HEADS	03/
A-570-502 CHINA PRC	IRON CONSTRUCTION CASTINGS	06/
A-570-504 CHINA PRC	PETROLEUM WAX CANDLES	09/
A-570-506 CHINA PRC	PORCELAIN-ON-STEEL COOKING WARE	12/
A-570-601 CHINA PRC	TAPERED ROLLER BEARINGS	09/
A-570-802 CHINA PRC	INDUSTRIAL NITROCELLULOSE	10/
A-570-803 CHINA PRC	HEAVY FORGED HAND TOOLS, W/WO HANDLES	05/
A-570-804 CHINA PRC	SPARKLERS	07/
A-570-805 CHINA PRC	SULFUR CHEMICALS (SODIUM THIOSULFATE)	08/
A-570-806 CHINA PRC	SILICON METAL	09/
A-570-808 CHINA PRC	CHROME-PLATE LUG NUTS	11/
A-570-811 CHINA PRC	TUNGSTEN ORE CONCENTRATES	02/
A-570-814 CHINA PRC	CARBON STEEL BUTT-WELD PIPE FITTINGS	06/
A-570-815 CHINA PRC	SULFANILIC ACID	10/
A-570-819 CHINA PRC	FERROSILICON	06/
A-570-820 CHINA PRC	COMPACT DUCTILE IRON WATERWORKS FITTINGS	08/
A-570-822 CHINA PRC	HELICAL SPRING LOCK WASHERS	10/
A-570-825 CHINA PRC	SEBACIC ACID	08/
A-570-826 CHINA PRC	PAPER CLIPS	11/
A-570-827 CHINA PRC	PENCILS, CASED	12/
A-570-828 CHINA PRC	SILICOMANGANESE	12/
A-570-830 CHINA PRC	COUMARIN	01/
A-570-831 CHINA PRC	GARLIC, FRESH	02/
A-570-832 CHINA PRC	PURE MAGNESIUM	04/
A-570-835 CHINA PRC	FURFURYL ALCOHOL	06/
A-570-836 CHINA PRC	GLYCINE	07/
A-570-840 CHINA PRC	MANGANESE METAL	12/
A-570-842 CHINA PRC	POLYVINYL ALCOHOL	04/
A-570-844 CHINA PRC	MELAMINE INSTITUTIONAL DINNERWARE	03/
A-570-846 CHINA PRC	BRAKE ROTORS	04/
A-570-847 CHINA PRC	PERSULFATES	08/
A-570-848 CHINA PRC	FRESHWATER CRAWFISH TAILMEAT	10/
A-583-008 CHINA TAIWAN	SMALL DIAM. WELDED CARBON STEEL PIPE & TUBE	05/
A-583-080 CHINA TAIWAN	CARBON STEEL PLATE	10/
A-583-505 CHINA TAIWAN	OIL COUNTRY TUBULAR GOODS	08/
A-583-507 CHINA TAIWAN	MALLEABLE CAST IRON PIPE FITTINGS	08/
A-583-508 CHINA TAIWAN	PORCELAIN-ON-STEEL COOKING WARE	12/
A-583-603 CHINA TAIWAN	TOP-OF-THE-STOVE STNLS STEEL COOKING WARE	02/
A-583-605 CHINA TAIWAN	CARBON STEEL BUTT-WELD PIPE FITTINGS	03/
A-583-803 CHINA TAIWAN	LIGHT-WALLED RECT. WELDED CARBON STEEL PIPE & TUBE	07/

ANTIDUMPING DUTY ORDERS IN EFFECT ON MARCH 1, 1999—Continued

[Duty orders revoked by Sunset Review remain in effect until Jan. 1, 2000]

CASE NUM AND COUNTRY		PRODUCT	DAT INI
A-583-806	CHINA TAIWAN	TELEPHONE SYSTEMS & SUBASSEMBLIES THEREOF	01/
A-583-810	CHINA TAIWAN	CHROME-PLATED LUG NUTS	11/
A-583-814	CHINA TAIWAN	CIRCULAR WELDED NON-ALLOY STEEL PIPE	10/
A-583-815	CHINA TAIWAN	WELDED ASTM A-312 STAINLESS STEEL PIPE	12/
A-583-816	CHINA TAIWAN	STAINLESS STEEL BUTT-WELD PIPE FITTINGS	06/
A-583-820	CHINA TAIWAN	HELICAL SPRING LOCK WASHERS	10/
A-583-821	CHINA TAIWAN	STAINLESS STEEL FLANGES	02/
A-583-824	CHINA TAIWAN	POLYVINYL ALCOHOL	04/
A-583-825	CHINA TAIWAN	MELAMINE INSTITUTIONAL DINNERWARE	03/
A-583-826	CHINA TAIWAN	COLLATED ROOFING NAILS	12/
A-583-827	CHINA TAIWAN	STATIC RANDOM ACCESS MEMORY	03/
A-583-828	CHINA TAIWAN	STAINLESS STEEL WIRE ROD	08/
A-301-602	COLOMBIA	FRESH CUT FLOWERS	06/
A-331-602	ECUADOR	FRESH CUT FLOWERS	06/
A-447-801	ESTONIA	SOLID UREA	08/
A-405-802	FINLAND	CUT-TO-LENGTH CARBON STEEL PLATE	07/
A-427-001	FRANCE	SORBITOL	07/
A-427-009	FRANCE	INDUSTRIAL NITROCELLULOSE	07/
A-427-078	FRANCE	SUGAR	08/
A-427-098	FRANCE	ANHYDROUS SODIUM METASILICATE	06/
A-427-602	FRANCE	BRASS SHEET & STRIP	04/
A-427-801	FRANCE	ANTIFRICTION BEARINGS	04/
A-427-804	FRANCE	HOT ROLLED LEAD/BISMUTH CARBON STEEL PRODUCTS	05/
A-427-808	FRANCE	CORROSION-RESISTANT CARBON STEEL FLAT PRODUCTS	07/
A-427-811	FRANCE	STAINLESS STEEL WIRE ROD	01/
A-427-812	FRANCE	CALCIUM ALUMINATE CEMENT AND CEMENT CLINKER	04/
A-100-001	GENERAL ISSUES	ANTIFRICTION BEARINGS	04/
A-100-003	GENERAL ISSUES	CARBON STEEL FLAT PRODUCTS (FILED 30-Jun-92)	07/
A-833-801	GEORGIA	SOLID UREA	08/
A-428-811	GERMANY UNITED	HOT ROLLED LEAD/BISMUTH CARBON STEEL PRODUCTS	05/
A-428-814	GERMANY UNITED	COLD-ROLLED CARBON STEEL FLAT PRODUCTS	07/
A-428-815	GERMANY UNITED	CORROSION-RESISTANT CARBON STEEL FLAT PRODUCTS	07/
A-428-816	GERMANY UNITED	CUT-TO-LENGTH CARBON STEEL PLATE	07/
A-428-820	GERMANY UNITED	SEAMLESS LINE AND PRESSURE PIPE	07/
A-428-821	GERMANY UNITED	LARGE NEWSPAPER PRINTING PRESSES & COMPONENTS	07/
A-428-082	GERMANY WEST	SUGAR	08/
A-428-602	GERMANY WEST	BRASS SHEET & STRIP	04/
A-428-801	GERMANY WEST	ANTIFRICTION BEARINGS	04/
A-428-802	GERMANY WEST	INDUSTRIAL BELTS	07/
A-428-803	GERMANY WEST	INDUSTRIAL NITROCELLULOSE	10/
A-428-807	GERMANY WEST	SULFUR CHEMICALS	08/
A-484-801	GREECE	ELECTROLYTIC MANGANESE DIOXIDE	06/
A-437-601	HUNGARY	TAPERED ROLLER BEARINGS	09/
A-533-502	INDIA	WELDED CARBON STEEL PIPES & TUBES	08/
A-533-806	INDIA	SULFANILIC ACID	06/
A-533-808	INDIA	STAINLESS STEEL WIRE ROD	01/
A-533-809	INDIA	STAINLESS STEEL FLANGES	02/
A-533-810	INDIA	STAINLESS STEEL BAR	01/
A-533-813	INDIA	PRESERVED MUSHROOMS	02/
A-560-801	INDONESIA	MELAMINE INSTITUTIONAL DINNERWARE	03/
A-560-802	INDONESIA	PRESERVED MUSHROOMS	02/
A-507-502	IRAN	IN SHELL PISTACHIOS	10/
A-508-602	ISRAEL	OIL COUNTRY TUBULAR GOODS	04/
A-508-604	ISRAEL	INDUSTRIAL PHOSPHORIC ACID	12/
A-475-059	ITALY	PRESSURE SENSITIVE PLASTIC TAPE	05/
A-475-401	ITALY	BRASS FIRE PROTECTION PRODUCTS	02/
A-475-601	ITALY	BRASS SHEET & STRIP	04/
A-475-703	ITALY	GRANULAR POLYTETRAFLUOROETHYLENE RESIN	12/
A-475-801	ITALY	ANTIFRICTION BEARINGS	04/
A-475-802	ITALY	INDUSTRIAL BELTS	07/
A-475-811	ITALY	GRAIN-ORIENTED ELECTRICAL STEEL	09/
A-475-814	ITALY	SEAMLESS LINE AND PRESSURE PIPE	07/
A-475-816	ITALY	OIL COUNTRY TUBULAR GOODS	07/
A-475-818	ITALY	PASTA, CERTAIN	06/
A-475-820	ITALY	STAINLESS STEEL WIRE ROD	08/
A-588-028	JAPAN	ROLLER CHAIN OTHER THAN BICYCLE	02/
A-588-041	JAPAN	METHIONINE, SYNTHETIC	08/
A-588-045	JAPAN	STEEL WIRE ROPE	08/
A-588-054	JAPAN	TAPERED ROLLER BEARINGS, UNDER 4"	12/
A-588-056	JAPAN	MELAMINE IN CRYSTAL FORM	12/
A-588-068	JAPAN	P.C. STEEL WIRE STRAND	11/
A-588-401	JAPAN	CALCIUM HYPOCHLORITE	05/
A-588-405	JAPAN	CELLULAR MOBILE TELEPHONES & SUBASSEMBLIES	11/
A-588-602	JAPAN	CARBON STEEL BUTT-WELD PIPE FITTINGS	03/
A-588-604	JAPAN	TAPERED ROLLER BEARINGS, OVER 4"	09/
A-588-605	JAPAN	MALLEABLE CAST IRON PIPE FITTINGS	09/
A-588-609	JAPAN	COLOR PICTURE TUBES	12/
A-588-702	JAPAN	STAINLESS STEEL BUTT-WELD PIPE FITTINGS	04/
A-588-703	JAPAN	INTERNAL COMBUSTION IND FORKLIFT TRUCKS	05/
A-588-704	JAPAN	BRASS SHEET & STRIP	08/
A-588-706	JAPAN	NITRILE RUBBER	09/
A-588-707	JAPAN	GRANULAR POLYTETRAFLUOROETHYLENE RESIN	12/
A-588-802	JAPAN	3.5" MICRODISKS AND MEDIA THEREFOR	03/
A-588-804	JAPAN	ANTIFRICTION BEARINGS	04/
A-588-806	JAPAN	ELECTROLYTIC MANGANESE DIOXIDE	06/
A-588-807	JAPAN	INDUSTRIAL BELTS	07/
A-588-809	JAPAN	TELEPHONE SYSTEMS & SUBASSEMBLIES THEREOF	01/
A-588-810	JAPAN	MECHANICAL TRANSFER PRESSES	02/
A-588-811	JAPAN	DRAFTING MACHINES & PARTS THEREOF	05/
A-588-812	JAPAN	INDUSTRIAL NITROCELLULOSE	10/
A-588-813	JAPAN	MULTIANGLE LASER LIGHT SCATTERING INSTR	04/
A-588-815	JAPAN	GRAY PORTLAND CEMENT AND CEMENT CLINKER	06/
A-588-816	JAPAN	BENZYL P-HYDROXYBENZOATE (BENZYL PARABEN)	07/
A-588-823	JAPAN	PROF ELECTRIC CUTTING/SANDING/GRINDING TOOLS	06/
A-588-826	JAPAN	CORROSION-RESISTANT CARBON STEEL FLAT PRODUCTS	07/
A-588-829	JAPAN	DEFROST TIMERS	02/
A-588-831	JAPAN	GRAIN-ORIENTED ELECTRICAL STEEL	09/
A-588-833	JAPAN	STAINLESS STEEL BAR	01/
A-588-835	JAPAN	OIL COUNTRY TUBULAR GOODS	07/
A-588-836	JAPAN	POLYVINYL ALCOHOL	04/
A-588-837	JAPAN	LARGE NEWSPAPER PRINTING PRESSES & COMPONENTS	07/
A-588-838	JAPAN	CLAD STEEL PLATE	10/
A-588-840	JAPAN	GAS TURBO COMPRESSORS	06/
A-588-843	JAPAN	STAINLESS STEEL WIRE ROD	08/
A-834-801	KAZAKHSTAN	SOLID UREA	08/
A-834-804	KAZAKHSTAN	FERROSILICON	06/
A-779-602	KENYA	FRESH CUT FLOWERS	06/
A-580-507	KOREA SOUTH	MALLEABLE CAST IRON PIPE FITTINGS	08/
A-580-601	KOREA SOUTH	TOP-OF-THE-STOVE STNLS STEEL COOKING WARE	02/
A-580-603	KOREA SOUTH	BRASS SHEET & STRIP	04/

ANTIDUMPING DUTY ORDERS IN EFFECT ON MARCH 1, 1999—Continued

[Duty orders revoked by Sunset Review remain in effect until Jan. 1, 2000]

CASE NUM AND COUNTRY	PRODUCT	DAT INI
A-580-605 KOREA SOUTH	COLOR PICTURE TUBES	12/
A-580-803 KOREA SOUTH	TELEPHONE SYSTEMS & SUBASSEMBLIES THEREOF	01/
A-580-805 KOREA SOUTH	INDUSTRIAL NITROCELLULOSE	10/
A-580-807 KOREA SOUTH	POLYETHYLENE TEREPHTHALATE (PET) FILM	05/
A-580-809 KOREA SOUTH	CIRCULAR WELDED NON-ALLOY STEEL PIPE	10/
A-580-810 KOREA SOUTH	WELDED ASTM A-312 STAINLESS STEEL PIPE	12/
A-580-811 KOREA SOUTH	CARBON STEEL WIRE ROPE	05/
A-580-812 KOREA SOUTH	DRAMS OF 1 MEGABIT & ABOVE	05/
A-580-813 KOREA SOUTH	STAINLESS STEEL BUTT-WELD PIPE FITTINGS	06/
A-580-815 KOREA SOUTH	COLD-ROLLED CARBON STEEL FLAT PRODUCTS	07/
A-580-816 KOREA SOUTH	CORROSION-RESISTANT CARBON STEEL FLAT PRODUCTS	07/
A-580-825 KOREA SOUTH	OIL COUNTRY TUBULAR GOODS	07/
A-580-829 KOREA SOUTH	STAINLESS STEEL WIRE ROD	08/
A-835-801 KYRGYZSTAN	SOLID UREA	08/
A-449-801 LATVIA	SOLID UREA	08/
A-451-801 LITHUANIA	SOLID UREA	08/
A-557-805 MALAYSIA	EXTRUDED RUBBER THREAD	09/
A-201-504 MEXICO	PORCELAIN-ON-STEEL COOKING WARE	12/
A-201-601 MEXICO	FRESH CUT FLOWERS	06/
A-201-802 MEXICO	GRAY PORTLAND CEMENT AND CEMENT CLINKER	10/
A-201-805 MEXICO	CIRCULAR WELDED NON-ALLOY STEEL PIPE	10/
A-201-806 MEXICO	CARBON STEEL WIRE ROPE	05/
A-201-809 MEXICO	CUT-TO-LENGTH CARBON STEEL PLATE	07/
A-201-817 MEXICO	OIL COUNTRY TUBULAR GOODS	07/
A-841-801 MOLDOVA	SOLID UREA	08/
A-421-701 NETHERLANDS	BRASS SHEET & STRIP	08/
A-421-804 NETHERLANDS	COLD-ROLLED CARBON STEEL FLAT PRODUCTS	07/
A-421-805 NETHERLANDS	ARAMID FIBER OF PPD-T	07/
A-614-502 NEW ZEALAND	LOW FUMING BRAZING COPPER WIRE & ROD	03/
A-614-801 NEW ZEALAND	FRESH KIWIFRUIT	05/
A-403-801 NORWAY	FRESH & CHILLED ATLANTIC SALMON	03/
A-455-802 POLAND	CUT-TO-LENGTH CARBON STEEL PLATE	07/
A-485-601 ROMANIA	UREA	08/
A-485-602 ROMANIA	TAPERED ROLLER BEARINGS	09/
A-485-801 ROMANIA	ANTIFRICTION BEARINGS	04/
A-485-803 ROMANIA	CUT-TO-LENGTH CARBON STEEL PLATE	07/
A-821-801 RUSSIA	SOLID UREA	08/
A-821-804 RUSSIA	FERROSILICON	06/
A-821-805 RUSSIA	PURE MAGNESIUM	04/
A-821-807 RUSSIA	FERROVANADIUM AND NITRIDED VANADIUM	06/
A-559-502 SINGAPORE	SMALL DIAMETER STANDARD & RECTANGULAR PIPE & TUBE	12/
A-559-601 SINGAPORE	COLOR PICTURE TUBES	12/
A-559-801 SINGAPORE	ANTIFRICTION BEARINGS	04/
A-559-802 SINGAPORE	INDUSTRIAL BELTS	07/
A-791-502 SOUTH AFRICA	LOW FUMING BRAZING COPPER WIRE & ROD	03/
A-791-802 SOUTH AFRICA	FURFURYL ALCOHOL	06/
A-469-007 SPAIN	POTASSIUM PERMANGANATE	03/
A-469-803 SPAIN	CUT-TO-LENGTH CARBON STEEL PLATE	07/
A-469-805 SPAIN	STAINLESS STEEL BAR	01/
A-469-807 SPAIN	STAINLESS STEEL WIRE ROD	08/
A-401-040 SWEDEN	STAINLESS STEEL PLATE	05/
A-401-601 SWEDEN	BRASS SHEET & STRIP	04/
A-401-603 SWEDEN	STAINLESS STEEL HOLLOW PRODUCTS	11/
A-401-801 SWEDEN	ANTIFRICTION BEARINGS	04/
A-401-805 SWEDEN	CUT-TO-LENGTH CARBON STEEL PLATE	07/
A-401-806 SWEDEN	STAINLESS STEEL WIRE ROD	08/
A-842-801 TAJIKISTAN	SOLID UREA	08/
A-549-502 THAILAND	WELDED CARBON STEEL PIPES & TUBES	03/
A-549-601 THAILAND	MALLEABLE CAST IRON PIPE FITTINGS	09/
A-549-807 THAILAND	CARBON STEEL BUTT-WELD PIPE FITTINGS	06/
A-549-812 THAILAND	FURFURYL ALCOHOL	06/
A-549-813 THAILAND	CANNED PINEAPPLE FRUIT	07/
A-489-501 TURKEY	WELDED CARBON STEEL PIPE & TUBE	08/
A-489-602 TURKEY	ASPIRIN	11/
A-489-805 TURKEY	PASTA, CERTAIN	06/
A-489-807 TURKEY	REBAR STEEL	04/
A-843-801 TURKMENISTAN	SOLID UREA	08/
A-823-801 UKRAINE	SOLID UREA	08/
A-823-802 UKRAINE	URANIUM	12/
A-823-804 UKRAINE	FERROSILICON	06/
A-823-806 UKRAINE	PURE MAGNESIUM	04/
A-412-801 UNITED KINGDOM	ANTIFRICTION BEARINGS	04/
A-412-803 UNITED KINGDOM	INDUSTRIAL NITROCELLULOSE	10/
A-412-805 UNITED KINGDOM	SULFUR CHEMICALS	08/
A-412-810 UNITED KINGDOM	HOT ROLLED LEAD/BISMUTH CARBON STEEL PRODUCTS	05/
A-412-814 UNITED KINGDOM	CUT-TO-LENGTH CARBON STEEL PLATE	07/
A-461-008 USSR	TITANIUM SPONGE	11/
A-461-601 USSR	SOLID UREA	08/
A-844-801 UZBEKISTAN	SOLID UREA	08/
A-307-805 VENEZUELA	CIRCULAR WELDED NON-ALLOY STEEL PIPE	10/
A-307-807 VENEZUELA	FERROSILICON	06/
A-479-801 YUGOSLAVIA	INDUSTRIAL NITROCELLULOSE	10/

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to my colleague's amendment. I do so do for three reasons. First, there is no evidence that the current antidumping and countervailing duty laws have failed to deliver relief to injured industries. My colleague argues that the amendment is required to address the unfair trade practices facing the steel industry. I would have preferred not to have to revisit the many points that were made in the context of the debate over the steel quota legislation this past summer. This bill is about trade and investment

with Africa, the Caribbean, and Central America. I prefer we keep our focus there. That said, since my colleague's amendment has raised those issues before us yet again, I think it is important to remind my colleagues about the points that were made at length in this past summer's debate.

You may recall that, at the time, the steel industry and the steelworkers made the point that they faced a sudden surge of increased imports of steel and were sufficiently threatened that they sought to impose direct quotas on imports of various steel products. They argued that the existing import relief laws were inadequate to the task of ad-

ressing that surge. What the debate revealed was quite a different story. In fact, while imports into the United States did surge dramatically in the wake of the Asian financial crisis, they then dropped precipitously in response to the filing of a series of antidumping measures. Imports have continued that downward trend as a result of those unfair trade actions and the suspension agreements negotiated by the Commerce Department that effectively blocked any further imports of hot and cold rolled products from Russia and other countries engaged in below cost sales into the United States market. What lessons should we draw from that

experience? One is that the existing laws work exactly as they are intended. They provide an effective and efficient means of obtaining relief from unfairly dumped or subsidized imports. Indeed, as the Wall Street Journal pointed out in an article published in the midst of the steel industry's filing of dumping actions this past year, the mere filing of an unfair trade action under existing laws has a dramatic impact on prices. The article quoted Curtiss Barnette, the chief executive of Bethlehem Steel as acknowledging that trade cases had become a "part of the Bethlehem's 'normal business-planning process,'" and acknowledging that, even where dumping actions failed, "You have won some interim relief and you have said you're going to protect your rights."

Nicholas Tolerico, executive vice president of Thyssen, a Detroit-based steel processing and importing unit of a German steelmaker, made the point even more emphatically. He indicated that, among importers faced with the prospect of an antidumping action, "the response is just to stop importing." The same holds true for foreign exporters faced with unfair trade complaints even when they eventually win cases. The article quoted the chairman of Ispat International, one of the largest steel manufacturers in the world to the effect that his company had cut exports to the United States from a wire-rod mill in Trinidad and Tobago by 40 percent simply due to the risk inherent in trade litigation even though Trinidad's steelmakers eventually won the case. Why is that the case? Some statistics might help here.

The reason that both exporters and importers of steel halt trade the minute a trade case is filed is because of the record compiled by U.S. industry. The Department of Commerce grants relief to the petitioning industry in over 90 percent of the cases filed under the antidumping and countervailing duty laws. Due to the deference that the Court of International Trade is obliged to pay to the Commerce Department's decisions under current law, the Department's decisions are upheld over 90 percent of the time. In other words, if you are an exporter of steel facing an unfair trade action in the United States, there is a 9 in 10 chance that you will face some considerable penalty. Given that steel is a commodity product, and microeconomic theory would dictate that all such products would be priced to the margin, you, as the foreign exporter, are likely to find yourself priced out of the competitive U.S. market with even a slight dumping or countervailing duty added onto the price of your current shipments.

Now, let's look at it from an importer's perspective. Let's say you are in the automobile industry in the United States, or one of the other steel consuming industries that employ more than 40 persons in the United States for every person employed in the steel in-

dustry here. In fact, let's say you are the plant manager for the Dodge Durango plant in Delaware and you are operating as efficiently as you possibly can to compete with your competition in the hotly contested market for sport utility vehicles. You operate on the basis of "just in time" delivery to ensure that you carry as little inventory as possible. You do that, in part, to reduce the associated costs and, in part, to take advantage of any change in prices for component parts that may help you compete in your market. That, however, can make you more vulnerable to price swings in the market for component parts. Then, suddenly, the steel industry files a series of dumping actions. Do you continue to import steel when you could be faced with a dramatic increase in price if the case succeeds? No. You stop importing from the targeted country or companies in order to reduce your risk.

The net result is that the cases filed before the Commerce Department begin to raise prices as soon as they are filed simply because the market is responding to the fact that the Commerce Department, 9 cases out of 10, is going to impose a significant penalty at the end of the day. Now, would the result be the same if these cases were litigated before the Federal courts, as my colleague's amendment would require? I strongly doubt that. The cases are complex, the facts frequently are in dispute, and the outcome less assured because of the nature of the litigation process.

Those who have spent time litigating in the Federal courts tell me that they do not quote odds on cases to their clients even on sure winners due solely to the risks of litigation. Those with experience litigating before Federal courts tell me that the likely result of a shift of jurisdiction from the administrative agencies to the courts would be a more intrusive review—without the deference the courts currently pay to Commerce Department decisions. The net result would be greater uncertainty as to the result in these cases, which, for the steel industry, would ultimately spell a less reliable outcome than they currently achieve before the administrative agencies.

In short, the dumping and countervailing duty laws appear to be working as designed and the change suggested by my colleague would simply increase the uncertainty of the outcome from the steel industry's perspective. Second, there is no evidence that shifting the burden of investigating foreign unfair trade practices to the courts would in any way enhance the prospect for prompt relief. At hearings earlier this year before the Finance Committee, those who have litigated under the "rocket docket" at the Commerce Department and the International Trade Commission have complained about the fact that they do not get relief as promptly as they like. But, no one suggested that a shift of jurisdiction to the courts would somehow improve

the situation. Given the record of the courts in handling complex economic litigation in other areas, it is not clear to me that shifting the burden of the initial investigation to the courts, with any allowance at all for the normal process of discovery between private litigants, would provide a benefit to the petitioning industry in these cases.

While both petitioners and respondents complain about their treatment before the administrative agencies, largely due to what they consider to be the arbitrary basis for their decisions, both sides to the litigation seem to agree that the cases themselves are completed as rapidly as possible. That not only helps provide relief to the petitioning industry on as timely a basis as practical, it also has the significant benefit of deciding the issue for the rest of the players in the marketplace. What that really does is reduce the uncertainty in the market that the filing of the case creates. So the plant manager at the Dodge Durango facility in Delaware can rely on decisions in making his own assessment of who to purchase steel from for the coming production run.

Finally, let me say that my colleague's proposal may simply be ahead of its time. What it suggests is something akin to an antitrust remedy—in other words, litigation between private parties that reduces the Government's role in the process. I personally think that there would be real merit to examining that sort of proposal in the Finance Committee in the future. And I would welcome the opportunity to do so rather than forcing a vote on the proposal today. The reason I say that the proposal may be ahead of its time is that an antitrust remedy is relevant when the actions involved are solely those of private parties. That is not the case with most foreign unfair trade practices today. Even dumping is not solely a function of private pricing decisions by foreign producers. As long as governments continue to distort markets, whether through high import tariffs on U.S. steel exports or heavy subsidies to their own domestic producers, prices in the marketplace for products like steel will not equilibrate based solely on private actions.

Thus, for example, dumping is often the result of a country maintaining a closed market in which its companies can maintain a relatively high profit margin, which effectively allows those producers to cross-subsidize their exports to the United States. A private right of action does not reach that conduct. That is conduct that the United States must address at its root—which is the government-induced distortion of the market, rather than the private pricing decisions of the foreign producers.

What that means for the proposed shift of the jurisdiction to the Federal courts proposed by my distinguished colleague's amendment is that it is premature. Neither he nor I would suggest that the steel industry's current

conditions are shaped solely by private pricing decisions. In fact, the principal problem facing the steel industry is the global overcapacity created by government protection of their home markets and subsidization of their exports to our shores. I therefore, ask my colleague to withdraw his amendment in order that the Finance Committee could take a look at the proposal and explore the ramifications of the far-sighted suggestions in greater depth. Failing that, I must oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I join in the Chairman's request and also in his very proper remarks about the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I believe it has been since 1982 that the Senator began offering amendments to this effect. The antidumping laws themselves have a much longer history and have been through several major revisions, most recently in the Uruguay Round, which we implemented in the Uruguay Round Agreements Act in 1994.

I think the idea of looking into this, as the Chairman suggests, is a very good one. But for the moment, sir, it is ineluctably the case that the amendment, as drafted, is inconsistent with the World Trade Organization's antidumping agreement in a number of significant ways. It does not say that we are wrong, but that we would be up against the agreed-upon international trading rules.

We have an international meeting of the World Trade Organization at the end of this month in Seattle. I do not think we should arrive there this way, particularly as other countries are seeking to reopen negotiations once again on these issues, arguing that they are an antiquated idea.

So I join in expressing the hope that the amendment might be withdrawn. We can take the idea with us to Seattle as something for other countries to consider when they approach our Government about modifying our existing laws.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the antidumping procedures are not antiquated at all. I have noted some 290 antidumping orders in effect as of March 1 of 1999 dealing with a wide variety of products: Steel, sugar, towels, raspberries, fresh cut flowers—the list goes on and on.

The grave difficulty is that the enforcement rests with the executive branch, and the executive branch is more concerned with foreign policy matters and defense policy than with any specific U.S. industry.

The trade-off is made, decimating industries and costing thousands of jobs in an unfair way. As of July 12 of this year, there were bankruptcies of five medium-size steel companies, Acme

Steel, Laclede Steel, Gulf States, Qualtech, and Geneva.

When the argument is made that there will be an effect on prices of automobile manufacturers, that is true. But our laws are designed to provide fairness as fairness and justice relate to the steel industry and the auto industry. The auto industry ought not to be able to buy steel from a foreign importer where it is dumped—sold in the United States at a price lower than it is sold in the foreign country.

When the distinguished chairman of the committee makes a reference to wire rod, it ought to be noted that steel wire rods continued at record high levels, more than 14 percent over levels about a year ago in September of 1998. The wire rod industry has sustained serious damage, losses of some \$94 million during the first half of 1999. A petition was filed on December 30, 1998, and the President, expected to make his determination by September 27, 1999, to postpone that decision, on September 28, claimed that the matter was still under review. To date, there hasn't been a decision.

Contrast that with what could be obtained in a court of equity, where a decision could be made on affidavits on an ex parte order in 5 days, within a few weeks on a preliminary injunction. It is not true that the Federal courts are unable to handle these serious matters. They do handle complicated anti-trust matters all the time and deal with complex economic matters. If a damaged party is in a position to prove the case, they move into court and get a prompt decision in a court of equity, certainly nothing like a year's delay.

The line pipe industry filed a section 201 petition with the ITC claiming that, in 1998, some 331,000 net tons of lime pipe had been imported into U.S. markets at an increase of 49.5 percent over 1997. This petition was filed on June 30, 1999. The ITC issued an affirmative finding on October 28, 1999, but the President is not expected to review the matter until December 17 of this year, long after an equitable court would have been able to take care of it.

The lamb issue is similar. On September 30, 1998, the American sheep industry filed a section 201 petition to stop the flood of imported lamb into the United States. During the 1998 Easter/Passover season, U.S. slaughtered lamb prices were at a 4-year low, some 60 cents a pound. On March 26, 1999, the ITC unanimously decided in favor of the industry and forwarded its recommendation to the President for decision by late May. In this case, the President did not make a decision to provide relief to the industry until July 7, 1999, which shows the enormous delay in proceedings under the International Trade Commission.

When the suggestion is made about having the matter taken up in Seattle, the grave difficulty is that the international trade agreements leave the ultimate discretion with the executive branch, and that works to the dis-

advantage of the American company and the American workers. We have provided that there would not be an opportunity for judge shopping, to go into a court in a jurisdiction where the damage had been done, by providing that the jurisdiction would be lodged in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

I think it is a matter of fundamental fairness as to whether our trade laws will be enforced, our trade laws consistent with GATT.

We see, again and again, enormous delays, very little effect, and then the executive branch taking over with suspension agreements to protect the Russians instead of seeing to it that there is justice for American industry and for American workers. This goes far beyond the question of steel, which is a major matter in my State. It goes to virtually every product on the books, as illustrated by the some 290 products which are subjected to antidumping orders in effect as of March 1, 1999.

This is an idea I have been pushing since 1982. My own experience in the court system, as a trial lawyer, shows me that when you go to court, you get the laws enforced—you have justice—contrasted with the executive branch decision, which will vary on many collateral considerations: U.S. foreign policy and U.S. defense policy.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). Is there a sufficient second?

There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. SPECTER. What does it take for a sufficient second?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One-fifth of those Senators present.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. SPECTER. The determination is one-fifth of the Senators present?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Constitution.

Mr. SPECTER. If there are two Senators present and both agree to a roll-call—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The presumption is that there are 51 Senators present, and it takes 11 in order to get the yeas and nays.

Mr. SPECTER. That is a rebuttable presumption, Mr. President. As the Chair notes, there are not 51 Senators present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is precluded from determining who is present without having a quorum call.

Mr. SPECTER. Well, if the quorum shows there is not a quorum present, then what?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate cannot proceed.

Mr. SPECTER. Except by unanimous consent to remove the quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And by—

Mr. SPECTER. At which point, the Chair could make a determination if there were 51 Senators present until the quorum call, and with the 51 Senators not being present, the Senate could not proceed, so it is circular.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those are the rules of the Senate.

Mr. SPECTER. I shall move to ask for the yeas and nays at a later time.

Mr. 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. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2487

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I had a chance to speak earlier about the amendment I had introduced, and then we cut off the discussion to enable Senator BAUCUS to have a chance to speak on the floor. I look forward to comments by my colleague from Delaware, but I think what I will first try to do is summarize this amendment and then hear what my colleague, Senator ROTH, has to say.

This amendment would provide for mutually beneficial trade relations—that is what we talked about earlier—between the U.S. and Caribbean countries by rewarding those countries that comply with internationally recognized core labor rights with increased access to the U.S. market for certain textile goods.

Secondly, it would provide for enforceable labor standards. Before any of the CBI trade bill's benefits could go into effect, the Secretary of Labor would have to determine that a CBI country is providing for enforcement of ILO core labor rights. The Secretary would make this determination after consulting with labor officials in these other countries and after public comments. But the Secretary of Labor makes the final decision. U.S. citizens would have a private right of action in district court to enforce these provisions.

This amendment would basically apply the labor standards of Senator FEINGOLD's HOPE for Africa bill to CBI countries. Supporters of CBI parity claim that NAFTA-like benefits will help the Caribbean workers. I want to point out again—because I am an internationalist and I am interested in mutually beneficial trade—that an October 1999 report on Mexican maquiladoras by the Comité Fronterizo de Obreros shows that wages and conditions have actually deteriorated since NAFTA. If NAFTA hasn't helped Mexican workers, why would NAFTA parity help CBI workers? I already presented data this morning, and I won't do it again.

In October of 1999, the CFO Border Committee of Women Workers issued a

report detailing what happened to workers in the Mexican maquiladoras since the passage of NAFTA. They found that the maquiladoras paid the lowest wages in Mexican industry; that real wages in Mexican manufacturing have declined by more than 20 percent since 1994; that wage levels have come under attack whenever they are over the threshold considered competitive by the maquiladoras; that border workers have endured a sharp decline in their standard of living since NAFTA; that the practice of using child labor in the maquilas is widespread; and that in the name of NAFTA, Mexican companies, aided by their government, are “waging a tireless and surreptitious campaign of dirty tricks to stamp out unions in the maquiladoras.” That is the report.

The same is true of the CBI countries. Those countries, which have the fastest growth in exports to the United States, have experienced the steepest decline in wages in the region. Honduran apparel exports to the United States increased 2,523 percent over the last 10 years but wages declined by 59 percent. In El Salvador, it was 2,512 percent and wages declined 27 percent. Jamaica had the least export growth, one reason being the rate of unionization in Jamaica.

You have average wages of 78 cents in Colombia, 69 cents in the Dominican Republic, 30 cents in Guatemala, and 23 cents in Nicaragua.

Basically, what we are saying again to workers in our own country is, if you organize and try to bargain collectively to make a better wage, these apparel companies will just go to these Caribbean countries. We will just basically undercut your right to organize.

I am in favor of the right of people to organize in our country. What we say to the workers in these countries is that if you want to make more than 35 cents an hour, or 43 cents an hour, and you join a union, or try to bargain collectively, we will deny you your right to do so. We don't have any enforceable labor standard to make sure these abuses don't continue to take place.

Sometimes I think the wage earners in our country are portrayed in some of this debate as if they are greedy or are portrayed as if they look backward and they don't understand this new international economy. I think in many ways this debate is about that.

What would you think if you were working for \$8.50 an hour and you saw adopted on the floor of the Senate a trade agreement without any enforceable labor standard, which meant you were going to be competing against people who make 30 cents an hour or against people making 30 cents an hour in Guatemala? They are never going to get to \$8.50. But don't we want to take these ILO standards and basic human rights standards and make sure they are enforceable? That way you can have the uplifting of the living standards of people in these countries.

Without this amendment, this CBI parity bill is going to merely encour-

age U.S. corporations to set up sweatshops in the Caribbean. This is an antisweatshop amendment. This amendment does not require that CBI countries match U.S. wages in work and working conditions, although 67 percent of the American people think the minimum wage of our trading partners should be raised to U.S. levels. That is not going to happen. But that is not what the amendment does. It only requires these countries to respect the core ILO labor standards before we give them additional benefits.

It is a human rights amendment. This amendment basically says we should not be encouraging these CBI countries to compete against our workers by setting up sweatshops, and it says that we have to make sure there is some means of enforcing such antisweatshop standards.

I want to support trade agreements. People in our country want to support trade agreements. But do you want to know something. The reason the trade policy is losing its legitimacy with the American people—I think probably poll after poll shows that the American people are suspicious of these trade agreements—is because they know they put our workers in a terrible position because they know there aren't enforceable labor standards, because they know there aren't enforceable human rights standards, and they tout these trade agreements as being great for the apparel industry, great for these corporations, and terrible for wage earners.

That is what this vote on this amendment is all about. Are you on the side of working people in our country so that they know they can organize in textile plants and the apparel industry, and they won't basically be shut out and the companies won't be able to say, goodbye; we are going to these other countries because we don't have to abide by any labor standards? Are you on the side of these workers or are you on the side of these corporations? American workers compete with Caribbean apparel workers earning from 23 cents an hour in Nicaragua to 80 cents an hour in Colombia. Our workers make about \$8.42, on average.

Who is going to benefit from extending NAFTA benefits to the CBI countries without enforceable labor standards?

All I am asking with this amendment, I say to my colleague from Delaware, is enforceable labor standards. It is not going to be the textile workers. It is not going to be the workers in the CBI countries. It is going to be the American textile companies that want to shift production to sweatshops offshore so they can save labor costs.

Can I repeat that one more time?

Who is going to benefit from this trade legislation without this amendment? Who is going to benefit from extending NAFTA benefits to the CBI countries without enforceable labor standards? Not American textile workers; not working people in our country;

not the workers in the CBI countries. It is the American textile companies that are going to benefit that want to shift production to sweatshops offshore so they can save labor costs.

I say to Republicans and Democrats alike: Whose side are you on? If you are on the side of working people, if you are on the side of the right of people to be able to organize, if you are on the side of working people in these CBI countries and poor people in these CBI countries, and you are on the side of human rights of people in these countries, at the very minimum, we ought to vote for this amendment which will put some teeth into some enforceable labor standards. The alternatives to this amendment are unenforceable.

Let me be clear about that. I don't want a Senator to come to the floor and say we have already dealt with labor standards. The CBI parity merely includes labor rights as an eligibility criteria which can only be enforced by the administration. The administration already enforces the GSP program and has never suspended one CBI country despite their terrible labor rights record.

If the administration won't use its GSP leverage to significantly improve labor rights, why would it use eligibility criteria? Nobody can seriously argue that this administration would deny eligibility to a CBI country based on labor rights violations. They have never done it.

The GAO issued a report last year that listed the various GSP worker rights in CBI countries accepted for review. In each case—I gave examples earlier, so I will not do it again—the petitions were withdrawn usually after some nominal changes in the CBI country labor law. But in one CBI country after another, labor laws are flouted, often openly.

There have been 95 worker rights petitions against CBI countries under GSP. None, not one, has led to investigation and suspension. The ILO is not an acceptable substitute because it has no enforcement power.

This amendment speaks to the compelling need to have enforceable labor standards. The ILO has no enforcement power. The managers' amendment directs the President to "seek the establishment in the ILO of a mechanism to ensure the effective implementation of each of the core labor conventions that ILO members have ratified." I commend Senators GRAHAM and MOYNIHAN for their effort in this direction. But, again, I have to say this on the floor of the Senate. The ILO has no enforcement power, so I am not sure how the ILO can ensure effective implementation. I think enforceable standards for core ILO labor rights need to be built into the trade agreement itself.

Let me repeat that.

You have to take these basic ILO labor rights, and you have to make sure that enforceable standards are there built into the trade agreement. Otherwise, what you have is a CBI par-

ity bill which is going to actually provide an incentive for CBI countries to move in the opposite direction.

I welcome the provision in the managers' amendment on increased transparency. Let me repeat that. I think it is a good idea. It will be useful. But I don't believe it is an enforceable standard that will encourage CBI countries to improve conditions for working people. That is what this is all about. I don't want anybody to misunderstand this amendment. This amendment is based upon a belief in the importance of international trade relations. It is based upon the importance of making sure we address the standard of living in CBI countries and the standard of living of working people in our country. But you can't do that unless you have enforceable labor standards. That is what this amendment calls for.

I reserve the remainder of my time. I will wait to hear what my colleagues have to say.

AMENDMENT NO. 2402

(Purpose: To clarify the acts, policies, and practices that are considered unreasonable for purposes of section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I filed on a timely basis an amendment numbered 2402. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment, and I ask for consideration of amendment No. 2402.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] proposes an amendment numbered 2402.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ UNREASONABLE ACTS, POLICIES, AND PRACTICES.

Section 301(d)(3)(B)(i) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2411(d)(3)(B)(i)) is amended by striking subclause (IV) and inserting the following:

"(IV) market opportunities, including the toleration by a foreign government of systematic anticompetitive activities, which include predatory pricing, discriminatory pricing, or pricing below cost of production by enterprises or among enterprises in the foreign country (including state trading enterprises and state corporations) if the acts, policies, or practices are inconsistent with commercial practices and have the effect of restricting access of United States goods or services to the foreign market or third country markets."

Mr. ROTH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask consent a vote occur on or in relation to the pending amendment No. 2487, of Senator WELLSTONE, and No. 2347, the Specter amendment, at 3:30, with 4 minutes prior to each vote for expla-

nation. I further ask consent it be in order for me to make a motion to table at this point on both amendments with one show of seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROTH. I move to table the above-described amendments, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, amendment No. 2402 deals with section 301 of the Trade Act. As a backdrop for this discussion, I wish to mention quickly several pieces of information.

First, we discuss the issue of trade with a backdrop of a trade deficit that is quite alarming. Almost everyone in this country now says a \$25 billion-a-month trade deficit is unsustainable. The merchandise deficit is worse than this. But this is the trade deficit of goods and services. The trade deficit is spiking up, up, up, way up—a very difficult circumstance for this country. We must do something to address it.

What does this deficit result from? This chart shows imports and exports. We can see exports are a flat line, with imports spiking dramatically.

The section 301 trade law remedy, which I intend to discuss briefly in a moment, describes something that relates to a trade dispute we have not only with Canada but others, a state-sanctioned monopoly selling Canadian wheat. This is what has happened with respect to the shipment of Canadian durum wheat into this country. It was almost nothing and then spikes up. It came down when this country enforced a tariff rate quota against Canada. This is unfair trade by a state-sanctioned monopoly with secret prices. It is unfair to our farmers who have flat prices. We produce more than we can use or consume domestically, and we have an avalanche of Canadian grain coming into our country traded unfairly by a state trading enterprise.

Is this problem receding or growing? The first 6 months of this year is nearly double the first 6 months of last year. Last year was a record high. This is just durum wheat, a small issue, but big in North Dakota and big for family farmers—just one issue.

What about a state trading enterprise or state monopoly that trades Canadian grain, or agricultural products to Australia, and decides they will have a trade relationship that doesn't play fair, for example, in Algeria? Assume that Canadians say: We will use our state trading enterprise and we intend to ship our grain to Algeria at 10 cents a bushel and take away the United States Algerian market. Is it fair trade? Is it actionable for the United States to file a 301 trade complaint? I think it ought to be. The law is unclear.

I propose with this amendment a simple process to clarify that section

301, a remedy in trade law, can be applied to predator pricing by state trading enterprises in third-country markets. Very simple. The law is completely unclear whether this now exists. I think it does; some people think it does not. In any event, I think it ought to.

If a state trading enterprise—for example in Canada, the Canadian wheat board—decides to push the United States out of a foreign market with predator pricing, is that not actionable by the United States? Of course, it should be. Our amendment clarifies that the actions, policies, and practices that are unreasonable and inequitable, that destroy market opportunities, are actionable under 301.

Anyone who is proud we have eliminated the fiscal policy deficit in our country—and I am among those—ought to be alarmed by this chart. Our budget policies have created a fiscal policy that is largely now in balance. We do not have growing, swollen Federal budget deficits, and that is a success; it belongs to everyone involved in public policy. However, this is a failure; this is a deficit that is running out of control.

The trade deficit is a very serious problem. We must remedy it. One way to remedy it is to be able to respond to unfair trading practices with remedies that work. This green book produced by the U.S. trade ambassador describes foreign trade barriers. In the bowels of this book rests the story about why our producers are unable to access foreign markets. It is a big, thick book, nearly 500 pages, country after country after country. One way to address these issues is to decide we are going to take action against those that discriminate against American producers with unfair trade practices.

A final point. I turn to Japan in this green book. Japan has agreed to gradually reduce tariffs on imports of beef, pork, fresh oranges, cheese, et cetera. Japan has a \$50 to \$60 billion trade surplus with us; we have a deficit with them, and it has gone on forever. Even after our negotiations on beef, if one buys a T-bone steak in Tokyo this afternoon, there is a 40.5-percent tariff on every single pound of beef that goes into Japan. It is unforgivable. This country cannot persuade our trade partners to trade fairly.

I ask we include in this piece of legislation something that strengthens section 301, that gives the United States a remedy to go after unfair trade practices. I hope the majority and minority will decide to accept this amendment and take it to conference. It is a small amendment. Nonetheless, I think it is very important to American producers—not just farmers but manufacturers, all producers.

I ask for some time to discuss this amendment with staff. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be set aside.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 2430

(Purpose: To limit preferential tariff treatment to countries with a gross national product that does not extend 5 times the average gross national product of all eligible sub-Saharan African countries)

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the pending amendment and call up amendment 2430.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU] proposes an amendment numbered 2430.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. —. LIMITATIONS ON PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not exercise the authority to extend preferential tariff treatment to any country in sub-Saharan Africa provided for in this Act, unless the President determines that the per capita gross national product of the country (calculated on the basis of the best available information including that of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) is not more than 5 times the average per capita gross national product of all sub-Saharan African countries eligible for such preferential tariff treatment under this Act.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Delaware that I am fully supportive of the efforts to provide opportunity for trade that will be mutually beneficial between the United States and Africa and the Caribbean. I have been to the floor now on more than one occasion talking about the merits of this bill. It is not perfect, but it is a good piece of legislation, and one I am convinced will be mutually beneficial to the nations included.

I believe my amendment will make this bill better and will clarify something which I think was the intention of this bill but may have been lost in the drafting.

This amendment simply says we will prohibit countries with a per capita GDP five times the average of all sub-Saharan African nations from participating in the Generalized System of Preferences portion of this legislation. Let me explain.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act, I believe, should live up to its billing; namely, this legislation should provide an opportunity for growth in Africa, not outside of Africa. As I stated last week, this bill is also an opportunity for businesses in my home State and for the whole country, but it is important we do not lose sight of this objective.

Faced with tight budgets, the United States will not make the same contributions to foreign aid as we have in the past. To replace this shortfall, we are relying on the great American

promise of opportunity. In this case, the opportunity is represented by access to the greatest market in the world—our market. In essence, this bill is an invitation for Africa and the Caribbean to offer their best to America, to compete in our marketplace and, in so doing, raise the standard of living on both sides of the relationship.

The success of this new relationship between Africa and America rides on the ability of poor African States to capitalize on greater market access. Until now, they have been unable to do so, but one of the promises of this bill is it will attract additional investment in the region. With the necessary infrastructure and capital, Africa may compete in international markets and establish the requisites for a robust manufacturing base. The question becomes: If new foreign investment comes to Africa, where will it be applied?

I believe it is the intent of my colleagues in the Senate, as well as in the House, to assist the countries generally known as sub-Saharan Africa. We want to turn around two decades of economic decline in places such as Kenya, Tanzania, Liberia, and Ghana. That is the point of this amendment.

If the United States is going to take this step, it is important we make certain the results assist the intended nations. We need to have confidence that the direct investment inspired by this legislation is directed to the countries that need it most.

I restate that this amendment I am offering will try to make a good bill even better by prohibiting the Generalized System of Preferences to countries with a per capita GDP five times the average of all the sub-Saharan nations. The average per capita GDP in Africa, for anyone's interest, is \$1,798. Thus, the cutoff of participation would be a per capita GDP of \$8,987. This per capita cutoff is more than \$2,500 more than South Africa, and also more than the per capita GDP in Russia, Brazil, Turkey, Hungary, and Poland. It is a reasonable cap.

Why is this important? This amendment does not seek to target any particular country, but it is important to know there is an island nation off the coast of Africa, Mauritius, that already has a GDP of \$10,300. Furthermore, this island is closer to Africa than any other continent, and it is hardly the kind of place I believe our colleagues or the American public would conceive as part of sub-Saharan Africa.

One might well wonder how this island of over 1 million people has been able to attain such economic success. The answer is a well-developed textile industry. Through investments, Mauritius has managed to create a mature apparel processing shipment and manufacturing hub right in the middle of the Indian Ocean. It is a very tiny island with over 1 million inhabitants, but it is well developed. Its GDP would make countries in Europe green with envy.

Mauritius can proudly boast of unemployment rates that would be welcomed in countries in Europe and is unheard of on the African Continent.

Unfortunately, I am afraid if nations similar to this are included in the African Growth and Opportunity Act, much of, if not all of, the opportunity will go to the country that is already successful and hardly needs our assistance and directed help.

If, after a hard-fought battle to bring this legislation to the floor, all we accomplish is to raise the standards of a small island where standards are already raised and already has a successful industry, I do not think we have done much, and we have truly toiled in vain.

Again, this amendment creates objective and dynamic criteria for who can and cannot participate. It does not attempt to single out any particular place. But I do use that as an example of something I do not think is our intention.

If we are successful, the average per capita GDP of Africa will increase as the continent moves forward. A more wealthy nation, such as the one I have described, may be eligible to participate later on. However, at this juncture, I believe we must remain focused on our objective. That is why I urge our manager, the Senator from Delaware, to take a look at this amendment. I hope it can be acceptable to both sides as we work to make this bill even better.

I do not think it was our intention to move investments to a place that is already developed, and it is not fair to our industry in the United States. Our intention is to increase and bolster the infrastructure investment in the continent of Africa itself, particularly countries that are known as sub-Saharan Africa.

So with this small amendment, we can correct and make that clear. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and thank them for their attention on this matter.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I oppose my colleague's amendment.

I do so because this amendment will undermine the very objectives this legislation is trying to further. In essence, this amendment says that if a country has managed to do well in that desperately poor and politically unstable region, its access to our market will be cut dramatically. I can't imagine a more damaging or more ironic signal to send.

Let me be a little more specific about my concerns. The purpose of this legislation is to use tariff preferences to spur investment in the sub-Saharan African countries. That investment will help create economic growth and create jobs in a region that has suffered so terribly for so long.

My colleague's amendment, however, would tell the Africans to watch out if

they start succeeding, because their access to our market will be taken. It is an ironic signal to send.

While the signal that it will send to the Africans is unfortunate, the signal it will send to investors is particularly damaging.

Let me explain. This legislation is designed to encourage increased investment in the sub-Saharan region. This amendment would undermine that objective by telling investors that they cannot count on the market access that this legislation provides over the long term. As an investor, nothing is more troubling than uncertainty. When investors cannot count on what the future will hold in terms of market access, then they will avoid the region.

Given the political and economic uncertainties that already exist in that region—and given the disincentives that this creates for investors—adding more uncertainty through this amendment would be particularly cruel.

This amendment also ignores the fact that trade among the African countries themselves is vital to their economic future and to the effectiveness of this legislation. The rules of origin in my legislation are specifically designed to encourage the Africans to enter into economic partnership amongst themselves.

Such partnering is particularly important among these nations because they each have different resources and capabilities. We should, therefore, encourage each of these countries to take advantage of their comparative advantage.

My colleague's amendment, however, would selectively exclude certain countries in that region. This, unfortunately, will undermine the process of economic integration and partnering among the African nations that is vital to sound economic development in that region.

This amendment seems to suggest that the economic growth of the sub-Saharan region must rely exclusively on trade with the United States. While we would all like to think that that is enough to spur growth and investment in that region, we all know that it is not.

For these reasons, I oppose this amendment.

Ms. LANDRIEU addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, could I ask unanimous consent to respond for a moment?

Mr. ROTH. I could not hear the Senator.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes to respond.

Mr. HARKIN. Please do.

Ms. LANDRIEU. The Senator from Delaware should know I am going to certainly support this bill. It is not my intention to offer an amendment that would in any way weaken this bill. But I also believe very strongly that we should not be presenting false hope or

providing loopholes or providing special treatment; that if our objective is clearly to develop Africa the continent of Africa and not islands off its shore, if it is to really develop sub-Saharan Africa, then we should shape a bill that will actually do this.

I say to the Senator, without this amendment, which clearly outlines that the per capita GDP I am suggesting is five times higher than any African nation currently—if we do not adopt this amendment, I could see clearly that the industries would just continue to go over to this one island off Africa, undercut some of the American industries, not result in investment in Africa, and give help to a particular place that does not need help. That does not make any sense to me.

So I offer this amendment in good faith. I have to say, respectfully, I do not understand the arguments against this amendment because, again, the per capita GDP in Africa is currently \$1,798, and the business community knows they would be free to continue to do work until the per capita income reached \$10,000, which is the cap. That would be many years down the line and would give them the stability they need but not allow us to be circumvented by an island that is not part of sub-Saharan Africa and I think could undercut our intentions.

I thank the Senators for extending me the time to respond. I look forward to a vote on this later today.

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 2487

Mr. ROTH. These comments I will now make are in connection with the Wellstone amendment No. 2487.

Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Wellstone amendment No. 2487. This amendment is very similar to one we tabled yesterday, and should be tabled today for similar reasons.

This amendment denies benefits until the U.S. Secretaries of Labor and State determine that the beneficiary country is enforcing internationally recognized human rights. In and of itself, this is unnecessary and duplicative. The managers substitute already contains criteria that the President must take into account in determining a beneficiary country's eligibility that includes the internationally agreed upon core labor standards.

I will address later in my statement the concern of the Senator from Minnesota as to the use of these criteria.

But this amendment goes further. It would force beneficiary countries to guarantee that the head of the national labor agency of that country, the U.S. Secretary of Labor, and an international union bureaucrat have access to all the private business information and records of all business enterprises in that country.

This undermines the sovereignty of these nations, and represents an intrusion on the privacy of their small businesses. The practical effect would be

that no country would ever allow an international union head to peek into the business dealings of all of their citizens. These countries simply would not choose to enjoy the trade benefits offered in this bill—and rightly so.

This amendment would also create an unprecedented private cause of action in U.S. courts if a U.S. citizen wants to seek compliance by those countries with the labor standards. This would invite unnecessary, wasteful litigation, and would create novel discovery activities by U.S. courts, to say the least.

To sum up, the provisions of this amendment would simply eviscerate the goals of this bill and is nothing more than protectionism by another name. The labor standards in the managers' substitute and the flexibility given to the President provide an appropriate means for regular dialog with the beneficiary countries on labor issues.

Let me be clear that the labor standards in the managers' substitute—and which are reflected in current law—are effective. As my colleague may know, CBI benefits are linked to a country's eligibility for the GSP program. If a country violates one of the requirements of the GSP program by, for example, failing to afford workers internationally recognized workers' rights, then that country will lose eligibility for both GSP and the CBI program.

The labor standards under the GSP program are not meaningless. In fact, 11 countries have been suspended from GSP benefits since 1985 for labor standard violations. Six countries are currently suspended. What this should tell us is that the system works, both under GSP and under my legislation for the CBI countries.

As evidence of the effectiveness of these criteria, I cite a June 1998 GAO report that concluded that the GSP and CBI programs have led to improvements of workers' rights in the beneficiary countries.

This is not the only evidence, however. In fact, the best way to tell whether the management's amendment presents an effective approach to the protection of labor standards is by asking those most affected: namely, the workers. I have with me a list of the labor unions in the Caribbean and Central America who endorse my approach on this issue. These leaders understand that the manager's amendment provides an effective way to protect workers, while at the same time spurring investment and economic growth that creates jobs.

I ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CBI UNIONS THAT SUPPORT CBI TRADE
ENHANCEMENT
EL SALVADOR

Ricardo Antonio Soriano, Secretary General of FESINCONSTRANS, Federación de Sindicatos de la Industria de la Construcción Similares Transportes y, Otras Actividades.

Anibal Somoza Peñate, Secretary General of CGS, Confederación General de Sindicatos.

Israel Huiza, Secretary General of FESINTRABS, Federación de Sindicatos de Trabajadores de Alimentos, Bebidas y Similares.

Miguel Ramírez, Secretary General of FESTRAES, Federación Sindical de Trabajadores de El Salvador.

Miguel Angel Lantan, President of FUNEPRODES, Fundación para la Educación Progreso y Desarrollo del Obrero Salvadoreño.

Salvador Carazo, Secretary General of OSILS, Organización de Sindicatos Independientes, Libres Salvadoreños.

Jesús Amado Pérez Marroquin, Secretary General de FLATICOM, Federación Laboral de Sindicatos, Independientes de Transporte, Comercio y Maquila.

Juan José Huez, FENASTRAS, Federación Nacional Sindical de Trabajadores Salvadoreños.

Juan Edito Juárez, FUSS, Federación Unitaria Sindical de El Salvador.

HAITI

Fignole St. Cyr, Secretary General, Centrale Autonome des Travailleurs, Haitiens (CATH).

Marc Antoine Destin, Secretary General, Confédération des Taravailleurs Haitiens (CTH).

Jacques Pierre, President, Konfederasyon Ouvriye Travayé Ayisyen (KOTA).

Patrick Numas, Secretary General, Organisation Général Indépendante des Tavailleurs Haitiens (OGITH).

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mariano Negrontejada, Secretary General, Confederación Nacional de Trabajadores Dominicanos (CNTD).

Jacobo Ramos, Secretary General, Federación Unitaria de Trabajadores de Zonas Francas (FENATRAZONAS).

HONDURAS

Israel Salina, Secretary General, Confederación Unitaria de Trabajadores de Honduras (CUTH).

Felicitto Avila Ordoñez, President, Central General de Trabajadores (CMT).

Felicitto Avila Ordoñez, President, Central de Trabajadores.

JAMAICA

Lloyd Goodleigh, General Secretary, Jamaica Confederation of Trade Unions.

Mr. ROTH. For these reasons, I oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, in the discussion of this trade bill, we hear a lot of talk about the different things involved in trade and how we want to lift countries up; that the essence of this trade bill before us is to open up the avenues and the corridors of free trade so people living in Third World countries, in Africa specifically, can begin to enjoy some of the benefits of increased production, increased distribution of goods and services, and an increased standard of living. That is what the proponents of the trade bill are arguing.

I am not here to argue against that. I believe free trade, if it is practiced as free trade, it can have genuine beneficial effects on all parties involved. There are anomalies, however, in the trade structure that keep the benefits of open and free trade from being genu-

inely and broadly distributed among people in Third World countries. There are a lot of these, but I believe the single most important feature, institution or practice of Third World countries that inhibits their economic growth, inhibits their social growth, even if they are allowed into a free trade structure, is the use and practice of abusive child labor.

Child labor is the last vestige of slavery on the face of the Earth. It is widespread. It is condoned—if not openly, at least passively—by many of the major industrial nations of the world. I think it is time we get rid of this last vestige of slavery: child labor.

I have an amendment that is very simple and straightforward. It builds on the international consensus that emerged from the ILO conference in Geneva this summer in which the delegates unanimously adopted a convention to eliminate the worst forms of child labor. The amendment simply states that in order to be eligible for the trade benefits in this bill, a country must meet and effectively enforce the standards regarding child labor, as established by the ILO convention 182 for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor. It is just that simple. In other words, if a country wants the benefits of this trade bill, they must meet and effectively enforce the standards of the recently adopted ILO convention 182.

This convention defines the worst forms of child labor as: all forms of slavery, debt bondage, forced or compulsory labor, or the sale and trafficking of children, including forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict; child prostitution, children producing and trafficking narcotic drugs; or any other work which by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, the safety, and the morals of children. These are the provisions of ILO convention 182.

As I stated earlier, for the first time in history, this last June, the world spoke with one voice in opposition to abusive and exploitative child labor. Countries from across the political, economic, and religious spectrum—from Jewish to Moslem, from Buddhist to Christians—came together to proclaim unequivocally that "abusive and exploitative child labor is a practice which will not be tolerated and must be abolished."

So gone is the argument that abusive and exploitative child labor is an acceptable practice because of a country's economic circumstances. Gone is the argument that abusive and exploitative child labor is acceptable because of cultural traditions. And gone is the argument that abusive and exploitative child labor is a necessary evil on the road to economic development. When this convention was approved, the United States and the international community as a whole laid these arguments to rest and laid the groundwork

to begin the process of ending the scourge of abusive and exploitative child labor.

Additionally, for the first time in its history, the U.S. tripartite group to the ILO—consisting of representatives from government, business, and labor—unanimously agreed on the final version of the ILO convention 182.

I believe strongly that the time has come to say to countries: If you want the trade benefits outlined in this bill, you must, at a minimum, enforce international standards on abusive and exploitative child labor. That is at a minimum.

So let me be clear about what is meant by abusive and exploitative child labor. This is not about kids working on the family farm. It is not about kids who work after school. There is nothing wrong with that. I worked in my youth when I was in school. Probably most of us in the Chamber today worked when we were young and in school. There is nothing wrong with that, and that is not what we are talking about. The convention that the ILO adopted in June deals with children who are chained to looms, who handle dangerous chemicals, who ingest metal dust from working around machinery, children who are forced to sell illegal drugs, forced into prostitution, forced into armed conflict, forced to work in factories where furnace temperatures exceed 1,500 degrees.

Let me refer to this chart again and repeat, for the sake of emphasis, what the convention does. It abolishes the harshest forms of child labor, including child slavery, child bondage, child prostitution, use of children in pornography, trafficking in children, the forced recruitment of children for armed conflict, the recruitment of children in the production or sale of narcotics, and hazardous work by children. Those are the abusive and exploitative forms of child labor that are covered.

According to the ILO, in Latin America and the Caribbean there are an estimated 17 million children working. In Africa—and we are on the Africa trade bill—80 million children are working. In Asia, about 153 million children are working. There are about half a million in Oceania, in the islands of the southwest Pacific. This totals about 250 million children world wide that are working full time.

They are forced to work with no protective equipment under hazardous and slave-like conditions. They endure long hours for little or no compensation. They simply work only for the economic gain of others. They are denied an education and denied the opportunity to grow and develop.

I paint this in sharp contrast to afterschool jobs that kids have so they can have some more spending money to buy the latest CD. These kids are not buying CDs. They are not even in school. They are kept out of school and are forced to work.

Again, I know firsthand what this is about. I have some charts here, some

pictures. Last year, my legislative assistant, Rosemary Gutierrez, and I traveled to several countries in South Asia to investigate child labor. This happens to be a picture that was taken outside of a compound in Katmandu, Nepal. This was on a Sunday evening, shortly after dark, maybe about 7 or 7:30 in the evening. I had heard repeated stories about children who were working, making carpets, children as young as 5 to 7 years of age. But I also knew from others I had talked to that if you asked to visit one of these plants, by the time you got there, they had the kids out the back door. So nobody could ever see them.

Well, it turned out that, through mutual acquaintances, we located a young man—I don't know how old he is now, maybe 21 or 22 years old—who had been a former child laborer in one of these plants. He knew of a plant where he knew the guard at the gate on this Sunday evening in question. So what we did is, we got in an unmarked car and we drove to the outskirts of Katmandu and went up to this compound. Later, we found out we were mistaken and the owner was in fact there. So we went up to the gate, four or five of us, with this young Nepalese man. He got us in the gate.

This was the picture I took outside the gate. There is a sign posted very prominently in Nepalese and in English. As you can see, it says, "Child labour under the age of 14 is strictly prohibited." They have these signs all over. So I took a picture of it.

We went to the gate of this compound. We walked down a fairly narrow alleyway. There were low-lying buildings on our left and right. We went down a few hundred yards and turned to our left to this carpet factory. We went into the carpet factory. Mind you, this is on a Sunday evening, and it is about 7:30. Here is what we found. I can tell you this is what we found because I took the picture. There were dozens and dozens of kids working in this building, with a lot of dust around; carpets put off a lot of dust when they make them. I took this picture of these two kids. I had the young man who spoke Nepalese there, and we were able to talk to them a little.

As best I could figure out, he was about 7 and she was about 8. This was at 7:30 in the evening. You can't see because the flashbulb wasn't strong enough, but there are dozens of children sitting in rows up and down the aisles working.

Here is a better picture, and I am in it. My staff assistant took this picture. These kids are 8, 9, 10, 11 years old, all the way back here, on both sides, up and down, working at 7:30 at night. These are kids who work probably 12 to 14 hours a day, 6 to 7 days a week. When they are not working, they are taken out of here to those low-lying buildings where they sleep and eat; that is where they live. They are not allowed to go out. They are not allowed to go out on the streets. They are not

allowed to get an education, go to school. They go from their little Quonset hut, where they stay like stacks of cord wood. Then they are herded in here, work 12 to 14 hours a day, and they are herded back into the building. They are 7, 8, 9 years of age.

I said: What happens when they get to be 12, 13, or 14? I didn't see any children there that old there. Well, sometimes the boys go into different kinds of work, and the girls are sold into prostitution. You don't have to take my word for that; you can talk with anybody in the U.N., the ILO, and talk about the trafficking of young girls from Nepal to India, some as far away as Saudi Arabia.

I met with some young girls who had been sold into prostitution. There is an organization in Nepal of women trying to repatriate these young women, get them back to their country and their villages. Some were sent as far away as Saudi Arabia. Trafficking in prostitution—that is what we are talking about in this amendment. We are not talking about kids working after school. We are talking about these kids. Should a country that permits this and condones this and doesn't take active steps to stop it—should they, I ask you, get the benefits of this trade bill?

Here is another kid. I did not take this picture. This is not my picture. I admit that. But there is a young boy in the Sialkot region of Pakistan. He is 8 years old. His name is Mohammad Ashraf Irfan. You may not be able to see it from there, but he is making surgical equipment. These are scissors used in surgery that are shipped to this country. Think about that. Think about that the next time you go into the doctor's office. It is clean, it is sterile, you have a wound, and they are going to sew you up or they are going to make you well again. You see those little scissors come out, or the little knife, and the things they use. Think about Ashraf here who is 8 years old. Look at him. The next time you go into a doctor's office, think about Ashraf and think about hundreds of thousands like him sitting there day after day. He has no protective goggles, no protective equipment on his hands, and he is making surgical equipment to be used in the finest of doctor's offices and hospitals in Europe and America. That is what we are talking about in this amendment.

I believe our goal must be to encourage and to persuade other countries to build on the prosperity that comes with trade and to lift their standards up. Exploited child labor in other countries not only penalize Ashraf to a lifetime of illiteracy, low wages, bad health, and not only does it condemn him to that, and hurt his life, but the fact they exploit him means that it unfairly puts workers in our country and other countries at a disadvantage.

You can't compete with slavery. This is slavery. You can dress it up and call it what you want. But this is about the nearest thing you can get to slavery.

Yet, unfortunately, the legislation before us does not address this issue. It simply relies on the criteria of the Generalized System of Preferences, or GSP, to extend countries trade benefits.

Is that adequate to what we know is going on in the world?

This criteria in GSP has been on the books since 1984—15 years. And child labor today is worse than it was 15 years ago.

Let me explain that the USTR, our own Trade Representative office, in its implementation and enforcement of GSP, has, I believe, abused the language in the statute that calls for taking steps to afford respect for workers' rights, including child labor. They have interpreted that any gesture made by a country will satisfy the requirements of GSP.

There is a list of five internationally recognized workers' rights provisions in GSP. Here they are: One, the right of association; two, the right to organize and bargain collectively; three, a prohibition on the use of any form of forced or compulsory labor; four, a minimum age for employment of children; five, acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health.

If a country takes steps—we don't say how big a step—if a country takes one teeny, little bit of a step in any one of those areas, they are allowed GSP benefits. They may have the most abusive forms of child labor, but if they have taken steps—for example, to have the right of free association—there you go. They have satisfied the requirements. Quite frankly, these countries should be taking steps in all five areas and enforcing the laws they have on the books.

The fact is, there are laws in Nepal against the use of child labor in these looms. There are laws in Pakistan against what Ashraf Irfan is doing. They all have laws on the books. They are just not enforcing them. Many of these countries have been able to provide cosmetic and unenforceable actions. Then they are recognized as having taken steps, and they are off the hook. In fact, the principal sponsor of the GSP criteria, an individual I served with in the House of Representatives, Representative Don Pease, wanted to set a high standard to ensure that countries not only have laws on their books with regard to these rights and minimum age requirements but that they were also being enforced. When it got to conference, it was watered down. We have that today. If they meet just one of those criteria, that is all they have to do.

Fifteen years later after GSP, we now have a universal standard adopted this June by the ILO in Geneva. The ILO convention 182 is a well-defined, internationally accepted standard that I believe should be the criteria in granting any country U.S. trade benefits. ILO convention 182 that will hold

everyone to one real and enforceable standard that was unanimously agreed to in Geneva this past June.

Again, as I have said before, I believe in free trade. I voted for the North American Free Trade Agreement. But I also believe in a level playing field. I also believe you should use trade to try to lift countries up—not lift countries up on the backs of children but to lift those countries up alongside of us.

U.S. workers can't compete with slaves. U.S. workers can't compete with 8-year-old kids working 12 and 14 hours a day who are paid almost nothing. You can dress it up any way you want. You can use whatever fancy words and language you want. That is slavery. These kids don't have a choice. They are forced to work in unbearable conditions. They don't have a choice. They do not have any freedom and liberty. Is that not the definition of slavery? Children are exploited for the economic gain of others. The child loses, the family loses, this country loses, and we in the world lose, too.

Every child lost to the workplace in this manner is a child who will not receive an education, learn a valuable skill, and help this country develop economically, or become a more active participant in the global market. When just one child is exploited in this manner, every one of us is diminished.

Recently, I came across a startling statistic. According to the UNICEF report entitled "The State of the World's Children 1999," nearly 1 billion people will enter the 21st century—the new millennium—1 billion people will enter unable to read a book, or unable to sign their name because they are illiterate. This is a formula for instability, violence, and conflict down the road.

Nearly one-sixth of all humanity—think about it; three and a half times the population of the United States—next year won't even be able to read a book or sign their name.

This is the reason: Because they were denied an education when they were young. They were forced to work in front of rug looms, or making surgical equipment, glassware, and metals in mines and places such as that.

I believe it is shocking. I believe children making pennies a day spells disaster and conflict down the road. In cold, hard, economic terms, children making pennies a day will never buy a computer, they will never buy the software to run it, they will never purchase the latest music CD or a VCR to play American-made movies.

By allowing abusive and exploitative child labor to continue, we not only doom the child to a future of poverty and destitution, we doom future markets for American goods and services.

Why in our trade bill do we not just look one foot in front of our nose? We think about next year or the year after. Why not think about 10, 15, or 20 years from now, when 8-year-old Ashraf Irfan is in his twenties and thirties? What will he be buying? Will he buy a computer? Will he buy software and log

on to the Internet? Will he buy clothes? No; he will be functionally illiterate. He will go to a store and watch television and see how the rest of the world lives and say, Why do I live like this?

It is ripe for revolutions, wars, insurrections, and instability all over the world.

Some say child labor shouldn't be dealt with in trade measures. I think this is wrongheaded thinking and closed minded. I believe we should be addressing child labor issues on trade measures. After all, we are ultimately talking about our trade policy. Not too long ago, agreements on intellectual property rights were not considered measures to be addressed by trade agreements. In the beginning, only tariffs and quotas were addressed by GATT because they were the most visible trade-distorting practices.

As time went on and as we began to develop more and more intellectual property in this country, we said we ought to include intellectual property rights and services, too. Now they have become an integral part of our trade agreements. The trade bill two years ago had several pages on intellectual property rights and one small, ineffectual paragraph on child labor. Now the WTO will consider rules dealing with foreign direct investment. That is another new step. A part of our trade agreements will now involve foreign direct investment and competition policy.

When I looked at the trade bill two years ago and saw all the pages dealing with intellectual property rights and I saw the little, ineffectual paragraph that actually turned the clock back on child labor, I thought to myself, if we can protect a song, can't we protect a kid? Think about it. We are going to protect someone's song so it can't be stolen, used, recorded, or sung by anybody else in the world—we can protect that; but we can't protect this kid? Tell me that child labor is not an apt policy for trade policy and trade bills. I believe it is time we do this. We as a nation cannot ignore what is happening.

In 1993, this Senate put itself on record in opposition to the exploitation of children for economic gain by passing a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that I submitted. That was in 1993. It was a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. Nonetheless, it passed. In 1994, I requested the Department of Labor to begin a series of reports on child labor. These reports now consist of five volumes representing the most comprehensive documentation ever assembled by the Government on this issue. Earlier this year, President Clinton issued an Executive order prohibiting the U.S. Government from procuring items made by forced or indentured child labor. We are making progress.

Some may say we have not even ratified convention 182 ourselves, so how do we expect others to abide by that? The chairman of the committee, Senator HELMS, had a hearing about 2

weeks ago on this. I thought it was a great hearing. I am pleased to report to my colleagues, just today the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported out the new ILO convention. I am hopeful we will have it on the floor to get a unanimous vote and to ratify that before we leave this year. I have every reason to believe we will before we leave this year.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. REID. We are going to have a couple of votes at 3:30. There is no time agreement. The Senator may speak as long he desires. Both managers of the bill are in a position to accept the amendment of the Senator or, if the Senator desires a recorded vote, we can have that, too. They are willing to accept this amendment. There is an order in effect that there will be two votes at 3:30.

Mr. HARKIN. I will abruptly finish my remarks.

Mr. REID. And then make a decision.

Mr. HARKIN. Normally, I would say fine to accept it, but since the Foreign Relations Committee passed it out this morning and I believe we will have it before the Senate before the end of the year, I think it is important for the Senate to express itself on this issue on the forms of abusive and exploitative child labor. It is important we do that. We have taken so many steps and come so far, we ought to do that. I am hopeful my colleagues will support this.

My amendment is cosponsored by Senator HELMS, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Mr. WELLSTONE from Minnesota. There is a pretty broad philosophical spectrum encompassed on this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent the pending amendment be temporarily set aside, and I ask to call up my amendment No. 2495.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, what was the unanimous consent request?

Mr. HARKIN. To set aside the amendment and call up my amendment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are trying to work out a time sequence. The Landrieu amendment is now pending. It is my understanding that we have two votes set and Landrieu makes three votes; is the Senator willing to make his the fourth vote in that stack?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes; I have no problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to setting aside the pending amendment?

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has the floor and has stated a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent the pending amendment be temporarily set aside, and I ask that my amendment No. 2495 be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I say to my friend, he has no prob-

lem, if his amendment is called up, having his the fourth after these other three?

Mr. HARKIN. No. I don't have any problem with that, no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROTH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware objects. Objection is heard. The Senator from Iowa continues to have the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I thought I had just agreed to have the amendment voted on.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. I will yield for a question to my colleague from Nevada. We are trying to work out an arrangement.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, and the manager of the bill, this is my understanding of what the managers want to occur. We already have two amendments pending and there are motions to table those two amendments. The Landrieu amendment is going to come on as the third matter. They also want to move to table that. That can only be done while the amendment is pending. So that amendment is pending now.

I suggest there be a tabling motion made and then the Senator will offer his amendment, and his amendment be voted up or down.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, let me see if I can revise my unanimous consent.

I ask unanimous consent after the Landrieu amendment is disposed of, in whatever form that disposal may take, that I be recognized to call up my amendment, amendment No. 2495, and to have the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator is advised he cannot obtain the yeas and nays by unanimous consent. That part of his consent cannot be granted.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First, we will have the unanimous consent request. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask consent a vote occur on or in relation to the pending amendment—the Landrieu amendment to H.R. 434 in the voting sequence occurring at 3:30 p.m. today, with all the parameters provided for the first two amendments in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the Landrieu amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2505

(Purpose: To authorize the extension of permanent normal trade relations to Albania and Kyrgyzstan, and for other purposes)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I send to the desk the managers' amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] proposes an amendment numbered 2505.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, President Clinton recently emphasized that while expanding trade, we also need to have basic labor standards so that people who work receive the dignity and reward of their work. The President said the WTO should create a working group in Seattle on trade and labor and asked, "How we can deny the legitimacy or the linking of these issues, trade and labor, in a global economy?"

How, indeed? The rhetoric sounds right—that we should link the granting of trade benefits to whether countries are abiding by internationally recognized standards on such things as child labor, collective bargaining, use of forced or coerced labor, occupational health and safety and other worker rights. This should be especially the case when these countries have freely undertaken such obligations in treaties or conventions. This is a laudable objective and one that the Administration is now promoting. But how do we implement this objective?

We have our first test case under consideration before the Senate today. We should begin to promote standards on such things as child labor, collective bargaining, use of forced or coerced labor, occupational health and safety and other worker rights as part of our trade relationships by considering progress on those goals when unilaterally granting a trade benefit. In considering whether to grant a country a unilateral trade benefit, the President surely ought to consider the extent to which that country has undertaken its own existing obligations, obligations under treaties and conventions it has freely entered into relative to child labor, collective bargaining, the use of forced or coerced labor, occupational health and safety and other worker rights. Unfortunately, in the bill under consideration today, the President is not required to even consider this factor.

Mr. President, the trade bill we are considering contains two provisions that would provide trade benefits to certain countries unilaterally without asking that reciprocal action be taken.

This bill is flawed and it doesn't live up to our repeatedly stated beliefs. It contains no required consideration of

the extent to which a beneficiary country has undertaken to live up to its own commitments to internationally recognized standards on such things as child labor, collective bargaining, use of forced or coerced labor, occupational health and safety and other worker rights, before the country may receive the trade benefit conferred in the bill. I believe the extent to which a country demonstrates a willingness to abide by its own commitments freely undertaken, be it to labor standards, or anything else, should be an element that is at least considered when determining a country's eligibility to receive special benefits.

As the bill is currently written, before granting the trade benefits, the President must make certain determinations, such as determining if the country has demonstrated a commitment to undertake WTO obligations and to take steps to join the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas (FTAA). Only as a secondary consideration, the President may consider, when determining if the country has demonstrated a commitment to the WTO and FTAA, additional criteria, including the extent to which the country provides internationally recognized worker rights.

This is not strong enough because it is a discretionary standard that the President is not required to even consider and it is also only a secondary consideration that can be taken into account when making a determination as to whether a country has demonstrated a commitment to pursue certain other ends. It is not an end in itself.

It seems to me that the type of trade benefit we are considering today, a one-way-granting by the United States of duty free treatment, is a logical place to include a consideration of whether a country is attempting to live up to its own obligations it has freely undertaken with regard to standards on such things as child labor, collective bargaining, use of forced or coerced labor, occupational health and safety and other worker rights.

The President has said he wants to start to link trade and labor standards and will take steps to try to achieve this in the next round of WTO negotiations starting in Seattle. We should start here at home by requiring that the extent to which a beneficiary country has demonstrated a commitment to abide by obligations it has already undertaken in treaties and conventions it has freely entered into relative to child labor, collective bargaining, use of forced or coerced labor, occupational health and safety and other worker rights. If we can't even include such a consideration in today's legislation, how do we expect to succeed in including such provisions in a multilateral negotiation of over 130 member nations?

Mr. President, I am offering an amendment which would require consideration of internationally recog-

nized labor standards when determining if a CBI country may benefit from unilateral trade preferences. My amendment would require the President, when designating a CBTEA beneficiary country, to consider the extent to which the country provides internationally recognized worker rights, such as the right of association, the right to organize and bargain collectively; prohibition on the use of any form of coerced or compulsory labor and a minimum age for the employment of children.

Most CBI countries are signatories of the International Labor Organization conventions. Considering the extent to which these countries abide by their own international obligations is the least we can do when considering whether they deserve to receive unilateral trade preferences from us.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I rise today to thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. ROTH, for including in the manager's package an amendment by Mr. SARBANES and myself expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the issue of debt relief for poor countries. Our resolution simply expresses the desire of this body to work with the President and the international community to forgive the debt owed to us by the world's poorest countries in exchange for commitments from these countries to reform their economies and work toward a better quality of life for their people. This follows on legislation we introduced earlier this month to accomplish this important objective.

Our effort today is premised on the notion that we must help these poverty-stricken nations break the vicious cycle of debt and give them the economic opportunity to liberate their futures. This issue has united people of diverse interests and backgrounds from all around the world. There is a growing sense across the cultural and political spectrum that debt burdens are a major impediment to economic reform and the alleviation of the abject poverty facing the world's poorest countries. And there is increasing certainty that debt forgiveness—if done right—can be a positive force for change in the developing world. Our resolution makes clear that the objectives of debt relief should be the promotion of policies that promote economic growth, openness to trade and investment, and the development of free markets. I am glad the full Senate is joining us in this endeavor.

Today, Mr. President, the world's poorest countries owe an average of \$400 for every man, woman, and child within their borders. This is much more than most people in these countries make in a year—in fact more than one billion people on Earth today live on less than a dollar a day. Debt service payments in many cases consume a majority of a poor country's annual budget, leaving scarce domestic resources for economic restructuring or such vital human services as edu-

cation, clean water and sanitary living conditions. In Tanzania, for example, debt payments would require nearly four-fifths of the government's budget. In a country where one child in six dies before the age of five, little money remains to finance initiatives that would improve the country's economic prospects, its openness to trade and investment, or the standard of living of its people. Among sub-Saharan African countries—many of the very countries we're looking to help in the trade package before us today—one in five adults can't read or write.

Mr. President, the problems in the developing countries that yield such grim statistics will never be solved without a monumental commitment of will from their leaders, their citizens, and the outside world. We cannot solve all these problems today. Rather, we are simply affirming to the world that the small step of debt relief is one that can and should be taken without delay.

The effort to forgive the debts of the world's poorest countries has been ongoing for more than a decade. During this time the international community and the G7 came to the realization that the world's poorest countries are simply unable to repay the debt they owe to foreign creditors. What's more, the payments that are being made are hampering progress toward more free, open, and economically vibrant economies. The external debt for many developing nations is more than twice their gross domestic product, leaving many unable to even make interest payments. We must accept the fact that this debt is unpayable. The question is not whether we'll ever get paid back, but rather what we can encourage these heavily indebted countries to do for themselves in exchange for our forgiveness.

In Uganda, for example, debt relief obtained under the existing debt forgiveness programs has cleared the way for a doubling of classroom size, allowing twice as many children to attend school as before. This type of benefit is real. It is tangible. And it will bring untold benefits to the country in future years. We must do more to encourage these types of programs and debt relief is one vehicle that can help effect real change in the developing world.

Prudent debt relief is in all of our best interests. It is an investment in the commitment of the world's poorest countries to implement sound economic reforms and help their people live longer, healthier and more prosperous lives.

Our amendment today is another step toward this goal and I thank my colleagues for their support.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to address the Trade Adjustment Assistance program.

Let me begin by stating—as others have on this issue—that I believe strongly in the concept of free and fair trade, and I have always supported legislation that opens foreign markets, assures that trade agreements are enforceable, and provides the opportunity

for competitive U.S. firms to do business overseas. I support legislation of this type because I feel that in the long run it increases the economic welfare of our nation and leads to substantial and measureable benefits for Americans. Exports now generate over one-third of all economic growth in the United States. Export jobs pay ten to fifteen percent more than the average wage. Depending upon who you listen to, it has generated anywhere from two to eleven million jobs over the last ten years. Without expanded trade brought on as a result of globalization, we will end up fighting over an ever-decreasing domestic economic pie. Trade is inevitable, it is the terms of trade that we debate.

And this debate is important, because while many Americans are enjoying unprecedented opportunities as a result of the process of globalization, others are not so fortunate. Clearly, free trade has negative attributes, and the United States has not been immune to them. In my state alone over the last two years we have seen several thousand people laid off in trade-related plant closures—from high-tech to apparel to copper. Many more New Mexicans have been forced to find other work because they can no longer compete on an international basis. The vast majority of these people live in rural communities where there really isn't anything else for them to do in terms of employment. When I talk to these people, they ask me: Where am I supposed to work now? Where do I find a job with a salary that allows me to support a family, own a house, put food on the table, and live a decent life? Where are the benefits of free trade for me now that my company has gone overseas? What good are cheaper products when I no longer have a salary to pay for them?

These are tough questions, especially from someone who is trying to pay a mortgage, or get their children an education, or buy food for the table, and they deserve an answer. In my opinion, the answer does not lie in protectionism, as many would suggest, because it is no longer a legitimate option. It is impossible to go back in time and trade only within our own borders. Instead the answer lies in the development of programs that provide people with the skills to be gainfully employed and provide companies with the tools so they can become internationally competitive. It is through workforce development and technological innovation. Globalization is inevitable. It is not going to stop. Therefore, the question for us in this Chamber is: How we can manage it to benefit the national interest of the United States? How can we make it work for our people? How can we establish an environment where high-wage jobs can be obtained and communities sustained?

The Trade Adjustment Assistance program is supposed to do just that. As my good friend and colleague Senator MOYNIHAN has pointed out on the floor

many times, this program and its component parts are part of a very reasonable agreement with American workers and companies: If Americans lose their jobs as a result of trade agreements entered into by the U.S. Government, then the U.S. government should assist these Americans in finding new employment with equivalent or better wages. If the U.S. government supports an open trading system, it is responsible to repair the negative impacts this policy has on its citizens. If you lose a job because of U.S. trade policy, you should have some help from the U.S. Government in getting unemployment benefits and retraining to get a new job that pays you as much or more as you were getting before.

And, since its inception, the Trade Adjustment Assistance program has attempted to do just that. It has over the years consistently helped individuals and companies in communities across the United States deal with the transitions that are an inevitable part of a changing international economic system. It helps people that can work and want to work to continue to work in productive jobs that contribute to the economic welfare of our country.

But, as good as the Trade Adjustment Assistance program is, it is not without flaws, and these flaws frequently make the program difficult to use for those that need it most. Even worse, in some cases, it is simply unavailable for those who need it most.

What are some concrete examples of these problems? In my state of New Mexico, we have over the last few years seen a serious lack of coordination between the federal and state agencies responsible for the provision of unemployment benefits and retraining, and we have seen a near complete incompatibility of application procedures. This lack of harmonization has made potential recipients run in circles to find information and advice that would help them find viable work.

We have passed legislation that provides benefits to some individuals that are not available to others. For instance, the NAFTA Trade Adjustment Assistance program provides unemployment benefits and retraining for those who have been negatively impacted by trade or shifts in production overseas, but the Trade Adjustment Assistance program only provides retraining in the case of former, not the latter. Furthermore, secondary workers—individuals who with their company provide direct inputs into primary manufacturing facilities—are not eligible for any support at all, this in spite of the fact that they too may lose their jobs when a primary facility is forced to close. How do you explain these programmatic differences to workers who need help, and need it now?

Another problem: Trade Adjustment Assistance provides assistance to workers in specific communities, but it does not provide assistance to those communities that have been significantly im-

pacted by trade or shifts in production overseas. No evaluation of community needs, no strategic plan for economic development, no technical assistance to help a community recover from what has happened. Thus, while we provide federal funds so workers can retrain to find employment, in many cases there is no simply gainful employment to be had in the community. There is no work to retrain for that pays a living wage. In other words, there is no linkage between retraining programs and community workforce needs. Individuals thus have a choice: stay in town on unemployment until it runs out, take a lesser paying job that disallows them from providing for themselves and their family, or relocate to a region that has employment to offer. In either case, the community loses. And this is happening with disturbing frequency not only in New Mexico, but in rural communities across the United States. Ask any of my colleagues, and they will tell you they have heard the same story.

I would argue that in some very specific cases foreign trade or the transfer of production overseas has had a such an impact on a community that it is analogous to a natural disaster. The impact on the community is so severe, pervasive, and painful that it is equivalent to a flood, tornado, or earthquake. In many cases, not just individuals, but an entire community has become dislocated, and is not prepared as a political or economic entity to take the steps needed to recover. Not only the individuals, but the community, needs help to get back on its feet.

So what must be done in these circumstances? In this country we have organized a unique approach to first anticipate, and then respond to, natural disasters—the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or FEMA—and it is designed to integrate the federal/state/local activities to obtain optimal recovery. Why not have this kind of coordinated program for trade? We organize this kind of response through the Department of Defense and the Office of Economic Adjustment when a military base closes in a community. Why not have such a program for communities affected by trade? I am not talking about giving funds to those in need in perpetuity. I am talking about establishing a coherent strategic plan with an entry and exit policy that helps individuals and communities develop a workforce plan, create good jobs for their citizens, and become viable economic competitors in the international marketplace.

The time is ripe to examine these issues, and in my view it is time to think outside the box. There are too many inconsistencies in existing unemployment and re-training benefit programs—Trade Adjustment Assistance, NAFTA Trade Adjustment Assistance, the Job Training Partnership Act, the Workforce Investment Act, and unemployment insurance—and they must be examined so we can make them efficient and effective mechanisms for our

workers. In my view, these problems are not necessarily the fault of the Department of Labor, which administers many of the programs I refer to today. The problems are indicative of an ad hoc approach to policy formation over the years, and it is time to align these programs so they will have the maximum benefit effect for those who need them. Trade Adjustment Assistance is an excellent idea and it has served us well, but it is time that it be refined to better fit the needs of an increasingly interdependent international political economy.

To this end, I offer a very straightforward amendment today, and an action that I see as a first, but very important, step to more comprehensive Trade Adjustment Assistance reform. The immediate goal of the amendment is to obtain the information necessary to make informed decisions on how to proceed in future legislation. My amendment asks that the General Accounting Office study this issue, and, within nine months, offer Congress specific data and recommendations concerning the efficiency and effectiveness of federal inter-agency and federal and state coordination of unemployment and retraining activities associated with the following programs: the Trade Adjustment Assistance program, the NAFTA Trade Adjustment Assistance program, the Job Training Partnership Act, the Workforce Investment Act, and the Unemployment Insurance Program. The report will examine the activities since the enactment of the NAFTA agreement on January 1, 1994, and will include analysis of many of the issues I mentioned previously: the compatibility of program requirements and application procedures related to the unemployment and retraining of dislocated workers in the United States, the capacity of these programs to assist primary and secondary workers negatively impacted by foreign trade and the transfer of production to other countries, and the effectiveness of the aforementioned programs relative to the re-employment of United States workers dislocated by foreign trade and the transfer of production to other countries. This is an unambiguous and uncomplicated amendment, and it will help us chart a course for the future.

Trade Adjustment Assistance is a necessary part of our national trade policy toolbox, and I believe it has done an admirable job over the years. But we all know it will become even more important as our country becomes more integrated into the global economy. For this reason, it is time that it be made more effective, and that its goals be better defined. I believe this amendment will assist us in this effort, and I hope that my colleagues will support the passage of this bill when it comes to a vote.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to present legislative background and history on a provision contained in the Manager's Amendment to the Afri-

can Growth and Opportunity Act adopted this evening by consent. Constituents in my state in the wool fabric industry have been concerned about any revision to tariff reduction and phase-out schedules that would unfairly alter their competitive posture and force layoffs of Connecticut employees.

The final language in the provision states that, "It is the sense of the Senate that U.S. trade policy should place a priority on the elimination or amelioration of tariff inversions that undermine the competitiveness of the U.S. consuming industries, while taking into account the conditions in the producing industry in the United States, especially those currently facing tariff phase-outs negotiated under prior trade agreements." I want to note that this provision as adopted was modified to reflect specific concerns I raised about it. While this provision merely expresses a "sense of the Senate" and is in no way law or binding, I do want to provide background on the intent of the provision.

I note, first, that language in the provision as originally proposed directing the inclusion of the "wool fabric" industry sector in this provision was specifically deleted in the version that passed in the Manager's Amendment, underscoring the Senate's clear intent that this provision is not directed at this sector.

Second, the provision specifically requires that full account be taken of "conditions" in the various "producing industry in the United States," indicating that whatever further action Congress may want to consider in the future on this issue, or that the U.S. Trade Representative may raise in future negotiations, must assure fairness and equitable treatment to those currently producing in the United States. Furthermore, the language specifically states that special attention and equity is to be provided to "those currently facing tariff phase-outs negotiated under prior trade agreements." Since my constituents in the wool fabrication sector specifically fall into exactly that posture, properly relying on phase-out schedules negotiated in prior trade agreements, this protection and assurance is directed at their concerns, which, in turn, is why their industry sector was dropped from application of this provision.

I further appreciate the assurances provided me by the Managers of this bill that I will be provided full notice of any consideration of this issue in conference and that it will be resolved in a manner satisfactory to me in representation of my constituent's concerns.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the managers' amendment has been worked on by the distinguished ranking member, Senator MOYNIHAN, and myself. We have worked with Members on both sides of the aisle. This represents the results. There is no objection from the Democrat or Republican side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, may I simply confirm the chairman's statement. I thank all who have worked very hard on this extensive measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the managers' amendment?

Mr. ROTH. I ask for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2505) was agreed to.

Mr. ROTH. I thank the ranking member of the committee for his cooperation and help.

I think now we are about ready to proceed with the votes.

A quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2487

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is entitled to 2 minutes of his time.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, this amendment provides for enforceable labor standards. This is about the terms of trade and wanting to make sure with the CBI countries that when it comes to the right to organize and bargain collectively, people are not imprisoned for asserting this right, and that basic human rights and basic labor rights are met. In that way, we will have a trade agreement with enforceable labor standards that says to wage earners in our country: You are not going to lose your job in the apparel industry to other countries because they are paying 35 cents an hour and violate basic labor rights. It also says to workers in CBI countries: It is a benefit to you; you do not have to depend on investment by only making 35 or 40 cents an hour and not able to have basic human rights and labor rights.

This amendment calls for enforceable labor rights. It is the right thing to do. It is all about the right terms of trade, and I hope my colleagues will vote for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the managers' amendment which has just been adopted at the behest of Senator LEVIN, myself, and others, requires that core labor standards are necessary matters that the President must consider in granting these trade privileges. Of course, the Generalized System of Preferences incorporates substantially the same measures. The President is authorized to consider countries' compliance with these standards. Indeed, the President has already endorsed the

core labor standards through the ILO Declaration adopted in 1998. There is no need to micromanage his handling of foreign affairs.

In the interest of moving this measure along, with full agreement with the purposes of the Senator from Minnesota, I move to table the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been used or yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 2487. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 349 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Abraham	Enzi	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Bayh	Frist	Moynihan
Bennett	Gorton	Murkowski
Biden	Graham	Murray
Bingaman	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grams	Robb
Breaux	Grassley	Roberts
Brownback	Gregg	Roth
Bryan	Hagel	Santorum
Bunning	Hatch	Sessions
Burns	Helms	Shelby
Cochran	Hutchinson	Smith (NH)
Coverdell	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
Craig	Inhofe	Stevens
Crapo	Kerrey	Thomas
Daschle	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Landrieu	Thurmond
Dodd	Lieberman	Voinovich
Domenici	Lincoln	Warner
Edwards	Lott	Wyden

NAYS—31

Akaka	Harkin	Reid
Baucus	Hollings	Reid
Boxer	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Byrd	Johnson	Sarbanes
Campbell	Kennedy	Schumer
Cleland	Kerry	Snowe
Collins	Kohl	Specter
Conrad	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dorgan	Leahy	Wellstone
Durbin	Levin	
Feingold	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—2

Inouye	McCain
--------	--------

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2347

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 4 minutes equally divided before a vote on the motion to table amendment No. 2347.

The Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SPECTER, is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, this amendment provides for a private right of action to go into Federal court and stop dumped goods from coming into the United States in order to enforce U.S. trade laws and international trade laws, consistent with GATT.

For example, today, if you take a case under 30201, the International Trade Commission takes up to a year to have it acted on, and then the administration can have a suspension

order and eliminate it totally. Dumped goods are unfairly taking jobs from farmers, where dumped wheat comes into the United States. Textiles are dumped, steel is dumped, lamb is dumped; and the administration consistently decides these cases—as they did on steel with Russia—on a suspension agreement as to what is going to help the Russian economy for foreign policy and defense reasons, as opposed to seeing to it that United States trade laws are enforced that prohibit dumping—selling in the United States at a lower cost than illustratively selling in Russia.

This would give an injured party a chance to go to court and get an injunction within a few weeks, to have countervailing duties imposed, which would be an effective way to see to it that our antidumping laws are enforced and we do not have the disintegration of industries such as steel or unfair practices for wheat farmers, lamb farmers, and the like.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to my colleague's amendment. I do so because there is no evidence that the current antidumping and countervailing duty laws have failed to deliver relief to injured industries. Indeed, it is not clear to me that shifting the burden of the initial investigation to the courts, with any allowance at all for the normal process of discovery between private litigants, would help the petitioning industry in these cases.

While both petitioners and respondents complain about their treatment before the administrative agencies, largely due to what they consider to be the arbitrary basis for their decisions, both sides to the litigation seem to agree that the cases themselves are completed as rapidly as possible. They also agree that the current system provides more certainty and predictability.

Given that, I urge my colleagues to think carefully about the implications of shifting these cases to the Federal courts. While the system is not perfect, the fact is that petitioners have been very successful in these cases. Moreover, the system is surprisingly quick and responsive, given the complexity of these cases. Anybody who has spent years before the Federal courts in a complex commercial matter can tell you that the current system of litigation of unfair trade cases administratively is quite rapid.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote to table the amendment. No such change, as proposed by this amendment, should be adopted without thorough study on the part of the appropriate committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this rollcall vote and future rollcalls in this series be limited to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 2347. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) would vote "no".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 350 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Abraham	Frist	Lugar
Allard	Gorton	Mack
Ashcroft	Graham	McConnell
Bennett	Gramm	Moynihan
Bingaman	Grams	Murkowski
Bond	Grassley	Murray
Boxer	Gregg	Nickles
Breaux	Hagel	Reid
Brownback	Harkin	Roberts
Bryan	Hutchinson	Roth
Cochran	Kerrey	Schumer
Coverdell	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Daschle	Kyl	Stevens
Dodd	Landrieu	Thomas
Domenici	Lautenberg	Thompson
Enzi	Lieberman	Voinovich
Feinstein	Lincoln	Warner
Fitzgerald	Lott	Wyden

NAYS—42

Akaka	Dorgan	Mikulski
Baucus	Durbin	Reed
Bayh	Edwards	Robb
Biden	Feingold	Rockefeller
Bunning	Hatch	Santorum
Burns	Helms	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hollings	Sessions
Campbell	Hutchison	Shelby
Cleland	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Collins	Jeffords	Snowe
Conrad	Johnson	Specter
Craig	Kohl	Thurmond
Crapo	Leahy	Torricelli
DeWine	Levin	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—3

Inouye	Kennedy	McCain
--------	---------	--------

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROTH. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BAUCUS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2430

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 4 minutes equally divided for a vote on the motion to table the LANDRIEU amendment.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I will not ask my colleagues to vote. I will ask for the vote to be vitiated. However, I want to spend 1 minute on this amendment because there seems to be a misunderstanding about some of the facts. With all respect to the chairman and ranking member who do not support this amendment, perhaps we will have longer to debate this in the years to come.

It is my understanding—and I am supporting this bill—that our idea is to help develop the continent of Africa in a mutually beneficial way that helps our Nation, also. However, in the current draft of the bill, there is an island that is included which is technically part of Africa. There are 1 million inhabitants and the per capita GDP is \$10,300, far exceeding other nations, such as Sudan with a GDP of \$875; Ethiopia, with a GDP of \$520; Somalia, with a GDP of \$600 per year per capita.

I don't understand why we are including some islands that are already doing very well—in fact, better than some of our European nations. I bring this to the attention of the Senate. I will not ask for a vote. The ranking member has said there are administrative provisions in this trade agreement that make it clear our efforts are directed to the nations that need development and not to give preferential treatment to nations or areas that are already quite developed.

That is my only point. I am not going to ask the Senate to vote on it. Perhaps we will have a time to discuss this in the next year or the next Congress.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague. She is absolutely right. We should address this issue. We will. I thank her for bringing it before us and do not forget to come back.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent we dispense with the vote on the motion to table the Landrieu amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I believe my amendment is next in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has an inquiry. Is it the intention of the Senator from Delaware—is the motion to withdraw the amendment?

Mr. ROTH. The Senator withdrew her amendment and I asked unanimous consent we dispense with the vote on the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 2430) was withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized under the previous order.

Mr. HARKIN. For how long? Is it 2 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized to offer an amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. I thought my amendment was pending, under the unanimous consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator would need to call up the amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2495

(Purpose: To deny benefits under the legislation to any country that does not comply with the Convention for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor)

Mr. HARKIN. I call up amendment 2495.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] proposes an amendment numbered 2495.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . LIMITATIONS ON BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no benefits under this Act shall be granted to any country (or to any designated zone in that country) that does not meet and effectively enforce the standards regarding child labor established by the ILO Convention (No. 182) for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the President, after consultation with the Trade Policy Review Committee, shall submit a report to Congress on the enforcement of, and compliance with, the standards described in subsection (a).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, under the understanding, I am going to take just a couple of minutes. Even though there was no time agreement, there was an understanding. I know people want to vote on this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will yield, the Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this amendment is cosponsored by my colleague from North Carolina, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator HELMS, and also by my friend from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE. As you can see, this has broad philosophical support.

I also at this moment inform my colleagues and thank Senator HELMS for reporting out just this morning, from the Foreign Relations Committee, the Convention 182 on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor. That is record time. It was just adopted in June of this year. Then it had to go through some legal reviews and the President submitted to the Senate on August 5, 1999. So I want the chairman to know how much we appreciate the expeditious handling of that and the fact it is reported out. I am hopeful we can get a vote on it before we go out toward the end of this year.

The reason I had the clerk read the entire amendment is because it is not very long and not very convoluted. All it says, basically, is no country will get the benefits of this bill unless they adopt and enforce the provisions of this Convention 182 that was just adopted in June.

I might point out that there are 160 signatories to this Convention. It is the first time in history the entire three

representatives of the ILO Tripartite group, which are representatives from government, business, and labor agreed on the final form of a convention out of ILO. So it has broad support.

This talk about the worst forms of child labor, child prostitution, child trafficking in drugs, child trafficking itself, hazardous work, any forms of bondage or slavery—all of those are listed under 182. All this amendment says is the benefits of this bill cannot go to any country that does not adopt and enforce the provisions of 182.

I hope we can get a vote on the convention itself before we go out this fall. I believe it will say to all these countries in Africa: We are willing to trade with you, we are willing to help, but if you are going to have child prostitution, if you are going to traffic in kids, going to use kids in the drug trade, if you are going to chain them to looms, and you are not going to let them go to school, you are not going to permit them to have their own childhood—you are not going to get the benefits of this trade bill.

I think it is the least we can do, to try to help take one more step forward in eliminating child labor throughout the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, we can all thank the Senator from Iowa for bringing this matter forward. I think we are all close to being unanimously in support of the objectives.

I note, of 160 signatories to the convention, only one country has ratified it; that is the Seychelles, an island complex in the Indian Ocean with a population of 75,000.

Building up an international regime in which this convention will take hold and have consequences for the children is going to be the work of a generation. It will be well worth it, but we are only at the beginning. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is to be congratulated and thanked for reporting the bill out. But we have not ratified it. That is the situation we face. But let us go forward with this vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 2495.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, Mr. KENNEDY would vote "aye."

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 351 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Abraham	Enzi	Lugar
Akaka	Feingold	Mack
Allard	Feinstein	McConnell
Ascroft	Fitzgerald	Mikulski
Baucus	Frist	Moynihan
Bayh	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Graham	Murray
Biden	Gramm	Nickles
Bingaman	Grams	Reed
Bond	Grassley	Reid
Boxer	Gregg	Robb
Breaux	Hagel	Roberts
Brownback	Harkin	Rockefeller
Bryan	Hatch	Roth
Bunning	Helms	Santorum
Burns	Hollings	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hutchinson	Schumer
Campbell	Hutchison	Sessions
Cleland	Inhofe	Shelby
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Collins	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerrey	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerry	Specter
Craig	Kohl	Stevens
Crapo	Kyl	Thomas
Daschle	Landrieu	Thompson
DeWine	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Dodd	Leahy	Torricelli
Domenici	Levin	Voinovich
Dorgan	Lieberman	Warner
Durbin	Lincoln	Wellstone
Edwards	Lott	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Inouye Kennedy McCain

The amendment (No. 2495) was agreed to.

Mr. ROTH. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 2359, AS MODIFIED

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the previously agreed to Grassley-Conrad amendment No. 2359 be modified. Further, the modifications have been agreed to by both sides. I ask unanimous consent that the modification be adopted.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2359), as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

At the end, insert the following new title:

TITLE —TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS

Subtitle A—Amendments to the Trade Act of 1974

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Trade Adjustment Assistance for Farmers Act”.

SEC. 02. TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 6—ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS

“SEC. 291. DEFINITIONS.

“In this chapter:

“(1) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PRODUCER.—The term ‘agricultural commodity producer’ means any person who is engaged in the production and sale of an agricultural commodity in the United States and who owns or

shares the ownership and risk of loss of the agricultural commodity.

“(2) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term ‘agricultural commodity’ means any agricultural commodity (including livestock, fish, or harvested seafood) in its raw or natural state.

“(3) DULY AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE.—The term ‘duly authorized representative’ means an association of agricultural commodity producers.

“(4) NATIONAL AVERAGE PRICE.—The term ‘national average price’ means the national average price paid to an agricultural commodity producer for an agricultural commodity in a marketing year as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

“(5) CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘contributed importantly’ means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

“(B) DETERMINATION OF CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY.—The determination of whether imports of articles like or directly competitive with an agricultural commodity with respect to which the petition under this chapter was filed contributed importantly to a decline in the price of the agricultural commodity shall be made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

“(6) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Agriculture.

“SEC. 292. PETITIONS; GROUP ELIGIBILITY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A petition for a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance under this chapter may be filed with the Secretary by a group of agricultural commodity producers or by their duly authorized representative. Upon receipt of the petition, the Secretary shall promptly publish notice in the Federal Register that the Secretary has received the petition and initiated an investigation.

“(b) HEARINGS.—If the petitioner, or any other person found by the Secretary to have a substantial interest in the proceedings, submits not later than 10 days after the date of the Secretary’s publication under subsection (a) a request for a hearing, the Secretary shall provide for a public hearing and afford such interested persons an opportunity to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard.

“(c) GROUP ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall certify a group of agricultural commodity producers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under this chapter if the Secretary determines—

“(1) that the national average price for the agricultural commodity, or a class of goods within the agricultural commodity, produced by the group for the most recent marketing year for which the national average price is available is less than 80 percent of the average of the national average price for such agricultural commodity, or such class of goods, for the 5 marketing years preceding the most recent marketing year; and

“(2) that either—

“(A) increases in imports of articles like or directly competitive with the agricultural commodity, or class of goods within the agricultural commodity, produced by the group contributed importantly to the decline in price described in paragraph (1); or

“(B) imports of articles like or directly competitive with the agricultural commodity, or class of goods within the agricultural commodity, produced by the group account for a significant percentage of the domestic market for the agricultural commodity (or class of goods) and have contributed importantly to the decline in price described in paragraph (1).

“(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR QUALIFIED SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—A group of agricultural com-

modity producers certified as eligible under section 293 shall be eligible to apply for assistance under this chapter in any qualified year after the year the group is first certified, if the Secretary determines that—

“(1) the national average price for the agricultural commodity, or class of goods within the agricultural commodity, produced by the group for the most recent marketing year for which the national average price is available is equal to or less than the price determined under subsection (c)(1); and

“(2) the requirements of subsection (c)(2) (A) or (B) are met.

“(e) DETERMINATION OF QUALIFIED YEAR AND COMMODITY.—In this chapter:

“(1) QUALIFIED YEAR.—The term ‘qualified year’, with respect to a group of agricultural commodity producers certified as eligible under section 293, means each consecutive year after the year in which the group is certified that the Secretary makes the determination under subsection (c) or (d), as the case may be.

“(2) CLASSES OF GOODS WITHIN A COMMODITY.—In any case in which there are separate classes of goods within an agricultural commodity, the Secretary shall treat each class as a separate commodity in determining group eligibility, the national average price, and level of imports under this section and section 296.

“SEC. 293. DETERMINATIONS BY SECRETARY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as possible after the date on which a petition is filed under section 292, but in any event not later than 60 days after that date, the Secretary shall determine whether the petitioning group meets the requirements of section 292(c) (or (d), as the case may be) and shall, if so, issue a certification of eligibility to apply for assistance under this chapter covering agricultural commodity producers in any group that meet the requirements. Each certification shall specify the date on which eligibility under this chapter begins.

“(b) NOTICE.—Upon making a determination on a petition, the Secretary shall promptly publish a summary of the determination in the Federal Register together with the Secretary’s reasons for making the determination.

“(c) TERMINATION OF CERTIFICATION.—Whenever the Secretary determines, with respect to any certification of eligibility under this chapter, that the decline in price for the agricultural commodity covered by the certification is no longer attributable to the conditions described in section 292, the Secretary shall terminate such certification and promptly cause notice of such termination to be published in the Federal Register together with the Secretary’s reasons for making such determination.

“SEC. 294. STUDY BY SECRETARY WHEN INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION BEGINS INVESTIGATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the International Trade Commission (in this chapter referred to as the ‘Commission’) begins an investigation under section 202 with respect to an agricultural commodity, the Commission shall immediately notify the Secretary of the investigation. Upon receipt of the notification, the Secretary shall immediately begin a study of—

“(1) the number of agricultural commodity producers producing a like or directly competitive agricultural commodity who have been or are likely to be certified as eligible for adjustment assistance under this chapter, and

“(2) the extent to which the adjustment of such producers to the import competition may be facilitated through the use of existing programs.

“(b) REPORT.—The report of the Secretary of the study under subsection (a) shall be

made to the President not later than 15 days after the day on which the Commission makes its report under section 202(f). Upon making his report to the President, the Secretary shall also promptly make it public (with the exception of information which the Secretary determines to be confidential) and shall have a summary of it published in the Federal Register.

“SEC. 295. BENEFIT INFORMATION TO AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PRODUCERS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide full information to producers about the benefit allowances, training, and other employment services available under this title and about the petition and application procedures, and the appropriate filing dates, for such allowances, training, and services. The Secretary shall provide whatever assistance is necessary to enable groups to prepare petitions or applications for program benefits under this title.

“(b) NOTICE OF BENEFITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall mail written notice of the benefits available under this chapter to each agricultural commodity producer that the Secretary has reason to believe is covered by a certification made under this chapter.

“(2) OTHER NOTICE.—The Secretary shall publish notice of the benefits available under this chapter to agricultural commodity producers that are covered by each certification made under this chapter in newspapers of general circulation in the areas in which such producers reside.

“SEC. 296. QUALIFYING REQUIREMENTS FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PRODUCERS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Payment of a trade adjustment allowance shall be made to an adversely affected agricultural commodity producer covered by a certification under this chapter who files an application for such allowance within 90 days after the date on which the Secretary makes a determination and issues a certification of eligibility under section 293, if the following conditions are met:

“(1) The producer submits to the Secretary sufficient information to establish the amount of agricultural commodity covered by the application filed under subsection (a), that was produced by the producer in the most recent year.

“(2) The producer certifies that the producer has not received cash benefits under any provision of this title other than this chapter.

“(3) The producer's net farm income (as determined by the Secretary) for the most recent year is less than the producer's net farm income for the latest year in which no adjustment assistance was received by the producer under this chapter.

“(4) The producer certifies that the producer has met with an Extension Service employee or agent to obtain, at no cost to the producer, information and technical assistance that will assist the producer in adjusting to import competition with respect to the adversely affected agricultural commodity, including—

“(A) information regarding the feasibility and desirability of substituting 1 or more alternative commodities for the adversely affected agricultural commodity; and

“(B) technical assistance that will improve the competitiveness of the production and marketing of the adversely affected agricultural commodity by the producer, including yield and marketing improvements.

“(b) AMOUNT OF CASH BENEFITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of section 298, an adversely affected agricultural commodity producer described in subsection (a) shall be entitled to adjustment assistance under this chapter in an amount equal to the product of—

“(A) one-half of the difference between—

“(i) an amount equal to 80 percent of the average of the national average price of the agricultural commodity covered by the application described in subsection (a) for the 5 marketing years preceding the most recent marketing year, and

“(ii) the national average price of the agricultural commodity for the most recent marketing year, and

“(B) the amount of the agricultural commodity produced by the agricultural commodity producer in the most recent marketing year.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR SUBSEQUENT QUALIFIED YEARS.—The amount of cash benefits for a qualified year shall be determined in the same manner as cash benefits are determined under paragraph (1) except that the average national price of the agricultural commodity shall be determined under paragraph (1)(A)(i) by using the 5-marketing-year period used to determine the amount of cash benefits for the first certification.

“(c) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF CASH ASSISTANCE.—The maximum amount of cash benefits an agricultural commodity producer may receive in any 12-month period shall not exceed \$10,000.

“(d) LIMITATIONS ON OTHER ASSISTANCE.—An agricultural commodity producer entitled to receive a cash benefit under this chapter—

“(1) shall not be eligible for any other cash benefit under this title, and

“(2) shall be entitled to employment services and training benefits under sections 235 and 236.

“SEC. 297. FRAUD AND RECOVERY OF OVERPAYMENTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) REPAYMENT.—If the Secretary, or a court of competent jurisdiction, determines that any person has received any payment under this chapter to which the person was not entitled, such person shall be liable to repay such amount to the Secretary, except that the Secretary may waive such repayment if the Secretary determines, in accordance with guidelines prescribed by the Secretary that—

“(A) the payment was made without fault on the part of such person, and

“(B) requiring such repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience.

“(2) RECOVERY OF OVERPAYMENT.—Unless an overpayment is otherwise recovered, or waived under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall recover the overpayment by deductions from any sums payable to such person under this chapter.

“(b) FALSE STATEMENTS.—If the Secretary, or a court of competent jurisdiction, determines that a person—

“(1) knowingly has made, or caused another to make, a false statement or representation of a material fact, or

“(2) knowingly has failed, or caused another to fail, to disclose a material fact,

and as a result of such false statement or representation, or of such nondisclosure, such person has received any payment under this chapter to which the person was not entitled, such person shall, in addition to any other penalty provided by law, be ineligible for any further payments under this chapter.

“(c) NOTICE AND DETERMINATION.—Except for overpayments determined by a court of competent jurisdiction, no repayment may be required, and no deduction may be made, under this section until a determination under subsection (a)(1) by the Secretary has been made, notice of the determination and an opportunity for a fair hearing thereon has been given to the person concerned, and the determination has become final.

“(d) PAYMENT TO TREASURY.—Any amount recovered under this section shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

“(e) PENALTIES.—Whoever makes a false statement of a material fact knowing it to be false, or knowingly fails to disclose a material fact, for the purpose of obtaining or increasing for himself or for any other person any payment authorized to be furnished under this chapter shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

“SEC. 298. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated and there are appropriated to the Department of Agriculture for fiscal years 2000 through 2001, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter not to exceed \$100,000,000 for each fiscal year.”

“(b) PROPORTIONATE REDUCTION.—If in any year, the amount appropriated under this chapter is insufficient to meet the requirements for adjustment assistance payable under this chapter, the amount of assistance payable under this chapter shall be reduced proportionately.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for title II of the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the items relating to chapter 5, the following:

“CHAPTER 6—ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS

“Sec. 291. Definitions.

“Sec. 292. Petitions; group eligibility.

“Sec. 293. Determinations by Secretary.

“Sec. 294. Study by Secretary when International Trade Commission begins investigation.

“Sec. 295. Benefit information to agricultural commodity producers.

“Sec. 296. Qualifying requirements for agricultural commodity producers.

“Sec. 297. Fraud and recovery of overpayments.

“Sec. 298. Authorization of appropriations.”

Subtitle B—Revenue Provisions Relating to Trade Adjustment Assistance

SEC. 10. REFERENCE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this subtitle an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 11. MODIFICATIONS TO ASSET DIVERSIFICATION TEST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 856(c)(4) is amended to read as follows:

“(B)(i) not more than 25 percent of the value of its total assets is represented by securities (other than those includible under subparagraph (A)).

“(ii) not more than 20 percent of the value of its total assets is represented by securities of 1 or more taxable REIT subsidiaries, and

“(iii) except with respect to a taxable REIT subsidiary and securities includible under subparagraph (A)—

“(I) not more than 5 percent of the value of its total assets is represented by securities of any one issuer,

“(II) the trust does not hold securities possessing more than 10 percent of the total voting power of the outstanding securities of any one issuer, and

“(III) the trust does not hold securities having a value of more than 10 percent of the total value of the outstanding securities of any one issuer.”

(b) EXCEPTION FOR STRAIGHT DEBT SECURITIES.—Subsection (c) of section 856 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) STRAIGHT DEBT SAFE HARBOR IN APPLYING PARAGRAPH (4).—Securities of an issuer which are straight debt (as defined in section 1361(c)(5)) without regard to subparagraph

(B)(iii) thereof) shall not be taken into account in applying paragraph (4)(B)(ii)(III) if—

“(A) the issuer is an individual, or

“(B) the only securities of such issuer which are held by the trust or a taxable REIT subsidiary of the trust are straight debt (as so defined), or

“(C) the issuer is a partnership and the trust holds at least a 20 percent profits interest in the partnership.”.

SEC. 12. TREATMENT OF INCOME AND SERVICES PROVIDED BY TAXABLE REIT SUBSIDIARIES.

(a) INCOME FROM TAXABLE REIT SUBSIDIARIES NOT TREATED AS IMPERMISSIBLE TENANT SERVICE INCOME.—Clause (i) of section 856(d)(7)(C) (relating to exceptions to impermissible tenant service income) is amended by inserting “or through a taxable REIT subsidiary of such trust” after “income”.

(b) CERTAIN INCOME FROM TAXABLE REIT SUBSIDIARIES NOT EXCLUDED FROM RENTS FROM REAL PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 856 (relating to rents from real property defined) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(8) SPECIAL RULE FOR TAXABLE REIT SUBSIDIARIES.—For purposes of this subsection, amounts paid to a real estate investment trust by a taxable REIT subsidiary of such trust shall not be excluded from rents from real property by reason of paragraph (2)(B) if the requirements of either of the following subparagraphs are met:

“(A) LIMITED RENTAL EXCEPTION.—The requirements of this subparagraph are met with respect to any property if at least 90 percent of the leased space of the property is rented to persons other than taxable REIT subsidiaries of such trust and other than persons described in section 856(d)(2)(B). The preceding sentence shall apply only to the extent that the amounts paid to the trust as rents from real property (as defined in paragraph (1) without regard to paragraph (2)(B)) from such property are substantially comparable to such rents made by the other tenants of the trust's property for comparable space.

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN LODGING FACILITIES.—The requirements of this subparagraph are met with respect to an interest in real property which is a qualified lodging facility leased by the trust to a taxable REIT subsidiary of the trust if the property is operated on behalf of such subsidiary by a person who is an eligible independent contractor.

“(9) ELIGIBLE INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR.—For purposes of paragraph (8)(B)—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘eligible independent contractor’ means, with respect to any qualified lodging facility, any independent contractor if, at the time such contractor enters into a management agreement or other similar service contract with the taxable REIT subsidiary to operate the facility, such contractor (or any related person) is actively engaged in the trade or business of operating qualified lodging facilities for any person who is not a related person with respect to the real estate investment trust or the taxable REIT subsidiary.

“(B) SPECIAL RULES.—Solely for purposes of this paragraph and paragraph (8)(B), a person shall not fail to be treated as an independent contractor with respect to any qualified lodging facility by reason of any of the following:

“(i) The taxable REIT subsidiary bears the expenses for the operation of the facility pursuant to the management agreement or other similar service contract.

“(ii) The taxable REIT subsidiary receives the revenues from the operation of such facility, net of expenses for such operation and

fees payable to the operator pursuant to such agreement or contract.

“(iii) The real estate investment trust receives income from such person with respect to another property that is attributable to a lease of such other property to such person that was in effect as of the later of—

“(I) January 1, 1999, or

“(II) the earliest date that any taxable REIT subsidiary of such trust entered into a management agreement or other similar service contract with such person with respect to such qualified lodging facility.

“(C) RENEWALS, ETC., OF EXISTING LEASES.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)(iii)—

“(i) a lease shall be treated as in effect on January 1, 1999, without regard to its renewal after such date, so long as such renewal is pursuant to the terms of such lease as in effect on whichever of the dates under subparagraph (B)(iii) is the latest, and

“(ii) a lease of a property entered into after whichever of the dates under subparagraph (B)(iii) is the latest shall be treated as in effect on such date if—

“(I) on such date, a lease of such property from the trust was in effect, and

“(II) under the terms of the new lease, such trust receives a substantially similar or lesser benefit in comparison to the lease referred to in subclause (I).

“(D) QUALIFIED LODGING FACILITY.—For purposes of this paragraph—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified lodging facility’ means any lodging facility unless wagering activities are conducted at or in connection with such facility by any person who is engaged in the business of accepting wagers and who is legally authorized to engage in such business at or in connection with such facility.

“(ii) LODGING FACILITY.—The term ‘lodging facility’ means a hotel, motel, or other establishment more than one-half of the dwelling units in which are used on a transient basis.

“(iii) CUSTOMARY AMENITIES AND FACILITIES.—The term ‘lodging facility’ includes customary amenities and facilities operated as part of, or associated with, the lodging facility so long as such amenities and facilities are customary for other properties of a comparable size and class owned by other owners unrelated to such real estate investment trust.

“(E) OPERATE INCLUDES MANAGE.—References in this paragraph to operating a property shall be treated as including a reference to managing the property.

“(F) RELATED PERSON.—Persons shall be treated as related to each other if such persons are treated as a single employer under subsection (a) or (b) of section 52.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (B) of section 856(d)(2) is amended by inserting “except as provided in paragraph (8),” after “(B)”.

(3) DETERMINING RENTS FROM REAL PROPERTY.—

(A)(i) Paragraph (1) of section 856(d) is amended by striking “adjusted bases” each place it occurs and inserting “fair market values”.

(ii) The amendment made by this subparagraph shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

(B)(i) Clause (i) of section 856(d)(2)(B) is amended by striking “number” and inserting “value”.

(ii) The amendment made by this subparagraph shall apply to amounts received or accrued in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000, except for amounts paid pursuant to leases in effect on July 12, 1999, or pursuant to a binding contract in effect on such date and at all times thereafter.

SEC. 13. TAXABLE REIT SUBSIDIARY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 856 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) TAXABLE REIT SUBSIDIARY.—For purposes of this part—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘taxable REIT subsidiary’ means, with respect to a real estate investment trust, a corporation (other than a real estate investment trust) if—

“(A) such trust directly or indirectly owns stock in such corporation, and

“(B) such trust and such corporation jointly elect that such corporation shall be treated as a taxable REIT subsidiary of such trust for purposes of this part.

Such an election, once made, shall be irrevocable unless both such trust and corporation consent to its revocation. Such election, and any revocation thereof, may be made without the consent of the Secretary.

“(2) 35 PERCENT OWNERSHIP IN ANOTHER TAXABLE REIT SUBSIDIARY.—The term ‘taxable REIT subsidiary’ includes, with respect to any real estate investment trust, any corporation (other than a real estate investment trust) with respect to which a taxable REIT subsidiary of such trust owns directly or indirectly—

“(A) securities possessing more than 35 percent of the total voting power of the outstanding securities of such corporation, or

“(B) securities having a value of more than 35 percent of the total value of the outstanding securities of such corporation.

The preceding sentence shall not apply to a qualified REIT subsidiary (as defined in subsection (i)(2)). The rule of section 856(c)(7) shall apply for purposes of subparagraph (B).

“(3) EXCEPTIONS.—The term ‘taxable REIT subsidiary’ shall not include—

“(A) any corporation which directly or indirectly operates or manages a lodging facility or a health care facility, and

“(B) any corporation which directly or indirectly provides to any other person (under a franchise, license, or otherwise) rights to any brand name under which any lodging facility or health care facility is operated.

Subparagraph (B) shall not apply to rights provided to an eligible independent contractor to operate or manage a lodging facility if such rights are held by such corporation as a franchisee, licensee, or in a similar capacity and such lodging facility is either owned by such corporation or is leased to such corporation from the real estate investment trust.

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (3)—

“(A) LODGING FACILITY.—The term ‘lodging facility’ has the meaning given to such term by paragraph (9)(D)(ii).

“(B) HEALTH CARE FACILITY.—The term ‘health care facility’ has the meaning given to such term by subsection (e)(6)(D)(ii).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 856(i) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Such term shall not include a taxable REIT subsidiary.”.

SEC. 14. LIMITATION ON EARNINGS STRIPPING.

Paragraph (3) of section 163(j) (relating to limitation on deduction for interest on certain indebtedness) is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) any interest paid or accrued (directly or indirectly) by a taxable REIT subsidiary (as defined in section 856(1)) of a real estate investment trust to such trust.”.

SEC. 15. 100 PERCENT TAX ON IMPROPERLY ALLOCATED AMOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 857 (relating to method of taxation of real estate investment trusts and holders of shares or certificates of beneficial interest) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (8) and (9), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

“(7) INCOME FROM REDETERMINED RENTS, REDETERMINED DEDUCTIONS, AND EXCESS INTEREST.—

“(A) IMPOSITION OF TAX.—There is hereby imposed for each taxable year of the real estate investment trust a tax equal to 100 percent of redetermined rents, redetermined deductions, and excess interest.

“(B) REDETERMINED RENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘redetermined rents’ means rents from real property (as defined in subsection 856(d)) the amount of which would (but for subparagraph (E)) be reduced on distribution, apportionment, or allocation under section 482 to clearly reflect income as a result of services furnished or rendered by a taxable REIT subsidiary of the real estate investment trust to a tenant of such trust.

“(ii) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN SERVICES.—Clause (i) shall not apply to amounts received directly or indirectly by a real estate investment trust for services described in paragraph (1)(B) or (7)(C)(i) of section 856(d).

“(iii) EXCEPTION FOR DE MINIMIS AMOUNTS.—Clause (i) shall not apply to amounts described in section 856(d)(7)(A) with respect to a property to the extent such amounts do not exceed the one percent threshold described in section 856(d)(7)(B) with respect to such property.

“(iv) EXCEPTION FOR COMPARABLY PRICED SERVICES.—Clause (i) shall not apply to any service rendered by a taxable REIT subsidiary of a real estate investment trust to a tenant of such trust if—

“(I) such subsidiary renders a significant amount of similar services to persons other than such trust and tenants of such trust who are unrelated (within the meaning of section 856(d)(8)(F)) to such subsidiary, trust, and tenants, but

“(II) only to the extent the charge for such service so rendered is substantially comparable to the charge for the similar services rendered to persons referred to in subclause (I).

“(v) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN SEPARATELY CHARGED SERVICES.—Clause (i) shall not apply to any service rendered by a taxable REIT subsidiary of a real estate investment trust to a tenant of such trust if—

“(I) the rents paid to the trust by tenants (leasing at least 25 percent of the net leasable space in the trust’s property) who are not receiving such service from such subsidiary are substantially comparable to the rents paid by tenants leasing comparable space who are receiving such service from such subsidiary, and

“(II) the charge for such service from such subsidiary is separately stated.

“(vi) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN SERVICES BASED ON SUBSIDIARY’S INCOME FROM THE SERVICES.—Clause (i) shall not apply to any service rendered by a taxable REIT subsidiary of a real estate investment trust to a tenant of such trust if the gross income of such subsidiary from such service is not less than 150 percent of such subsidiary’s direct cost in furnishing or rendering the service.

“(vii) EXCEPTIONS GRANTED BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary may waive the tax otherwise imposed by subparagraph (A) if the trust establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary that rents charged to tenants were established on an arms’ length basis even

though a taxable REIT subsidiary of the trust provided services to such tenants.

“(C) REDETERMINED DEDUCTIONS.—The term ‘redetermined deductions’ means deductions (other than redetermined rents) of a taxable REIT subsidiary of a real estate investment trust if the amount of such deductions would (but for subparagraph (E)) be decreased on distribution, apportionment, or allocation under section 482 to clearly reflect income as between such subsidiary and such trust.

“(D) EXCESS INTEREST.—The term ‘excess interest’ means any deductions for interest payments by a taxable REIT subsidiary of a real estate investment trust to such trust to the extent that the interest payments are in excess of a rate that is commercially reasonable.

“(E) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 482.—The imposition of tax under subparagraph (A) shall be in lieu of any distribution, apportionment, or allocation under section 482.

“(F) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this paragraph. Until the Secretary prescribes such regulations, real estate investment trusts and their taxable REIT subsidiaries may base their allocations on any reasonable method.”

(b) AMOUNT SUBJECT TO TAX NOT REQUIRED TO BE DISTRIBUTED.—Subparagraph (E) of section 857(b)(2) (relating to real estate investment trust taxable income) is amended by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraphs (5) and (7)”.

SEC. 16. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by sections 11 through 15 shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

(b) TRANSITIONAL RULES RELATED TO SECTION 11.—

(1) EXISTING ARRANGEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the amendment made by section 11 shall not apply to a real estate investment trust with respect to—

(i) securities of a corporation held directly or indirectly by such trust on July 12, 1999,

(ii) securities of a corporation held by an entity on July 12, 1999, if such trust acquires control of such entity pursuant to a written binding contract in effect on such date and at all times thereafter before such acquisition,

(iii) securities received by such trust (or a successor) in exchange for, or with respect to, securities described in clause (i) or (ii) in a transaction in which gain or loss is not recognized, and

(iv) securities acquired directly or indirectly by such trust as part of a reorganization (as defined in section 368(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) with respect to such trust if such securities are described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) with respect to any other real estate investment trust.

(B) NEW TRADE OR BUSINESS OR SUBSTANTIAL NEW ASSETS.—Subparagraph (A) shall cease to apply to securities of a corporation as of the first day after July 12, 1999, on which such corporation engages in a substantial new line of business, or acquires any substantial asset, other than—

(i) pursuant to a binding contract in effect on such date and at all times thereafter before the acquisition of such asset,

(ii) in a transaction in which gain or loss is not recognized by reason of section 1031 or 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or

(iii) in a reorganization (as so defined) with another corporation the securities of which are described in paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection.

(C) LIMITATION ON TRANSITION RULES.—Subparagraph (A) shall cease to apply to securi-

ties of a corporation held, acquired, or received, directly or indirectly, by a real estate investment trust as of the first day after July 12, 1999, on which such trust acquires any additional securities of such corporation other than—

(i) pursuant to a binding contract in effect on July 12, 1999, and at all times thereafter, or

(ii) in a reorganization (as so defined) with another corporation the securities of which are described in paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection.

(2) TAX-FREE CONVERSION.—If—

(A) at the time of an election for a corporation to become a taxable REIT subsidiary, the amendment made by section 11 does not apply to such corporation by reason of paragraph (1), and

(B) such election first takes effect before January 1, 2004,

such election shall be treated as a reorganization qualifying under section 368(a)(1)(A) of such Code.

SEC. 17. HEALTH CARE REITS.

(a) SPECIAL FORECLOSURE RULE FOR HEALTH CARE PROPERTIES.—Subsection (e) of section 856 (relating to special rules for foreclosure property) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) SPECIAL RULE FOR QUALIFIED HEALTH CARE PROPERTIES.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) ACQUISITION AT EXPIRATION OF LEASE.—The term ‘foreclosure property’ shall include any qualified health care property acquired by a real estate investment trust as the result of the termination of a lease of such property (other than a termination by reason of a default, or the imminence of a default, on the lease).

“(B) GRACE PERIOD.—In the case of a qualified health care property which is foreclosure property solely by reason of subparagraph (A), in lieu of applying paragraphs (2) and (3)—

“(i) the qualified health care property shall cease to be foreclosure property as of the close of the second taxable year after the taxable year in which such trust acquired such property, and

“(ii) if the real estate investment trust establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary that an extension of the grace period in clause (i) is necessary to the orderly leasing or liquidation of the trust’s interest in such qualified health care property, the Secretary may grant one or more extensions of the grace period for such qualified health care property.

Any such extension shall not extend the grace period beyond the close of the 6th year after the taxable year in which such trust acquired such qualified health care property.

“(C) INCOME FROM INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS.—For purposes of applying paragraph (4)(C) with respect to qualified health care property which is foreclosure property by reason of subparagraph (A) or paragraph (1), income derived or received by the trust from an independent contractor shall be disregarded to the extent such income is attributable to—

“(i) any lease of property in effect on the date the real estate investment trust acquired the qualified health care property (without regard to its renewal after such date so long as such renewal is pursuant to the terms of such lease as in effect on such date), or

“(ii) any lease of property entered into after such date if—

“(I) on such date, a lease of such property from the trust was in effect, and

“(II) under the terms of the new lease, such trust receives a substantially similar or lesser benefit in comparison to the lease referred to in subclause (I).

“(D) QUALIFIED HEALTH CARE PROPERTY.—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘qualified health care property’ means any real property (including interests therein), and any personal property incident to such real property, which—

“(I) is a health care facility, or

“(II) is necessary or incidental to the use of a health care facility.

“(ii) **HEALTH CARE FACILITY.**—For purposes of clause (i), the term ‘health care facility’ means a hospital, nursing facility, assisted living facility, congregate care facility, qualified continuing care facility (as defined in section 7872(g)(4)), or other licensed facility which extends medical or nursing or ancillary services to patients and which, immediately before the termination, expiration, default, or breach of the lease of or mortgage secured by such facility, was operated by a provider of such services which was eligible for participation in the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to such facility.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

SEC. 18. CONFORMITY WITH REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANY RULES.

(a) **DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT.**—Clauses (i) and (ii) of section 857(a)(1)(A) (relating to requirements applicable to real estate investment trusts) are each amended by striking “95 percent (90 percent for taxable years beginning before January 1, 1980)” and inserting “90 percent”.

(b) **IMPOSITION OF TAX.**—Clause (i) of section 857(b)(5)(A) (relating to imposition of tax in case of failure to meet certain requirements) is amended by striking “95 percent (90 percent in the case of taxable years beginning before January 1, 1980)” and inserting “90 percent”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

SEC. 19. CLARIFICATION OF EXCEPTION FOR INDEPENDENT OPERATORS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (3) of section 856(d) (relating to independent contractor defined) is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

“In the event that any class of stock of either the real estate investment trust or such person is regularly traded on an established securities market, only persons who own, directly or indirectly, more than 5 percent of such class of stock shall be taken into account as owning any of the stock of such class for purposes of applying the 35 percent limitation set forth in subparagraph (B) (but all of the outstanding stock of such class shall be considered outstanding in order to compute the denominator for purpose of determining the applicable percentage of ownership).”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

SEC. 20. MODIFICATION OF EARNINGS AND PROFITS RULES.

(a) **RULES FOR DETERMINING WHETHER REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANY HAS EARNINGS AND PROFITS FROM NON-RIC YEAR.**—Subsection (c) of section 852 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **DISTRIBUTIONS TO MEET REQUIREMENTS OF SUBSECTION (a)(2)(B).**—Any distribution which is made in order to comply with the requirements of subsection (a)(2)(B)—

“(A) shall be treated for purposes of this subsection and subsection (a)(2)(B) as made from the earliest earnings and profits accumulated in any taxable year to which the provisions of this part did not apply rather than the most recently accumulated earnings and profits, and

“(B) to the extent treated under subparagraph (A) as made from accumulated earnings and profits, shall not be treated as a distribution for purposes of subsection (b)(2)(D) and section 855.”.

(b) **CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF REIT SPILLOVER DIVIDEND RULES TO DISTRIBUTIONS TO MEET QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENT.**—Subparagraph (B) of section 857(d)(3) is amended by inserting before the period “and section 858”.

(c) **APPLICATION OF DEFICIENCY DIVIDEND PROCEDURES.**—Paragraph (1) of section 852(e) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “If the determination under subparagraph (A) is solely as a result of the failure to meet the requirements of subsection (a)(2), the preceding sentence shall also apply for purposes of applying subsection (a)(2) to the non-RIC year.”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions after December 31, 2000.

SEC. 21. MODIFICATION OF ESTIMATED TAX RULES FOR CLOSELY HELD REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (e) of section 6655 (relating to estimated tax by corporations) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN REIT DIVIDENDS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Any dividend received from a closely held real estate investment trust by any person which owns (after application of subsections (d)(5) and (1)(3)(B) of section 856) 10 percent or more (by vote or value) of the stock or beneficial interests in the trust shall be taken into account in computing annualized income installments under paragraph (2) in a manner similar to the manner under which partnership income inclusions are taken into account.

“(B) **CLOSELY HELD REIT.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘closely held real estate investment trust’ means a real estate investment trust with respect to which 5 or fewer persons own (after application of subsections (d)(5) and (1)(3)(B) of section 856) 50 percent or more (by vote or value) of the stock or beneficial interests in the trust.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to estimated tax payments due on or after November 15, 1999.

SEC. 22. CONTROLLED ENTITIES INELIGIBLE FOR REIT STATUS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (a) of section 856 (relating to definition of real estate investment trust) is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (6), by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8), and by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

“(7) which is not a controlled entity (as defined in subsection (1)); and”.

(b) **CONTROLLED ENTITY.**—Section 856 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) **CONTROLLED ENTITY.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of subsection (a)(7), an entity is a controlled entity if, at any time during the taxable year, one person (other than a qualified entity)—

“(A) in the case of a corporation, owns stock—

“(i) possessing at least 50 percent of the total voting power of the stock of such corporation, or

“(ii) having a value equal to at least 50 percent of the total value of the stock of such corporation, or

“(B) in the case of a trust, owns beneficial interests in the trust which would meet the requirements of subparagraph (A) if such interests were stock.

“(2) **QUALIFIED ENTITY.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘qualified entity’ means—

“(A) any real estate investment trust, and

“(B) any partnership in which one real estate investment trust owns at least 50 percent of the capital and profits interests in the partnership.

“(3) **ATTRIBUTION RULES.**—For purposes of this paragraphs (1) and (2)—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (d)(5) and (h)(3) shall apply; except that section 318(a)(3)(C) shall not be applied under such rules to treat stock owned by a qualified entity as being owned by a person which is not a qualified entity.

“(B) **STAPLED ENTITIES.**—A group of entities which are stapled entities (as defined in section 269B(c)(2)) shall be treated as one person.

“(4) **EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN NEW REITS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘controlled entity’ shall not include an incubator REIT.

“(B) **INCUBATOR REIT.**—A corporation shall be treated as an incubator REIT for any taxable year during the eligibility period if it meets all the following requirements for such year:

“(i) The corporation elects to be treated as an incubator REIT.

“(ii) The corporation has only voting common stock outstanding.

“(iii) Not more than 50 percent of the corporation’s real estate assets consist of mortgages.

“(iv) From not later than the beginning of the last half of the second taxable year, at least 10 percent of the corporation’s capital is provided by lenders or equity investors who are unrelated to the corporation’s largest shareholder.

“(v) The corporation annually increases the value of its real estate assets by at least 10 percent.

“(vi) The directors of the corporation adopt a resolution setting forth an intent to engage in a going public transaction.

No election may be made with respect to any REIT if an election under this subsection was in effect for any predecessor of such REIT. The requirement of clause (ii) shall not fail to be met merely because a going public transaction is accomplished through a transaction described in section 368(a)(1) with another corporation which had another class of stock outstanding prior to the transaction.

“(C) **ELIGIBILITY PERIOD.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The eligibility period (for which an incubator REIT election can be made) begins with the REIT’s second taxable year and ends at the close of the REIT’s third taxable year, except that the REIT may, subject to clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv), elect to extend such period for an additional 2 taxable years.

“(ii) **GOING PUBLIC TRANSACTION.**—A REIT may not elect to extend the eligibility period under clause (i) unless it enters into an agreement with the Secretary that if it does not engage in a going public transaction by the end of the extended eligibility period, it shall pay Federal income taxes for the 2 years of the extended eligibility period as if it had not made an incubator REIT election and had ceased to qualify as a REIT for those 2 taxable years.

“(iii) **RETURNS, INTEREST, AND NOTICE.**—

“(I) **RETURNS.**—In the event the corporation ceases to be treated as a REIT by operation of clause (ii), the corporation shall file any appropriate amended returns reflecting the change in status within 3 months of the close of the extended eligibility period.

“(II) **INTEREST.**—Interest shall be payable on any tax imposed by reason of clause (ii) for any taxable year but, unless there was a finding under subparagraph (D), no substantial underpayment penalties shall be imposed.

“(III) NOTICE.—The corporation shall, at the same time it files its returns under subclause (I), notify its shareholders and any other persons whose tax position is, or may reasonably be expected to be, affected by the change in status so they also may file any appropriate amended returns to conform their tax treatment consistent with the corporation's loss of REIT status.

“(IV) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall provide appropriate regulations setting forth transferee liability and other provisions to ensure collection of tax and the proper administration of this provision.

“(iv) Clauses (ii) and (iii) shall not apply if the corporation allows its incubator REIT status to lapse at the end of the initial 2-year eligibility period without engaging in a going public transaction if the corporation is not a controlled entity as of the beginning of its fourth taxable year. In such a case, the corporation's directors may still be liable for the penalties described in subparagraph (D) during the eligibility period.

“(D) SPECIAL PENALTIES.—If the Secretary determines that an incubator REIT election was filed for a principal purpose other than as part of a reasonable plan to undertake a going public transaction, an excise tax of \$20,000 shall be imposed on each of the corporation's directors for each taxable year for which an election was in effect.

“(E) GOING PUBLIC TRANSACTION.—For purposes of this paragraph, a going public transaction means—

“(i) a public offering of shares of the stock of the incubator REIT;

“(ii) a transaction, or series of transactions, that results in the stock of the incubator REIT being regularly traded on an established securities market and that results in at least 50 percent of such stock being held by shareholders who are unrelated to persons who held such stock before it began to be so regularly traded; or

“(iii) any transaction resulting in ownership of the REIT by 200 or more persons (excluding the largest single shareholder) who in the aggregate own at least 50 percent of the stock of the REIT.

For the purposes of this subparagraph, the rules of paragraph (3) shall apply in determining the ownership of stock.

“(F) DEFINITIONS.—The term ‘established securities market’ shall have the meaning set forth in the regulations under section 897.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 856(h) is amended by striking “and (6)” each place it appears and inserting “, (6), and (7)”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after July 14, 1999.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR EXISTING CONTROLLED ENTITIES.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any entity which is a controlled entity (as defined in section 856(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this section) as of July 14, 1999, which is a real estate investment trust for the taxable year which includes such date, and which has significant business assets or activities as of such date. For purposes of the preceding sentence, an entity shall be treated as such a controlled entity on July 14, 1999, if it becomes such an entity after such date in a transaction—

(A) made pursuant to a written agreement which was binding on such date and at all times thereafter, or

(B) described on or before such date in a filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission required solely by reason of the transaction.

SEC. 23. MODIFICATION OF INDIVIDUAL ESTIMATED TAX SAFE HARBOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The table contained in clause (i) of section 6654(d)(1)(C) (relating to limitation on use of preceding year's tax) is amended by striking all matter beginning with the item relating to 1999 or 2000 and inserting the following new items:

“1999	106.5
2000	106
2001	112
2002 or thereafter	110”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to any installment payment for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1999.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 2360, AS MODIFIED

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2360.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been reported earlier. It is now pending.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment and send the modification to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. —. AGRICULTURE TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES AND CONSULTATIONS WITH CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) United States agriculture contributes positively to the United States balance of trade and United States agricultural exports support in excess of 1,000,000 United States jobs;

(2) United States agriculture competes successfully worldwide despite the fact that United States producers are at a competitive disadvantage because of the trade distorting support and subsidy practices of other countries and despite the fact that significant tariff and nontariff barriers exist to United States exports; and

(3) a successful conclusion of the next round of World Trade Organization negotiations is critically important to the United States agricultural sector.

(b) OBJECTIVES.—The agricultural trade negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to the World Trade Organization negotiations include—

(1) immediately eliminating all export subsidies worldwide while maintaining bona fide food aid and preserving United States market development and export credit programs that allow the United States to compete with other foreign export promotion efforts;

(2) leveling the playing field for United States producers of agricultural products by eliminating blue box subsidies and disciplining domestic supports in a way that forces producers to face world prices on all production in excess of domestic food security needs while allowing the preservation of non-trade distorting programs to support family farms and rural communities;

(3) disciplining state trading enterprises by insisting on transparency and banning discriminatory pricing practices that amount to de facto export subsidies so that the enterprises do not (except in cases of bona fide food aid) sell in foreign markets at prices below domestic market prices or prices below the full costs of acquiring and deliv-

ering agricultural products to the foreign markets;

(4) insisting that the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Accord agreed to in the Uruguay Round applies to new technologies, including biotechnology, and clarifying that labeling requirements to allow consumers to make choices regarding biotechnology products or other regulatory requirements cannot be used as disguised barriers to trade;

(5) increasing opportunities for United States exports of agricultural products by first reducing tariff and nontariff barriers to trade to the same or lower levels than exist in the United States and then eliminating barriers, such as—

(A) restrictive or trade distorting practices that adversely impact perishable or cyclical products;

(B) restrictive rules in the administration of tariff-rate quotas; and

(C) unjustified sanitary and phytosanitary restrictions or other unjustified technical barriers to agricultural trade;

(6) encouraging government policies that avoid price-depressing surpluses; and

(7) strengthening dispute settlement procedures so that countries cannot maintain unjustified restrictions on United States exports in contravention of their commitments.

(c) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—

(1) CONSULTATION BEFORE OFFER MADE.—Before the United States Trade Representative negotiates a trade agreement that would reduce tariffs on agricultural products or require a change in United States agricultural law, the United States Trade Representative shall consult with the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) CONSULTATION BEFORE AGREEMENT INITIALED.—Not less than 48 hours before initialing an agreement relating to agricultural trade negotiated under the auspices of the World Trade Organization, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely with the committees referred to in paragraph (1) regarding—

(A) the details of the agreement;

(B) the potential impact of the agreement on United States agricultural producers; and

(C) any changes in United States law necessary to implement the agreement.

(3) NO SECRET SIDE DEALS.—Any agreement or other understanding (whether verbal or in writing) that relates to agricultural trade that is not disclosed to the Congress before legislation implementing a trade agreement is introduced in either house of Congress shall not be considered to be part of the agreement approved by Congress and shall have no force and effect under United States law or in any dispute settlement body.

(d) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) reaching a successful agreement on agriculture should be the top priority of United States negotiators; and

(2) if the primary competitors of the United States do not reduce their trade distorting domestic supports and export subsidies in accordance with the negotiating objectives expressed in this section, the United States should take steps to increase the leverage of United States negotiators and level the playing field for United States producers in order to improve United States farm income and to encourage United States competitors to eliminate export subsidies and domestic supports that are harmful to United States farmers and ranchers.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, for point of clarification, this is a matter

that has now been negotiated so that we could reach agreement on the negotiating objectives for our trade representatives at the WTO Round.

I thank all the Members who have participated in this, certainly my cosponsor, Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa, and a special thanks to the chairman of the committee and the ranking member of the committee for their assistance in working this out.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, we are prepared to accept the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

If not, without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment, as modified, is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2360), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT NO. 2427, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide expanded trade benefits to countries in sub-Saharan Africa)

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2427 and ask unanimous consent that it be modified with the language I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

Would the Senator tell me what the modification is?

Mr. FEINGOLD. I say to the Senator, we have worked this out with you and your staff. What it does is add a certain number of items, goods, to the Lome Treaty product list of items that could be covered under this agreement. Actually, it makes it consistent with the legislation we have before us.

I believe we worked this out in advance with the Senator.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD] proposes an amendment numbered 2427.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Strike sections 111 through 114 and insert the following:

SEC. 111. ENCOURAGING MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL TRADE AND INVESTMENT.

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

(1) A mutually beneficial United States Sub-Saharan Africa trade policy will grant new access to the United States market for a broad range of goods produced in Africa, by Africans, and include safeguards to ensure that the corporations manufacturing these goods (or the product or manufacture of the oil or mineral extraction industry) respect the rights of their employees and the local environment. Such trade opportunities will promote equitable economic development and thus increase demand in African countries for United States goods and service exports.

(2) Recognizing that the global system of textile and apparel quotas under the MultiFiber Arrangement will be phased out under the Uruguay Round Agreements over the next 5 years with the total termination of the quota system in 2005, the grant of additional access to the United States market in these sectors is a short-lived benefit.

(b) TREATMENT OF QUOTAS.—

(1) KENYA AND MAURITIUS.—Pursuant to the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing, the United States shall eliminate the existing quotas on textile and apparel imports to the United States from Kenya and Mauritius, respectively, not later than 30 days after each country demonstrates the following:

(A) The country is not ineligible for benefits under section 502(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2462(b)(2)).

(B) The country does not engage in significant violations of internationally recognized human rights and the Secretary of State agrees with this determination.

(C)(i) The country is providing for effective enforcement of internationally recognized worker rights throughout the country (including in export processing zones) as determined under paragraph (5), including the core labor standards enumerated in the appropriate treaties of the International Labor Organization, and including—

(I) the right of association;

(II) the right to organize and bargain collectively;

(III) a prohibition on the use of any form of coerced or compulsory labor;

(IV) the international minimum age for the employment of children (age 15); and

(V) acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health.

(ii) The government of the country ensures that the Secretary of Labor, the head of the national labor agency of the government of that country, and the head of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions-Africa Region Office (ICFTU-AFRO) each has access to all appropriate records and other information of all business enterprises in the country.

(D) The country is taking adequate measures to prevent illegal transshipment of goods that is carried out by rerouting, false declaration concerning country of origin or place of origin, falsification of official documents, evasion of United States rules of origin for textile and apparel goods, or any other means, in accordance with the requirements of subsection (d).

(E) The country is taking adequate measures to prevent being used as a transit point for the shipment of goods in violation of the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing or any other applicable textile agreement.

(F) The cost or value of the textile or apparel product produced in the country, or by companies in any 2 or more sub-Saharan African countries, plus the direct costs of processing operations performed in the country or such countries, is not less than 60 percent of the appraised value of the product at the time it is entered into the customs territory of the United States.

(G) Not less than 90 percent of employees in business enterprises producing the textile and apparel goods are citizens of that country, or any 2 or more sub-Saharan African countries.

(H) The country has established, or is making continual progress toward establishing—

(i) a market-based economy, where private property rights are protected and the principles of an open, rules-based trading system are observed;

(ii) a democratic society, where the rule of law, political freedom, participatory democracy, and the right to due process and a fair trial are observed;

(iii) an open trading system through the elimination of barriers to United States trade and investment and the resolution of bilateral trade and investment disputes; and

(iv) economic policies to reduce poverty, increase the availability of health care and educational opportunities, expand physical infrastructure, and promote the establishment of private enterprise.

(2) OTHER SUB-SAHARAN COUNTRIES.—The President shall continue the existing no quota policy for each other country in sub-Saharan Africa if the country is in compliance with the requirements applicable to Kenya and Mauritius under subparagraphs (A) through (H) of paragraph (1).

(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Customs Service shall provide the necessary technical assistance to sub-Saharan African countries in the development and implementation of adequate measures against the illegal transshipment of goods.

(4) OFFSETTING REDUCTION OF CHINESE QUOTA.—When the quota for textile and apparel products imported from Kenya or Mauritius is eliminated, the quota for textile and apparel products from the People's Republic of China for each calendar year in each product category shall be reduced by the amount equal to the volume of all textile and apparel products in that product category imported from all sub-Saharan African countries into the United States in the preceding calendar year, plus 5 percent of that amount.

(5) DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED WORKER RIGHTS.—

(A) DETERMINATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of carrying out paragraph (1)(C), the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the individuals described in clause (ii) and pursuant to the procedures described in clause (iii), shall determine whether or not each sub-Saharan African country is providing for effective enforcement of internationally recognized worker rights throughout the country (including in export processing zones).

(ii) INDIVIDUALS DESCRIBED.—The individuals described in this clause are the head of the national labor agency of the government of the sub-Saharan African country in question and the head of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions-Africa Region Office (ICFTU-AFRO).

(iii) PUBLIC COMMENT.—Not later than 90 days before the Secretary of Labor makes a determination that a country is in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1)(C), the Secretary shall publish notice in the Federal Register and an opportunity for public comment. The Secretary shall take into consideration the comments received in making a determination under such paragraph (1)(C).

(B) CONTINUING COMPLIANCE.—In the case of a country for which the Secretary of Labor has made an initial determination under subparagraph (A) that the country is in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1)(C), the Secretary, in consultation with the individuals described in subparagraph (A), shall, not less than once every 3 years

thereafter, conduct a review and make a determination with respect to that country to ensure continuing compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1)(C). The Secretary shall submit the determination to Congress.

(C) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and on an annual basis thereafter, the Secretary of Labor shall prepare and submit to Congress a report containing—

(i) a description of each determination made under this paragraph during the preceding year;

(ii) a description of the position taken by each of the individuals described in subparagraph (A)(ii) with respect to each such determination; and

(iii) a report on the public comments received pursuant to subparagraph (A)(iii).

(6) REPORT.—Not later than March 31 of each year, the President shall publish in the Federal Register and submit to Congress a report on the growth in textiles and apparel imported into the United States from countries in sub-Saharan Africa in order to inform United States consumers, workers, and textile manufacturers about the effects of the no quota policy.

(c) TREATMENT OF TARIFFS.—The President shall provide an additional benefit of a 50 percent tariff reduction for any textile and apparel product of a sub-Saharan African country that meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (H) of subsection (b)(1) and subsection (d) and that is imported directly into the United States from such sub-Saharan African country if the business enterprise, or a subcontractor of the enterprise, producing the product is in compliance with the following:

(1) Citizens of 1 or more sub-Saharan African countries own not less than 51 percent of the business enterprise.

(2) If the business enterprise involves a joint-venture arrangement with, or related to as a subsidiary, trust, or subcontractor, a business enterprise organized under the laws of the United States, the European Union, Japan, or any other developed country (or group of developed countries), or operating in such countries, the business enterprise complies with the environmental standards that would apply to a similar operation in the United States, the European Union, Japan, or any other developed country (or group of developed countries), as the case may be.

(d) CUSTOMS PROCEDURES AND ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) OBLIGATIONS OF IMPORTERS AND PARTIES ON WHOSE BEHALF APPAREL AND TEXTILES ARE IMPORTED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all imports to the United States of textile and apparel goods pursuant to this Act shall be accompanied by—

(i)(I) the name and address of the manufacturer or producer of the goods, and any other information with respect to the manufacturer or producer that the Customs Service may require; and

(II) if there is more than one manufacturer or producer, or if there is a contractor or subcontractor of the manufacturer or producer with respect to the manufacture or production of the goods, the information required under subclause (I) with respect to each such manufacturer, producer, contractor, or subcontractor, including a description of the process performed by each such entity;

(ii) a certification by the importer of record that the importer has exercised reasonable care to ascertain the true country of origin of the textile and apparel goods and the accuracy of all other information pro-

vided on the documentation accompanying the imported goods, as well as a certification of the specific action taken by the importer to ensure reasonable care for purposes of this paragraph; and

(iii) a certification by the importer that the goods being entered do not violate applicable trademark, copyright, and patent laws.

(B) LIABILITY.—The importer of record and the final retail seller of the merchandise shall be jointly liable for any material false statement, act, or omission made with the intention or effect of—

(i) circumventing any quota that applies to the merchandise; or

(ii) avoiding any duty that would otherwise be applicable to the merchandise.

(2) OBLIGATIONS OF COUNTRIES TO TAKE ACTION AGAINST TRANSSHIPMENT AND CIRCUMVENTION.—The President shall ensure that any country in sub-Saharan Africa that intends to import textile and apparel goods into the United States—

(A) has in place adequate measures to guard against unlawful transshipment of textile and apparel goods and the use of counterfeit documents; and

(B) will cooperate fully with the United States to address and take action necessary to prevent circumvention of any provision of this section or of any agreement regulating trade in apparel and textiles between that country and the United States.

(3) STANDARDS OF PROOF.—

(A) FOR IMPORTERS AND RETAILERS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The United States Customs Service (in this Act referred to as the "Customs Service") shall seek imposition of a penalty against an importer or retailer for a violation of any provision of this section if the Customs Service determines, after appropriate investigation, that there is a substantial likelihood that the violation occurred.

(ii) USE OF BEST AVAILABLE INFORMATION.—If an importer or retailer fails to cooperate with the Customs Service in an investigation to determine if there has been a violation of any provision of this section, the Customs Service shall base its determination on the best available information.

(B) FOR COUNTRIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The President may determine that a country is not taking adequate measures to prevent illegal transshipment of goods or to prevent being used as a transit point for the shipment of goods in violation of this section if the Customs Service determines, after consultations with the country concerned, that there is a substantial likelihood that a violation of this section occurred.

(ii) USE OF BEST AVAILABLE INFORMATION.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—If a country fails to cooperate with the Customs Service in an investigation to determine if an illegal transshipment has occurred, the Customs Service shall base its determination on the best available information.

(II) EXAMPLES.—Actions indicating failure of a country to cooperate under subclause (I) include—

(aa) denying or unreasonably delaying entry of officials of the Customs Service to investigate violations of, or promote compliance with, this section or any textile agreement;

(bb) providing appropriate United States officials with inaccurate or incomplete information, including information required under the provisions of this section; and

(cc) denying appropriate United States officials access to information or documentation relating to production capacity of, and outward processing done by, manufacturers, producers, contractors, or subcontractors within the country.

(4) PENALTIES.—

(A) FOR IMPORTERS AND RETAILERS.—The penalty for a violation of any provision of this section by an importer or retailer of textile and apparel goods—

(i) for a first offense (except as provided in clause (iii)), shall be a civil penalty in an amount equal to 200 percent of the declared value of the merchandise, plus forfeiture of the merchandise;

(ii) for a second offense (except as provided in clause (iii)), shall be a civil penalty in an amount equal to 400 percent of the declared value of the merchandise, plus forfeiture of the merchandise, and, shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$100,000, imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both; and

(iii) for a third or subsequent offense, or for a first or second offense if the violation of the provision of this section is committed knowingly and willingly, shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$1,000,000, imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both, and, in addition, shall result in forfeiture of the merchandise.

(B) FOR COUNTRIES.—If a country fails to undertake the measures or fails to cooperate as required by this section, the President shall impose a quota on textile and apparel goods imported from the country, based on the volume of such goods imported during the first 12 of the preceding 24 months, or shall impose a duty on the apparel or textile goods of the country, at a level designed to secure future cooperation.

(5) APPLICABILITY OF UNITED STATES LAWS AND PROCEDURES.—All provisions of the laws, regulations, and procedures of the United States relating to the denial of entry of articles or penalties against individuals or entities for engaging in illegal transshipment, fraud, or other violations of the customs laws, shall apply to imports of textiles and apparel from sub-Saharan African countries, in addition to the specific provisions of this section.

(6) MONITORING AND REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than March 31 of each year, the Customs Service shall monitor and the Commissioner of Customs shall submit to Congress a report on the measures taken by each country in sub-Saharan Africa that imports textiles or apparel goods into the United States—

(A) to prevent transshipment; and

(B) to prevent circumvention of this section or of any agreement regulating trade in textiles and apparel between that country and the United States.

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "Agreement on Textiles and Clothing" means the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing referred to in section 101(d)(4) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(4)).

SEC. 112. GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN ARTICLES.—Section 503(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—

“(I) DUTY-FREE TREATMENT.—Subject to clause (ii), the President may provide duty-free treatment for any article described in subclause (II) that is imported directly into the United States from a sub-Saharan African country.

“(II) ARTICLE DESCRIBED.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—An article described in this subclause is any article described in section 503(b)(1) (B) through (G) (except for textile luggage) or an article set forth in the

most current Lome Treaty product list, that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a sub-Saharan African country that is a beneficiary developing country and that is in compliance with the requirements of subsections (b) and (d) of section 111 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act, with respect to such article, if, after receiving the advice of the International Trade Commission in accordance with subsection (e), the President determines that such article is not import-sensitive in the context of all articles imported from United States Trading partners. This subparagraph shall not affect the designation of eligible articles under subparagraph (B).

“(bb) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—In addition to meeting the requirements of division (aa), in the case of an article that is the product or manufacture of the oil or mineral extraction industry, and the business enterprise that produces or manufactures the article is involved in a joint-venture arrangement with, or related to as a subsidiary, trust, or subcontractor, a business enterprise organized under the laws of the United States, the European Union, Japan, or any other developed country (or group of developed countries), or operating in such countries, the business enterprise complies with the environmental standards that would apply to a similar operation in the United States, the European Union, Japan, or any other developed country (or group of developed countries), as the case may be.

“(ii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of clause (i), in applying section 111(b)(1) (A) through (H) and section 111(d) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act, any reference to textile and apparel goods or products shall be deemed to refer to the article provided duty-free treatment under clause (i).”

(b) TERMINATION.—Title V of the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after section 505 the following new section:

“SEC. 505A. TERMINATION OF BENEFITS FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

“No duty-free treatment provided under this title shall remain in effect after September 30, 2006 in the case of a beneficiary developing country that is a sub-Saharan African country.”

(d) DEFINITIONS.—Section 507 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2467) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The terms ‘sub-Saharan African country’ and ‘sub-Saharan African countries’ mean a country or countries in sub-Saharan Africa, as defined in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

“(7) LOME TREATY PRODUCT LIST.—The term ‘Lome Treaty product list’ means the list of products that may be granted duty-free access into the European Union according to the provisions of the fourth iteration of the Lome Convention between the European Union and the African-Caribbean and Pacific States (commonly referred to as ‘Lome IV’) signed on November 4, 1995.”

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for title V of the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 505 the following new item:

“505A. Termination of benefits for sub-Saharan African countries.”

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date enactment of this Act.

SEC. 113. ADDITIONAL ENFORCEMENT.

A citizen of the United States shall have a cause of action in the United States district court in the district in which the citizen resides or in any other appropriate district to seek compliance with the standards set forth under subparagraphs (A) through (H) of sec-

tion 111(b)(1), section 111(c), and section 111(d) of this Act with respect to any sub-Saharan African country, including a cause of action in an appropriate United States district court for other appropriate equitable relief. In addition to any other relief sought in such an action, a citizen may seek three times the value of any damages caused by the failure of a country or company to comply. The amount of damages described in the preceding sentence shall be paid by the business enterprise (or business enterprises) the operations or conduct of which is responsible for the failure to meet the standards set forth under subparagraphs (A) through (H) of section 111(b)(1), section 111(c), and section 111(d).

SEC. 114. UNITED STATES-SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN TRADE AND ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION FORUM.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—The President shall convene annual meetings between senior officials of the United States Government and officials of the governments of sub-Saharan African countries in order to foster close economic ties between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the President, after consulting with the officials of interested sub-Saharan African governments, shall establish a United States-Sub-Saharan African Trade and Economic Cooperation Forum (in this section referred to as the “Forum”).

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—In creating the Forum, the President shall meet the following requirements:

(1) FIRST MEETING.—The President shall direct the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, and the United States Trade Representative to invite their counterparts from interested sub-Saharan African governments and representatives of appropriate regional organizations to participate in the first annual meeting to discuss expanding trade and investment relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

(2) NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President, in consultation with Congress, shall invite United States nongovernmental organizations to host meetings with their counterparts from sub-Saharan Africa in conjunction with meetings of the Forum for the purpose of discussing the issues described in paragraph (1).

(B) PRIVATE SECTOR.—The President, in consultation with Congress, shall invite United States representatives of the private sector to host meetings with their counterparts from sub-Saharan Africa in conjunction with meetings of the Forum for the purpose of discussing the issues described in paragraph (1).

(3) ANNUAL MEETINGS.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall meet with the heads of the governments of interested sub-Saharan African countries for the purpose of discussing the issues described in paragraph (1).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the two floor leaders—the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee—for allowing me to make this modification to my amendment.

I understand they will be opposing it, but I very much appreciate their willingness to allow me to offer it in the form I want.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act is all about increasing our level of trade with sub-Saharan Africa. That’s

a worthy goal, because the current level of trade between the American and the African people is depressingly small. Africa represents only 1 percent of U.S. imports, 1 percent of U.S. exports, and 1 percent of U.S. foreign direct investment. AGOA’s supporters want to see those numbers increase, and that is what I want as well. However, the principal trade benefit appearing in AGOA is temporary preferential access to the U.S. market for textiles and apparel. This kind of legislation discourages the economic diversification that Africa needs to build economic strength.

AGOA does renew the GSP program, but does not amend it to provide duty-free benefits for many of Africa’s primary exports. This amendment, if accepted, will make the African Growth and Opportunity Act much more meaningful in terms of potential trade, while at the same time ensuring that this legislation does no harm. It expands the list of African products eligible for duty-free access to U.S. markets, while at the same time adding important qualifications to ensure that growth does not come at the expense of human development.

My amendment would make goods listed under the Lome Convention eligible for duty-free access, provided those goods are not determined to be import-sensitive by the President of the United States. Products covered include all of sub-Saharan Africa’s industrial products, all primary mineral products, and most of Africa’s agricultural products, such as fruits, nuts, cereals, cocoa, and basketware. These provisions mean more trade opportunities for more African people.

That’s an important idea—opportunities for African people. In fact, unlike the African Growth and Opportunity Act as it stands now, this amendment would ensure that Africans themselves are employed at the firms receiving benefits. My amendment requires that any textile firm receiving trade benefits must employ a workforce that is 90 percent African. In addition, my amendment requires that 60 percent of the value-added to a product comes from Africa. These provisions hold out an incentive to African governments, businesses, and civil societies to develop their human resources. And that would not only be good for Africa, but it would be good for America as well, as our trade partners in the region gain economic strength. At the same time that this amendment does more for Africans, it also takes important steps to protect American jobs from being lost to transshipment.

Trans-shipment occurs when textiles originating in one country are sent through another before they come to the United States. In this way, the actual country of origin can ignore U.S. quotas. Approximately \$2 billion worth of illegally transshipped textiles enter the United States every year. The U.S. Customs Service has determined that for every \$1 billion of illegally transshipped products that enter the United

States, 40,000 jobs in the textile and apparel sector are lost.

Those who think that transshipment isn't going to be a problem in Africa had better think again. An official website of China's Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation quoted an analyst as saying that:

Setting up assembly plants with Chinese equipment, technology and personnel could not only greatly increase sales in African countries, but also circumvent the quotas imposed in commodities of Chinese origin imposed by European and American countries.

The Chinese know that standard United States protections against transshipment are weak and easy to defeat.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act, as it currently stands, relies on the same old weak protections that have led to these statistics—the same textile visa system that China and the other countries have manipulated in the past. This inadequate system requires government officials in the country of manufacturing to give textiles visas before those textiles can be exported, in order to certify the goods' country of origin. But often, corrupt officials simply sell visas to the highest bidder.

My amendment would create a new system—one that makes the U.S. importer responsible for certifying where textiles and apparel were produced. This gives U.S. entities a strong financial stake in the legality of their imports. Instead of relying on foreign officials, this standard relies on the American companies who operate right here, under American law. This amendment also requires foreign governments to cooperate with Customs Service investigations into transshipment, or risk losing their trade benefits.

If we pass this amendment, countries that want to skirt U.S. trade regulations will have to re-think their designs on Africa. As the Senate moves to increase the levels of legal trade between the United States and Africa, we must think carefully about the context in which we conduct our trade relations. Labor rights, human rights, and environmental protections are given short shrift by the current version of the African Growth and Opportunity Act. This is a recipe for social unrest and distorted development, and it is clearly in the United States' best interest to address these issues.

We are all affected when logging and mining deplete African rainforests and increase global warming. We are all degraded when the products we buy and use are created by exploitation and abuse. And we all reap the benefits of an Africa where freedom and human dignity reign, creating a stable environment in which business can thrive. American ideals and simple good sense require that we be vigilant in this regard. This amendment contains provisions to address labor rights, human rights, and environmental protection. Mr. President, Africa labor unions have

been opposing AGOA for good reasons. This amendment takes their concerns seriously. It clearly spells out the labor rights that our trade partners in Africa must enforce in order to receive benefits. These include the right of association, the right to organize and bargain collectively, a prohibition on forced labor, minimum age of 15, and provisions for acceptable conditions with respect to wages, hours, and safety.

This amendment also provides for a monitoring procedure that involves the Africa Region branch of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions in compliance reporting. These provisions go far beyond the labor protections in the current bill, which are linked to GSP—and they do so for a reason. GSP labor rights provisions are rarely enforced. Some African countries—such as Equatorial Guinea—receive GSP currently yet do not allow the establishment of independent free trade unions. Clearly, GSP is not enough to ensure the growth and opportunity are not exchanged for abuse and exploitation.

This amendment would also deny benefits to countries engaging in significant human rights abuses. Mr. President, that is stronger language than AGOA currently contains, and it sends a clear signal about the kinds of partners the United States is seeking in Africa. As it stands, AGOA contains no environmental provisions whatsoever. Yet in some African countries like Tanzania, 85 percent of the population lives directly off the land. Clearly, development in Africa is contingent on environmental sustainability. My amendment grants additional trade benefits to U.S. and other foreign investors from developed countries when they use the same environmental technology and practices in Africa that they use at home. This amendment makes AGOA more important and more responsible. If we are serious about engaging in Africa, let's make a genuine effort, rather than a token one. Let's make a responsible effort rather than an indifferent one.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, regretfully, but once again, I rise in opposition to this measure. It would add overly restrictive African content and citizenship requirements, and the transshipment penalties are extraordinary. On the matter of citizenship, sir, I would not doubt that there are 30 garment shops, factories, if you like, floors or lofts, in New York City, in Manhattan, where a majority of the employees are not American citizens. They are legal immigrants, they have rights of American workers, they are paid, and they pay taxes. But in the course of the last three centuries, we

have seen enormous movements of labor from one place to another, a lot of recycling.

If I could take one moment, since it is quiet and we have some distinguished Senators here, recently there was a study of illegal immigration from Mexico by some very fine sociologists, American and Mexican. The question is, Under what circumstances would illegal immigration increase? The answer is that immigration would increase if you sealed the borders because it is circular. People come up north to work. They raise money, and they go back and they can buy a car. Then they return. If there was a real wall, they would not go back. The world economy has been such since the 18th century. Exceedingly, these are good intentions of the Senator who offered essentially the same amendment yesterday.

I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I hope Senators are not confused by the comments of the Senator from New York. Certainly, the 90-percent requirement with regard to workers in Africa is one of many provisions in this. This is not the same amendment as yesterday. This involves labor protections, human rights protections, environmental protections, expanding the list of goods. This is a much broader alternative. In fact, it is essentially the HOPE alternative. So I hope the Senators vote for this. Although we received 44 votes on the transshipment amendment, this is by no means a vote on this particular provision. I want to be clear about that.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the Senator is right. If I mischaracterized his amendment, I apologize. It is an extension of yesterday's amendment. Would he accept that characterization?

Mr. FEINGOLD. It covers a range of topics that have nothing to do with yesterday's amendment. It expands the number of products and trade and an alternative provision of what should be done. The Senator is correct that a couple of provisions are the same. I think many other provisions are of substantial importance, and I hope people regard this as an alternative approach.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I accept the Senator's account.

Again, I make a motion to table the amendment.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we set aside the Feingold amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2410

(Purpose: To provide expedited trade adjustment assistance for certain textile and apparel workers)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] proposes an amendment numbered 2410.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR TEXTILE AND APPAREL WORKERS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, workers in textile and apparel firms who lose their jobs or are threatened with job loss as a result of either (1) a decrease in the firm's sales or production; or (2) a firm's plant or facility closure or relocation, shall be certified by the Secretary of Labor as eligible to receive adjustment assistance at the same level of benefits as workers certified under subchapter D of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 not later than 30 days after the date a petition for certification is filed under such title II.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as we consider the African Growth and Opportunity Act, I rise to speak about the status of the United States textile and apparel industry. Last week I made a more complete statement regarding the demise of the industry, done in the name of free trade, under the guise of promoting market-based economies and democratic governments in developing countries.

The result of these trade agreements on the textile and apparel industry in the United States has been a flood of imports and a significant impact on employment. In my own state, the loss of textile and apparel jobs has been particularly devastating. Since 1987, South Carolina has lost nearly one-third of all textile jobs and over 50 percent of all its apparel jobs.

Another concern I have is how our legislation impacts our broader foreign policy and drug control objectives. I am concerned that as we propose to drastically increase container shipping through the Caribbean, we will be exposing our Nation to the potential for a tremendous increase in illicit drug imports.

Mr. President, the key to resolving many of our hemispheric problems is coordinating our criminal justice efforts, defense requirements, foreign policy, and economic and trade strategy toward Latin American countries. We cannot afford to look at these in isolation of one another.

Finally, let me highlight some of the more dangerous elements of legislation which some in Congress are proposing. While the Senate bill alleviates some

of the worst of these issues, I want the record to be clear on why these provisions must never become law. If, by some chance, this bill moves to a conference with the House, there may be an effort to incorporate some of these proposals. This would be a terrible mistake.

There are some in Congress who would favor the quota-free entry into the United States for apparel made in the Caribbean Basin countries from fabric produced anywhere in the world. Such a provision would void the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing.

Another flawed proposal is the scheme to use Tariff Preference Levels, whereby fabric produced anywhere in the world may be used in apparel sewn in the Caribbean Basin countries and imported duty-free and quota-free into the United States. Such preferences are permitted under NAFTA. Canada has used its preferences to export into the United States textile and apparel products made of non-North American yarns and fabrics. This violation of NAFTA has permitted \$300 million from textile mills in Europe and Asia to severely damage U.S. manufacturers of wool suits and wool fabrics as well as other U.S. producers. Likewise, Mexico is now sending textiles and apparel made from cheap Asian yarns and fabrics into the United States. Tariff Preference Levels are bad for the American textile and apparel industry and for its workers. They must not be permitted to be extended further.

Perhaps the worst provisions proposed in the House bill are those related to transshipment. Transshipment is the practice of producing textile and apparel goods in one country, and shipping it to the United States using the quota and tariff preferences reserved for a third country. The most egregious part of the House bill is that it fails to include provisions for origin verification identical to those in Article 506 of the North American Free Trade Act. This could lead to Africa and the Caribbean Basin being used as an illegal transshipment point by Asian manufacturers. It would encourage the use of non-U.S. produced fiber and fabric in apparel goods entering the United States duty-free.

Finally, the House bill grants overly generous privileges and preferences to African and the Caribbean Basin countries in a unilateral fashion. There is little incentive for these countries to grant reciprocal access for products made in the United States.

Mr. President, there is no question that unfair trade policies have negatively impacted employment levels in this important sector of our economy. There is no reason to believe the trade bills we are debating will lead to a different result. Furthermore, these bills raise serious national defense and foreign policy questions. Finally, many provisions, which unfortunately might be included in the final legislative product, would cause unnecessary

harm to the textile and apparel industry in the United States. The textile and apparel firms may survive as they adapt to our legislative actions and changing economic conditions. American textile workers may not be so fortunate. This is my main concern—for those textile and apparel workers who work hard, pay their taxes and raise their families. This is why I have reservations about this bill.

Mr. President, that is also why I am proposing an amendment to this bill. My amendment would correct an injustice in the current Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. If you accept the premise that it is good policy for the Senate to enact legislation that will result in Americans losing their jobs, then you must agree that Trade Adjustment Assistance is a program which deserves our support. This program provides extended unemployment insurance coverage and retraining benefits to displaced workers. It is the least we can do for the Americans working in the textile and apparel industry who will lose their jobs because of this bill.

My amendment would correct weaknesses in the current program. The Department of Labor would have 30 days to certify that the employees who are going to lose or who have lost their jobs would be eligible for the highest possible level of benefits available under the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program.

Mr. President, I call up amendment number 2410 and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. President, this amendment is very simple. It clarifies that textile workers who lose their job as a result of plant closure or relocation or as a result of a decrease in production or sales, shall receive trade adjustment assistance benefits from the Department of Labor. These benefits shall be the same as those available to workers who become employed as a result of NAFTA-related job losses.

I urge support for this amendment. It is the least we can do for the thousands of Americans who are going to lose their jobs as a result of this legislation. I yield the floor.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask for a voice vote on amendment No. 2410 at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2410) was agreed to.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, for the information of our colleagues, I think we are getting close to a vote on the Feingold amendment momentarily, or in the next few moments, and a vote on final passage.

First, I want to compliment Senator ROTH and Senator MOYNIHAN for their leadership in managing this bill. This wasn't the easiest bill in the world to manage. They handled it professionally and with great class. I think we are getting ready to pass a good bill. I

think we are going to pass a bill that proves, one, the Senate in 1999 is not isolationist and protectionist. It proves we can help a lot of our fellow people across the world by expanding trade, whether they be in Africa or whether they be in the Caribbean nations. We want to help them through trade, which we believe is mutually beneficial.

So I particularly compliment the two managers of this bill for their outstanding work and bringing to a close a bill that I think will be a real compliment to the first session of this Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 2480

(Purpose: To provide a waiver of a section 901(j) denial of foreign tax credit in the national interest of the United States, and to expand trade and investment opportunities for U.S. companies and workers)

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] proposes an amendment numbered 2480.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . APPLICATION OF DENIAL OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT REGARDING TRADE AND INVESTMENT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901(j) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to denial of foreign tax credit, etc., regarding trade and investment with respect to certain foreign countries) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) WAIVER OF DENIAL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to taxes paid or accrued to a country if the President—

“(i) determines that a waiver of the application of such paragraph is in the national interest of the United States and will expand trade and investment opportunities for U.S. companies in such country, and

“(ii) reports such waivers under paragraph (B).

“(B) REPORT.—Not less than 30 days before the date on which a waiver is granted under this paragraph, the President shall report to Congress—

“(i) the intention to grant such waiver, and

“(ii) the reason for the determination under subparagraph (A)(i).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply on or after February 1, 2001.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, the essence of this amendment is to allow the President of the United States a waiver to section 901, which denies foreign tax credits if he determines it is in the national interest of the United States and also to expand trade and investment opportunities for U.S. companies and workers.

Again, I appreciate the cooperation of both managers of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. ROTH. I call for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2480) was agreed to.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 2402

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I call up the Dorgan amendment No. 2402.

There is no further debate on this amendment. I ask that we proceed with a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2402) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2427

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, we are now prepared to return to Senator FEINGOLD's amendment, No. 2427 and proceed with the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 2427. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) would vote “no.”

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 352 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Abraham	Feinstein	Mack
Allard	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Moynihan
Baucus	Gorton	Murkowski
Bayh	Graham	Murray
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Bingaman	Grams	Robb
Bond	Grassley	Roberts
Breaux	Gregg	Rockefeller
Brownback	Hagel	Roth
Bunning	Hatch	Santorum
Burns	Helms	Sessions
Cochran	Hutchinson	Shelby
Conrad	Hutchison	Smith (NH)
Coverdell	Inhofe	Smith (OR)
Craig	Kerrey	Stevens
Crapo	Kyl	Thomas
Daschle	Landrieu	Thompson
DeWine	Lieberman	Thurmond
Dodd	Lincoln	Voinovich
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Enzi	Lugar	Wyden

NAYS—29

Akaka	Bryan	Cleland
Biden	Byrd	Collins
Boxer	Campbell	Dorgan

Durbin	Kerry	Sarbanes
Edwards	Lautenberg	Schumer
Feingold	Leahy	Snowe
Harkin	Levin	Specter
Hollings	Mikulski	Torricelli
Jeffords	Reed	Wellstone
Johnson	Reid	

NOT VOTING—4

Inouye	Kohl
Kennedy	McCain

The motion to table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 2505

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previously agreed to managers' amendment be modified with a technical change which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The modification is as follows:

SEC. 621. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TARIFF INVERSIONS.

It is the sense of the Senate that United States trade policy should, while taking into account the conditions of United States producers, especially those currently facing tariff phase-outs negotiated under prior trade agreements, place a priority on the elimination or amelioration of tariff inversions that undermine the competitiveness of United States consuming industries.

AMENDMENT NO. 2325

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be vitiated on the substitute amendment and the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2325) was agreed to.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion on the underlying bill be vitiated and the bill be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this is a difficult vote for me. This bill contains provisions I support such as the reauthorization of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act (TAA) and the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act. But the

CBI provision of the bill is troubling because it extends benefits unilaterally without assurances that reciprocal trade benefits will be granted to U.S. products.

However, with the adoption of the Levin-Moynihan amendment some progress is assured because under this amendment, the President would be required to take into consideration the extent to which a country provides internationally recognized worker rights, including child labor, collective bargaining, the use of forced or coerced labor, occupational health and safety and labor standards before the trade benefit can be granted.

The adoption of this amendment is a major reason I have decided to vote for this bill.

I hope this provision can be further strengthened in Conference. However, at a minimum, Senator MOYNIHAN has assured me a strong effort will be made to retain the provision in Conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARISON OF LEVIN-MOYNIHAN AMENDMENT
WITH UNDERLYING BILL

(Criteria for Designating CBTEA Beneficiary Country)

Under the Senate bill prior to adoption of the Levin-Moynihan amendment, to designate a beneficiary CBTEA country, the President must determine that a country has demonstrated a commitment to three things: (I) undertake its obligations under the WTO on or ahead of schedule; (II) participate in negotiations toward the completion of the FTAA or a comparable trade agreement; and (III) undertake other steps necessary for that country to become a party to the FTAA or a comparable trade agreement.

It then allows the President to consider ten criteria for making the determination that a country has demonstrated a commitment to the above three things. Among the ten criteria that can be considered is: the extent to which a country provides protection of intellectual property rights; the extent to which the country provides protections to investors and investment of the U.S. and; the extent to which the country provides internationally recognized worker rights.

The Levin-Moynihan amendment would require that in designating a beneficiary country, the President must consider the extent to which that country has demonstrated a commitment to each of the 13 criteria in the underlying bill. In other words, the Levin-Moynihan amendment elevates the criteria in the underlying bill to a mandatory status for consideration. Under this amendment, the President, in designating a country as a CBTEA country, must take into account, for instance, the extent to which the country provides internationally recognized worker rights, including:

(a) the right of association, (b) the right to organize and bargain collectively, (c) prohibition on the use of any form of coerced or compulsory labor, (d) a minimum age for the employment of children, and (e) acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health.

Some of the other specifically recognized items for mandatory consideration in our amendment are: (a) whether the country has

met specific counter-narcotics certification criteria, (b) the extent to which the country becomes a party to and implements the Inter-American Convention Against Corruption, (c) the extent to which the country affords to products of the U.S. tariff treatment that is no less favorable than the most favorable tariff treatment provided by the country to any other country pursuant to any free trade agreement to which such a country is a party, other than the Central American Common Market or the Caribbean Community and Common Market.

Under the Levin-Moynihan amendment consideration of these items is no longer just an option. The President must take these factors into consideration.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, this bill was not an easy bill for me to support. While I believe that fostering trade with our neighbors leads to growth both here and abroad, I also know that some companies use trade to take advantage of foreign low wage workers. I had hoped that this bill would take stronger measures to ensure that labor and environmental rights received greater respect.

I opposed cloture initially on this bill because it would unfairly limit the ability to improve the bill. After an agreement was worked out to allow trade related amendments, I decided to support cloture to move the legislation forward. I supported amendments that would have required labor and environmental agreements and stricter oversight of imports to avoid trans-shipment. I was disappointed that these amendments were not agreed to, but I encourage the conferees to continue fighting for these important issues.

Some important changes were made. The Senate included a provision to help our farmers cope with the negative effects of trade agreements. This Trade Adjustment Assistance for farmers parallels the Trade Adjustment Assistance program that has helped so many industrial workers. Senator HARKIN offered an amendment that will go a long way toward eliminating child labor in these developing countries if they hope to take advantage of the benefits in this legislation. This provision makes the bill more humane, and reflects our moral values, not just our economic interests.

While the bill is not perfect, increasing opportunity for some of the poorest countries is an important goal and deserves the support of the Senate. The countries of the Caribbean and sub-Saharan Africa know that trade and investment coupled with aid programs are more effective than foreign aid alone. The countries involved support this bill and look forward to a chance to sell their products in our market.

The struggle for labor standards is a long road, but that journey cannot start if people do not have jobs. There is no way to improve working conditions for the unemployed. Only when trade and investment bring jobs to these countries will workers be able to organize and fight for better conditions. Many of these countries are new democracies that have much to learn about the benefits of protecting their

workers. We should remember that the United States is a democracy that is 225 years old, and that the backbone of our labor laws are only 65 years old. Those laws did not come easily. There was a long, bitter, and sometimes bloody fight before the United States saw the wisdom of protecting workers rights. We need to continue our efforts, both at the government and non-governmental level, to convince these countries to follow our example. Unfortunately, our trade negotiators have only recently come to the conclusion that labor rights matter to workers here and abroad.

Making access to the U.S. market difficult is not going to improve the lot of workers in Africa and the Caribbean. The more we do to engage these countries and improve the climate for investment, the closer these countries get to moving out of poverty and toward prosperity.

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am, unfortunately, unable to be present for this vote, but would like to express my support for the final passage of the amended version of H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act. This legislation includes a modified version of the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the United States-Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act, and reauthorization of the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) and Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) programs.

This legislation will end up helping more than 1 billion people begin to enjoy the benefits of democracy and the free market system. Unfortunately when most Americans think of recent politics in Sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean, they only think of dictatorships, civil wars, and people crushed in the grip of poverty. It is a compelling portrait and shows the necessity of this legislation.

However, there is hope in the nightly news reports. Both in the Caribbean and in Africa, democracy and economic development are emerging from the shambles of the past. According to a 1998 global survey by Freedom House, 30 countries in Africa are now politically free or partially free. In addition, these countries are beginning to pursue policies of economic development that will help their citizens rise above the debilitating poverty of the past. In 1998, while the Asian economic crisis pummelled other countries, Africa's economies actually grew by an average rate of 3.1 percent.

Democracy and market economics also are established in the Caribbean. The civil wars in El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Guatemala have ended. Unfortunately, many of these countries are still suffering from the effects of Hurricanes Mitch and Georges, and need these trade benefits to rebuild their economies.

This year's elections in Nigeria and South Africa, and the upcoming election in Guatemala, exemplify the democratic developments in Africa and the Caribbean. As the bulwark of freedom and liberty, the United States

must do all that it can to ensure that democracy and market economics continue to spread and grow. This legislation is crafted to aid these transformations.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act establishes a special GSP program to give duty and quota-free treatment to selected African textiles and goods, and enhances cooperation between the United States and Sub-Saharan Africa. It is my hope that the President will use the provisions of this legislation to seriously pursue a free trade agreement with the leaders of Sub-Saharan African countries. The United States-Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act grants selected exports from Caribbean nations the duty- and quota-free treatment that has benefitted Mexico in the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Finally, the reauthorization of the GSP program helps many other developing countries benefit from preferential trade treatment. These GSP provisions will help developing countries become members of the global community and prosper in the growing world marketplace. Also, this legislation will reinforce the core American values of freedom and equal opportunity that are a cornerstone of our great country. This legislation is based on the commonsense principle that if you give a nation a handout, you feed it for a day, but if you teach its people to grow and trade, you assist them in becoming independent and self-reliant.

This legislation also helps U.S. workers and companies. U.S. exports to the Caribbean nations exceeded \$19 billion last year, and produced a \$2 billion trade surplus. This trade has created 400,000 American jobs. In 1998, the United States exported \$6.5 billion in goods to Sub-Saharan Africa. This trade supported over 100,000 American jobs. However, the United States only has a 7% share in the African market, while Europe has a 40% share. More U.S. trade and investment in both the Caribbean and Sub-Saharan Africa will increase U.S. market share and create more American jobs.

While I support this legislation, I believe that it can be improved during the conference with our colleagues from the House side. The House-passed version of the African Growth and Opportunity Act includes programs under the auspices of the Export-Import Bank and Overseas Private Investment Corporation that will give American companies incentives to invest in Africa. Also, I am concerned that the Congressional Budget Office estimates that "almost no apparel imports would qualify for special treatment" under the textile provisions of the Finance Committee amendment. The House-passed version of the bill removes quotas and duties on all African textile imports, and will be of much greater benefit to the African nations as well as to the U.S. It is my hope that the conferees will adopt these provisions in the House-passed version of the African

Growth and Opportunity Act. These measures will ensure true economic development and increased U.S. market access in Africa.

In addition, I have some concerns about the provision of the bill referring to the excise tax collected on rum. This provision increases by \$3.00 the amount of the excise tax on rum that is transferred to Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands retroactively from June 30, 1999, to October 1, 1999. The bill earmarks \$0.50 of this tax for the Puerto Rico Conservation Trust Fund. I am aware of the importance of helping our territories to become economically self-reliant, while also protecting their environments. However, I believe that we should look at more efficient ways to achieve this goal. It makes no sense for the federal government to collect a tax and then turn it all back over to the territories. I hope that this provision will be stricken from this legislation, and that we can more thoroughly examine how to help our territories achieve economic growth without unnecessary federal bureaucracy and taxation.

I am also concerned about certain other provisions that have found their way into this legislation. This legislation includes a provision to extend TAA benefits to farmers and fishermen. I know that the collapse of foreign markets abroad has hurt American farmers and believe that this issue should be given more consideration. I am also concerned by provisions included for Oregon power plant workers to apply for TAA benefits after their eligibility has expired, provisions to allow a company with operations in Connecticut and Missouri to obtain a refund on duties it paid on imports of nuclear fuel assemblies, and \$2 million earmark for a two-year study on how American Land Grant Colleges and not-for-profit international organizations can improve the flow of American farming techniques and practices for African farmers. These measures should be examined in the usual authorization process to ensure that it is considered on merit and not special interests. It should not be attached to this legislation when Senators have not had a chance to examine the costs and benefits.

In conclusion, I support this historic legislation to ensure the progress of democracy and economic development in Africa, the Caribbean, and other developing countries. By promoting freedom and interdependence, the United States can help millions of people live in a future without repression where any child's potential is limited only by their dreams.●

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on an issue of utmost importance to American suit manufacturers in New York and around the country, an issue that my colleague PAT MOYNIHAN has been fighting on for many years.

I am referring to an anomaly in America's tariff policy that harms

American companies like Hickey-Freeman, Pietrafesa, and other producers of fine wool suits.

Our response will determine whether this country will be able to support companies that manufacture suits with a "Made in America" label.

My general belief is that free trade is a boon to the overall economy. But our wool tariff policy is a patchwork quilt of part free trade, part high tariff, part no tariff: policies stitched together with no rhyme or reason as to how it will impact U.S. companies and consumers.

Under the current tariff schedule, U.S. suit companies that must import the very high quality wool fabric used to make high-end men's suits pay a tariff of 30 percent on that fabric. These American companies, in turn, compete with companies that import finished wool suits from other countries, which pay a 19 percent tariff on the finished suit. And since the NAFTA agreement, U.S. importers of suits made in Canada and Mexico pay no tariff whatever.

And those Canadian and Mexican suit manufacturers pay no, or very low, duties on their imported wool fabric from Italy and elsewhere. They, in effect, get a perfectly free ride into the U.S. market, while American clothing companies, employing American textile workers, have to pay to play.

Where is the consistency here? All we have today are randomly placed zero, 19 percent, or 30 percent tariffs with no concern over the big picture: American companies and American jobs.

In fact, U.S. companies have been fighting a war of attrition for nearly ten years, a war which they are slowly losing, due solely to American laws.

So we are now at a crossroads.

Some domestic fabric manufacturers support the tariff policies because they argue that Hickey-Freeman and other high-end suit manufacturers ought to buy their fabric here in the U.S. That would be great—if there was ample domestic supply of the fabric these suit companies require: But there is not.

According to leading American fabric manufacturers, U.S.-produced high-end wool fabric supply falls short of demand by more than 2.5 million square meters. That leaves Hickey-Freeman, a Rochester, New York, institution since 1899, Pietrafesa of Syracuse New York, and dozens of other fine suit manufacturers with two options: import more than half of their wool fabric at a 30 percent tariff, or shift their operations to countries where they will not be hindered by the restrictive added costs they face here.

In other words, these American companies are virtually compelled to move their operations out of the U.S. by these irrational U.S. laws.

That is why the textile workers unions are fighting hard to repeal these unfair tariff policies. Indeed, since 1991, fine suit manufacturers in New York and around the country have been forced to close dozens of manufacturing

facilities, and lay off more than 10,000 employees.

Don't get me wrong: I support the idea of free trade. I believe that our nation is the strongest and most prosperous on earth, and in such a strong global leadership position, due to our open trading system, and our principles of free trade which we help instill on other nations around the world.

But what I'm talking about today is not free trade. It is a hodge-podge of non-sensical trade laws. These wool tariffs give the advantage to foreign companies in other countries in their ability to compete in our market.

All I ask for is a level playing field—I believe that under fair trade and competition the U.S. worker and U.S. industries will prevail. But they will not be given a chance if the deck is stacked against them. Under current law, the game is fixed.

Now, I recognize that good faith negotiations are ongoing between American fine wool suit manufacturers, domestic wool producers, Senators MOYNIHAN and ROTH, Members of this body from interested states, and the White House. Senator MOYNIHAN has, for many years, made this unfair wool tariff a cornerstone of his efforts to ensure fair trade. And I am doing what I can to help move these negotiations along.

But I want to make clear that we need to resolve this issue as soon as possible. The American fine suit industry and their employees can wait no longer. Too many jobs have already been lost due to these tariffs, and too many more remain on the line.

The trade package currently under consideration in the Senate provides the best opportunity to finally provide economic justice to American companies struggling to compete in a global trading system which is still struggling to work out its kinks.

I believe that reasonable minds will resolve this issue when the facts are clear to all involved. And the main fact is that loyal, productive, U.S. companies are currently at a serious disadvantage in its own home economy. That should not stand.

AMENDMENTS NO. 2379 AND NO. 2483

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to explain my reasons for voting to table amendments No. 2379 and No. 2483 sponsored by Senator HOLLINGS. The two amendments would have required the United States to negotiate side agreements with the countries named in the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the United States-Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act concerning labor standards and the environment similar to the North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation and the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation. Mandating that the United States negotiate agreements before providing the benefits granted to these countries under this act would have had the effect of nullifying the bill.

Labor and environmental issues should be considered when negotiating

trade agreements. In today's global economy, the economic actions of one country can have profound implications for the entire world economy. We witnessed this firsthand with the recent global economic crisis. Just as the economic decisions of one person in Indonesia can have significant consequences for someone in Germany, the living standards, working conditions, and the environment standards of workers in Peru or Malaysia can have an impact on our workers here in the United States.

The two amendments offered by Senator HOLLINGS have admirable goals, however they are unworkable in the context of this bill. Because this bill calls for the United States to take the unilateral action of reducing tariffs on a wide range of products in order to provide incentive for these countries to develop their economies, it would be out of place to mandate negotiations that were designed to accompany bilateral trade agreements. If we are serious about protecting workers and the environment, we should include them as part of a bilateral negotiation when our trading partners will have obligations to fulfill.

Our goal with this bill is to improve and grow the economies of sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean Basin. We are doing this by opening our markets in the hope that these economies will integrate into the world economy as responsible trading partners and will develop as future markets for our exports.

The two amendments offered by Senator HOLLINGS would have had the effect of neutralizing the underlying bill to support economic development in sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean Basin. I could support similar amendments when they are raised in the context of trade agreements when side agreements can be enforced.

TARIFFS ON WOOL FABRICS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to commend the chairman and ranking member for their efforts on an issue that is important to workers in Illinois, as well as those in New York and other states. Specifically, I refer to their efforts and leadership in addressing the need to modify tariffs on wool fabrics used in the men's suit industry. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of S. 218 introduced by Senator MOYNIHAN at the beginning of this year, and have worked with both Senators from New York and many other colleagues on both sides of the aisle, on this issue.

Because of a loophole in NAFTA, Canadian suitmakers have become our largest source of imported suits at the expense of tens of thousands of American workers who have seen their plants close. I am a supporter of NAFTA—I voted for it and I believe it is good trade policy for our country. However, as part of NAFTA, concessions were made by our U.S. negotiators to allow Canada to bring Canadian manufactured suits in to the

United States, duty-free. Canada proceeded by removing its tariffs on imported wool fabrics, setting up a situation where its manufacturers could import the same fine wool fabrics American manufacturers import, manufacture a suit in Canada, and export that suit to the United States, without paying a single tariff. Our U.S. manufacturers are forced to pay over 30 percent in tariffs for this same fine wool fabric. All our manufacturers ask for from us is to provide a level playing field on which they can compete.

This has been a difficult issue to resolve because of the various stakeholders involved. However, unless the final trade bill offers some relief for this industry, more Americans will lose their jobs as a result of our own U.S. trade policies.

The pending amendment will allow this issue to be resolved in conference, and I commend both our majority and minority committee leaders for their efforts.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I also thank my chairman for his work, and that of his staff, in addressing an issue that I have worked on for many years. I first started this effort with my friend Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER a number of years ago. Since that time even more Americans have lost their jobs as a result of tariffs on wool fabric—fabric that is not produced in the quantity and quality needed by our domestic industry. I believe that we are close to finalizing an approach to finally resolve this issue, and I commend the chairman for his willingness to work with us on this important matter.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on behalf of the thousands of workers in New York, I join my colleagues in thanking both Chairman ROTH and Senator MOYNIHAN for their work on this issue. Earlier this year I was visited by one of these workers, Mr. Fred Cotraccia, a Shop Steward for Hickey-Freeman of Rochester, NY. At that time he explained to me the importance of providing relief to the suit manufacturing industry, and he presented me with a teddy bear dressed in an American-made, hand-made, fine wool fabric suit. In a letter from him accompanying the bear he says, "Please stand up for American jobs . . . My livelihood and the livelihood of thousands of other hard working American employees, depends on you supporting our jobs—please choose 'made in America.'"

A number of my Senate colleagues received a similar type letter, and a similar request to help save their jobs. I believe we have made significant strides in finding a way to provide relief to this industry at the expense of no one, but to the benefit of many.

Mr. KERRY. Today we must vote on a package of bills that are intended to promote trade and thereby lift-up the economies of sub-Saharan African and Caribbean Basin nations. I believe strongly in that premise. I believe that

free and fair trade can improve the lives of workers in developing nations and is vital to improve our economy at home. On balance, this achieves those goals, and I therefore support it.

Much of the debate surrounding this package of trade bills has centered on the provisions dealing with Africa. This is proper, as it is the AGOA portion of the bill that I am most concerned about. Many argue that AGOA is the last chance for Africa to develop a textile industry. In 2005, current quotas on textiles from Asia and other parts of the world will be lifted. If we lift those quotas on sub-Saharan African countries now, those countries may have some chance to develop their textile industry in the next five years, before Asia—especially China—has a chance to dominate textile manufacturing. If Africa does not develop its textile industry now, there is no way it will be able to compete with China in 2005. This would not only hurt African nations, who will be without a textile industry, but it will hurt US apparel manufacturers, who will have one less resource to produce their products and will be forced to send more of their work to China.

That said, this bill fails to address many of the crucial problems facing Africa, and it would be tragic if this were the final word on Africa. First, this bill fails to address the perhaps the single greatest barrier to economic growth and development in Africa: the spread of AIDS. Unless our efforts to combat this epidemic are bolstered immediately, this public health disaster will result in severe economic distress for African countries. The effect of this disease, which strikes people in their most economically productive years, cannot be ignored if we expect these countries to be effective trading partners. It is imperative and entirely appropriate to include AIDS relief in this legislation. A recent study in Namibia estimated that AIDS cost the country almost 8 percent of its GNP in 1996. Another analysis predicts that Kenya's GDP will be 14.5 percent smaller in 2005 than it would have been without AIDS, and that income per person will be 10 percent lower.

The microeconomic outlook is not much better. Businesses across sub-Saharan Africa are already suffering at the hands of HIV. In Zimbabwe, for instance, life insurance premiums grew four-fold in just two years because of AIDS deaths. Some companies there have reported a doubling of their health bills. In Botswana, companies estimate that AIDS-related costs will soar from under one percent of wages in 1999 to five percent by 2005. In Zambia and Tanzania, some companies have already reported that costs resulting from AIDS-related health costs and lower productivity have exceeded total profits. Without addressing a health crisis of this enormity, we are ignoring one of the most important impediments to development of the African continent.

The second concern I have with the AGOA bill is that it ignores the great albatross of debt that hangs around the neck of the African people and is a tremendous impediment to their economic growth and development. AGOA provides no debt relief to Africa, despite the fact that Africa's crushing \$230 billion debt burden is a massive obstacle to economic and social progress. By ending the vicious circle of debt and debt servicing, debt relief for Africa would open the way for private investment in African enterprises, investment that is critical to the long-term development and growth of every economy.

I believe that the United States should play a prominent role in reducing the debt burden of nations that are unable to achieve sustainable economic growth and development under the constraint of servicing their national debts. Our economic relationship with Africa must take the long view and advance policies that will build a solid basis for continued growth, rather than simply extending the short-sighted, debt-centered policies of decades past.

Unfortunately, many amendments that would have begun to address the weaknesses of the AGOA bill failed on the Senate floor. I supported amendments that would have improved labor and environmental standards and that would have better addressed transshipment concerns. Although those amendments failed, I will, nevertheless, support this package, not because I am fully satisfied with its treatment of Africa, but because as a whole, the package includes other important trade measures that will not only bolster the economies of developing nations, but will have a positive economic impact here at home. I have long been a proponent of Trade Adjustment Assistance as a way to help U.S. workers and industries that have been harmed by trade. The Generalized System of Preferences is also a crucial to developing countries by stimulating their exports. I am pleased that this package includes these very important programs.

Finally, the CBI portion of the package will put our neighbors in the Caribbean on more equal footing with Mexico. By providing duty free treatment to apparel assembled in the Caribbean basin only if US fabrics are used, this bill will strengthen the economy and long term stability of Caribbean Basin countries. This will go a long way to help them to recover from the extensive damage they suffered during Hurricanes Mitch and Georges. The U.S. has a trade surplus with Caribbean Basin which has led to more and better jobs in my home state of Massachusetts and throughout the country.

Because the balance of the package of trade bills before us today is favorable, I support the bill with the sincere hope that we revisit the issues of concern to sub-Saharan Africa soon.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, we have stepped back from the brink. A

week ago it appeared that we would reject this essential trade legislation. The first in five years. Weeks before the opening of the Third Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organization, which will launch a new round of trade negotiations. Here in the United States, in Seattle.

As a tribute to the patience of our esteemed chairman, Senator ROTH, and our leaders Senators LOTT and DASCHLE, we somehow agreed to revive the bill. We now move one step closer to providing the President with legislation that will confirm, when he arrives in Seattle, that the United States Senate remains committed to open trade policies.

I join the chairman of the Finance Committee in urging the Senate's support for this package of trade measures which includes the Finance Committee's sub-Saharan African and CBI trade bills, as well as the reauthorization of the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) and the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) programs. Each of these measures was approved by the Finance Committee with near unanimous support.

Federal Reserve Board Chairman Greenspan noted, in a speech he delivered in Boston on June 2, the "recent evident weakening of support for free trade in this country." We appear to be turning against trade policies that we have pursued for 65 years. It is hard to understand this in a period when, as the New York Times reported last Friday:

The American economy turned in its best quarterly performance of the year this summer, virtually guaranteeing enough momentum to carry the nation to its longest economic expansion in history early next year.

Let me repeat that last phrase—"its longest economic expansion in history. . . ." Not just peacetime, or just wartime, but "in history."

And what are the benefits of this unprecedented economic expansion—an expansion that started in April 1991, is now in its eighth year, will break the record of 107 months in February 2000, and shows no sign of ending? The answer is clear: an unemployment rate of 4.2 percent—a level not seen in almost 30 years; and near zero inflation.

To what can we attribute this remarkable performance of the American economy?

I dare say that if the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930 was one of the causes of World War II, then trade liberalization is one of the reasons for the unprecedented expansion.

Other factors I would cite are just-in-time inventories—made possible by the information age, the 1993 deficit reduction act, Alan Greenspan, and perhaps some "good luck."

Given the tremendous transformation of the American economy—between 1960 and 1998 manufacturing employment dropped from 30 to 15 percent of total employment—there inevitably were and will be dislocations. Since 1962 we have eased the cost of

dislocation to workers by providing Trade Adjustment Assistance—assistance which will expire at the end of this week. More than 200,000 workers are eligible for trade adjustment assistance. The bill before us would continue Trade Adjustment Assistance, something we ought to do as we enact trade liberalization policies.

I would also note that this legislation reflects our commitment to honor the ILO's core labor standards, a commitment made by all 174 members of the ILO. The Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, adopted at the 86th International Labor Conference, declares that "all members, even if they have not ratified the Convention in question, have an obligation, arising from the very fact of membership in the Organization, to respect, to promote, and to realize, in good faith" these core labor standards; (1) freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; (2) the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labor; (3) the effective abolition of child labor; and (4) the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

Under the managers' substitute the President must assess the compliance of the CBI and sub-Saharan African countries with these core labor standards—these "internationally recognized worker rights."

The Generalized System of Preferences—which we put in place a quarter century ago—was the United States' response to the plea of developing countries that the industrial world ought to give them an opportunity—and a bit of an incentive—to compete in world markets. The theme then—as today—was that "trade, not aid" would ultimately wean countries from their dependence on foreign aid and help diversify their economies. This legislation will continue this important program.

The bill puts in place—at long last—a trade policy with respect to sub-Saharan Africa, a policy that is long overdue. The economic challenges facing sub-Saharan Africa today may be even greater than they were at the height of the cold war. Consider the differing paths of South Korea and Ghana: in 1958, the year after Ghana achieved independence, its per capita GDP, at \$203, exceeded that of South Korea (\$171 at the time). Forty years later, in 1998, South Korea's per capita income had soared to \$10,550, even after the Asian financial crisis, while Ghana's stood at a modest \$390.

The Africa trade legislation in this package will not reverse years of neglect and decline, but it may provide a decent start.

And we endorse with this legislation President Reagan's Caribbean Basin Initiative—begun in 1983—updating the program to enable the CBI countries to remain competitive even as the NAFTA has eroded their market positions. The chairman and I met 6 weeks

ago with the Presidents and Vice Presidents and Foreign Ministers of a number of the CBI states—the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Trinidad and Tobago, Costa Rica. They made a simple request—that we allow our trade to grow. And so this legislation will do.

This is legislation which deserves strong support here in the Senate, so that we can quickly move to a conference with the House and send the President to Seattle negotiations with the bipartisan backing of trade liberalization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) would vote "no."

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 353 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Abraham	Fitzgerald	Lugar
Allard	Frist	Mack
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Baucus	Graham	Mikulski
Bayh	Gramm	Moynihan
Bennett	Grams	Murkowski
Biden	Grassley	Murray
Bingaman	Gregg	Nickles
Bond	Hagel	Robb
Breaux	Harkin	Roberts
Brownback	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bryan	Hutchinson	Roth
Burns	Hutchison	Schumer
Campbell	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Jeffords	Shelby
Conrad	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Kerrey	Specter
Craig	Kerry	Stevens
Crapo	Kohl	Thomas
Daschle	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Lautenberg	Voinovich
Domenici	Levin	Warner
Durbin	Lieberman	Wyden
Enzi	Lincoln	
Feinstein	Lott	

NAYS—19

Akaka	Edwards	Sarbanes
Boxer	Feingold	Smith (NH)
Bunning	Helms	Snowe
Byrd	Hollings	Thurmond
Cleland	Leahy	Wellstone
Collins	Reed	
Dorgan	Reid	

NOT VOTING—4

Inouye	McCain
Kennedy	Santorum

The bill (H.R. 434), as amended, was passed.

Mr. ROTH. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I want to take a few seconds to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for a

very strong bipartisan support for the bill. I also want to extend my thanks to the majority and minority leaders who worked so hard to find the compromise that enabled the legislation to move forward.

Let me underscore and emphasize that we would not be where we are if it had not been for my good friend, Senator MOYNIHAN. His patience, his historical perspective on trade, and the key role he has played through the years were instrumental in getting this legislation through. I want to say I think it gives a clear statement to our neighbors in the Caribbean, Central America, and Africa that we are willing to invest in a long-term economic relationship—a relationship of partners and a common endeavor of expanding trade, enhancing economic growth, and improving living standards.

I also think, most importantly, it will send a very clear signal to our partners around the world that isolationism is dead, that liberal trade policies are still supported overwhelmingly. It signals, I believe, that the United States is prepared to engage constructively in the wider world around us and to provide the kind of leadership necessary to reach our common goals.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I stand here to assert that we would not be here at this moment without the revered chairman of the Committee on Finance. He has kept to a party tradition that goes back generations. He has enabled us, sir, to pass the first trade bill in this Senate in 5 years. We were beginning to send a signal that was ominous and could have been, in the end, ruinous. But we have stepped back from that brink, and we have WILLIAM ROTH of Delaware to thank.

I thank all of our wornout and excellent associates, David Podoff, Debbie Lamb, Linda Menghetti, and Tim Hogan on our side, and all of the majority staff. I see Frank Polk over there, and Grant Aldonas, Faryar Shirzad and Tim Keeler. It is a fine moment. Let us hope we make the most of it, sir.

With great thanks to all, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ROTH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LOTT, Mr. HELMS, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. BIDEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIOLENCE IN SEATTLE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, during the course of our debate on the floor of the Senate today, we have considered a myriad of important amendments to a very important trade bill. The attention of Senators on both sides of the aisle was focused on the floor, of course, but it was also focused on our Cloakrooms, the rooms that are a few feet away from me. Again, on television, every time we walked in the Cloakroom, we looked up to see another all-news channel with pictures that were incredible. Of course, the footage today comes from the city of Seattle, WA. Seattle, WA, has become another battlefield in America's endless gun war. Seattle, WA, erupted in violence today.

As I stand here now, I don't know if they have been able to apprehend the terrorist who was involved in this. They were searching for him. The latest news suggests that two people are dead and two are critically wounded. I know some eight or nine schools have been locked down with children inside in the surrounding neighborhood, for fear they might become victims of senseless gun violence as well.

One of my colleagues in the Senate, PATTY MURRAY, lives in Seattle, WA, just a few blocks away from the scene. She has been on the phone all day calling her son, a grown man who is working at a business nearby, to make certain he was safe. Her plea to her son to take care, I am sure, has been repeated over and over thousands of times by the residents in Seattle who are worried about their loved ones who might be in the path of another gun terrorist.

This surreal scene that seems to be unfolding in Seattle as we watch the television screen shows SWAT teams going through the neighborhoods of that lovely city with bulletproof shields, trying to find this gun terrorist, schools locked down, people staying behind closed doors for fear if they walk out in the street, they will literally be killed, as two already have been.

This is what happened today in the State of Washington. But America's families should also know what did not happen today in the city of Washington—Washington, DC. What did not happen today was a meeting between House and Senate conferees to finish work on a commonsense gun control bill to try to keep guns out of the hands of those who would misuse them—kids, criminals, people with a history of violent mental illness.

The Nation was shocked and the Senate was shocked a few months ago with the Columbine killings—shocked into finally doing something. We passed a bill by one vote, the tie-breaking vote being that of Vice President Al Gore, who came to this floor and voted for the bill which provided, very modestly,

that before a person can buy a gun at a gun show, we have the right to know whether they have ever been convicted of a violent crime or whether they have a history of violent mental illness.

Is it a radical idea to try to keep guns out of the hands of kids, criminals, and those who are unstable? Most American families don't find that radical. I am glad we passed that bill. We sent it over a few hundred feet away to the House of Representatives so that, in our bicameral Government, they could do their part of the job.

Well, in the ensuing time between it leaving the Senate and arriving in the House, the people with the gun lobbies in Washington got very busy. They lined up enough votes to literally stall and kill that bill. So we have the only attempt in this congressional session for sensible gun control being stopped in its tracks by the gun lobby on Capitol Hill. Yet day after frightening day, another city across the United States of America is subjected to senseless gun violence.

Today, it was Seattle. Yesterday, it was Honolulu, HI, where a man walked into the company where he once worked and killed seven people with a handgun, a man who had a history of psychological problems. When they finally apprehended him and searched his home, they found some 18 different weapons, semiautomatic weapons, shotguns, and handguns—a small arsenal in the hands of a person who was turned down when he attempted to get a firearm owner's permit in 1994.

That was Honolulu yesterday; Seattle today, two more victims.

I need not tell you that nothing happened on Capitol Hill yesterday to deal with gun violence, and nothing happened today as this senseless violence unfolds in Seattle. You have to ask yourself whether the men and women elected to the Senate and to the House of Representatives can walk blindly by the television screens and ignore this endless war of gun violence in America that unfolds every day.

Have we become so oblivious to the pain that is being visited upon America by the proliferation of guns in the hands of those who shouldn't have them? You would have to draw the conclusion that the gun lobby has blinded this Congress to the reality of gun violence in America.

Sadly, what happened in Honolulu yesterday and is happening in Seattle even as we speak is repeated day in and day out across America. We lose 13 children every single day in America, as many children as were killed in Columbine we lose every day in gun violence.

Have we become so callous we can't even feel this any longer, that we don't understand what is happening to our country, this great and noble Nation which has allowed itself to disintegrate into areas of violence that, frankly, people around the world can't even understand? How can this Nation that has so much to say for itself stand by and

do literally nothing when it comes to this gun violence?

This Congress has been at its worst when it comes to responding to this national crisis—at its worst. This Congress has been a captive of the gun lobby, unable and unwilling to promote even the most basic and modest provision in the law to protect families across America. We stand idly by.

Some even argue, well, the answer is to give everyone in America a gun. What a solution that would be, the so-called "concealed carry law." So that no matter what restaurant you walk into, what high school basketball game you attend, what mall you stroll through, never knowing if that little argument in the corner is going to erupt into gunfire because people are packing guns right and left. What an answer. That is no answer whatsoever. America's families know it.

Let me tell you something else that recently happened. Senator BOXER of California put a provision in an appropriations bill which said as follows: No licensed gun dealer in the United States can sell a gun to a person they know to be intoxicated. They accepted the amendment on the floor. As soon as it got to conference, the gun lobby took it out. Think about that. They would even want us to allow gun dealers to sell guns to intoxicated people. How irresponsible can you be?

When I tried to put in an amendment that held gun owners who are licensed legally responsible for the safe storage of their own guns away from children—beaten back by the gun lobby, unacceptable. Many States have put that standard in the law. But in Washington we wouldn't even consider it as we see day after weary day children finding the gun cabinet, reaching in, getting a handgun, killing themselves, or some innocent playmate whose family may not have even known there was a gun in the residence.

When we tried to put a provision in the law to say you can't buy more than one gun a month in the United States, unacceptable; one gun a month, unacceptable.

This fellow in Honolulu and others build up a personal arsenal and build up their own psychological problems to the point where they break and turn on innocent people.

I hope those who serve in Congress understand that we will be held accountable and should be held accountable. But I hope even more that families across America who are afraid of gun violence in their communities and who are fed up with what the gun lobby has done to this Congress will speak out. That is the only way this will change. You have to ask your candidate for Congress, the House Member or Senate: Where do you stand? Where are you going to be when it comes to sensible gun control? Will you stand up for the families of America or will you stand up for the gun lobby and the National Rifle Association? It is a very basic question. If it is not asked and

answered, the sad reality is that what happened today in Seattle and what happened yesterday in Honolulu could happen in anyone's hometown tomorrow.

We have been told by the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Henry Hyde, that it is not likely the conference will meet in the next few days on this gun control bill. That is a shame. We may leave this year doing absolutely nothing to make America's streets safer.

Frankly, this Congress, again, has put first things last. We have done some good things today; we are proud of them, I am sure. But tonight's news will not herald our accomplishments on the Senate floor. Tonight's news reports another tragedy in America, a tragedy in America which this Senate and this House of Representatives refuses to even acknowledge.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I can't help but lament that we have an administration that has prosecuted fewer people for gun violations than any administration in modern history. That is something that could be done today. It could have started this afternoon; it could have begun 7 years ago; but it was not.

FINANCIAL SERVICES MODERNIZATION ACT OF 1999—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that under the previous agreement I call up the conference report to accompany S. 900, the Financial Services Modernization Act of 1999.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 900), to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, insurance companies, and other financial service providers, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective House as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment and the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the bill; signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of November 2, 1999.)

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, in case any of our colleagues are watching, let me try to outline what we were going to do tonight.

Senator SARBANES and I are going to make opening statements tonight. It is our understanding that no one else wishes to speak tonight. Then it would be our objective to reserve the remainder of our time for the debate tomorrow. Then the Senate would begin the process of shutting down for the evening.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, will the chairman yield?

Mr. GRAMM. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, as I understand it, there is a time agreement which has been entered into, which I hope all Members are aware of, with 4 hours equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member. There is an hour for Senator SHELBY, and an hour for Senator WELLSTONE, 30 minutes for Senator BRYAN, and 20 minutes for Senator DORGAN.

I understand Senator WELLSTONE intends to be here in the morning at 9:30 to start using his time, which is when the Senate will come in. I presume we will then work right straight through.

I think we ought to say to Members that we intend to try to carry this thing through to completion and run our time straight through, which would enable us to finish this bill by mid afternoon.

I understand the House would like to act on this matter yet tomorrow. Of course, that would be assisted, if we could move it through the Senate in a reasonable time.

Parliamentary inquiry: If quorum calls are registered, is the time then drawn down equally from allocations of time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only by unanimous consent. Otherwise, it is charged to the side to which it is assigned.

Mr. SARBANES. I am sure the chairman and I can work that out between us. I think it would be our intention not to have quorum calls. We want people to come and use this time, and not end up drawing it down.

I think we ought to, in effect, alert our Members to that effect, and also of our desire to be able to move straight through. So for Members who wish to speak beginning about 10:15 or 10:30, the thing will be open for Members to get time and speak on this conference report.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I join Senator SARBANES in urging Senators who want to speak on the bill, and I know there will be many, to be here. The clock will run. We will have to take a break right before 12 o'clock to swear in Senator Chafee, but except for that period of time where we will be off this bill, it will be my intention, and I know it is the intention of the leadership on both sides of the aisle, to stay on the bill until we finish it.

Today we are bringing to the floor a bill that has been a long time in the making. When Glass-Steagall was adopted, Franklin Roosevelt called it the most important and far-reaching legislation ever enacted by the Amer-

ican Congress. In fact, Time magazine just yesterday called it the defining financial legislation of the 20th century. Yet, while it is both of those, or has become both of those, Senator Glass almost immediately after the adoption of the Act bearing his name began to have second thoughts and started the process of overturning Glass-Steagall.

We are here today with a bill which I believe will prove to be the most important banking bill in 60 years. It does overturn the key provision of Glass-Steagall that basically divided the American financial system into securities and banking halves. In the process an unnatural competitive environment was created, and over time, the market and the regulators have through a variety of innovations sought to undo this separation.

This bill we bring to the floor of the Senate basically knocks down the barriers in American law that separate banking from insurance and banking from securities. These walls, over time, because of innovative regulators and because of the pressure of the market system, have come to look like very thin slices of Swiss cheese. As a result, we already have substantial competition occurring, but it is competition that is largely inefficient and costly, it is unstable, and it is not in the public interest for this situation to continue.

The Financial Services Modernization Act strikes down these walls and opens up new competition. It will create wholly new financial services organizations in America. It will literally bring to every city and town in America the financial services supermarket.

Americans today spend about \$350 billion on financial services—on fees and charges and interest. Most people who have looked at the capacity for our markets under a more rational system believe, as I believe, that there are tens of billions of dollars of savings for the American consumer that will be produced by the reforms of this bill.

This bill will allow Dicky Flatt, a printer in Mexia, Texas, to go to the bank and take the checks he has received in his print shop that day and do his banking, deal with his insurance business, work on the retirement program that he and his wife and his employees have, all in one location with all the efficiencies and synergies that come from that.

This is a dramatic bill that will produce new products. It will produce a diversity of financial services and products that we have never seen before. Because of the competition in allowing these three major industries to compete head on, these products will be produced and these services will be provided at lower prices than we have ever seen.

There has been great debate in the media, and it will go on until the facts are in, as it should. That is what happens in a free society. But when people ask me who benefits from this bill, I answer, everybody who uses financial

services will benefit from this bill: Everybody who borrows money, everybody who has a checking account or a credit card, everybody who buys insurance or securities, everybody who is engaged in modern financial transactions. When you sum all that up, that is everybody in America, for all practical purposes.

Once we had decided to tear down these barriers, the logical question was, in providing these new financial services and these new products, how were they going to be provided? Were they going to be provided within the bank itself, or were they going to be provided in a holding company, separated from the bank? We had a very heated debate and, I believe, a debate with very high intellectual content on that subject on the floor of the Senate. It was decided in the Senate by a relatively close vote. It is one of these issues on which everybody's eyes glaze over, but it is an issue that has profound importance.

What we have produced in this bill, which is what is always produced in the legislative process, is a compromise. I think the compromise on the question of whether banks should provide these new services within the bank or outside the bank is a good compromise, and I strongly support it. I want to congratulate Larry Summers, the Secretary of the Treasury, and Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, for working out this compromise. I very strongly support it.

The compromise allows banks, under very limited circumstances, to provide some of these expanded services within the bank. Basically, those circumstances try to deal with two problems about which many have been concerned. I have been concerned about them, Alan Greenspan was concerned about them, and others were as well. We were concerned about safety and soundness and concentration of financial activities within a bank, driven by the potential for a bank benefiting from a subsidy because deposits are insured by the taxpayer, because the bank has access to the Fed window in borrowing money at lower rates than anybody else, and because of the bank's access to the Fed wire, and transferring funds risk free.

I believe the compromise deals with that by very severely limiting what banks can do within the bank, requiring that banks, in order to provide even limited financial services within the bank, be extremely well managed and well capitalized. That is, they have to have at least an A rating on their subordinated debt. Subordinated debt is the last debt to be paid, so if you are a bank and you have outstanding subordinated debt, that obligation is paid after the depositors, after the creditors, after everybody. For a bank to have an A or an AA or an AAA rating, it has to be extraordinarily well managed and well capitalized, and banks will not be able to engage in activities

within the bank unless they meet that test.

We eliminate the double counting of assets that is inherent in providing these services within the bank. If you provide securities activities and services within the bank by setting up a securities operating subsidiary in the bank, you put capital into that securities business, but because it is under the umbrella of the bank, it counts as part of the capital of the bank even though it is committed to capitalizing the securities business. What we require in this compromise—and I think wisely require—is that we eliminate this double counting by saying the capital that is invested in the subsidiary cannot count as part of the capital of the bank.

We limit all subsidiaries that banks can engage in, and the investments they can make within the bank itself, to no more than 20 percent of the capital of the bank.

So these are very strict limitations. We have an outright prohibition on many activities. In terms of where we started and in terms of the legitimate concerns that were raised on both sides, I think this is a very strong and a very good compromise.

The second major feature of the bill is that we promote and strengthen functional regulation. Under the bill, the general rule is that if you are a bank and you are in the securities business, you are regulated by the Securities and Exchange Commission. If you are a bank and you are in the insurance business, you are regulated by the state insurance commissioner in the area where you are engaged in the insurance business. If you are a bank and you are engaged in banking, you are regulated by the bank regulator. By opting for functional regulation, we preserve consumer protection, we lower costs.

One of the issues on which an extraordinary amount of time was spent and which for 99.99 percent of the American people would be meaningless is the whole issue about swaps and derivatives. We currently have literally trillions of dollars of swaps and derivatives in the global economy that have become the underpinnings of the financial structure of the country. They are used by sophisticated parties. We went to great lengths in this bill not to upset the current regulatory environment for these products, to see that we did not create any new law giving anybody any new, or removing any existing, jurisdiction over swaps or derivatives. I thank Chairman Levitt and Chairman Greenspan for their help on this issue.

Probably the most contentious issue in the bill, as it turned out, was not the decision to repeal Glass-Steagall but what to do with the so-called Community Reinvestment Act, or CRA. The CRA was a bill created in 1977, that started out as a very small program, but over the years it has grown to be a very large program with increased en-

forcement and with greater impact due to the tremendous mergers taking place among financial institutions in America. CRA has literally become bigger than General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler combined. It has evolved in such a way that it not only involves loans but cash payments.

Concerns were raised—and I as chairman of the committee raised many of those concerns—that we needed to begin to see a reform process. We have two changes in the bill that are related to reforming CRA. By far the most important is the sunshine provision. The sunshine provision is very important because it recognizes that banks are making CRA payments as part of compliance practices, that while these payments are made with private funds, they are made under public direction. As a result, this money takes on a very clear government tint because it is paid substantially in part as a way of complying with a Federal mandate that has become a cost of business for people who are engaged in commercial banking in America. Because of the fact that these funds are paid as a result of a Federal mandate and a Federal law and a Federal regulatory process, these funds do take on the characteristic of public funds.

A decision was made in this bill to make two fundamental changes that I believe will change CRA's operation in America. The first was a decision to require a public disclosure and reporting of CRA agreements. I believe this is fundamentally important. If I am a community activist and I am paid \$175,000 in cash by a bank to promote objectives within the community, if people who live in the community don't know that I received the \$175,000, purportedly to serve the needs of the community, how can they hold me accountable as to how I used the money?

Second, we require on an annual basis both the bank and the recipient of money and things of value under the Community Reinvestment Act to disclose in a report what was done with the money. The language of the bill is very precise and quite demanding on this subject. While we have made a strong effort to give the regulators the ability within this language to reduce regulatory burden and paperwork, the language of the law is very clear, and regulators are given no power to decide to negate or refuse to implement this law as it is written. The language is very clear. The language says in setting out the reporting requirement: "The accounting referred to in [the report] shall include a detailed, itemized list of the uses to which such funds have been made, including compensation, administrative expenses, travel, entertainment, consulting and professional fees paid, and such other categories, as determined by regulation by the appropriate Federal banking agency with supervisory responsibility over insured depository institution."

It is our intent that the regulators clearly have the authority within reason to try to minimize regulatory burden. If some of this information is included in someone's tax return and they want to submit their tax return in lieu of the report, clearly the regulator has the power to allow that to be done and to make the tax return public. If the tax return did not include this information, it could not be accepted in lieu of this information.

The flexibility is flexibility in a reasonable enforcement of the law; it is not flexibility on the part of the regulator to decide to negate the law. As chairman, I say when we wrote "de-tailed" and "itemized," we meant it.

As I have discussed with other Members, if one is talking about taking somebody to lunch at McDonald's—we are talking about de minimus amounts—obviously the regulator has the ability to set rules of reason. If one is talking about expenditures of substantial amounts of money either in individual expenditures or the aggregate of those expenditures, or talking about reporting items specifically listed in the law when we wrote it, we meant it. This is critically important. If one is a CRA activist in a city, and they go to Atlanta to a CRA conference, that is a legitimate expenditure to be reported. People expect to see that on their report. If they went to Hawaii for 3 weeks, that should be reported, and people at the local newspaper would have a right, and I think a responsibility, to ask what they were doing with that expenditure.

What we are trying to do is reasonable. I urge the regulators to comply with the law and enforce it as it has been written.

The second reform of CRA we undertake is regulatory relief. Our ranking member and I got a good laugh out of my arithmetic. Senator BYRD objected to people bringing calculators or computers on the floor, so without the aid of my trusty calculator, I estimated the cost of compliance with CRA was \$1 trillion when I meant to say \$1 billion. The point is, for small banks, many of whom have fewer than 10 employees, \$1 billion is a lot of money. What we have done in regulatory relief is this. We said that every bank in America with less than \$250 million in assets will be audited for CRA compliance once every 4 years as the normal audit process if they had a satisfactory rating on their last CRA evaluation. If they had the highest CRA rating, an outstanding, then they would be audited every 5 years. People who work hard to get an outstanding rating would thereby be rewarded.

We put into the language the flexibility, for reasonable cause, that the regulators could go back on a case-by-case basis and reduce or increase the intervals at which such audits would occur. By reasonable cause, we mean based on the actions of the bank, the record of the bank. We are not here giving or intending to give, nor can it

be reasonably construed to give to the regulators, any kind of blank check to alter the intention of this law. If they have a finding on a factual basis that something has changed, they have the right, as anyone would expect, to go in and to audit more or less frequently. However, they have to have a finding based on facts.

When this bill came to the floor of the Senate about a year ago, it had two provisions expanding CRA. One was a provision that said that being out of compliance with CRA was a violation of banking law and could have, in extreme circumstances, subjected a bank officer or director to fines of up to \$1 million, and could have given the regulator the ability to impose strong sanctions against the bank as well. That provision is not present in this bill.

The second provision of the old bill required a maintenance of a CRA rating in order for a bank to conduct certain activities. That provision is not in this bill. That is critically important, because that would literally have given the regulator the ability to force a financial services holding company, that might have hundreds of billions of dollars in assets in the holding company, to unwind investments as a result of literally one branch being out of compliance with CRA.

This bill is very simple and, again, the language is very precise, and meant to be. It says that on the day you become a financial services holding company, you have to have been in compliance with your last CRA report. In other words, with the last audit that was done, you have to have had one of those two ratings, satisfactory or outstanding. This would be in the last CRA report that was filed, and if you had that rating, you are automatically qualified.

Once a company becomes a financial services holding company, they can invest any amount of their money and grow any activity already in engaged in within the financial services holding company, without regard to CRA. If they want to commence a new activity, on the date they make that undertaking they have to have been in compliance with CRA as certified on their last CRA report. This does not trigger a new audit. This does not entertain any new protest. It simply is a verification by the regulator that on that day of commencing their new activity, their most recent evaluation will have shown that they had at least a satisfactory CRA rating.

The next issue we dealt with was financial privacy. When we dealt with the bill in the Senate, this had not yet become an issue that had inflamed the public's consciousness. We adopted the provisions of the minority substitute related to privacy, and it basically had to do with people who willfully misrepresent themselves to get financial data. We come down on them like a ton of bricks, as we should. But by the time the House acted, financial privacy had become a substantial issue, and the

House included very extensive privacy provisions.

We have made changes to those privacy provisions, and I believe we have strengthened them, and we have made the bill better. I want to very briefly say a couple of things about privacy.

Obviously, in the new world in which we live, we have become accustomed to people knowing a great deal about us. The day I turned 50, I got a kit from AARP with all kinds of applications for AARP and a tube of Preparation H. One might say my privacy was invaded, that somehow AARP found out I was 50 years old. My children got a great laugh out of the Preparation H. One could say that somehow my privacy had been breached, but do we really want a society where an organization such as AARP cannot get access to information about when we turn 50 and invite us to join? I chose not to join because 50 sounded younger every minute to me; 57 sounds younger than it used to.

I have hunting dogs, and like many people who have enlightened habits, I subscribe to Gun Dog magazine. I guess because I subscribe to Gun Dog magazine, I get every hunting catalog, every fishing catalog, every dog food catalog, every dog accessory catalog on the planet. I literally get two or three of them a week. Quite frankly, I love getting them.

Did Gun Dog magazine violate my most intimate secrets by selling the list so that I get, every once in a while, free samples of dog food or dog bones or a dried pig's ear? I get a lot of things in the mail. I do not think my privacy is being violated. Maybe some people object to that, but I do not.

What I have tried to do, and what I think we have done in this bill, is we tried to set a rule of reason. Above the archway going into Delphi, the ancient Greeks wrote: Moderation in all things. It is a hard thing for somebody who feels as strongly about things as I do to remember, but everyone should remember it.

We did not want to kill off the information age before it was ever born. We are not writing the final word on privacy. This is something we want to watch and follow and see where abuses are and, when they occur, try to fix them. But, on the other hand, we all benefit. Some people could say we lose.

I do not get a Neiman Marcus catalog. One might ask: How come I do not? Neiman Marcus catalogs cost a lot of money to print and mail, and they have somehow figured out enough about me to figure that I do not buy luxury items, so they do not send me a Neiman Marcus catalog. Again, is that an invasion of my privacy? Is my freedom somehow diminished? I do not think so. The point is, if Neiman Marcus can get the catalog to people who are likely to buy something, they can sell it at a lower price, so society benefits.

This is what we did on privacy: The most important thing we did was not

in the House bill. It was an amendment that was offered by Senator GRAMS and Senator SANTORUM that put into the bill for the first time a full disclosure requirement. It requires every bank in America, when you open your account, to tell you precisely what their policy is: Do they share personal financial information within the bank? Do they share it outside the bank? We have a comprehensive listing of the conditions they have to meet. Do they disclose nonpublic information once you are no longer a customer? And what do they do to protect information?

Why is this important? This is important because this is the ultimate protection of privacy. If I do not believe a bank protects my privacy, I do not want to bank with them. I can bank with somebody else. If millions of people feel the way I do, you will get banks that will set out policies of not sharing information, and they will attract customers.

For example, I am proud to have an American Express card. American Express is a great American company. And I am proud I have been a member since 1970 something. They say that they do not share my information on that card with anybody.

I do not get that same guarantee from another card, but I get that guarantee from American Express. I happen to have a variety of credit cards. Obviously, I am not very worried about it, but if I were worried about it, I could just use my American Express Card. So I have an opt-in when people give me full information. If I do not like their policy, I do not become their customer. I can opt out. That is the basic freedom.

I just add, freedom is based on knowledge and the right to choose, not based on government. I believe that we are guaranteeing that with full disclosure.

Second, we adopted the House provision that said if the bank was going to use, or the financial services holding company was going to let people outside the bank have access to, the information, they have to give you the right to opt out. That provision was adopted.

Finally, we have a provision in the language which will allow financial institutions to partner with other financial services providers. This will give flexibility that we hope will be implemented to allow, in particular, small banks to share information with their business partners in a manner so that they can compete with a larger corporation that does a variety of activities within the corporation or among its affiliates.

Let me talk about one other issue, and then I want to say some thanks and stop, because I know Senator SARBANES wants to speak, and we want to go home.

This is not the end of the process. I believe this is the most important banking bill in 60 years. But there will be another banking bill within 10 years, and it will deal with commerce. Banking and commerce is already a re-

ality. This bill is a pause, and it is only a pause, and it is not going to last very long.

One of the things that is in this bill, which I am opposed to—it was adopted by a two-thirds vote in the Senate, and here we live by majority rule, by and large—but basically this was a provision that said if you went in and invested money as a commercial company, in a thrift—and many people did when many thrifts were in trouble and we did not have money enough to shut them down—that now you cannot sell your charter unless the charter is broken apart into its component parts.

I do not believe this provision and other prohibitions against commerce and banking will last very long. It is just my opinion. I do not view with any great horror the possibility of going to Wal-Mart and having them sell financial services. In fact, I view it as something that would be good. They now do it all over America in partnership with city banks in those towns, but they can only get partners where they have enough customers to make it worthwhile to the bank.

The idea they might someday be able to provide the service as part of the overall functioning of Wal-Mart, through a thrift charter or through a credit union charter or a banking charter, I see that as a positive thing. I suspect that a very substantial number of Wal-Mart employees do not have a banking relationship with a credit union or an S&L or a bank. Many of their customers do not. And taking services to them, I would view as a public good, not a public evil. But other people see it differently.

What we are doing in this bill is agreeing that we have a pause. I do not believe it will last long. I think in 10 years we will have widespread commerce and banking in America.

I want to just say some thanks.

I thank Al D'Amato. I do not want people to forget that this bill did not start on my watch as chairman. This bill started when Al D'Amato was chairman of the Senate Banking Committee. And while that bill did not become law, and while in some ways this bill is very different from that bill, in other ways the two bills are very similar.

Al D'Amato did probably his best legislative work in his career in helping to move this process forward. When we started, we started where Al D'Amato left off. So I think the former chairman of this committee is due a substantial amount of the credit. I wanted to be sure that I began with that, and I did not want to forget to say that.

I thank Senator LOTT for his strong, committed support. I think it is clear, without his support, with the long and difficult negotiations we have had, that this bill would be very different from what it is today. I can assure you, as every Member of the Senate knows, when you have your leadership's support, it is like having a good stone wall to your back in a gun fight. It does not

keep you from getting killed, but at least nobody shoots you in the back. It has been a very important thing to me as we have negotiated out this bill, very important in a difficult process.

I thank Senator SARBANES, who is very knowledgeable and experienced on these issues. I thank him for his input, and that has been input that has varied, from issues to issues themselves, to advice on how, as a brand new chairman, I was conducting my part of the conference. I would have to say that more often than not I think he was right in the comments he made. I believe I have learned from that process.

I thank Senator JOHNSON, the first Democrat who signed the conference report.

I thank Senators DODD and EDWARDS and SCHUMER and BAYH. They were real catalysts in getting the administration together with us to push the ball over the goal line. I think they contributed significantly in doing that.

I thank Chairman LEACH, the chairman of the House Banking Committee, who also served as the chairman of the conference. There have been people in the media who tried to portray this conference as a contest somehow between Congressman LEACH and me. I do not think that is fair to me or to Congressman LEACH. I think Chairman LEACH did a great job. I think he contributed to the process. I would have to say there were difficult times in trying to work things out. Our approaches were very different. But in the end, it worked. And the great thing about success is, it has a thousand parents, and we can all claim credit; and we would have all rightly gotten blamed had we failed.

I thank Chairman BLILEY. I knew TOM much better than I knew Congressman LEACH when we started the process. I thank him for his leadership on securities issues and on the bill itself.

I thank Congressmen LAFALCE and VENTO, the ranking Democrat members of the House Banking Committee, for their input and their knowledge and their leadership.

I thank Congressman RICHARD BAKER, who I believe is a very talented young man, and certainly one of the most knowledgeable people in the House of Representatives on banking issues.

I thank Larry Summers and Gene Sperling. I had many hours of negotiating with them and others, and alone with them. If you could make a living selling them something or buying something from them to resell, you would be pretty good. They negotiated hard. They were totally honorable in their negotiations. I am glad that we reached a product that they have enthusiastically endorsed and I have endorsed.

I thank Arthur Levitt, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Chairman Levitt raised legitimate security concerns that I thought should be addressed. I and others sat

down with Chairman Levitt and heard him out, and he had a substantial impact on the bill.

I thank Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan. I have said it on many occasions—and I am always happy to say it again—Alan Greenspan is the greatest central banker in American history; therefore by definition, the greatest central banker in the history of the world. He probably had as much impact on this bill as any non-Member did. His input and impact were always positive. And from the operating subsidiary issue, to virtually hundreds of other issues, his input was critically important.

And his general counsel, Virgil Mattingly, is one of these indispensable people who the public never knows about—thinks of them as faceless bureaucrats—but the reality is, his institutional knowledge and good sense had a substantial impact on this bill.

I thank all of my Republican colleagues on the conference. We had, at least in my opinion, an effort on the part of some on the House side to try to satisfy everybody. As a result, we got all sorts of amendments that came over to our side of the conference which basically were in conflict with the underlying logic of the bill, many of them popular, as various interest groups tried to go back and recut their deal once more or gain some special privilege or special advantage. I thank Senator SHELBY, Senator MACK, Senator BENNETT, Senator GRAMS, Senator ALLARD, Senator HAGEL, Senator ENZI, Senator SANTORUM, Senator BUNNING, and Senator CRAPO for consistently and courageously voting down every one of those amendments.

We have one of the cleanest pieces of major legislation I have seen and, I believe, one of the cleanest bills that has passed Congress in the last 20 years, in large part because these Members knew what they wanted to do. They took a position, and they stuck with it consistently throughout the process.

I thank Senator BENNETT, who was chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, the subcommittee with jurisdiction over major portions of this bill. I thank Senator HAGEL for his leadership on Federal Home Loan Bank issues. I thank Senators GRAMS and SANTORUM on privacy issues.

Finally, I want to thank some people on my staff. I thank Dina Ellis, who has done all the hard work on CRA. She is a very sweet lady with a very soft voice, but she is a very serious, tough person. Much of our success in bringing sunshine to CRA and regulatory relief to smaller banks has been due to her great work.

I thank Christi Harlan, who has taken the duller of issues that are totally incomprehensible to most people and done an excellent job in trying to communicate to the media in a form they could understand what was going on and why it mattered.

I thank Steve McMillin, who is an indispensable staff member to me. He

came to work for me right out of college from the University of Texas. I am from Texas A&M, so I didn't start with any kind of overwhelming expectations. But Steve McMillin has become an indispensable person to me as a legislator. It would be virtually impossible to run my office and do what I do without him.

I thank Geoff Gray for his legal work in burrowing in on the issues that didn't seem important until he spoke up. But when he spoke up, they became very important.

I thank Linda Lord. Linda Lord, throughout this process, has known more about this bill and more about the underlying law that it changed than all the staff members of all the Members of the House and Senate, of all the staff members of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Bank and the Securities and Exchange Commission, and all of the outside lawyers who were hired by people to represent their interests, all combined. Her knowledge and the force with which she has presented it have had a dramatic impact on this bill. In fact, the words of this bill are largely her words. She has been an indispensable person in doing this bill.

I thank Joe Kolinski, who organized the conferences. It was a nightmare, moving from place to place. He was able to do it all. The mikes always worked. There was plenty of water. It was always crowded, which made people uncomfortable and got them to move on, which was very helpful.

Finally, I thank our staff director, Wayne Abernathy. Wayne started on the Banking Committee as an intern and is now the staff director. He knows everything about these issues. I trust his judgment as well as I trust my own judgment. I think I can sum up his contribution—the way I feel about him—by simply quoting a great philosopher who once said: In no way can you get a keener insight into the true nature of a leader than by looking at the people with whom he surrounds himself. I would be very proud to have anybody on Earth judge me by Wayne Abernathy. I think they would be giving me mercy and not justice by doing it.

I thank everybody for their contribution, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise in support of the conference report on the Financial Services Modernization Act of 1999.

The Congress has struggled for over two decades with the issue of whether to permit banks to affiliate with securities firms and insurance companies. This issue raises important questions for the safety and soundness of the financial system, important questions about the concentration of economic power, important questions about consumer protection, and important questions about access to credit for all Americans.

These are far-reaching and difficult public policy issues. The fact that they are so far-reaching and difficult, combined with differences among affected financial sectors—sectors of the financial industry over what should be contained in legislation and how to balance the concerns of consumers, the important consideration of safety and soundness and of assuring that the credit system will work to the benefit of all Americans—has made the enactment of a bill a significant challenge over an extended period of time.

In recent years, actions by regulators have permitted significant affiliations between banks and nonbank financial companies to take place. It is very important to keep that in mind as we consider enacting a piece of legislation because one has to be very much aware of what has transpired and the changes that have taken place in the financial arena as they consider the changes this legislation would now permit. Very frankly, the issue for Congress is not whether these affiliations should occur, because they have occurred one way or another, but whether they should take place on an orderly basis in the context of a responsible statutory framework or, instead, on an ad hoc basis as permitted by the regulators.

In my view, the preferable circumstance is for these affiliations to take place in the context of a responsible statutory framework established by the Congress, a framework that provides the regulators sufficient authority to protect the safety and soundness of the financial system, which maintains the separation of banking and commerce, protects consumers, preserves the relevance of the Community Reinvestment Act, and provides a choice to banks to conduct their expanded activities either through a holding company or a subsidiary of the bank.

It was not clear at the beginning of this Congress whether these goals could be achieved. The Senate passed a bill by the relatively close margin of 54-44 that, in my judgment, did not meet these objectives and was the object of a strong veto threat by the President. The House of Representatives, on the other hand, had passed a bill that largely met these objectives and that the Administration was prepared to support.

Today I am pleased to say to my colleagues that, in my view and in the view of the Administration, the bill produced by the conference committee is perceived as basically meeting the necessary standards. It is for that reason I am prepared to support the conference report. It is my understanding that the President is prepared to sign this legislation into law.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Secretary Summers to Senator DASCHLE stating the Administration's position, indicating their strong support for this legislation and urging its adoption, be printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to lay out why, on balance, I believe the enactment of this conference report is in the public interest.

First, the legislation gives the regulators significant authority to supervise newly affiliated financial companies and protect the safety and soundness of the financial system. I started with the safety and soundness issue because I think it is paramount. I think the U.S. economy, in large part, depends on the confidence in the safety and soundness of our economic and financial institutions. If we are to lose that confidence, which exists not only in this country, but around the world, I think we would be in severe difficulties in a very broad and fundamental economic sense. So safety and soundness, I think, always has to be at the very top of the list of our concerns.

Specifically, section 114 of the conference report provides the Federal Reserve, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the FDIC authority to place restrictions or requirements on relationships or transactions between a bank and an affiliated company or a subsidiary, appropriate to prevent an evasion of any provision of law applicable to depository institutions, or—and I quote the bill now, soon to become a statute, I hope—“to avoid any significant risk to the safety and soundness of depository institutions, or any Federal deposit insurance fund, or other adverse effects, such as undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interest, or unsound banking practices.”

This important and broad delegation of authority to require “firewalls” to protect the federally insured bank from nonbank affiliates or subsidiaries emphasizes the important burden being placed on the regulators by this legislation to develop a coherent, responsible, safe and prudent approach to the supervision of the financial system. The permission contained herein for the expansion of activities calls for vigilant supervision of the financial system by the regulators. The legislation, in my view, provides the regulators the authority to do the job, but the responsibility will be on them to carry it out.

So this “firewall” provision that is in the conference report, which was actually taken from the House bill—we had no comparable provision on this side—gives the regulators the authority, I believe, to ensure a responsible, safe, and prudent approach. But it places, I think, a significant responsibility upon the regulators to exercise this authority in a way that it ensures that these objectives are realized.

This legislation also codifies a principle of functional regulation under which bank activities are generally supervised by bank regulators, securities activities by securities regulators, and

insurance activities by insurance regulators. New financial activities are the joint responsibility of the Federal Reserve and the Treasury, which also serve as the umbrella regulators respectively of a financial holding company or a bank and its operating subsidiaries.

Now, secondly, the conference report strengthens the separation that currently exists in our financial system between banking and commerce. Financial authorities, including Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, Treasury Secretary Larry Summers, former Treasury Secretary Bob Rubin, former Federal Reserve Board Chairman Paul Volcker, and many other commentators, such as Henry Kaufman, Gerald Corrigan—and the list goes on—have expressed strong concerns about the mixing of banking and commerce, particularly in light of the recent experiences in Asia.

The conference report, therefore, closes the so-called unitary thrift holding company loophole to the separation of banking and commerce. The report before us prohibits all unitary thrift holding companies from having commercial affiliates. In addition, it prohibits exists unitary thrift holding companies from being transferred to commercial companies. This prohibition on transfer to commercial companies was added to the Senate bill on the floor by an amendment offered by my colleague, Senator JOHNSON of South Dakota, and it carried in the Senate by a 2-to-1 vote and was subsequently adopted by the conference committee.

In addition, the conference report contains important limitations similar to the House bill on merchant banking activities and activities complementary to financial activities that are designed to maintain the separation of banking and commerce.

In regard to merchant banking, the conference report allows a financial holding company to retain a merchant banking investment only for a limited period of time and generally prohibits the company from routinely managing or operating a nonfinancial company held as a merchant banking investment. Importantly, the conference report also gives the Federal Reserve and the Treasury the authority to jointly develop implementing regulations on merchant banking activities that they deem appropriate to further the purposes and prevent evasions of the conference report and the Bank Holding Company Act. Under this authority, the Federal Reserve and the Treasury may define relevant terms and impose such limitations as they deem appropriate to ensure that this new authority does not foster conflicts of interest or undermine the safety and soundness of depository institutions, or the conference report’s general prohibition on the mixing of banking and commerce.

In regard to activities determined by the Federal Reserve Board to be complementary to financial activities, it is

expected that such activities will not be significant in size, and determinations will be made on a case by case basis.

Third, with respect to consumer protections, the conference report contains important protections for consumers regarding the sale of uninsured financial products by banks. The conference report provides the Securities and Exchange Commission significant authority to supervise the securities activities of banks and includes several crucial investor protections. The conference report incorporates provisions to ensure the SEC can adequately regulate bank-sponsored mutual funds. These provisions are necessary to ensure that the SEC has adequate information about and inspection authority over bank investment advisers to inspect for trading violations, such as front-running and personal trading.

The provisions also address potential significant conflicts of interest that may impact banks that advise registered investment companies. The conference report also ensures SEC protections for new hybrid products and for most sales of securities by banks. It also includes protections for sales of sophisticated securities instruments to retail investors.

Similarly, the conference report requires the Federal banking agencies to issue consumer protection regulations within one year, applicable to the sale of insurance by any bank or other depository institution, or by any person on behalf of such an institution. The regulations will give protection over several aspects of insurance sales, such as sales practices, including anti-tying and anti-coercion rules; advertising; location, limiting sales to an area physically segregated from where deposits are taken; and qualification and licensing of sales personnel.

The conference report also preserves important authorities for the States to provide consumer protection on bank sales of insurance products. These protections were in the House bill and were included in the Senate bill by an amendment offered by Senator BRYAN during the markup in the Banking Committee. It was in the legislation that came to the Senate floor, and was passed by the Senate.

Fourth, with respect to the operating subsidiary issue, the conference report contains a provision authorizing banks to conduct certain new activities through an operating subsidiary of the bank. I will not go into this provision in detail. I simply note that it was worked out between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve over an extended period of time, and was crucial to the Administration giving its support to this bill. It will give financial services firms some latitude in choosing the corporate structure that best serves their customers.

In regard to the Community Reinvestment Act, this legislation establishes a fundamental principle: No bank or financial holding company can

engage in any new activities authorized by the bill, or engage in any new merger or acquisition authorized by the bill, if the bank or financial holding company does not have a satisfactory CRA rating.

This requirement on a bank or financial holding company for a satisfactory CRA rating in order to benefit from the new powers provided by the legislation was necessary to preserve the relevance of CRA in the new financial world which will be created by this bill. Without it, a bank's CRA performance would have become irrelevant to what will likely be the most intense area of activity in the financial industry. And the acceptance of this provision was essential for the Administration, and indeed for the Democratic members of the conference committee, to support the conference report.

The conference report does not contain two provisions with respect to CRA that were in the Senate bill, and I think would have been very damaging. One would have provided a safe harbor for banks from public comment on their CRA performance when they submitted an application to a regulator. The second exempted rural banks with assets under \$100 million from CRA altogether.

The conference report does contain a provision providing for banks with assets under \$250 million to have CRA examinations once every 4 years if they have a satisfactory rating, and once every 5 years if they have an outstanding rating. The regulators do retain authority to examine a bank at any time for reasonable cause.

The conference report also contains a provision requiring public disclosure and reporting on CRA agreements. The conference report explicitly directs the regulators to ensure that regulations prescribed by the agencies do not impose an undue burden on parties. In this regard, the statement of managers specifically provides that the reporting requirements of the provision can be fulfilled by the submission of a group's annual audited financial statement, or its Federal income tax return.

This was a provision that was intensely discussed and negotiated. The concept of public disclosure which was in the Senate bill was accepted by the conferees. The question that had to be worked out was exactly what did that mean and what was the reach of it and the requirements of it. As with many other provisions of this bill, the regulators will carry a particular responsibility to implement these provisions in a reasonable and responsible way.

Finally, let me point out where the conference report does not fully address two important areas. First, I do not think that the right of an individual to financial privacy is adequately protected. I expect that issue will be discussed at some length by some of my colleagues in the course of the debate on this conference report. Second, we have not dealt with what I think is a very important issue of what is called "too big to fail."

On the issue of privacy, last January I introduced the "Financial Information Privacy Act of 1999" together with a number of my colleagues, some of whom serve on the Banking Committee. I am frank to say I believe the central issue in this debate on privacy boils down to answering the question: To whom does this personal financial information belong, the individual, or the financial institution? I think upon reflection most people would answer the individual.

This legislation introduced earlier this year would have given an individual the right to "opt out", which would mean the right to say "no" to the sharing of or selling of his or her personal information to an affiliate within a financial services holding company. It also would have required an "opt-in" for the selling of such information to a third party. An "opt-in" would require a customer's informed consent before selling or sharing confidential customer information with an unaffiliated third party.

Neither of these provisions are included in the legislation before us. However, we were able to include in the conference report an amendment that I proposed which ensures that the Federal Government will not preempt stronger State financial privacy laws that exist now or may be enacted in the future. As a result, States will be free to enact stronger privacy safeguards if they deem it appropriate.

I am very frank to say that I think Americans are becoming increasingly concerned about this issue of financial privacy protection. I predict that this issue of privacy will not go away with the passage of this legislation. I know Senators BRYAN and SHELBY took a very strong lead in the conference committee on the privacy issue, along with a number of their colleagues from the House. Many of those who were very supportive of that effort will want to speak at some length on this subject during the discussion of this conference report, and they have specifically reserved time in order to do that.

The conference report also fails to deal with the creation of institutions which may be deemed "too big to fail." The legislation before us substantially transforms the structure of the financial services industry by eliminating restrictions on the affiliations of banks, insurance companies, and securities firms. Despite the benefits which may accrue from such affiliations, there continue to be legitimate concerns that mergers permitted under this bill would create financial organizations so large that they would be deemed "too big to fail."

Organizations as diverse as the American Enterprise Institute, the Brookings Institution, and the former Bankers Roundtable have repeatedly encouraged us to address the "too big to fail" problem by requiring large banking organizations to back some portion of their assets with subordinated debt. Regrettably, the conference

report contains no such mandatory subordinated debt requirement or other market policing mechanisms. The report does contain an 18-month study to be conducted by the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department regarding the use of subordinated debt to protect the financial system, and to protect federally insured deposit funds from the "too big to fail" institutions.

While obviously I think it would have been better to address this issue directly in the legislation, I certainly hope that 18 months from now, if not sooner, the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury will present the Congress with a joint recommendation together with legislative proposals on how best to deal with the issue of "too big to fail." In trying circumstances, the consequences of failing to deal with this issue could be extremely severe. I am hopeful that the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury will come back with a joint set of recommendations we can place into law.

These issues—dealing comprehensively with privacy and with "too big to fail"—remain to be addressed as we move into the future.

Finally, I want to make a brief observation about the context in which we are working and have to consider this legislation. The need for this legislation has been influenced by the marketplace. In seeking to respond to the financial needs of their customers, securities firms have offered bank-like products, banks have offered insurance-like products, and both banks and insurance companies have engaged in significant securities activities. This blurring of the lines among banks, securities, and insurance products has been taking place in the marketplace since at least the mid-1970s.

Those who look at this endeavor and say we don't want to allow any of this affiliation to take place need to appreciate and understand, it has been happening in a significant way. A development which began the blurring of the distinction between securities and bank products was the offering by securities firms of cash management accounts. That development added a bank deposit transaction feature to a securities account. It allows customers to write checks on their money market funds, enabling those accounts to function much like the traditional checking account. Subsequently, marketplace changes, regulatory actions, and court decisions have enabled banks to sell insurance and to develop annuity products that have insurance characteristics but are defined as bank products.

On the commercial banking side, interpretations of existing laws have brought about a significant shift in ownership of firms underwriting securities. As of this past September, all the top 20 bank holding companies had what are known as section 20 subsidiaries that may engage under certain conditions in securities underwriting.

Updating our financial services laws is not only important to enable financial services firms to respond to the financial service needs of their customers, it is also important in order to ensure that appropriate regulatory oversight is maintained in the evolving marketplace.

In my view, this conference report will put in place a rational legislative framework for the future evolution of the U.S. financial services industry. It is a framework that will preserve safety and soundness, maintain the separation of banking and commerce, provide meaningful consumer protections, and preserve the relevance of the Community Reinvestment Act. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I extend my congratulations to the chairman of the Banking Committee, Senator GRAMM. It has been a long ride, as one might say, with its ups and downs. However, the ship has been brought into port, so to speak. With the various accommodations worked out in the course of the conference, I expect the very close vote on the Senate bill will shift very markedly in the direction of support for this conference report.

I echo Senator GRAMM's commendation of House Banking Committee Chairman LEACH who was chairman of the conference committee. Chairman LEACH showed great fairness and calm under pressing circumstances. He kept the process working at times when it might otherwise have been in some jeopardy. Congressman LAFALCE as ranking member of the House Banking Committee, Congressman BLILEY and Congressman DINGELL, the chairman and ranking member of the House Commerce Committee, and indeed all the members of the conference who in one way or another played very constructive roles in trying to work this situation out deserve commendation.

I am particularly grateful to my Democratic colleagues on the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee for working through and joining together as we sought to achieve legislation that would meet our desires and meet the perceptions of the Administration and therefore bring about a Presidential signature at the end of this process. All Members on both sides of the aisle did not want to go through this very extended process and then have it vetoed and have to start all over again. Fortunately, we have accomplished that.

Federal Reserve Board Chairman Greenspan played a significant role, as did the members of his staff who are extremely able, as did Treasury Secretary Summers and the members of his Treasury staff. I also acknowledge the role Bob Rubin has played in shaping where we are today, although he is no longer Secretary of the Treasury. Chairman GRAMM appropriately recognized the role Chairman D'AMATO played in moving this legislation along. The Chairman of the SEC, Arthur Levitt, was important on the investor protection provisions.

Finally, I thank the staff on this side of the aisle. Chairman GRAMM has recognized staff on his side of the aisle. I have high respect for their commitment and their competency. I don't think people fully appreciate the kind of dedication staff provides when Members are working through a very complex, complicated piece of legislation such as this. In this we have not only the concepts on which to reach agreement, but we have to work the concepts in the statutory language in a way that embodies what the understanding was that will also work in a technical and complex way. We are dealing with the sort of issues where, if it does not work, there are problems. I am hopeful we won't have to come back with extended technical corrections with respect to this legislation. If that is the case, obviously, we bow our heads to the staff.

On our side, I acknowledge our staff director Steve Harris, Marty Gruenberg, Patience Singleton, Dean Shahinian, Mitchell Feuer, Michael Beresik, Jonathan Miller, Yael Belkind, Erin Hanson, and Christen Schaefer. That is a long list, but it is a long list because some of the people are no longer on the staff. This issue has been going on long enough that people have come and gone. A number of those I listed are no longer on the staff, but they were here through at least part, if not a lot, of this effort. They made a significant contribution. It would be an oversight not to reference them.

Tomorrow, obviously, we will resume the debate. We will have the opportunity to hear from a number of our colleagues on this issue. I anticipate we will be able to go to a vote by mid-afternoon on this very important piece of legislation.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, DC, November 3, 1999.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR TOM: The Administration strongly supports passage of S. 900, the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act of 1999. This legislation will modernize our financial services laws to better enable American companies to compete in the new economy.

The bill makes the most important legislative changes to the structure of the U.S. financial system since the 1930s. By allowing a single organization to offer any type of financial product, the bill stimulate competition, thereby increasing choice and reducing costs for consumers, communities and businesses. Americans spent over \$350 billion per year on fees and commissions for brokerage insurance, and banking services. If increased competition yielded savings to consumers of even 5 percent, they would save over \$18 billion per year.

Removal of barriers to competition will also enhance the stability of our financial services system. Financial firms will be able to diversify the product offerings and thus their sources of revenue. They also will be better able to compete in global financial markets.

The President has strongly supported the elimination of barriers to financial services

competition. He has made clear, however, that any financial modernization bill must also preserve the vitality of the Community Reinvestment Act, enhance consumer protection to the privacy and other areas, follow financial services firms to choose the corporate structure that best serves their customers, and continue the traditional separation of banking commerce. As approved by the Conference Committee, S. 900 accomplishes each of these goals.

With respect to CRA, S. 900 establishes an important, prospective principle: banking organizations seeking to take advantage of new, non-banking authority must demonstrate a satisfactory record of meeting the credit needs of all the communities they serve, including low and moderate income communities. Thus, S. 900 for the first time prohibits a bank or holding company from expanding into newly authorized businesses such as securities and insurance underwriting unless all of its insured depository institutions have a satisfactory or better CRA rating. Furthermore, CRA will continue to apply to all banks, and existing procedures for public comment on, and CRA review of, any application to acquire or merge with a bank will be preserved. The bill offers further support for community development in the form of a new program to provide technical help to low- and moderate-income micro-entrepreneurs.

The bill includes other measures affecting CRA that have been narrowed significantly from their earlier Senate form. The bill includes a limited extension of the CRA examination cycle for small banks with outstanding or satisfactory CRA records, but expressly preserves the ability of regulators to examine a bank any time for reasonable cause, and does not affect regulators ability to inquire in connection with an application. Finally, the bill includes a requirement for disclosure and reporting of CRA agreements. We believe that the legislation and its legislative history have been constructed to prevent undue burdens from being imposed on banks and those working to stimulate investment in underserved communities.

In May, the President stressed the importance of adopting strong and enforceable privacy protections for consumers financial information. S. 900 provides protections for consumers that extend far beyond existing law. For the first time, consumers will have an absolute right to know if their financial institution intends to share or sell their personal financial data, and will have the right to block sharing or sale outside the financial institutions' corporate family. Of equal importance, these restrictions have teeth. S. 900 gives regulatory agencies full authority to enforce privacy protections, as well as new rulemaking authority under the existing Fair Credit Reporting Act. The bill also expressly preserves the ability of states to provide stronger privacy protections. In addition, it establishes new safeguards to prevent pretext calling, by which unscrupulous operators seek to discover the financial assets of consumers. In sum, we believe that this reflects a real improvement over the status quo; but, we will not rest. We will continue to press for even greater protections—especially effective choice about whether personal financial information can be shared with affiliates.

We are pleased that the bill promotes innovation and competition in the financial sector, by allowing banks to choose whether to conduct most new non-banking activities, including securities underwriting and dealing, in either a financial subsidiary or an affiliate of a bank.

The bill also promotes the safety and soundness of the financial system by enhancing the traditional separation of banking and

commerce. The bill strictly limits the ability of thrift institutions to affiliate with commercial companies, closing a gap in existing law. The bill also includes restrictions on control of commercial companies through merchant banking.

Although the Administration strongly supports S. 900, there are provisions of the bill that concern us. The bill's redomestication provisions could allow mutual insurance companies to avoid state law protecting policyholders, enriching insiders at the expense of consumers. The Administration intends to monitor any redomestications and state law changes closely, and return to the Congress if necessary. The bill's Federal Home Loan Bank provisions fail to focus the System more on lending to community banks and less on arbitrage activities short-term lending that do not advance its public purpose.

The Administration strongly supports S. 900, and urges its adoption by the Congress. Sincerely,

LAWRENCE H. SUMMERS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I thank Senator SARBANES for his kind remarks and for remembering Bob Rubin, who was a very major contributor to this bill. Let me also say that I think it would be helpful if in the morning everyone will come over so we do not have long pauses. My concern is that we do have a lot of people who are going to want to speak on this bill. We are going to be forced to try to stay with the schedule because the House wants to vote on this tomorrow afternoon. So I hope people will come over and speak so we do not end up with this problem where people are given 1 or 2 minutes when they have something they need to say.

I think that can be avoided if people come over early.

Mr. SARBANES. If the chairman will yield, I want to echo the chairman's comments. I say to our colleagues, if Senators will come early on and we can perhaps sequence them, we can give them more time than if some of the time is used up in quorum calls. Waiting for people to come becomes lost time. Then, when people come over, we may be very limited in how much time we have available to give them.

If Senators have statements they want to make of some consequence, we very much hope they will come over and do that.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, we both want to reserve the remainder of our time for use tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WOOL TARIFFS

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, a moment on a matter that is not in-

cluded in the trade legislation that has just been approved by the Senate—the near-exorbitant tariff on fine wool fabrics. This modest proposal appears to have generated an inordinate amount of controversy, all the more baffling because the facts are so persuasive.

We have just a few suit manufacturers left in the United States, including Hickey-Freeman, which has produced fine tailored suits in Rochester, New York since 1899. Our tariffs are stacked against them.

There is only a limited supply in the United States of fine wool fabric. The suit makers must import significant quantities of this fabric, at a current tariff rate of 30.6%. But importers can bring in completely finished wool suits duty free from Canada and Mexico, and subject to a 19.8% duty when imported from other sources. This anomaly in our tariff schedule—this tariff “inversion”—puts domestic manufacturers of wool suits at a significant disadvantage.

Senators SCHUMER, DURBIN, HAGEL, MIKULSKI, SPECTER, NICKLES, FITZGERALD, SANTORUM, GRAMM, and THOMPSON have joined me in sponsoring a very modest measure that would provide temporary relief to the suit-makers. We have proposed that the tariff on the very finest wool fabric—produced in only limited quantities in the United States—be suspended for a short period, and that the tariff on other classes of fine wool fabric be reduced to 19.8%—hardly a negligible tariff. This was an effort to provide some relief to our suit makers.

Through the good offices of the Chairman of the Finance Committee, we undertook to address the concerns that has been raised when our bill was first introduced. After a series of meetings with all of the interested parties—and there are many—we modified our proposal to address, in a constructive way, the concerns that were raised.

Our first compromise proposal was rejected out of hand. No counterproposal was forthcoming. The objection stems chiefly from two sources: a fabric manufacturer that is not currently producing the fine wool fabric at issue—but promises to do so in the future, principally from a plant it is building in Mexico; and from the American Sheep Industry Association—this despite the fact that wool of the quality required for suit fabric is sourced overwhelmingly from Australia.

I am at a loss to explain the vehemence of the opposition. The fabric producer that so strongly opposes this legislation—Burlington Industries—is positioning itself to compete in the global market. As it ought to do.

On January 26, 1999, the company announced a major reorganization. To quote, “operations will be streamlined and U.S. capacity will be reduced by 25%.” Let me repeat: “U.S. capacity will be reduced by 25%.” The company announced that 2900 jobs would be eliminated, an announcement made just one month after the company re-

ported to its shareholders—on December 2, 1998, that “we have launched a major growth initiative in Mexico.”

There followed an announcement to its customers that the fine wool fabric used to manufacture men's suits—so called “fancies”—would not be available for a time.

Even so, we cannot get agreement on tariff relief for our suit makers, who have greater need than ever for imported fabric. They must still pay a 31% tariff on imported fine wool fabric. We ought to enable them to remain competitive, just as Burlington has taken steps to remain competitive.

We have kept at it. In recent days, our efforts have intensified. With a great deal of good will on the part of all interested parties, it appears that we may be inching toward an agreement that would, in fact, benefit all parties in some measure.

We have included a place-holder in the trade legislation—not a solution to the wool tariffs problem, but a provision that will allow our discussions to continue over the next several days.

I do thank the chairman and his staff—particularly Grant Aldonas—for their efforts, as well as the considerable interest and attention of Senators DURBIN, SCHUMER, and BAUCUS, all of whom are eager, as am I, to work this out. I intend to continue to work with our chairman and with others to resolve this matter.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the issue of prescription drugs for the Nation's senior citizens is back in the headlines this morning with yet another study having been published that millions of senior citizens in America cannot afford their prescriptions.

This is the 12th time I have come to the floor in recent days to talk about this issue because I think it is so critical that the Senate act in a bipartisan way to deal with what are clearly the great out-of-pocket costs for the Nation's older people. Specifically, as this poster next to me says, I have been urging senior citizens to send in copies of their prescription drug bills to each of us in the Senate in Washington, DC.

The reason I hope we will hear from seniors around the country is there is one bipartisan bill, one that is before the Senate now, to deal with this question of prescription needs for seniors. It is the bill on which Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE and I have teamed up in recent months, and 54 Members of this body, the majority, have already voted for the funding plan that is laid out in the Snowe-Wyden legislation. So we have 54 Members of the Senate on record as supporting a specific plan to cover prescription drugs for the Nation's older people.

The model in the Snowe-Wyden legislation is something that every Member of the Senate is familiar with because it is the model we have for health care for ourselves and our families. The

Snowe-Wyden legislation is called SPICE, the Senior Prescription Insurance Coverage Equity Act. It would ensure that seniors would get their medicine at an affordable rate because our bill would allow them the bargaining power that big organizations, big purchasers such as the health maintenance organizations would have.

The tragedy today with respect to our Nation's seniors and prescriptions is they get shellacked twice; first, because Medicare does not cover prescriptions. When the program began in 1965, it did not cover prescriptions initially. Second, because the big buyers, the health maintenance organizations and the other big purchasers, are able to use their clout in the marketplace, those folks can get a discount and a senior citizen in rural Oregon or rural New Mexico or another part of this country in effect has to subsidize with their dollars the break the large organizations are getting.

Frankly, there are other ideas for dealing with this issue. Colleagues on both sides of the aisle have them. What I am trying to do to support the Snowe-Wyden bipartisan legislation is to come to the floor and, as this poster says, ask our seniors to send copies of their prescription drug bills directly to us in the Senate in Washington. I am going to, as I have done on 11 previous occasions recently, actually read from some of these bills so we can make the case for how urgent this need is.

For example, I recently received a letter from a woman in Portland who described to me what she and her husband are facing with respect to their prescription drug costs. This couple in Portland has a combined income of about \$1,500 a month. She spends, from that \$1,500-a-month income, \$230 on prescription drugs and he spends about \$180 a month. So the two of them, an elderly couple in Portland, are spending more than \$400 a month on prescription drugs. They are spending upwards of \$4,000 a year on their prescription medicine and, as they reported to me, they have no insurance to cover these costs.

This morning in Washington we saw, again, more press conferences on this issue. I guess we can go day after day having dueling press conferences with respect to this issue of prescription drugs. We can have a lot of finger pointing, we can have a lot of bickering, a lot of quarreling about how serious the problem is and what to do about it, but there is one bipartisan bill that uses marketplace forces to try to deal with this issue. The Snowe-Wyden legislation steers clear of price controls. We do not have a Federal regime for handling this benefit. It is not one-size-fits-all Federal policy. It uses marketplace forces to make sure seniors have choices and options and alternatives for their prescription medicines. It is based on a model that all of us are pretty familiar with because we utilize the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan.

I want to go through a couple more of these cases. I know the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is here to speak on an important matter, as are other colleagues. But I do, as part of this effort, want to highlight with these specific cases some of what we are seeing all across this country as seniors walk this economic tightrope, balancing their food costs against their fuel costs, and their fuel costs against their medical bills and find themselves, again and again, not in a position to pay for their prescriptions.

I received another letter in the last few days from a senior citizen in Oregon. She is on seven prescriptions. She has heart disease; she has high blood pressure and diabetes. She and her husband exist on Social Security and a tiny disability check. They get a couple of thousand dollars a month maximum in their income. Every month, they spend at least \$300 of it on prescription drugs. That is just the wife in the household. Her husband has to spend additionally on prescription drugs. This particular elderly person wrote and said if it were not for the free samples that she was getting from her physician, she simply could not meet her expenses.

Another letter I received described a senior taking five prescription drugs. She has high blood pressure and high thyroid. She has an income of a little under \$1,000 a month. She spends about \$100 a month on prescription drugs. And she wrote me:

I am lucky that my kids will give me a hand when I have difficulty in affording my prescriptions.

As part of this effort to have the Senate deal with this urgent need for older people in a bipartisan way, I would like to see the Senate consider the one bipartisan bill before us now, the Snowe-Wyden legislation. But I am sure colleagues have other ideas, and I think if we will listen to the senior citizens of this country who are sending me and our colleagues copies of these bills—as the poster says, “Send in copies of prescription drug bills directly to us here in the Senate”—we can help the Senate deal with this issue on a bipartisan basis.

I am going to wrap up this afternoon with a question I hope a lot of colleagues are asking with respect to prescription drug coverage: Can our Nation afford to cover prescription drug costs of older people? My answer to that is: I believe we cannot afford not to ensure that our seniors get this coverage. I want to cite an example before I wrap up.

Last week, I talked about the evidence we are seeing with the new anticoagulant drugs. These are important drugs that can help seniors prevent strokes and debilitating illnesses. As a result of seniors taking these medicines, which cost about \$1,000 a year, there is documented medical evidence now that these drugs can help prevent strokes, which cost upwards of \$100,000 a year. So think about the investment,

the wise investment—not just from a health standpoint, not just from the standpoint of trying to make sure our seniors get a fair shake but purely from a financial standpoint—the benefit of having seniors get prescription drug coverage, getting, for example, these anticoagulant drugs that cost about \$1,000 a year, and seeing a savings as a result of the older person not having a stroke, of that person not incurring \$100,000 in expenses that would be involved in treating the stroke.

I was director of the Gray Panthers at home for about 7 years before I was elected to the Congress. Prescription drugs were important then. You would always hear from seniors that they want this coverage. But the prescriptions today are even more important because they can help keep seniors well. Prescriptions today, helping to lower blood pressure, helping lower cholesterol, are drugs that are going to help us hold costs down for the Medicare program.

As we all know, Medicare Part A, the hospital portion, the institutional portion of the program is particularly expensive, and these drugs today, if we can get decent Medicare coverage for the Nation's older people, will help us save some of the money that would otherwise be spent under Part A of the program when seniors incur these debilitating illnesses.

I intend, as I have done now on 12 occasions, to keep coming to the floor to urge seniors to send in copies of their prescription drug bills directly to us in the Senate in hopes we can get bipartisan action. I am very proud that the Snowe-Wyden funding plan got 54 votes, a majority of votes in the Senate already for going forward with a specific plan to fund this program, but I am sure colleagues have other ideas.

The distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee is here. He has been very involved in the question of Medicare. I was very honored when Senator MOYNIHAN, last week, spoke favorably about the SPICE legislation we have introduced. Colleagues have plenty of ideas on how to deal with it, but what is important is we go forward in a bipartisan way and not wait until after another election which is literally a year away.

In the hope the Senate will act in a bipartisan way, I intend to keep coming back to the floor to discuss this issue.

I yield the floor.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his terrific statement and his terrific work with our colleague from Maine on a very important piece of legislation. The President has said time and again, as have most of us, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, that we would never even think of designing a Medicare program today without having prescription drug coverage. It would be unthinkable, particularly because of the advances in science and technology which, at a minimal cost, help keep

people well and out of hospitals and out of difficulty and pain and suffering. It would be cost-effective to the taxpayer.

I thank him and commit to him my intention to continue to work with him and with many Members on both sides of the aisle until we can resolve this problem and answer the legitimate needs and requests of our seniors in America.

BANKRUPTCY JUDGES

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the Delaware bankruptcy court has come to fully understand the old adage that "the reward for a job well done is more work". Long recognized as one of the nation's quickest, most innovative and fairest, The Delaware corporate bankruptcy court's caseload has grown to the point that at least one additional judge is necessary. I want to commend a number of my congressional colleagues for joining with me to address this situation.

Yesterday, Senator GRASSLEY and Representative GEKAS held a joint hearing on the need for additional bankruptcy judges. Representative MIKE CASTLE was among those who testified at this hearing, and I understand he eloquently elaborated on Delaware's status as the busiest bankruptcy venue per judge in the nation.

Simply put, more capable judges are needed to tend to corporate bankruptcy cases in Delaware and a select number of other states. Realizing this, Senator PAUL COVERDELL has introduced S. 1830, to provide for the appointment of additional temporary bankruptcy judges. I, along with Senator BIDEN and a number of other Senators, have cosponsored this vital proposal.

I commend my fellow sponsors of this legislation as well as the chairmen of the subcommittees of jurisdiction for holding yesterday's hearing. I look forward to working with them on this important matter in the future.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, November 2, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,668,409,010,147.10 (Five trillion, six hundred sixty-eight billion, four hundred nine million, ten thousand, one hundred forty-seven dollars and ten cents).

One year ago, November 2, 1998, the Federal debt stood at \$5,539,037,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred thirty-nine billion, thirty-seven million).

Five years ago, November 2, 1994, the Federal debt stood at \$4,730,361,000,000 (Four trillion, seven hundred thirty billion, three hundred sixty-one million).

Ten years ago, November 2, 1989, the Federal debt stood at \$2,864,778,000,000 (Two trillion, eight hundred sixty-four billion, seven hundred seventy-eight million).

Fifteen years ago, November 2, 1984, the Federal debt stood at \$1,619,801,000,000 (One trillion, six hundred nineteen billion, eight hundred one million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,048,608,010,147.10 (Four trillion, forty-eight billion, six hundred eight million, ten thousand, one hundred forty-seven dollars and ten cents) during the past 15 years.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND AUSTRALIA CONCERNING TECHNOLOGY FOR THE SEPARATION OF ISOTOPES OF URANIUM BY LASER EXCITATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 70

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the United States of America and Australia Concerning Technology for the Separation of Isotopes of Uranium by Laser Excitation, with accompanying annexes and agreed minute. I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Agreement, and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the Agreement. (In accordance with section 123 of the Act, as amended by title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277), a classified annex to the NPAS, prepared by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information, will be submitted to the Congress separately.) The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, which includes a summary of the provisions of the Agreement and the views of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, is also enclosed.

A U.S. company and an Australian company have entered into a contract jointly to develop and evaluate the commercial potential of a particular uranium enrichment process (known as the "SILEX" process) invented by the Australian company. If the commercial viability of the process is demonstrated, the U.S. company may adopt it to enrich uranium for sale to U.S. and foreign utilities for use as reactor fuel.

Research on and development of the new enrichment process may require transfer from the United States to Australia of technology controlled by the United States as sensitive nuclear technology or Restricted Data. Australia exercises similar controls on the transfer of such technology outside Australia. There is currently in force an Agreement Between the United States of America and Australia Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, signed at Canberra July 5, 1979 (the "1979 Agreement"). However, the 1979 Agreement does not permit transfers of sensitive nuclear technology and Restricted Data between the parties unless specifically provided for by an amendment or by a separate agreement.

Accordingly, the United States and Australia have negotiated, as a complement to the 1979 Agreement, a specialized agreement for peaceful nuclear cooperation to provide the necessary legal basis for transfer of the relevant technology between the two countries for peaceful purposes.

The proposed Agreement provides for cooperation between the parties and authorized persons within their respective jurisdictions in research on and development of the SILEX process (the particular process for the separation of isotopes of uranium by laser excitation). The Agreement permits the transfer for peaceful purposes from Australia to the United States and from the United States to Australia, subject to the nonproliferation conditions and controls set forth in the Agreement, of Restricted Data, sensitive nuclear technology, sensitive nuclear facilities, and major critical components of such facilities, to the extent that these relate to the SILEX technology.

The nonproliferation conditions and controls required by the Agreement are the standard conditions and controls required by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (NNPA), for all new U.S. agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation. These include safeguards, a guarantee of no explosive or military use, a guarantee of adequate physical protection, and rights to approve re-transfers, enrichment, reprocessing, other alterations in form or content, and storage. The Agreement contains additional detailed provisions for the protection of sensitive nuclear technology, Restricted Data, sensitive nuclear facilities, and major critical components of such facilities transferred pursuant to it.

Material, facilities, and technology subject to the Agreement may not be used to produce highly enriched uranium without further agreement of the parties.

The Agreement also provides that co-operation under it within the territory of Australia will be limited to research on and development of SILEX technology, and will not be for the purpose of constructing a uranium enrichment facility in Australia unless provided for by an amendment to the Agreement. The United States would treat any such amendment as a new agreement pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act, including the requirement for congressional review.

Australia is in the forefront of nations supporting international efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries. It is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and has an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for the application of full-scope safeguards to its nuclear program. It subscribes to the Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) Guidelines, which set forth standards for the responsible export of nuclear commodities for peaceful use, and to the Zangger (NPT Exporters) Committee Guidelines, which oblige members to require the application of IAEA safeguards on nuclear exports to nonnuclear weapon states. In addition, Australia is a party to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, whereby it has agreed to apply international standards of physical protection to the storage and transport of nuclear material under its jurisdiction or control.

The proposed Agreement with Australia has been negotiated in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation, foreign policy, and commercial interests of the United States.

A consideration in interagency deliberations on the Agreement was the potential consequences of the Agreement for U.S. military needs. If SILEX technology is successfully developed and becomes operational, then all material produced by and through this technology would be precluded from use in the U.S. nuclear weapons and naval nuclear propulsion programs. Furthermore, all other military uses of this material, such as tritium production and material testing, would also not be possible because of the assurances given to the Government of Australia. Yet, to ensure the enduring ability of the United States to meet its common defense and security needs, the United States must maintain its military nuclear capabilities. Recognizing this requirement and the restrictions being placed on the SILEX technology, the Department of Energy will monitor closely the development of SILEX but ensure that alternative uranium en-

richment technologies are available to meet the requirements for national security.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed Agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the Agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

Because this Agreement meets all applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, for agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation, I am transmitting it to the Congress without exempting it from any requirement contained in section 123 a. of that Act. This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and House International Relations Committee as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 b., the 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 3, 1999.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:07 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hanarahan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 170. An act to require certain notices in any mailing using a game of chance for the promotion of a product or service, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1801. An act to make technical corrections to various antitrust laws and to references to such laws.

H.R. 2513. An act to direct the Administrator of General Services to acquire a building located in Terre Haute, Indiana, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3137. An act 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.

H.R. 3164. An act to provide for the imposition of economic sanctions on certain foreign persons engaging in, or otherwise involved in, international narcotics trafficking.

H.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution conferring status as a honorary veteran of the United States Armed Forces on Zachary Fisher.

The message also announced that the House has agreed the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress relating to the recent allegations of espionage and illegal campaign financing that have brought

into question the loyalty and probity of Americans of Asian ancestry.

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution expressing the support of Congress for activities to increase public participation in the decennial census.

H. Con. Res. 199. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that prayers and invocations at public school sporting events contribute to the moral foundation of our Nation and urging the Supreme Court to uphold their constitutionality.

H. Con. Res. 213. Concurrent resolution encouraging the Secretary of Education to promote, and State and local educational agencies to incorporate in their educational programs, financial literacy training.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 468. An act to improve the effectiveness and performance of Federal financial assistance programs, simplify Federal financial assistance application and reporting requirement, and improve the delivery of services to the public.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 441) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the requirement for the admission of nonimmigrant nurses who will practice in health professional shortage areas.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 491 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1098(c)), and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, the Speaker appoints the following member on the part of the House to the advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for a 3 year term to fill the existing vacancy thereon: Ms. Judith Flink of Illinois

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 11:50 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 974. An act to establish a program to afford high school graduates from the District of Columbia the benefits of in-State tuition at State colleges and universities outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 5:12 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

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

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

At 6:36 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, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3194. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2990) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals greater access to health insurance through a health care tax deduction, a long-term care deduction, and other health-related tax incentives, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide access to and choice in health care through association health plans, to amend the Public Health Service Act to create new pooling opportunities for small employers to obtain greater access to health coverage through HealthMarts; to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage; and for other purposes", and agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints.

The following Members as the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Commerce, for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. PALLONE.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. ARCHER, Mr. THOMAS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. STARK: *Provided*, That McCRERY is appointed in lieu of Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut for consideration of title XIV of the House bill and sections 102, 111(b) and 304 and title II of the Senate amendment.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. ANDREWS.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Government Reform, for consideration of section 503 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. WAXMAN.

As additional conferees for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. GOSS and Mr. BERRY.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1883. An act to provide the application of measures to foreign persons who transfer to Iran certain goods, services, or technology, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

H.R. 1477. A bill to withhold voluntary proportional assistance for programs and projects of the International Atomic Energy Agency relating to the development and completion of the Bushehr nuclear power plant in Iran, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1794. A bill concerning the participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization (WHO).

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 208. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States policy toward the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union, in light of the Alliance's April 1999 Washington Summit and the European Union's June 1999 Cologne Summit.

S. Res. 209. A resolution expressing concern over interference with freedom of the press and the independence of judicial and electoral institutions in Peru.

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 923. A bill to promote full equality at the United Nations for Israel.

S. Con. Res. 30. A concurrent resolution recognizing the sacrifice and dedication of members of America's non-governmental organizations and private volunteer organizations throughout their history and specifically in answer to their courageous response to recent disasters in Central America and Kosovo.

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Con. Res. 68. An original concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of historic events in Central and Eastern Europe, particularly the Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, and reaffirming trends of friendship and cooperation between the United States and the Czech and Slovak Republics.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JEFFORDS from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

Stephen Hadley, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2003.

Zalmay Khalilzad, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2001.

Charles Richard Barnes, of Georgia, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

Paul Steven Miller, of California, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2004. (Reappointment)

A. Lee Fritschler, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

Irasema Garza, of Maryland, to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor.

T. Michael Kerr, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

Anthony Musick, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service.

Amy C. Achor, of Texas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2003.

Linda Lee Aaker, of Texas, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2004.

Edward L. Ayers, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2004.

Pedro G. Castillo, of California, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2004.

Peggy Whitman Preshaw, of Louisiana, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2002.

Theodore William Striggles, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2004.

Ira Berlin, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2004.

Evelyn Edson, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2004.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Treaty Doc. 105-55: Tax Convention With Estonia (Exec. Report 106-3).

TEXT OF THE COMMITTEE-RECOMMENDED RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Republic of Estonia for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on January 15, 1998 (Treaty Doc. 105-55), subject to the declaration of subsection (a) and the proviso of subsection (b).

(a) DECLARATION.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declaration, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally based principles of treaty interpretation set forth in Condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and Condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(b) PROVISIO.—The resolution of ratification is subject to the following proviso, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) SUPREMACY OF CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Convention requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States.

Treaty Doc. 105-56: Tax Convention With Lithuania (Exec. Report 106-4).

TEXT OF THE COMMITTEE-RECOMMENDED
RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Lithuania for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on January 15, 1998 (Treaty Doc. 105-56), subject to the declaration of subsection (a) and the proviso of subsection (b).

(a) DECLARATION.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declaration, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally based principles of treaty interpretation set forth in Condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and Condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(b) PROVISIO.—The resolution of ratification is subject to the following proviso, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) SUPREMACY OF CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Convention requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States.

Treaty Doc. 105-57: Tax Convention With Latvia (Exec. Report 106-5).

TEXT OF THE COMMITTEE-RECOMMENDED
RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Republic of Latvia for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on January 15, 1998 (Treaty Doc. 105-57), subject to the declaration of subsection (a) and the proviso of subsection (b).

(a) DECLARATION.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declaration, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally based principles of treaty interpretation set forth in Condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and Condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(b) PROVISIO.—The resolution of ratification is subject to the following proviso, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) SUPREMACY OF CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Convention requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States.

Treaty Doc. 106-3: Tax Convention With Venezuela (Exec. Report 106-6).

TEXT OF THE COMMITTEE-RECOMMENDED
RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Con-

vention between the Government of the United States of America and the Republic of Venezuela for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, together with a Protocol, signed at Caracas on January 25, 1999 (Treaty Doc. 106-3), subject to the understandings of subsection (a), the declarations of subsection (b), and the proviso of subsection (c).

(a) UNDERSTANDINGS.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following understandings, which shall be included in the instrument of ratification, and shall be binding on the President.

(1) PREVENTION OF DOUBLE EXEMPTION.—Where under Article 7 (Business profits) or Article 14 (Independent Personal Services) of this Convention income is relieved from tax in one Contracting State and, under the law in force in the other Contracting State a person is not subject to tax in that other Contracting State in respect of such income, then the relief to be allowed under this Convention in the first-mentioned Contracting State shall apply only to so much of the income as is subject to tax in the other contracting State. This understanding shall cease to have effect when the provisions of Venezuela's Law Amending the Income Tax Law (hereinafter the "new Venezuelan tax law"), relating to the implementation of a worldwide tax system in replacement of Venezuela's current territorial tax system, are effective in accordance with the provisions of such new Venezuelan tax law.

(2) VENEZUELAN BRANCH PROFITS TAX.—The United States understands that the reference to an "additional tax" in Article 11A of the Convention includes the tax that may be imposed by Venezuela (the "Venezuelan Branch Tax") pursuant to the relevant provisions of the new Venezuelan tax law. In addition, the United States understands that the limit imposed under Article 11A of the Convention shall apply with respect to the Venezuelan Branch Tax and that for purposes of that article, the Venezuelan Branch Tax shall be imposed only on an amount not in excess of the amount that is analogous to the "dividend equivalent amount" defined in subparagraph (a) of paragraph 10 of the Protocol with respect to the United States.

(b) DECLARATIONS.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declarations, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) NEW VENEZUELAN TAX LAW.—Before the President may notify Venezuela pursuant to Article 29 of the Constitution that the United States has completed the required ratification procedures, he shall certify to the Committee on Foreign Relations that:

(i) the new Venezuelan tax law has been enacted in accordance with Venezuelan law;

(ii) the Department of Treasury, in consultation with the Department of State, has thoroughly examined the new Venezuelan tax law; and

(iii) the new Venezuelan tax law is fully consistent with and appropriate to the obligations under the Convention.

(2) TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally based principles of treaty interpretation set forth in Condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and Condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(c) PROVISIO.—The resolution of ratification is subject to the following proviso, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) SUPREMACY OF CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Convention requires or authorizes leg-

islation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States.

Treaty Doc. 106-9: Tax Convention With Slovenia (Exec. Report 106-7).

TEXT OF THE COMMITTEE-RECOMMENDED
RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Ljubljana on June 21, 1999 (Treaty Doc. 106-9), subject to the reservation of subsection (a), the understanding of subsection (b), the declaration of subsection (c), and the proviso of subsection (d).

(a) RESERVATION.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following reservation, which shall be included in the instrument of ratification, and shall be binding on the President:

(1) MAIN PURPOSES TESTS.—Paragraph 10 of Article 10 (Dividends), paragraph 10 of Article 11 (Interest), paragraph 7 of article 12 (Royalties), paragraph 3 of Article 21 (Other Income), and subparagraph (g) of paragraph 3 of Article 25 (Mutual Agreement Procedure) of the Convention shall be stricken in their entirety.

(b) UNDERSTANDING.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following understanding, which shall be included in the instrument of ratification, and shall be binding on the President:

(1) EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION.—The United States understands that, pursuant to Article 26 of the Convention, both the competent authority of the United States and the competent authority of the Republic of Slovenia have the authority to obtain and provide information held by financial institutions, nominees or persons acting in an agency or fiduciary capacity, or respecting interests in a person.

(c) DECLARATION.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declaration, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally based principles of treaty interpretation set forth in Condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and Condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(d) PROVISIO.—The resolution of ratification is subject to the following proviso, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) SUPREMACY OF CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Convention requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States.

Treaty Doc. 106-11: Tax Convention With Italy (Exec. Report 106-8).

TEXT OF THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED
RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Italian Republic for the Avoidance of Double Taxation with Respect to Taxes on Income and the Prevention of

Fraud or Fiscal Evasion, signed at Washington on August 25, 1999, together with a Protocol (Treaty Doc. 106-11), subject to the reservation of subsection (a), the understanding of subsection (b), the declaration of subsection (c), and the proviso of subsection (d).

(a) RESERVATION.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following reservation, which shall be included in the instrument of ratification, and shall be binding on the President:

(1) MAIN PURPOSE TESTS.—Paragraph 10 of Article 10 (Dividends), paragraph 9 of Article 11 (Interest), paragraph 8 of Article 12 (Royalties), and paragraph 3 of Article 22 (Other Income) of the Convention, and paragraph 19 of Article 1 of the Protocol (dealing with Article 25 (Mutual Agreement Procedure) of the Convention) shall be stricken in their entirety, and paragraph 20 of Article 1 of the Protocol shall be renumbered as paragraph 19.

(b) UNDERSTANDING.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following understanding, which shall be included in the instrument of ratification, and shall be binding on the President:

(1) EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION.—The United States understands that, pursuant to Article 26 of the Convention, both the competent authority of the United States and the competent authority of the Republic of Italy have the authority to obtain and provide information held by financial institutions, nominees or persons acting in an agency or fiduciary capacity, or respecting interests in a person.

(c) DECLARATION.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declaration, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally based principles of treaty interpretation set forth in Condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and Condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(d) PROVISIO.—The resolution of ratification is subject to the following proviso, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) SUPREMACY OF CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Convention requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States.

Treaty Doc. 106-12: Tax Convention With Denmark (Exec. Report 106-9).

TEXT OF THE COMMITTEE-RECOMMENDED
RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on August 19, 1999, together with a Protocol (Treaty Doc. 106-12), subject to the declaration of subsection (a) and the proviso of subsection (b).

(a) DECLARATION.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declaration, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally based principles of treaty

interpretation set forth in Condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and Condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(b) PROVISIO.—The resolution of ratification is subject to the following proviso, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) SUPREMACY OF CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Convention requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States.

Treaty Doc. 106-13: Protocol Amending Tax Convention with Germany (Exec. Report 106-10).

TEXT OF THE COMMITTEE-RECOMMENDED
RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany for the Avoidance of Double Taxation with Respect to Taxes on Estates, Inheritances, and Gifts signed at Bonn on December 3, 1980, signed at Washington on December 14, 1998 (Treaty Doc. 106-13), subject to the declaration of subsection (a) and the proviso of subsection (b).

(a) DECLARATION.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declaration, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally based principles of treaty interpretation set forth in Condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and Condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(b) PROVISIO.—The resolution of ratification is subject to the following proviso, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) SUPREMACY OF CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Protocol requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States.

Treaty Doc. 106-15: Amending Convention with Ireland (Exec. Report 106-11)

TEXT OF THE COMMITTEE-RECOMMENDED
RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Ireland for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital Gains, signed at Dublin on July 28, 1997 (the Amending Convention was signed at Washington on September 24, 1999) (Treaty Doc. 106-15), subject to the declaration of subsection (a) and the proviso of subsection (b).

(a) DECLARATION.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declaration, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally based principles of treaty interpretation set forth in Condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF

Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and Condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(b) PROVISIO.—The resolution of ratification is subject to the following proviso, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) SUPREMACY OF CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Amending Convention requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States.

Treaty Doc. 106-5: Convention (No. 182) for Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor (Exec. Report 106-12).

TEXT OF THE COMMITTEE-RECOMMENDED
RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Convention (No. 182) Concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 87th Session in Geneva on June 17, 1999 (Treaty Doc. 106-5), subject to the understandings of subsection (a), the declaration of subsection (b), and the proviso of subsection (c).

(a) UNDERSTANDINGS.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following understandings, which shall be included in the instrument of ratification:

(1) CHILDREN WORKING ON FARMS.—The United States understands that Article 3(d) of Convention 182 does not encompass situations in which children are employed by a parent or by a person standing in the place of a parent on a farm owned or operated by such parent or person, nor does it change, or is it intended to lead to a change in the agricultural employment provisions or any other provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act in the United States.

(2) BASIC EDUCATION.—The United States understands that the term "basic education" in Article 7 of Convention 182 means primary education plus one year: eight or nine years of schooling, based on curriculum and not age.

(b) DECLARATION.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declaration, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally based principles of treaty interpretation set forth in Condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and Condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(c) PROVISIO.—The resolution of ratification is subject to the following proviso, which shall not be included in the instrument of ratification to be signed by the President:

(1) SUPREMACY OF THE CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Treaty requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States.

Treaty Doc. 106-2: Extradition Treaty With Korea (Exec. Report 106-13).

TEXT OF THE COMMITTEE-RECOMMENDED
RESOLUTION OF ADVICE AND CONSENT:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Extradition Treaty between the Government of

the United States of America and the Government of Republic of Korea, signed at Washington on June 9, 1998 (Treaty Doc. 106-2), subject to the understanding of subsection (a), the declaration of subsection (b), and the proviso of subsection (c).

(a) UNDERSTANDING.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following understanding, which shall be included in the instrument of ratification:

(1) PROHIBITION ON EXTRADITION TO THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT.—The United States understands that the protections contained in Article 15 concerning the Rule of Specialty would preclude the surrender of any person from the United States to the International Criminal Court agreed to in Rome, Italy, on July 17, 1998, unless the United States consents to such surrender; and the United States shall not consent to the transfer of any person extradited to the Republic of Korea by the United States to the International Criminal Court agreed to in Rome, Italy, on July 17, 1998, unless the treaty establishing that Court has entered into force for the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as required by Article II, section 2 of the United States Constitution.

(b) DECLARATION.—The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declaration, which shall be binding on the President:

(1) TREATY INTERPRETATION.—The Senate affirms the applicability to all treaties of the constitutionally based principles of treaty interpretation set forth in Condition (1) of the resolution of ratification of the INF Treaty, approved by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and Condition (8) of the resolution of ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, approved by the Senate on May 14, 1997.

(c) PROVISOR.—The resolution of ratification is subject to the following proviso, which shall not be included in the instrument of ratification to be signed by the President:

(1) SUPREMACY OF THE CONSTITUTION.—Nothing in the Treaty requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1846. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 10301 South Compton Avenue, in Los Angeles, California, and known as the Watts Finance Office, as the "Augustus F. Hawkins Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

S. 1847. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 701 South Santa Fe Avenue in Compton, California, and known as the Compton Main Post Office, as the "Mervyn Dymally Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 1848. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Denver Water Reuse project; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself and Mr. ROTH):

S. 1849. A bill to designate segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

S. 1850. A bill to amend section 222 of the Communications Act of 1934 to modify the requirements relating to the use and disclosure of customer proprietary network information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAU, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CHAFFEE, Mr. CLELAND, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. FRIST, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERREY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KYL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 218. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued recognizing the 4-H Youth Development Program's centennial; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. HELMS):

S. Res. 219. A resolution recognizing and honoring Walter Jerry Payton and expressing the condolences of the Senate to his family on his death; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. Con. Res. 68. An original concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of historic events in Central and Eastern Europe, particularly the Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, and reaffirming the bonds of friendship and cooperation between the United States and the Czech and Slovak Republics; from the Committee on Foreign Relations; placed on the calendar.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1846. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 10301 South Compton Avenue, in Los Angeles, California, and known as the Watts Finance Office, as the "Augustus F. Hawkins Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

REDESIGNATION OF THE WATTS FINANCE OFFICE BUILDING AS THE AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS POST OFFICE BUILDING

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today, I am introducing legislation to pay tribute to a former colleague of mine and a fellow Californian, former Congressman Augustus F. Hawkins, by renaming the Federal building located at 10301 South Compton Avenue, in Los Angeles, California, currently known as the Watts Finance Office, as the Augustus F. Hawkins Post Office Building.

Gus Hawkins was born in Shreveport, Louisiana in 1907. His family moved to Los Angeles when he was 11 to escape the racial discrimination that was prevalent in the South at that time. This experience made him a passionate advocate of racial justice and social equality, and he committed his life to the service of others.

His efforts began in the California Assembly where he passed the state's first law against discrimination in housing and employment. Building on that success, he passed other important legislation concerning minimum wages for women, child care centers, workers' compensation for domestic employees, and the removal of racial designations on state documents.

In 1962, Gus was elected to the United States House of Representatives. During his 28 years in office, he served on the Committee on House Administration, and served as Chairman for both the Joint Committee on Printing and the Committee on Education and Labor. He authored more than 17 federal laws dealing with civil rights, educational improvements, job training and employment opportunities. He fought tirelessly for the rights of children, the poor, the disabled, the elderly, and minorities.

Throughout his distinguished career, Gus was recognized as a hardworking man of integrity who cared little for personal accolades while concentrating on the issues affecting his constituents. He has continually pursued fairness and opportunity for all.

Designating the Watts Finance Office Building as the Augustus F. Hawkins Post Office Building is an honor befitting his 56 years of service to his community and to the State of California. •

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1847. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 701 South Santa Fe Avenue in Compton, California, and known as the Compton Main Post Office, as the "Mervyn Dymally Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

REDESIGNATION OF THE COMPTON MAIN POST OFFICE AS THE MERVYN DYMALLY POST OFFICE BUILDING

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today, I am introducing legislation to pay tribute to a former colleague of mine and a fellow Californian, former Congressman Mervyn Malcolm Dymally, by renaming the post office located at 701 South Santa Fe Avenue in Compton, California, currently known as the Compton Main Post Office, as the Mervyn Dymally Post Office Building.

Mr. Dymally came to this country in 1945 from Cedros, Trinidad, British West Indies. In 1960, he began his political career by working as a field coordinator for John F. Kennedy during the Presidential campaign. Mr. Dymally's own service as an elected official began when he was elected to the California State Assembly in 1963 and then to the State Senate in 1967, where he served for eight years. Next, he was elected Lieutenant Governor of the State of California and was the State's highest ranking black elected official.

Building on a career of political success, Mervyn Dymally was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1981. During his six terms in office, he served on several committees, including the Post Office and Civil Service Committee; the Committee on the District of Columbia, where he chaired its Subcommittee on Judiciary and Education; and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, where he was the Chair of the Subcommittee on International Operations.

As the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, Mr. Dymally's passion became immediately evident when he visited 20 African countries in his first year. He worked tirelessly to raise awareness of the plight of Africans and to monitor U.S. assistance levels to African and Caribbean nations. Throughout his distinguished career, he was recognized for his leadership in humanitarian efforts.

Since retirement from Congress in 1992, Mr. Dymally is busier than ever. He serves as President of the Grace Home for Waiting Children and as Chairman of the Caribbean Action Lobby. In addition, he is the President of a consulting firm and a Professor at the Central State University in Ohio. He still travels frequently, serving as Honorary Consul to the Republic of Benin, West Africa and Vice President of the Pacific Century Institute.

Designating the Compton Main Post Office as the Mervyn Dymally Post Office Building is an honor befitting his service to his community and to the State of California.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The bill follows:

S. 1847

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

SECTION 1. REDESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 701 South Santa Fe Avenue in Compton, California,

and known as the Compton Main Post Office, shall be known and designated as the "Mervyn Malcolm Dymally Post Office Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the Mervyn Malcolm Dymally Post Office Building.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 1848. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Denver Water Reuse project; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE DENVER WATER REUSE PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I take the time today to reintroduce a bill that will help millions of water consumers throughout my state. This bill is based on S. 2140, legislation I introduced last year, which passed out of the full Senate.

The Denver Water Department has developed a unique plan to re-use non-potable water for irrigation and industrial uses. In the arid West, where growing populations and changing values are place increasing demands on existing water supplies, water and availability remain important issues. Recent conflicts are particularly apparent in the West where agricultural needs for water are often in direct conflict with urban needs. This legislation will help remedy some of this conflict.

This bill authorizes the Denver Water Department to access federal funds to assist in the implementation of this plan. The State of Colorado, the Colorado Water Congress, the Denver Board of Water Commissioners, and the Mayor of Denver have fully endorsed this legislation. I am pleased to assist these interested parties with this worthwhile proposal.

The Denver Water Department serves over a million customers and is the largest water supplier in the Rocky Mountain region. Over the past several years Denver Water has developed a plan to treat and re-use some of its water supply for uses not involving human consumption, such as irrigation and industrial purposes. In this manner, Denver will stretch its water supply without the cost and potential environmental disruption of building new reservoirs. It will also ease the demand on fresh drinking-quality water supplies.

The Denver Nonpotable Reuse Project will treat secondary wastewater, that is water which has already been used once in Denver's system. It is an environmentally and economically viable method for extending and conserving our limited water supplies. The water quality will meet all Colorado and federal standards. The water will still be clean and odorless, but since it will be used for irrigation and industrial uses around the Denver

International Airport and the Rocky Mountain Wildlife Refuge, the additional expense to treat it for drinking will be avoided.

The nonpotable project will be constructed in three phases and ultimately will result in an additional useable water supply of 15,000 acre feet. The use of the nonpotable water for irrigation and industrial customers will make potable water supplies available for up to 30,000 homes.

Construction will include a treatment plant and a distribution system that is separate from the potable water system. Phase I will serve customers in the vicinity of the reuse plant, including a Public Service Company power plant, other industrial users and other public areas. Phase II will add irrigation for parks and golf courses in the former Stapleton Airport and the recently closed Lowry Air Force Base redevelopment areas. The Rocky Mountain Arsenal, which is being converted to a national wildlife refuge, will also use the reuse water to maintain lake levels on-site and to provide water for wildlife habitats. Phase III will serve existing parks as well as new development of a commercial corridor leading to the Denver International Airport. With the construction of Phase II, the irrigation, heating and cooling, and car washing facilities at Denver International Airport will convert to reuse water, where a dual distribution system has already been installed.

In the West, naturally scarce water supplies and increasing urban populations have furthered our need for water reuse, recycling, conservation, and storage proposals which are the keys to successfully meet the water needs of everyone. This plan would benefit many Coloradans, and would help relieve many of the water burdens faced in the Denver region. Again, I'd like to thank the interested parties for their support, and I am hopeful this bill can be quickly passed and put into effect.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and copies of letters of support from the Colorado Department of Natural Resources, the Colorado Water Congress, the Denver Board of Water Commissioners, and the Mayor of Denver be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1848

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

SECTION 1. DENVER WATER REUSE PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 1631, 1632, 1633, and 1634 (43 U.S.C. 390h-13, 390h-14, 390h-15, 390h-16) as sections 1632, 1633, 1634, and 1635, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 1630 the following:

"SEC. 1631. DENVER WATER REUSE PROJECT.

"(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the appropriate State and

local authorities, may participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Denver Water Reuse project to reclaim and reuse water in the service area of the Denver Water Department of the city and county of Denver, Colorado.

"(b) COST SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost.

"(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for the operation or maintenance of the project described in subsection (a)."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (as amended by subsection (a)(1)) is amended—

(A) in section 1632(a), by striking "1630" and inserting "1631";

(B) in section 1633(c), by striking "section 1633" and inserting "section 1634"; and

(C) in section 1634, by striking "section 1632" and inserting "section 1633".

(2) The table of contents in section 2 of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 is amended by striking the items relating to sections 1631 through 1634 and inserting the following:

"Sec. 1631. Denver water reuse project.

"Sec. 1632. Authorization of appropriations.

"Sec. 1633. Groundwater study.

"Sec. 1634. Authorization of appropriations.

"Sec. 1635. Willow Lake natural treatment system project."

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
Denver, CO, November 1, 1999.

Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: I am writing to support the inclusion of the Denver Water Nonpotable Reuse Project on the Title XVI authorizing list. Inclusion of this project recognizes the importance of creative procedures to meet future water needs for metropolitan Denver. As it becomes more and more difficult to provide water supplies for a rapidly growing metropolitan area, innovative projects such as reuse and conjunctive use must supplant existing capacity. Denver Water's reuse plant will produce over 1,000 acre feet of usable water supply by treatment of effluent for industrial and irrigation purposes. The reuse water will be treated to attain important public health standards even for those limited purposes.

Reuse of water is valuable not only for Denver, but for other areas of Colorado. Reuse of water will delay the need to develop new water supplies from other water sources. This project has wide-spread support in Colorado. Your efforts to see Denver Water's Nonpotable Reuse Project listed as a Bureau of Reclamation approved project are appreciated. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

GREG WALCHER,
Executive Director.

COLORADO WATER CONGRESS,
Denver, CO, October 25, 1999.

Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: As you well know, the chronic water shortages in Colorado have forced Colorado Water supply agencies to develop water in new and ingenious ways. One of the best water projects being planned is Denver Water's Nonpotable Reuse Project that will take water already used, treat it and deliver it for industrial and irrigation supply. This project will supply about 15% of Denver's anticipated water shortfall without building a new reservoir,

without tremendous federal compliance costs, and without a new transbasin diversion.

The Water Congress has members throughout the state of Colorado; and I know of no opposition to this project. I understand you are trying to get the project listed pursuant to Title XVI of the Bureau of Reclamation approved reuse projects list. You have the support of the Colorado Water Congress. Thank you for your consideration in this endeavor.

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. MACRAVEY,
Executive Director.

DENVER BOARD OF
WATER COMMISSIONERS,
Denver, CO, October 27, 1999.

Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: I appreciate your support and sponsorship of the bill that adds the Denver Nonpotable Reuse Project to Public Law 102-575 Title XVI, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's authorized list. This project allows us to conserve potable water sources and helps us to defer importation of water from the Western Slope. As I think you know, we are only seeking authorization, not federal funding, for the Denver Reuse Project.

We are planning a project that will provide over 15,000 acre-feet of nonpotable supply. That, in turn, frees up enough treated water supply to provide for some 30,000 homes. It represents a substantial portion of the supply that will be needed for future demand in the Denver Water system as an expanding population strains our limited water resources. By reclaiming wastewater for irrigation and industrial use, we can serve growth in a way that is environmentally responsible and economic.

Please feel free to call upon us should you need further information or assistance.

Sincerely,

H.J. BARRY,
Manager.

CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER,
CITY AND COUNTY BUILDING,
Denver, CO, November 2, 1999.

Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: Once again, I want to express my appreciation for your support of legislation adding the Denver Water Non-potable Reuse Project to the Bureau of Reclamation's approved projects list.

We are proud to include non-potable reuse, coupled with water conservation and system refinements, as core components of the Denver Water 20-year plan. We certainly acknowledge the importance and value of our limited water resources throughout Colorado. Reuse efforts allow us to reduce or minimize the Denver metro area's demands on limited Colorado River sources.

Once again, thank you for your support.

Yours truly,

WELLINGTON, E. WEBB,
Mayor.

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself and
Mr. ROTH):

S. 1849. A bill to designate segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE WHITE CLAY CREEK WILD AND SCENIC
RIVERS ACT

• Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today I am joined by Senator ROTH, in intro-

ducing a bill that would designate the White Clay Creek and its tributaries in Delaware and Pennsylvania as a unit of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

It has been eight years since I introduced the bill authorizing the study of the White Clay Creek watershed, and thirty years since I began my efforts to protect this unique and valuable region from the over development and urban sprawl that are of increasing concern to all of us.

The White Clay Creek watershed is a truly remarkable environment, covering 107 square miles and draining over 69,000 acres in Delaware and Pennsylvania. Centrally located between the densely urbanized regions of New York and Washington, D.C., the White Clay Creek watershed is within a 2 hour drive of eight million people.

Its diversity of natural, historic, cultural and recreational resources, as detailed in the National Park Service's Resources and Issues Report in September of 1994, is extraordinary. The watershed is home to a wide variety of plant and animal life, archeological sites dating back to prehistoric times, a bi-state preserve and state park, and a source of drinking water for the region.

It became clear, early on, that these resources warranted the federal protection provided under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. With the introduction of my legislation today, we are entering the last major phase of seeing that protection become a reality.

Before I begin to speak on the particulars of today's legislation and the study process that got us to this point, I think it is important to note that while there are over 150 National Wild and Scenic Rivers across this nation, the White Clay Creek brings with it two distinctions: Specifically, it will be the first and only Wild and Scenic River in Delaware; and, it is the first and only river to be studied for designation on a watershed basis.

The study of the White Clay Creek for possible inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System recently culminated with the release of a National Park Service study report in September of this year. The study process began in 1992, when Congress directed the National Park Service to convene a study task force consisting of state and local governments, community organizations, watershed residents and landowners within the White Clay Creek watershed.

As described in the study legislation, the duties of the task force were to evaluate the eligibility and suitability of the White Clay Creek and its tributaries, and to develop a management plan for the preservation and protection of the watershed. Fifteen local governments in Delaware and Pennsylvania participated in the study task force.

I stated during hearings on the study legislation, before the Senate Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land

Management in November of 1991, that there was tremendous support for the study and subsequent designation. However, I realized that with the diverse group of individuals, organizations and agencies making up the task force, the possibility for conflict in determining which segments should be designated and what protections afforded them, could be great.

What I could not have expected and what I am extremely pleased to report is that the support for protection of the White Clay Creek is so strong, that over 190 miles of the approximately 400 river miles studied in the watershed are being requested for designation today. Clearly, Delawareans and Pennsylvanians alike understand the value of preserving areas as unique as the White Clay Creek.

And, the legislation I am introducing will do just that. It directs the National Park Service to incorporate 190.9 miles of the White Clay Creek and its tributaries into its National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Along with the designation, all 15 local governments within the watershed area have unanimously supported, through the passage of resolutions, the ideals and goals of the White Clay Creek Management Plan. The plan, developed by the White Clay Creek Task Force, will ensure long-term protection of the White Clay Creek watershed, emphasizing the importance of local governments working together, which is key in obtaining the federal designation I am seeking today.

Designation of the White Clay Creek and its tributaries will bring national attention to the unique cultural, natural and recreational values of the area. It will provide an added level of protection from over development, by requiring an in-depth review by the National Park Service of any proposed project requiring federal permits or federal funding in the affected area. And finally, it elevates the value of the watershed when applying for state, local and federal preservation grants.

Of the 69,000 acres in the watershed, 5,000 acres are public lands owned by state and local governments, the rest is privately owned and maintained. There are no federal lands within the watershed and no federal dollars will be used to purchase any land within its boundaries.

I believe the protection of the White Clay Creek watershed to be one of the most important environmental initiatives I have undertaken since taking office in 1973, and it is my hope that Congress will act quickly on this bill so it can be preserved not only for us, but also for all the generations to come. ●

By Mr. EDWARDS:

S. 1850. A bill to amend section 222 of the Communications Act of 1934 to modify the requirements relating to the use and disclosure of customer proprietary network information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

TELEPHONE CALL PRIVACY ACT OF 1999

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I rise to talk about privacy and about how we can regain some control over our personal information. Privacy is an increasing concern for all Americans. And the public rightly believes that their control over some of their most personal information is being slowly but surely eroded.

Today I introduce legislation that would help end that erosion. The "Telephone Call Privacy Act of 1999," would prevent telecommunications companies from using an individual's personal phone call records without their consent, in order to sell that individual products or services.

Most Americans would be stunned to learn that the law does not protect them from having their phone records sold to third parties. Imagine getting a call one night—during dinner—and having a telemarketer try to sell you membership in a travel club because your phone calling patterns show frequent calls overseas. My legislation would prevent this from occurring without the individual's permission.

Mr. President, no one denies that the rapid development of modern technology has been beneficial. New and improved technologies have enabled us to obtain information more quickly and easily than ever before. Students can participate in classes that are being taught in other states, or even other countries. Current events can be broadcast around the world as they happen. And companies have streamlined their processes for providing goods and services.

But these remarkable developments can have a startling downside. They have made it easier to track personal information such as medical and financial records, and buying habits. And in turn, our ability to keep our personal information private is being eroded. I have to say there are times when it feels like companies know more about me than I know myself.

The list of ways our privacy is being eroded is growing longer and longer. And sadly telephone call privacy got added to the list this August when the 10th Circuit struck down FCC regulations aimed at protecting privacy and implementing congressional intent.

The decision was the result of a suit filed by U.S. West against the FCC arguing that its regulations restrict the ability of carriers to engage in commercial speech with customers. In August, the Tenth Circuit issued its decision in the case and agreed with U.S. West. The court stated that "privacy is not an absolute good because it imposes real costs on society."

I believe the court was terribly wrong. Individuals have a reasonable expectation that their calling habits are not being shared with third parties without their knowledge or permission. And when I weigh the right of people to control who has access to their personal information against the ability of companies to use only one of many

marketing methods, there is no question that the right of people to privacy is overriding. Surely people have a right to control some of their most private information. And surely they have the right to prevent harassing and unwanted solicitations. I for one cannot believe that expanding the variety of marketing techniques at a company's disposal is more important than a person's privacy right.

Mr. President, let me describe how my legislation would address the problem. Current law defines information about who we call, how often, and how long we talk to them as "customer proprietary network information," or "CPNI." It is possible for telephone companies to track an individual's CPNI and use it to market various products and services to that person.

My legislation requires that consumers be notified about potential disclosures of their private calling information and allows them to have some measure of control over how their information can be used. Specifically, my bill would do two things.

First, if a telecommunications carrier wishes to use CPNI in order to market its own products or services to them, it must provide each customer with a clear and conspicuous notice stating the type of calling information that may be used and the purpose for which it will be used. The customer may contact the carrier to deny permission to use their information within 15 days of the notice. If the customer does not contact the carrier in that time, the carrier can use the customer's CPNI to market its products and services to that customer. In other words, customers are provided with a limited opportunity to "opt-out" of the sharing of their information under these circumstances.

The second part of my bill addresses situations where a carrier wishes to share a customer's CPNI with a third party, such as a telemarketer. In these situations, in addition to providing the customer with notice, the carrier must also receive prior written approval from the customer. My bill clearly spells out that customers must affirmatively "opt-in" before a carrier can sell calling information to any third party.

The "Telephone Call Privacy Act" also allows for some reasonable and common sense exceptions. If a telecommunications carrier uses a customer's CPNI to provide the customer with the very services the carrier used to obtain the calling information, or if law enforcement or the courts require CPNI for certain reasons, the carrier does not need to provide the customer with notice and the opportunity to opt-out or opt-in.

Mr. President, consumers are very worried about how their personal information is being used. In 1994, a Harris Survey assessed Americans' views about privacy. It found that eighty-two percent of people surveyed are concerned about threats to their personal

privacy. And more specifically, more than half the people surveyed also stated they would be concerned if an interactive service engaged in "subscriber profiling" or using an individual's purchasing patterns to determine what types of goods and services to market to them. The survey also showed that people are less concerned about subscriber profiling if they are provided with notice that a profile would be created and how it would be used, and also if they are given access to the information in the profile.

Something must be done to empower consumers to prevent their private calling information from being used without their consent. The Telephone Call Privacy Act is an important step towards this goal. I believe the principles set forth in my legislation are a reasonable way to protect privacy and do not unduly burden the ability of businesses to market their products and services.

As Justice Brandeis said in his famous dissent in *Olmstead v. U.S.*, "the right to be let alone [is] the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men." The government must not only refrain from violating this right, but it must also ensure its preservation. I believe the Telephone Call Privacy Act is a sensible means to achieving this goal. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1850

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Telephone Call Privacy Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. MODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO USE AND DISCLOSURE OF CUSTOMER PROPRIETARY NETWORK INFORMATION.

(a) MODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 222(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 222(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) PRIVACY REQUIREMENTS FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B) or as required by law, a telecommunications carrier that receives or obtains customer proprietary network information by virtue of its provision of a telecommunications service may use, disclose, or permit access to customer proprietary network information that identifies a customer as follows:

"(i) In the provision of—

"(I) the telecommunications service from which such information is derived; and

"(II) services necessary to, or used in, the provision of such telecommunications service, including the publishing of directories.

"(ii) In the case of the use of such information by the telecommunications carrier for the provision of another of its products or services to the customer, only if the telecommunications carrier—

"(I) provides the customer a clear and conspicuous notice meeting the requirements set forth in subparagraph (C);

"(II) permits the customer to review such information for accuracy, and to correct and supplement such information; and

"(III) does not receive from the customer within 15 days after the date of the notice

under subclause (I) notice disapproving the use of such information for the provision of such product or service to the customer as specified in the notice under such subclause.

"(iii) In the case of the use, disclosure, or access of or to such information by another party, only if the telecommunications carrier that originally receives or obtains such information—

"(I) meets the requirements set forth in subclauses (I) and (II) of clause (ii) with respect to such information; and

"(II) receives from the customer written notice approving the use, disclosure, or access of or to such information for the provision of the product or service to the customer as specified in the notice under subclause (I) of this clause.

"(B) CUSTOMER DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding the previous approval of the use, disclosure, or access of or to information for a purpose under clause (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (A), upon receipt from a customer of written notice of the customer's disapproval of the use, disclosure, or access of or to information for such purpose, a telecommunications carrier shall terminate the use, disclosure, or access of or to such information for such purpose.

"(C) NOTICE ELEMENTS.—Each notice under clause (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

"(i) The types information that may be used, disclosed, or accessed.

"(ii) The specific types of businesses or individuals that may use or access the information or to which the information may be disclosed.

"(iii) The specific product or service for which the information may be used, disclosed, or accessed."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Paragraph (3) of such section is amended by striking "paragraph (1)" both places it appears and inserting "paragraph (1)(A)(i)".

(b) JUDICIAL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4) JUDICIAL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—A person that receives or obtains consumer proprietary network information may disclose such information—

"(i) pursuant to the standards and procedures established in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or comparable rules of other courts or administrative agencies, in connection with litigation or proceedings to which an individual who is the subject of the information is a party and in which the individual has placed the use, disclosure, or access to such information at issue;

"(ii) to a court, and to others ordered by the court, if in response to a court order issued in accordance with subparagraph (B); or

"(iii) to an investigative or law enforcement officer pursuant to a warrant issued under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, an equivalent State warrant, or a grand jury subpoena, or a court order issued in accordance with subparagraph (B).

"(B) REQUIREMENTS FOR COURT ORDERS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a court order for the disclosure of customer proprietary network information under subparagraph (A) may be issued by a court of competent jurisdiction only upon written application, upon oath or equivalent affirmation, by an investigative or law enforcement officer demonstrating that there is probable cause to believe that—

"(I) the information sought is relevant and material to an ongoing criminal investigation; and

"(II) the law enforcement need for the information outweighs the privacy interest of

the individual to whom the information pertains.

"(ii) CERTAIN ORDERS.—A court order may not be issued under this paragraph upon application of an officer of a State or local government if prohibited by the law of the State concerned."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 59

At the request of Mr. THOMPSON, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 59, a bill to provide Government-wide accounting of regulatory costs and benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 185

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 185, a bill to establish a Chief Agricultural Negotiator in the Office of the United States Trade Representative.

S. 345

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 345, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to remove the limitation that permits interstate movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is lawful.

S. 398

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 398, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Native American history and culture.

S. 976

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 976, a bill to amend title V of the Public Health Service Act to focus the authority of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration on community-based services children and adolescents, to enhance flexibility and accountability, to establish programs for youth treatment, and to respond to crises, especially those related to children and violence.

S. 1036

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1036, a bill to amend parts A and D of title IV of the Social Security Act to give States the option to pass through directly to a family receiving assistance under the temporary assistance to

needy families program all child support collected by the State and the option to disregard any child support that the family receives in determining a family's eligibility for, or amount of, assistance under that program.

S. 1109

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) 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. 1187

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES), and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1187, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, and for other purposes.

S. 1239

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1239, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat spaceports like airports under the exempt facility bond rules.

S. 1332

At the request of Mr. BAYH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1332, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Father Theodore M. Hesburg, in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions to civil rights, higher education, the Catholic Church, the Nation, and the global community.

S. 1384

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) were added as co-

sponsors of S. 1384, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a national folic acid education program to prevent birth defects, and for other purposes.

S. 1419

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1419, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to designate May as "National Military Appreciation Month."

S. 1487

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1487, a bill to provide for excellence in economic education, and for other purposes.

S. 1500

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an additional payment for services provided to certain high-cost individuals under the prospective payment system for skilled nursing facility services, and for other purposes.

S. 1528

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) 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. 1547

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) 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 Arizona (Mr. KYL) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) 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. 1656

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1656, a bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to permit children covered under a State child health plan (SCHIP) to continue to be eligible for benefits under the vaccine for children program.

S. 1710

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Texas (Mr. GRAMM), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON), the Senator from South

Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1710, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in conjunction with the minting of coins by the Republic of Iceland in commemoration of the millennium of the discovery of the New World by Leif Ericson.

S. 1771

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of 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 medical sanction against a foreign country or foreign entity.

S. 1791

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1791, a bill to authorize the Librarian of Congress to purchase papers of Dr. Martin Luther King, Junior, from Dr. King's estate.

S. 1795

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1795, a bill to require that before issuing an order, the President shall cite the authority for the order, conduct a cost benefit analysis, provide for public comment, and for other purposes.

S. 1809

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1809, a bill to improve service systems for individuals with developmental disabilities, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 118

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 118, a resolution designating December 12, 1999, as "National Children's Memorial Day."

SENATE RESOLUTION 212

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 212, a resolution to designate August 1, 2000, as "National Relatives as Parents Day."

SENATE RESOLUTION 217

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 217, a resolution relating to the freedom of belief, expression, and association in the People's Republic of China.

AMENDMENT NO. 2359

At the request of Mr. BURNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2359 proposed to H.R. 434, a bill to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa.

AMENDMENT NO. 2360

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2360 proposed to H.R. 434, a bill to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa.

SENATE RESOLUTION 218—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT A COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP SHOULD BE ISSUED RECOGNIZING THE 4-H YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM'S CENTENNIAL

Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. CLELAND, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. FRIST, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERREY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KYL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 218

Expressing the sense of the Senate that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued recognizing the 4-H Youth Development Program's centennial.

Whereas the 4-H Youth Development Program celebrates its 100th anniversary in 2002;

Whereas the 4-H Youth Development Program has grown to over 5,600,000 annual participants, from 5 to 19 years of age;

Whereas today's 4-H Club is very diverse, offering agricultural, career development,

information technology, and general life skills programs;

Whereas these programs are offered in rural and urban areas throughout the world; and

Whereas the 4-H Youth Development Program continues to make great contributions toward the development of well-rounded youth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States Postal Service should make preparations to issue a commemorative postage stamp recognizing the 4-H Youth Development Program's centennial; and

(2) the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a postage stamp be issued in 2002.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise to make a few remarks in support of the 4-H postal stamp resolution.

We must not fail to notice all the admirable efforts of youth today across the country. One fine example of young people joining together to make a positive impact in our country is the 4-H Youth Development Program. In the year 2002, 4-H will celebrate its 100th Anniversary. To recognize this national organization's achievements, I am submitting this resolution urging the U.S. Postal Service to create a stamp in honor of their centennial.

4-H is comprised of over 6 million youth, 45 million alumni, and over 600,000 volunteers. As the 4-H pledge states, they are working everyday to become positive members of "their clubs, their communities, their country and their world." Although this program started at the turn of the century focusing on rural agriculture and homemaking, today it boasts a diverse group with nearly a quarter of its members coming from central cities.

With programs in every state and 80 other countries, 4-H has demonstrated the importance of its ideals. Members follow the motto "To make the best better." Their mission is to create supportive environments enabling youth and adults to reach their full potential. In this way they become capable, competent and caring citizens. As a result, participation in 4-H programs has helped reduce violence, substance abuse, teen pregnancy, and unethical behavior in millions of youth.

Every state has seen the benefits of 4-H membership. A recent report, "Programs of Excellence" demonstrates this. Published by the USDA, the report highlights noteworthy 4-H programs in various states from New Jersey to New Mexico. In my state of Idaho, 4-H achieved recognition for its programs in youth development and ethics in agriculture. Idaho's "Know Your Government" conferences were applauded for giving youth positive attitudes toward government and increasing civic involvement and government knowledge.

This positive organization deserves our support and recognition. A centennial stamp issued by the U.S. Postal Service is the perfect way to honor and celebrate a job well done.

SENATE RESOLUTION 219—RECOGNIZING AND HONORING WALTER JERRY PAYTON AND EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE SENATE TO HIS FAMILY ON HIS DEATH

Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. HELMS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 219

Whereas Walter Payton was a hero, a leader, and a role model both on and off the field;

Whereas for 13 years, Walter Payton thrilled Chicago Bears fans as the National Football League's (NFL's) all-time leading rusher—and as one of the greatest running backs ever to play the game—culminating with his induction into the Professional Football Hall of Fame;

Whereas after retiring from professional football in 1987, Payton continued to touch the lives of both his fellow Chicagoans and citizens of his native state of Mississippi, as a businessman and a community leader;

Whereas Walter Payton was born 1954 to Mrs. Alyne Payton and the late Mr. Edward Payton, and his historic career began as a star running back at Columbia High School in his native hometown of Columbia, Mississippi, which he called "a child's paradise." He went on to choose Jackson State University over 100 college offers, and to set nine university football records, eventually scoring more points than any other football player in the history of the National Collegiate Athletic Association;

Whereas the first choice in the 1975 NFL draft, Payton—or "Sweetness"—as he was known to his fans—became the NFL's all-time leader in running and combined net yards and scored 110 touchdowns during his career with the Bears;

Whereas Walter Payton made the Pro Bowl nine times and was named the league's Most Valuable Player twice, in 1977 and 1985;

Whereas in 1977, Payton rushed for a career-high, 1,852 yards and carried the Bears to the playoffs for the first time since 1963;

Whereas Payton broke Jim Brown's long-standing record in 1984 to become the league's all-time leading rusher, and finished his career with a record 16,726 total rushing yards;

Whereas in 1985-86, Walter Payton led the Bears to an unforgettable 15-1 season and Super Bowl victory—the first and only Super Bowl win in Bears' history;

Whereas Payton was inducted into the Pro Football Hall of Fame in 1993, and was selected this year as the Greatest All-Time NFL Player by more than 200 players from the NFL Draft Class of 1999;

Whereas Walter Payton matched his accomplishments on the football field with his selfless actions off the field on behalf of those in need. He excelled academically as well as athletically, earning a degree in special education from Jackson State University in just three and one half years, and going on to undertake additional graduate study. Payton worked throughout his adult life to improve the lives of others through personal involvement with many charitable organizations. He was particularly active in working with children facing physical, mental, or economic challenges. In 1988, he established the Halas/Payton Foundation, which continues his legacy of community involvement to help educate Chicago's youth;

Whereas Walter Payton was a dedicated man of faith and principle, who, as a lifelong Baptist, was known for his deep rever-

ence for God; and, as a gracious and selfless citizen, was a devoted father with sterling personal integrity and a warm sense of humor. Walter Payton will always be remembered as a true gentleman with a heart full of genuine and active concern for others;

Whereas Walter Payton was truly an American hero in every sense of the term;

Whereas the members of the Senate extend our deepest sympathies to Walter Payton's family and the host of friends that he had across the country; and

Whereas Walter Payton died tragically on November 1, 1999, at age 45, but his legacy will live in our hearts and minds forever: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) hereby recognizes and honors Walter Jerry Payton (A) as one of the greatest football players of all time; and (B) for his many contributions to the Nation, especially to children, throughout his lifetime; and

(2) extends its deepest condolences to Walter Payton's wife, Connie; his two children, Jarrett and Brittney; his mother, Alyne; his brother, Eddie; his sister, Pam; and other members of his family.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

ROTH AMENDMENT NO. 2505

Mr. ROTH proposed an amendment to amendment No. 2325 proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa; as follows:

On page 10, strike lines 3 through 12, and insert the following:

"(iii) an open trading system through the elimination of barriers to United States trade and investment and the resolution of bilateral trade and investment disputes;

"(iv) economic policies to reduce poverty, increase the availability of health care and educational opportunities, expand physical infrastructure, and promote the establishment of private enterprise; and

"(v) a system to combat corruption and bribery, such as signing the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions;

On page 17, line 6, strike "2 years" and insert "5 years".

On page 36, beginning on line 3, strike all through page 41, line 21, and insert the following:

"(B) CBTEA BENEFICIARY COUNTRY.—The term 'CBTEA beneficiary country' means any 'beneficiary country', as defined by section 212(a)(1)(A) of this title, which the President designates as a CBTEA beneficiary country, taking into account the following criteria:

"(i) Whether a beneficiary country has demonstrated a commitment to—

"(I) undertake its obligations under the WTO on or ahead of schedule;

"(II) participate in negotiations toward the completion of the FTAA or a comparable trade agreement; and

"(III) undertake other steps necessary for that country to become a party to the FTAA or a comparable trade agreement.

"(ii) The extent to which the country follows accepted rules of international trade provided for under the agreements listed in section 101(d) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

"(iii) The extent to which the country provides protection of intellectual property rights—

"(I) in accordance with standards established in the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights described in section 101(d)(15) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act;

"(II) in accordance with standards established in chapter 17 of the NAFTA; and

"(III) by granting the holders of copyrights the ability to control the importation and sale of products that embody copyrighted works, extending the period set forth in Article 1711(6) of NAFTA for protecting test data for agricultural chemicals to 10 years, protecting trademarks regardless of their subsequent designation as geographic indications, and providing enforcement against the importation of infringing products at the border.

"(iv) The extent to which the country provides protections to investors and investments of the United States substantially equivalent to those set forth in chapter 11 of the NAFTA.

"(v) The extent to which the country provides the United States and other WTO members nondiscriminatory, equitable, and reasonable market access with respect to the products for which benefits are provided under paragraphs (2) and (3), and in other relevant product sectors as determined by the President.

"(vi) The extent to which the country provides internationally recognized worker rights, including—

"(I) the right of association,

"(II) the right to organize and bargain collectively,

"(III) prohibition on the use of any form of coerced or compulsory labor,

"(IV) a minimum age for the employment of children, and

"(V) acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health;

"(vii) Whether the country has met the counter-narcotics certification criteria set forth in section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j) for eligibility for United States assistance.

"(viii) The extent to which the country becomes a party to and implements the Inter-American Convention Against Corruption, and becomes party to a convention regarding the extradition of its nationals.

"(ix) The extent to which the country—

"(I) supports the multilateral and regional objectives of the United States with respect to government procurement, including the negotiation of government procurement provisions as part of the FTAA and conclusion of a WTO transparency agreement as provided in the declaration of the WTO Ministerial Conference held in Singapore on December 9 through 13, 1996; and

"(II) applies transparent and competitive procedures in government procurement equivalent to those contained in the WTO Agreement on Government Procurement (described in section 101(d)(17) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act).

"(x) The extent to which the country follows the rules on customs valuation set forth in the WTO Agreement on Implementation of Article VII of the GATT 1994 (described in section 101(d)(8) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act).

"(xi) The extent to which the country affords to products of the United States which the President determines to be of commercial importance to the United States with respect to such country, and on a nondiscriminatory basis to like products of other WTO members, tariff treatment that is no less favorable than the most favorable tariff treatment provided by the country to any other country pursuant to any free trade agreement to which such country is a party, other than the Central American Common Market

or the Caribbean Community and Common Market.

On page 22, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following new section:

SEC. 116. ACCESS TO HIV/AIDS PHARMACEUTICALS AND MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) since the onset of the worldwide HIV/AIDS epidemic, approximately 34,000,000 people living in sub-Saharan Africa have been infected with the disease;

(2) of those infected, approximately 11,500,000 have died; and

(3) the deaths represent 83 percent of the total HIV/AIDS-related deaths worldwide.

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

(1) it is in the interest of the United States to take all necessary steps to prevent further spread of infectious disease, particularly HIV/AIDS;

(2) there is critical need for effective incentives to develop new pharmaceuticals, vaccines, and therapies to combat the HIV/AIDS crisis, especially effective global standards for protecting pharmaceutical and medical innovation;

(3) the overriding priority for responding to the crisis on HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa should be the development of the infrastructure necessary to deliver adequate health care services, and of public education to prevent transmission and infection, rather than legal standards issues; and

(4) individual countries should have the ability to determine the availability of pharmaceuticals and health care for their citizens in general, and particularly with respect to the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated or otherwise made available to any department or agency of the United States may not be obligated or expended to seek, through negotiation or otherwise, the revocation or revision of any intellectual property or competition law or policy that regulates HIV/AIDS pharmaceuticals or medical technologies of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country if the law or policy promotes access to HIV/AIDS pharmaceuticals or medical technologies and the law or policy of the country provides adequate and effective intellectual property protection consistent with the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights referred to in section 101(d)(15) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

At the end, insert the following new title:

TITLE VI—OTHER TRADE PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS FOR ALBANIA.

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

(1) Albania has been found to be in full compliance with the freedom of emigration requirements under title IV of the Trade Act of 1974.

(2) Since its emergence from communism, Albania has made progress toward democratic rule and the creation of a free-market economy.

(3) Albania has concluded a bilateral investment treaty with the United States.

(4) Albania has demonstrated a strong desire to build a friendly relationship with the United States and has been very cooperative with NATO and the international community during and after the Kosova crisis.

(5) The extension of unconditional normal trade relations treatment to the products of Albania will enable the United States to avail itself of all rights under the World Trade Organization with respect to Albania when that country becomes a member of the World Trade Organization.

(b) TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 TO ALBANIA.—

(1) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATIONS AND EXTENSIONS OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any provision of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.), the President may—

(A) determine that such title should no longer apply to Albania; and

(B) after making a determination under subparagraph (A) with respect to Albania, proclaim the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of that country.

(2) TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV.—On or after the effective date of the extension under paragraph (1)(B) of nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of Albania, title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 shall cease to apply to that country.

SEC. 602. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS FOR KYRGYZSTAN.

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

(1) Kyrgyzstan has been found to be in full compliance with the freedom of emigration requirements under title IV of the Trade Act of 1974.

(2) Since its independence from the Soviet Union in 1991, Kyrgyzstan has made great progress toward democratic rule and toward creating a free-market economic system.

(3) Kyrgyzstan concluded a bilateral investment treaty with the United States in 1994.

(4) Kyrgyzstan has demonstrated a strong desire to build a friendly and cooperative relationship with the United States.

(5) The extension of unconditional normal trade relations treatment to the products of Kyrgyzstan will enable the United States to avail itself of all rights under the World Trade Organization with respect to Kyrgyzstan.

(b) TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 TO KYRGYZSTAN.—

(1) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATIONS AND EXTENSIONS OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any provision of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.), the President may—

(A) determine that such title should no longer apply to Kyrgyzstan; and

(B) after making a determination under subparagraph (A) with respect to Kyrgyzstan, proclaim the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of that country.

(2) TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV.—On or after the effective date of the extension under paragraph (1)(B) of nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of Kyrgyzstan, title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 shall cease to apply to that country.

SEC. 603. REPORT ON EMPLOYMENT AND TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress regarding the efficiency and effectiveness of Federal and State coordination of employment and retraining activities associated with the following programs and legislation:

(1) trade adjustment assistance (including NAFTA trade adjustment assistance) provided for under title II of the Trade Act of 1974;

(2) the Job Training Partnership Act;

(3) the Workforce Investment Act; and

(4) unemployment insurance.

(b) PERIOD COVERED.—The report shall cover the activities involved in the programs and legislation listed in subsection (a) from January 1, 1994, to December 31, 1999.

(c) DATA AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report shall at a minimum include specific data and recommendations regarding—

(1) the compatibility of program requirements related to the employment and retraining of dislocated workers in the United States, with particular emphasis on the trade adjustment assistance programs provided for under title II of the Trade Act of 1974;

(2) the compatibility of application procedures related to the employment and retraining of dislocated workers in the United States;

(3) the capacity of the programs in addressing foreign trade and the transfer of production to other countries on workers in the United States measured in terms of loss of employment and wages;

(4) the capacity of the programs in addressing foreign trade and the transfer of production to other countries on secondary workers in the United States measured in terms of loss of employment and wages;

(5) how the impact of foreign trade and the transfer of production to other countries would have changed the number of beneficiaries covered under the trade adjustment assistance program if the trade adjustment assistance program covered secondary workers in the United States; and

(6) the effectiveness of the programs described in subsection (a) in achieving reemployment of United States workers and maintaining wage levels of United States workers who have been dislocated as a result of foreign trade and the transfer of production to other countries.

SEC. 604. TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) CERTIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR WORKERS REQUIRED FOR DECOMMISSIONING OR CLOSURE OF FACILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any decision by the Secretary of Labor denying certification or eligibility for certification for adjustment assistance under title II of the Trade Act of 1974, a qualified worker described in paragraph (2) shall be certified by the Secretary as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under such title II.

(2) QUALIFIED WORKER.—For purposes of this subsection, a “qualified worker” means a worker who—

(A) was determined to be covered under Trade Adjustment Assistance Certification TA-W-28,438; and

(B) was necessary for the decommissioning or closure of a nuclear power facility.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 605. REPORT ON DEBT RELIEF.

The President shall, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to Congress a report on the President's recommendations for bilateral debt relief for sub-Saharan African countries, the President's recommendations for new loan, credit, and guarantee programs and procedures for such countries, and the President's assessment of how debt relief will affect the ability of each such country to participate fully in the international trading system.

SEC. 606. HIV/AIDS EFFECT ON THE SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN WORKFORCE.

In selecting issues of common interest to the United States-Sub-Saharan African Trade and Economic Cooperation Forum, the President shall instruct the United States delegates to the Forum to promote a review by the Forum of the HIV/AIDS epidemic in each sub-Saharan African country and the effect of the HIV/AIDS epidemic on human and social development in each country.

SEC. 607. GOODS MADE WITH FORCED OR INDENTURED CHILD LABOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence:

"For purposes of this section, the term 'forced labor or/and indentured labor' includes forced or indentured child labor."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 608. RELIQUIDATION OF CERTAIN NUCLEAR FUEL ASSEMBLIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law, upon proper request filed with the Secretary of the Treasury not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) reliquidate as free of duty the entries listed in subsection (b); and

(2) refund any duties paid with respect to such entries as shown on Customs Service Collection Receipt Number 527006753.

(b) **ENTRIES.**—The entries referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

Entry number	Date of entry
062-2320014-5	January 16, 1996
062-2320085-5	February 13, 1996
839-4030989-7	January 25, 1996
839-4031053-1	December 2, 1996
839-4031591-0	January 21, 1997.

SEC. 609. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FAIR ACCESS TO JAPANESE TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES AND SERVICES.

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

(1) The United States has a deep and sustained interest in the promotion of deregulation, competition, and regulatory reform in Japan.

(2) New and bold measures by the Government of Japan regarding regulatory reform will help remove the regulatory and structural impediments to the effective functioning of market forces in the Japanese economy.

(3) Regulatory reform will increase the efficient allocation of resources in Japan, which is critical to returning Japan to a long-term growth path powered by domestic demand.

(4) Regulatory reform will not only improve market access for United States business and other foreign firms, but will also enhance consumer choice and economic prosperity in Japan.

(5) A sustained recovery of the Japanese economy is vital to a sustained recovery of Asian economies.

(6) The Japanese economy must serve as one of the main engines of growth for Asia and for the global economy.

(7) The Governments of the United States and Japan reconfirmed the critical importance of deregulation, competition, and regulatory reform when the two governments established the Enhanced Initiative on Deregulation and Competition Policy in 1997.

(8) Telecommunications is a critical sector requiring reform in Japan, where the market is hampered by a history of laws, regulations, and monopolistic practices that do not meet the needs of a competitive market.

(9) As the result of Japan's laws, regulations, and monopolistic practices, Japanese consumers and Japanese industry have been denied the broad benefits of innovative telecommunications services, cutting edge technology, and lower prices that competition would bring to the market.

(10) Japan's significant lag in developing broadband and Internet services, and Japan's lag in the entire area of electronic commerce, is a direct result of a noncompetitive telecommunications regulatory structure.

(11) Japan's lag in developing broadband and Internet services is evidenced by the following:

(A) Japan has only 17,000,000 Internet users, while the United States has 80,000,000 Internet users.

(B) Japan hosts fewer than 2,000,000 websites, while the United States hosts over 30,000,000 websites.

(C) Electronic commerce in Japan is valued at less than \$1,000,000,000, while in the United States electronic commerce is valued at over \$30,000,000,000.

(D) 19 percent of Japan's schools are connected to the Internet, while in the United States 89 percent of schools are connected.

(12) Leading edge foreign telecommunications companies, because of their high level of technology and innovation, are the key to building the necessary telecommunications infrastructure in Japan, which will only be able to serve Japanese consumers and industry if there is a fundamental change in Japan's regulatory approach to telecommunications.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the appropriate officials in the executive branch should implement vigorously the call for Japan to undertake a major regulatory reform in the telecommunications sector, the so-called "Telecommunications Big Bang";

(2) a "Telecommunications Big Bang" must address fundamental legislative and regulatory issues within a strictly defined timeframe;

(3) the new telecommunications regulatory framework should put competition first in order to encourage new and innovative businesses to enter the telecommunications market in Japan;

(4) the Government of Japan should ensure that Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation (NTT) and its affiliates (the NTT Group) are prevented from using their dominant position in the wired and wireless market in an anticompetitive manner; and

(5) the Government of Japan should take credible steps to ensure that competitive carriers have reasonable, cost-based, and nondiscriminatory access to the rights-of-way, facilities, and services controlled by NTT, the NTT Group, other utilities, and the Government of Japan, including—

(A) access to interconnection at market-based rates;

(B) unrestricted access to unbundled elements of the network belonging to NTT and the NTT Group; and

(C) access to public roads for the installation of facilities.

SEC. 610. REPORTS TO THE FINANCE AND WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEES.

(a) **REPORTS REGARDING INITIATIVES TO UPDATE THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND.**—Section 607 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(d) of division A of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999) (Public Law 105-277; 112 Stat. 2681-224), relating to international financial programs and reform, is amended—

(1) by inserting "Finance," after "Foreign Relations,"; and

(2) by inserting " , Ways and Means," before "and Banking and Financial Services".

(b) **REPORTS ON FINANCIAL STABILIZATION PROGRAMS.**—Section 1704(b) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r-3(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) **TIMING.**—Not later than March 15, 1999, and semiannually thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, Ways and Means, and International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Finance, Foreign Relations, and Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report on the matters described in subsection (a)."

(c) **ANNUAL REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL SYSTEM, IMF RE-**

FORM, AND COMPLIANCE WITH IMF AGREEMENTS.—Section 1705(a) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r-4(a)) is amended by striking "Committee on Banking and Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate" and inserting "Committees on Banking and Financial Services and on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Finance and on Foreign Relations of the Senate".

(d) **AUDITS OF THE IMF.**—Section 1706(a) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r-5(a)) is amended by striking "Committee on Banking and Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate" and inserting "Committees on Banking and Financial Services and on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Finance and on Foreign Relations of the Senate".

(e) **REPORT ON PROTECTION OF BORDERS AGAINST DRUG TRAFFIC.**—Section 629 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(h) of division A of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999) (Public Law 105-277; 112 Stat. 2681-522), relating to general provisions, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'appropriate congressional committees' includes the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives."

SEC. 611. CLARIFICATION OF SECTION 334 OF THE URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS ACT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 334(b)(2) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3592(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(2) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as redesignated), by striking "Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(D)" and inserting "(A) Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(D) and except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C)"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(C), fabric classified under the HTS as of silk, cotton, man-made fiber, or vegetable fiber shall be considered to originate in, and be the growth, product, or manufacture of, the country, territory, or possession in which the fabric is both dyed and printed when accompanied by 2 or more of the following finishing operations: bleaching, shrinking, fulling, napping, decating, permanent stiffening, weighting, permanent embossing, or moireing."

"(C) Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(D), goods classified under HTS heading 6117.10, 6213.00, 6214.00, 6302.22, 6302.29, 6302.52, 6302.53, 6302.59, 6302.92, 6302.93, 6302.99, 6303.92, 6303.99, 6304.19, 6304.93, 6304.99, 9404.90.85, or 9404.90.95, except for goods classified under such headings as of cotton or of wool or consisting of fiber blends containing 16 percent or more by weight of cotton, shall be considered to originate in, and be the growth, product, or manufacture of, the country, territory, or possession in which the fabric is both dyed and printed when accompanied by 2 or more of the following finishing operations: bleaching, shrinking, fulling, napping, decating, permanent stiffening, weighting, permanent embossing, or moireing."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section apply to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 612. 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 United States agricultural products and services. The Chief Agricultural Negotiator shall be a vigorous advocate on behalf of United States 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.

SEC. 613. REVISION OF RETALIATION LIST OR OTHER REMEDIAL ACTION.

Section 306(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2416(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “If the” and inserting the following:

“(A) FAILURE TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATION.—If the”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) REVISION OF RETALIATION LIST AND ACTION.—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), in the event that the United States initiates a retaliation list or takes any other action described in section 301(c)(1) (A) or (B) against the goods of a foreign country or countries because of the failure of such country or countries to implement the recommendation made pursuant to a dispute settlement proceeding under the World Trade Organization, the Trade Representative shall periodically revise the list or action to affect other goods of the country or countries that have failed to implement the recommendation.

“(ii) **EXCEPTION.**—The Trade Representative is not required to revise the retaliation list or the action described in clause (i) with respect to a country, if—

“(I) the Trade Representative determines that implementation of a recommendation made pursuant to a dispute settlement proceeding described in clause (i) by the country is imminent; or

“(II) the Trade Representative together with the petitioner involved in the initial investigation under this chapter (or if no petition was filed, the affected United States industry) agree that it is unnecessary to revise the retaliation list.

“(C) **SCHEDULE FOR REVISING LIST OR ACTION.**—The Trade Representative shall, 120 days after the date the retaliation list or other section 301(a) action is first taken, and every 180 days thereafter, review the list or action taken and revise, in whole or in part, the list or action to affect other goods of the subject country or countries.

“(D) **STANDARDS FOR REVISING LIST OR ACTION.**—In revising any list or action against a country or countries under this subsection, the Trade Representative shall act in a manner that is most likely to result in the country or countries implementing the recommendations adopted in the dispute settlement proceeding or in achieving a mutually satisfactory solution to the issue that gave rise to the dispute settlement proceeding. The Trade Representative shall consult with the petitioner, if any, involved in the initial investigation under this chapter.

“(E) **RETALIATION LIST.**—The term ‘retaliation list’ means the list of products of a foreign country or countries that have failed to

comply with the report of the panel or Appellate Body of the WTO and with respect to which the Trade Representative is imposing duties above the level that would otherwise be imposed under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.”.

SEC. 614. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING COMPREHENSIVE DEBT RELIEF FOR THE WORLD'S POOREST COUNTRIES.

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

(1) The burden of external debt has become a major impediment to economic growth and poverty reduction in many of the world's poorest countries.

(2) Until recently, the United States Government and other official creditors sought to address this problem by rescheduling loans and in some cases providing limited debt reduction.

(3) Despite such efforts, the cumulative debt of many of the world's poorest countries continued to grow beyond their capacity to repay.

(4) In 1997, the Group of Seven, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund adopted the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative (HIPC), a commitment by the international community that all multilateral and bilateral creditors, acting in a coordinated and concerted fashion, would reduce poor country debt to a sustainable level.

(5) The HIPC Initiative is currently undergoing reforms to address concerns raised about country conditionality, the amount of debt forgiven, and the allocation of savings realized through the debt forgiveness program to ensure that the Initiative accomplishes the goals of economic growth and poverty alleviation in the world's poorest countries.

(6) Recently, the President requested Congress to provide additional resources for bilateral debt forgiveness and additional United States contributions to the HIPC Trust Fund.

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

(1) Congress and the President should work together, without undue delay and in concert with the international community, to make comprehensive debt relief available to the world's poorest countries in a manner that promotes economic growth and poverty alleviation;

(2) this program of bilateral and multilateral debt relief should be designed to strengthen and expand the private sector, encourage increased trade and investment, support the development of free markets, and promote broad-scale economic growth in beneficiary countries;

(3) this program of debt relief should also support the adoption of policies to alleviate poverty and to ensure that benefits are shared widely among the population, such as through initiatives to advance education, improve health, combat AIDS, and promote clean water and environmental protection;

(4) these debt relief agreements should be designed and implemented in a transparent manner and with the broad participation of the citizenry of the debtor country and should ensure that country circumstances are adequately taken into account;

(5) no country should receive the benefits of debt relief if that country does not cooperate with the United States on terrorism or narcotics enforcement, is a gross violator of the human rights of its citizens, or is engaged in conflict or spends excessively on its military; and

(6) in order to prevent adverse impact on a key industry in many developing countries, the International Monetary Fund must mobilize its own resources for providing debt relief to eligible countries without allowing

gold to reach the open market, or otherwise adversely affecting the market price of gold.

SEC. 615. REPORT ON TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PRODUCERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 4 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce, shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report that—

(1) examines the applicability to agricultural commodity producers of trade adjustment assistance programs established under title II of the Trade Act of 1974; and

(2) sets forth recommendations to improve the operation of those programs as the programs apply to agricultural commodity producers or to establish a new trade adjustment assistance program for agricultural commodity producers.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—In preparing the report required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Labor shall—

(1) assess the degree to which the existing trade adjustment assistance programs address the adverse effects on agricultural commodity producers due to price suppression caused by increased imports of like or directly competitive agricultural commodities; and

(2) examine the effectiveness of the program benefits authorized under subchapter B of chapter 2 and chapter 3 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 in remedying the adverse effects, including price suppression, caused by increased imports of like or directly competitive agricultural commodities.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.**—The term “agricultural commodity” means any agricultural commodity, including livestock, fish or harvested seafood in its raw or natural state.

(2) **AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PRODUCER.**—The term “agricultural commodity producer” means any person who is engaged in the production and sale of an agricultural commodity in the United States and who owns or shares the ownership and risk of loss of the agricultural commodity.

SEC. 616. STUDY ON IMPROVING AFRICAN AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The United States Department of Agriculture, in consultation with American Land Grant Colleges and Universities and not-for-profit international organizations, is authorized to conduct a two-year study on ways to improve the flow of American farming techniques and practices to African farmers. The study conducted by the Department of Agriculture shall include an examination of ways of improving or utilizing—

(1) knowledge of insect and sanitation procedures;

(2) modern farming and soil conservation techniques;

(3) modern farming equipment (including maintaining the equipment);

(4) marketing crop yields to prospective purchasers; and

(5) crop maximization practices.

The study shall be submitted to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives not later than September 30, 2001.

(b) **LAND GRANT COLLEGES AND NOT-FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS.**—The Department of Agriculture is encouraged to consult with American Land Grant Colleges and not-for-profit international organizations that have firsthand knowledge of current African farming practices.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000 to conduct the study described in subsection (a).

SEC. 617. ANTICORRUPTION EFFORTS.

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

(1) Corruption and bribery of public officials is a major problem in many African countries and represents a serious threat to the development of a functioning domestic private sector, to United States business and trade interests, and to prospects for democracy and good governance in African countries.

(2) Of the 17 countries in sub-Saharan Africa rated by the international watchdog group, Transparency International, as part of the 1998 Corruption Perception Index, 13 ranked in the bottom half.

(3) The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions, which has been signed by all 29 members of the OECD plus Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, and the Slovak Republic and which entered into force on February 15, 1999, represents a significant step in the elimination of bribery and corruption in international commerce.

(4) As a party to the OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions, the United States should encourage the highest standards possible with respect to bribery and corruption.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should encourage at every opportunity the accession of sub-Saharan African countries, as defined in section 6, to the OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions.

SEC. 618. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING EFFORTS TO COMBAT DESERTIFICATION IN AFRICA AND OTHER NATIONS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) desertification affects approximately one-sixth of the world's population and one-quarter of the total land area;

(2) over 1,000,000 hectares of Africa are affected by desertification;

(3) dryland degradation is an underlying cause of recurrent famine in Africa;

(4) the United Nations Environment Programme estimates that desertification costs the world \$42,000,000,000 a year, not including incalculable costs in human suffering; and

(5) the United States can strengthen its partnerships throughout Africa and other nations affected by desertification, help alleviate social and economic crises caused by misuse of natural resources, and reduce dependence on foreign aid, by taking a leading role to combat desertification.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that the United States should expeditiously work with the international community, particularly Africa and other nations affected by desertification, to—

(1) strengthen international cooperation to combat desertification;

(2) promote the development of national and regional strategies to address desertification and increase public awareness of this serious problem and its effects;

(3) develop and implement national action programs that identify the causes of desertification and measures to address it; and

(4) recognize the essential role of local governments and nongovernmental organizations in developing and implementing measures to address desertification.

SEC. 619. REPORT ON WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION MINISTERIAL.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—Congress recognizes the importance of the new round of international trade negotiations that will be launched at the World Trade Organization (WTO) Ministerial Conference in Seattle, Washington, from November 30 to December 3, 1999.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than February 3, 2000, the United States Trade Representative shall submit a report to Congress regarding discussions on the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (the Anti-dumping Agreement) and the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures during the Seattle Ministerial Conference. The report shall include a complete description of such discussions, including proposals made to renegotiate those agreements, the member government making the proposal, and the United States Trade Representative's response to the proposal, with a description as to how the response achieves United States trade goals.

SEC. 620. MARKING OF IMPORTED JEWELRY.

(a) **MARKING REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe and implement regulations that require that all jewelry described in subsection (b) that enters the customs territory of the United States have the English name of the country of origin indelibly marked in a conspicuous place on such jewelry by cutting, die-sinking, engraving, stamping, or some other permanent method to the same extent as such marking is required for Native American-style jewelry under section 134.43 of title 19, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on October 1, 1998.

(b) **JEWELRY.**—The jewelry described in this subsection means any article described in heading 7117 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—As used in this section, the term “enters the customs territory of the United States” means enters, or is withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, in the customs territory of the United States.

SEC. 621. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TARIFF INVERSIONS.

It is the sense of the Senate that United States trade policy should, while taking into account the conditions of United States producers, especially those currently facing tariff phase-outs negotiated under prior trade agreements, place a priority on the elimination or amelioration of tariff inversions, including those applicable to wool fabric, that undermine the competitiveness of United States consuming industries.

THE HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY ACT OF 1999

FRIST (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2506

Mr. GRAMM (for Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. KENNEDY)) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 580) to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the Agency for Healthcare Policy and Research; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Healthcare Research and Quality Act of 1999”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title IX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 299 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“TITLE IX—AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY

“PART A—ESTABLISHMENT AND GENERAL DUTIES

“SEC. 901. MISSION AND DUTIES.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established within the Public Health Service an agency to be known as the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, which shall be headed by a director appointed by the Secretary. The Secretary shall carry out this title acting through the Director.

“(b) **MISSION.**—The purpose of the Agency is to enhance the quality, appropriateness, and effectiveness of health services, and access to such services, through the establishment of a broad base of scientific research and through the promotion of improvements in clinical and health system practices, including the prevention of diseases and other health conditions. The Agency shall promote health care quality improvement by conducting and supporting—

“(1) research that develops and presents scientific evidence regarding all aspects of health care, including—

“(A) the development and assessment of methods for enhancing patient participation in their own care and for facilitating shared patient-physician decision-making;

“(B) the outcomes, effectiveness, and cost-effectiveness of health care practices, including preventive measures and long-term care;

“(C) existing and innovative technologies;

“(D) the costs and utilization of, and access to health care;

“(E) the ways in which health care services are organized, delivered, and financed and the interaction and impact of these factors on the quality of patient care;

“(F) methods for measuring quality and strategies for improving quality; and

“(G) ways in which patients, consumers, purchasers, and practitioners acquire new information about best practices and health benefits, the determinants and impact of their use of this information;

“(2) the synthesis and dissemination of available scientific evidence for use by patients, consumers, practitioners, providers, purchasers, policy makers, and educators; and

“(3) initiatives to advance private and public efforts to improve health care quality.

“(c) **REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO RURAL AND INNER-CITY AREAS AND PRIORITY POPULATIONS.**—

“(1) **RESEARCH, EVALUATIONS AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.**—In carrying out this title, the Director shall conduct and support research and evaluations, and support demonstration projects, with respect to—

“(A) the delivery of health care in inner-city areas, and in rural areas (including frontier areas); and

“(B) health care for priority populations, which shall include—

“(i) low-income groups;

“(ii) minority groups;

“(iii) women;

“(iv) children;

“(v) the elderly; and

“(vi) individuals with special health care needs, including individuals with disabilities and individuals who need chronic care or end-of-life health care.

“(2) **PROCESS TO ENSURE APPROPRIATE RESEARCH.**—The Director shall establish a process to ensure that the requirements of paragraph (1) are reflected in the overall portfolio of research conducted and supported by the Agency.

“(3) OFFICE OF PRIORITY POPULATIONS.—The Director shall establish an Office of Priority Populations to assist in carrying out the requirements of paragraph (1).

“SEC. 902. GENERAL AUTHORITIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out section 901(b), the Director shall conduct and support research, evaluations, and training, support demonstration projects, research networks, and multi-disciplinary centers, provide technical assistance, and disseminate information on health care and on systems for the delivery of such care, including activities with respect to—

“(1) the quality, effectiveness, efficiency, appropriateness and value of health care services;

“(2) quality measurement and improvement;

“(3) the outcomes, cost, cost-effectiveness, and use of health care services and access to such services;

“(4) clinical practice, including primary care and practice-oriented research;

“(5) health care technologies, facilities, and equipment;

“(6) health care costs, productivity, organization, and market forces;

“(7) health promotion and disease prevention, including clinical preventive services;

“(8) health statistics, surveys, database development, and epidemiology; and

“(9) medical liability.

“(b) HEALTH SERVICES TRAINING GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director may provide training grants in the field of health services research related to activities authorized under subsection (a), to include pre- and post-doctoral fellowships and training programs, young investigator awards, and other programs and activities as appropriate. In carrying out this subsection, the Director shall make use of funds made available under section 487(d)(3) as well as other appropriated funds.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In developing priorities for the allocation of training funds under this subsection, the Director shall take into consideration shortages in the number of trained researchers who are addressing health care issues for the priority populations identified in section 901(c)(1)(B) and in addition, shall take into consideration indications of long-term commitment, amongst applicants for training funds, to addressing health care needs of the priority populations.

“(c) MULTIDISCIPLINARY CENTERS.—The Director may provide financial assistance to assist in meeting the costs of planning and establishing new centers, and operating existing and new centers, for multidisciplinary health services research, demonstration projects, evaluations, training, and policy analysis with respect to the matters referred to in subsection (a).

“(d) RELATION TO CERTAIN AUTHORITIES REGARDING SOCIAL SECURITY.—Activities authorized in this section shall be appropriately coordinated with experiments, demonstration projects, and other related activities authorized by the Social Security Act and the Social Security Amendments of 1967. Activities under subsection (a)(2) of this section that affect the programs under titles XVIII, XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act shall be carried out consistent with section 1142 of such Act.

“(e) DISCLAIMER.—The Agency shall not mandate national standards of clinical practice or quality health care standards. Recommendations resulting from projects funded and published by the Agency shall include a corresponding disclaimer.

“(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to imply that the Agency's role is to mandate a national

standard or specific approach to quality measurement and reporting. In research and quality improvement activities, the Agency shall consider a wide range of choices, providers, health care delivery systems, and individual preferences.

“(g) ANNUAL REPORT.—Beginning with fiscal year 2003, the Director shall annually submit to the Congress a report regarding prevailing disparities in health care delivery as it relates to racial factors and socioeconomic factors in priority populations.

“PART B—HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT RESEARCH

“SEC. 911. HEALTH CARE OUTCOME IMPROVEMENT RESEARCH.

“(a) EVIDENCE RATING SYSTEMS.—In collaboration with experts from the public and private sector, the Agency shall identify and disseminate methods or systems to assess health care research results, particularly methods or systems to rate the strength of the scientific evidence underlying health care practice, recommendations in the research literature, and technology assessments. The Agency shall make methods or systems for evidence rating widely available. Agency publications containing health care recommendations shall indicate the level of substantiating evidence using such methods or systems.

“(b) HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT RESEARCH CENTERS AND PROVIDER-BASED RESEARCH NETWORKS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to address the full continuum of care and outcomes research, to link research to practice improvement, and to speed the dissemination of research findings to community practice settings, the Agency shall employ research strategies and mechanisms that will link research directly with clinical practice in geographically diverse locations throughout the United States, including—

“(A) health care improvement research centers that combine demonstrated multidisciplinary expertise in outcomes or quality improvement research with linkages to relevant sites of care;

“(B) provider-based research networks, including plan, facility, or delivery system sites of care (especially primary care), that can evaluate outcomes and evaluate and promote quality improvement; and

“(C) other innovative mechanisms or strategies to link research with clinical practice.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Director is authorized to establish the requirements for entities applying for grants under this subsection.

“SEC. 912. PRIVATE-PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS TO IMPROVE ORGANIZATION AND DELIVERY.

“(a) SUPPORT FOR EFFORTS TO DEVELOP INFORMATION ON QUALITY.—

“(1) SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT.—In its role as the principal agency for health care research and quality, the Agency may provide scientific and technical support for private and public efforts to improve health care quality, including the activities of accrediting organizations.

“(2) ROLE OF THE AGENCY.—With respect to paragraph (1), the role of the Agency shall include—

“(A) the identification and assessment of methods for the evaluation of the health of—

“(i) enrollees in health plans by type of plan, provider, and provider arrangements; and

“(ii) other populations, including those receiving long-term care services;

“(B) the ongoing development, testing, and dissemination of quality measures, including measures of health and functional outcomes;

“(C) the compilation and dissemination of health care quality measures developed in the private and public sector;

“(D) assistance in the development of improved health care information systems;

“(E) the development of survey tools for the purpose of measuring participant and beneficiary assessments of their health care; and

“(F) identifying and disseminating information on mechanisms for the integration of information on quality into purchaser and consumer decision-making processes.

“(b) CENTERS FOR EDUCATION AND RESEARCH ON THERAPEUTICS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director and in consultation with the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, shall establish a program for the purpose of making one or more grants for the establishment and operation of one or more centers to carry out the activities specified in paragraph (2).

“(2) REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—The activities referred to in this paragraph are the following:

“(A) The conduct of state-of-the-art research for the following purposes:

“(i) To increase awareness of—

“(I) new uses of drugs, biological products, and devices;

“(II) ways to improve the effective use of drugs, biological products, and devices; and

“(III) risks of new uses and risks of combinations of drugs and biological products.

“(ii) To provide objective clinical information to the following individuals and entities:

“(I) Health care practitioners and other providers of health care goods or services.

“(II) Pharmacists, pharmacy benefit managers and purchasers.

“(III) Health maintenance organizations and other managed health care organizations.

“(IV) Health care insurers and governmental agencies.

“(V) Patients and consumers.

“(iii) To improve the quality of health care while reducing the cost of health care through—

“(I) an increase in the appropriate use of drugs, biological products, or devices; and

“(II) the prevention of adverse effects of drugs, biological products, and devices and the consequences of such effects, such as unnecessary hospitalizations.

“(B) The conduct of research on the comparative effectiveness, cost-effectiveness, and safety of drugs, biological products, and devices.

“(C) Such other activities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, except that a grant may not be expended to assist the Secretary in the review of new drugs, biological products, and devices.

“(c) REDUCING ERRORS IN MEDICINE.—The Director shall conduct and support research and build private-public partnerships to—

“(1) identify the causes of preventable health care errors and patient injury in health care delivery;

“(2) develop, demonstrate, and evaluate strategies for reducing errors and improving patient safety; and

“(3) disseminate such effective strategies throughout the health care industry.

“SEC. 913. INFORMATION ON QUALITY AND COST OF CARE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall—

“(1) conduct a survey to collect data on a nationally representative sample of the population on the cost, use and, for fiscal year 2001 and subsequent fiscal years, quality of health care, including the types of health care services Americans use, their access to health care services, frequency of use, how much is paid for the services used, the source of those payments, the types and costs of

private health insurance, access, satisfaction, and quality of care for the general population including rural residents and also for populations identified in section 901(c); and

“(2) develop databases and tools that provide information to States on the quality, access, and use of health care services provided to their residents.

“(b) QUALITY AND OUTCOMES INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in fiscal year 2001, the Director shall ensure that the survey conducted under subsection (a)(1) will—

“(A) identify determinants of health outcomes and functional status, including the health care needs of populations identified in section 901(c), provide data to study the relationships between health care quality, outcomes, access, use, and cost, measure changes over time, and monitor the overall national impact of Federal and State policy changes on health care;

“(B) provide information on the quality of care and patient outcomes for frequently occurring clinical conditions for a nationally representative sample of the population including rural residents; and

“(C) provide reliable national estimates for children and persons with special health care needs through the use of supplements or periodic expansions of the survey.

In expanding the Medical Expenditure Panel Survey, as in existence on the date of the enactment of this title in fiscal year 2001 to collect information on the quality of care, the Director shall take into account any outcomes measurements generally collected by private sector accreditation organizations.

“(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Beginning in fiscal year 2003, the Secretary, acting through the Director, shall submit to Congress an annual report on national trends in the quality of health care provided to the American people.

“SEC. 914. INFORMATION SYSTEMS FOR HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to foster a range of innovative approaches to the management and communication of health information, the Agency shall conduct and support research, evaluations, and initiatives to advance—

“(1) the use of information systems for the study of health care quality and outcomes, including the generation of both individual provider and plan-level comparative performance data;

“(2) training for health care practitioners and researchers in the use of information systems;

“(3) the creation of effective linkages between various sources of health information, including the development of information networks;

“(4) the delivery and coordination of evidence-based health care services, including the use of real-time health care decision-support programs;

“(5) the utility and comparability of health information data and medical vocabularies by addressing issues related to the content, structure, definitions and coding of such information and data in consultation with appropriate Federal, State and private entities;

“(6) the use of computer-based health records in all settings for the development of personal health records for individual health assessment and maintenance, and for monitoring public health and outcomes of care within populations; and

“(7) the protection of individually identifiable information in health services research and health care quality improvement.

“(b) DEMONSTRATION.—The Agency shall support demonstrations into the use of new information tools aimed at improving shared decision-making between patients and their care-givers.

“(c) FACILITATING PUBLIC ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—The Director shall work with appropriate public and private sector entities to facilitate public access to information regarding the quality of and consumer satisfaction with health care.

“SEC. 915. RESEARCH SUPPORTING PRIMARY CARE AND ACCESS IN UNDERSERVED AREAS.

“(a) PREVENTIVE SERVICES TASK FORCE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—The Director may periodically convene a Preventive Services Task Force to be composed of individuals with appropriate expertise. Such a task force shall review the scientific evidence related to the effectiveness, appropriateness, and cost-effectiveness of clinical preventive services for the purpose of developing recommendations for the health care community, and updating previous clinical preventive recommendations.

“(2) ROLE OF AGENCY.—The Agency shall provide ongoing administrative, research, and technical support for the operations of the Preventive Services Task Force, including coordinating and supporting the dissemination of the recommendations of the Task Force.

“(3) OPERATION.—In carrying out its responsibilities under paragraph (1), the Task Force is not subject to the provisions of Appendix 2 of title 5, United States Code.

“(b) PRIMARY CARE RESEARCH.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established within the Agency a Center for Primary Care Research (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Center’) that shall serve as the principal source of funding for primary care practice research in the Department of Health and Human Services. For purposes of this paragraph, primary care research focuses on the first contact when illness or health concerns arise, the diagnosis, treatment or referral to specialty care, preventive care, and the relationship between the clinician and the patient in the context of the family and community.

“(2) RESEARCH.—In carrying out this section, the Center shall conduct and support research concerning—

“(A) the nature and characteristics of primary care practice;

“(B) the management of commonly occurring clinical problems;

“(C) the management of undifferentiated clinical problems; and

“(D) the continuity and coordination of health services.

“SEC. 916. HEALTH CARE PRACTICE AND TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall promote innovation in evidence-based health care practices and technologies by—

“(1) conducting and supporting research on the development, diffusion, and use of health care technology;

“(2) developing, evaluating, and disseminating methodologies for assessments of health care practices and technologies;

“(3) conducting intramural and supporting extramural assessments of existing and new health care practices and technologies;

“(4) promoting education and training and providing technical assistance in the use of health care practice and technology assessment methodologies and results; and

“(5) working with the National Library of Medicine and the public and private sector to develop an electronic clearinghouse of currently available assessments and those in progress.

“(b) SPECIFICATION OF PROCESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2000, the Director shall develop and publish a description of the methods used by the Agency and its contractors for health care practice and technology assessment.

“(2) CONSULTATIONS.—In carrying out this subsection, the Director shall cooperate and consult with the Assistant Secretary for Health, the Administrator of the Health Care Financing Administration, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, and the heads of any other interested Federal department or agency, and shall seek input, where appropriate, from professional societies and other private and public entities.

“(3) METHODOLOGY.—The Director shall, in developing the methods used under paragraph (1), consider—

“(A) safety, efficacy, and effectiveness;

“(B) legal, social, and ethical implications;

“(C) costs, benefits, and cost-effectiveness;

“(D) comparisons to alternate health care practices and technologies; and

“(E) requirements of Food and Drug Administration approval to avoid duplication.

“(c) SPECIFIC ASSESSMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall conduct or support specific assessments of health care technologies and practices.

“(2) REQUESTS FOR ASSESSMENTS.—The Director is authorized to conduct or support assessments, on a reimbursable basis, for the Health Care Financing Administration, the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Office of Personnel Management, and other public or private entities.

“(3) GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.—In addition to conducting assessments, the Director may make grants to, or enter into cooperative agreements or contracts with, entities described in paragraph (4) for the purpose of conducting assessments of experimental, emerging, existing, or potentially outmoded health care technologies, and for related activities.

“(4) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—An entity described in this paragraph is an entity that is determined to be appropriate by the Director, including academic medical centers, research institutions and organizations, professional organizations, third party payers, governmental agencies, minority institutions of higher education (such as Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and Hispanic institutions), and consortia of appropriate research entities established for the purpose of conducting technology assessments.

“(d) MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN VICTIMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall develop and disseminate a report on evidence-based clinical practices for—

“(A) the examination and treatment by health professionals of individuals who are victims of sexual assault (including child molestation) or attempted sexual assault; and

“(B) the training of health professionals, in consultation with the Health Resources and Services Administration, on performing medical evidentiary examinations of individuals who are victims of child abuse or neglect, sexual assault, elder abuse, or domestic violence.

“(2) CERTAIN CONSIDERATIONS.—In identifying the issues to be addressed by the report, the Director shall, to the extent practicable, take into consideration the expertise and experience of Federal and State law enforcement officials regarding the victims referred to in paragraph (1), and of other appropriate public and private entities (including medical societies, victim services organizations, sexual assault prevention organizations, and social services organizations).

“SEC. 917. COORDINATION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT QUALITY IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS.

“(a) REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To avoid duplication and ensure that Federal resources are used efficiently and effectively, the Secretary, acting through the Director, shall coordinate all research, evaluations, and demonstrations related to health services research, quality measurement and quality improvement activities undertaken and supported by the Federal Government.

“(2) SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES.—The Director, in collaboration with the appropriate Federal officials representing all concerned executive agencies and departments, shall develop and manage a process to—

“(A) improve interagency coordination, priority setting, and the use and sharing of research findings and data pertaining to Federal quality improvement programs, technology assessment, and health services research;

“(B) strengthen the research information infrastructure, including databases, pertaining to Federal health services research and health care quality improvement initiatives;

“(C) set specific goals for participating agencies and departments to further health services research and health care quality improvement; and

“(D) strengthen the management of Federal health care quality improvement programs.

“(b) STUDY BY THE INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To provide Congress, the Department of Health and Human Services, and other relevant departments with an independent, external review of their quality oversight, quality improvement and quality research programs, the Secretary shall enter into a contract with the Institute of Medicine—

“(A) to describe and evaluate current quality improvement, quality research and quality monitoring processes through—

“(i) an overview of pertinent health services research activities and quality improvement efforts conducted by all Federal programs, with particular attention paid to those under titles XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act; and

“(ii) a summary of the partnerships that the Department of Health and Human Services has pursued with private accreditation, quality measurement and improvement organizations; and

“(B) to identify options and make recommendations to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of quality improvement programs through—

“(i) the improved coordination of activities across the medicare, medicaid and child health insurance programs under titles XVIII, XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act and health services research programs;

“(ii) the strengthening of patient choice and participation by incorporating state-of-the-art quality monitoring tools and making information on quality available; and

“(iii) the enhancement of the most effective programs, consolidation as appropriate, and elimination of duplicative activities within various federal agencies.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into a contract with the Institute of Medicine for the preparation—

“(i) not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this title, of a report providing an overview of the quality improvement programs of the Department of Health and Human Services for the medicare, medicaid, and CHIP programs under titles XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act; and

“(ii) not later than 24 months after the date of the enactment of this title, of a final report containing recommendations.

“(B) REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit the reports described in subparagraph (A) to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives.

“PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

“SEC. 921. ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an advisory council to be known as the National Advisory Council for Healthcare Research and Quality.

“(b) DUTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Council shall advise the Secretary and the Director with respect to activities proposed or undertaken to carry out the mission of the Agency under section 901(b).

“(2) CERTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS.—Activities of the Advisory Council under paragraph (1) shall include making recommendations to the Director regarding—

“(A) priorities regarding health care research, especially studies related to quality, outcomes, cost and the utilization of, and access to, health care services;

“(B) the field of health care research and related disciplines, especially issues related to training needs, and dissemination of information pertaining to health care quality; and

“(C) the appropriate role of the Agency in each of these areas in light of private sector activity and identification of opportunities for public-private sector partnerships.

“(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Council shall, in accordance with this subsection, be composed of appointed members and ex officio members. All members of the Advisory Council shall be voting members other than the individuals designated under paragraph (3)(B) as ex officio members.

“(2) APPOINTED MEMBERS.—The Secretary shall appoint to the Advisory Council 21 appropriately qualified individuals. At least 17 members of the Advisory Council shall be representatives of the public who are not officers or employees of the United States and at least 1 member who shall be a specialist in the rural aspects of 1 or more of the professions or fields described in subparagraphs (A) through (G). The Secretary shall ensure that the appointed members of the Council, as a group, are representative of professions and entities concerned with, or affected by, activities under this title and under section 1142 of the Social Security Act. Of such members—

“(A) three shall be individuals distinguished in the conduct of research, demonstration projects, and evaluations with respect to health care;

“(B) three shall be individuals distinguished in the fields of health care quality research or health care improvement;

“(C) three shall be individuals distinguished in the practice of medicine of which at least one shall be a primary care practitioner;

“(D) three shall be individuals distinguished in the other health professions;

“(E) three shall be individuals either representing the private health care sector, including health plans, providers, and purchasers or individuals distinguished as administrators of health care delivery systems;

“(F) three shall be individuals distinguished in the fields of health care economics, information systems, law, ethics, business, or public policy; and

“(G) three shall be individuals representing the interests of patients and consumers of health care.

“(3) EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—The Secretary shall designate as ex officio members of the Advisory Council—

“(A) the Assistant Secretary for Health, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Administrator of the Health Care Financing Administration, the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs), and the Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

“(B) such other Federal officials as the Secretary may consider appropriate.

“(d) TERMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Members of the Advisory Council appointed under subsection (c)(2) shall serve for a term of 3 years.

“(2) STAGGERED TERMS.—To ensure the staggered rotation of one-third of the members of the Advisory Council each year, the Secretary is authorized to appoint the initial members of the Advisory Council for terms of 1, 2, or 3 years.

“(3) SERVICE BEYOND TERM.—A member of the Council appointed under subsection (c)(2) may continue to serve after the expiration of the term of the members until a successor is appointed.

“(e) VACANCIES.—If a member of the Advisory Council appointed under subsection (c)(2) does not serve the full term applicable under subsection (d), the individual appointed to fill the resulting vacancy shall be appointed for the remainder of the term of the predecessor of the individual.

“(f) CHAIR.—The Director shall, from among the members of the Advisory Council appointed under subsection (c)(2), designate an individual to serve as the chair of the Advisory Council.

“(g) MEETINGS.—The Advisory Council shall meet not less than once during each discrete 4-month period and shall otherwise meet at the call of the Director or the chair.

“(h) COMPENSATION AND REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES.—

“(1) APPOINTED MEMBERS.—Members of the Advisory Council appointed under subsection (c)(2) shall receive compensation for each day (including travel time) engaged in carrying out the duties of the Advisory Council unless declined by the member. Such compensation may not be in an amount in excess of the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Advisory Council.

“(2) EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—Officials designated under subsection (c)(3) as ex officio members of the Advisory Council may not receive compensation for service on the Advisory Council in addition to the compensation otherwise received for duties carried out as officers of the United States.

“(i) STAFF.—The Director shall provide to the Advisory Council such staff, information, and other assistance as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the Council.

“(j) DURATION.—Notwithstanding section 14(a) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the Advisory Council shall continue in existence until otherwise provided by law.

“SEC. 922. PEER REVIEW WITH RESPECT TO GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.

“(a) REQUIREMENT OF REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Appropriate technical and scientific peer review shall be conducted with respect to each application for a grant, cooperative agreement, or contract under this title.

“(2) REPORTS TO DIRECTOR.—Each peer review group to which an application is submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) shall report

its finding and recommendations respecting the application to the Director in such form and in such manner as the Director shall require.

“(b) **APPROVAL AS PRECONDITION OF AWARDS.**—The Director may not approve an application described in subsection (a)(1) unless the application is recommended for approval by a peer review group established under subsection (c).

“(c) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PEER REVIEW GROUPS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall establish such technical and scientific peer review groups as may be necessary to carry out this section. Such groups shall be established without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, that govern appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51, and subchapter III of chapter 53, of such title that relate to classification and pay rates under the General Schedule.

“(2) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The members of any peer review group established under this section shall be appointed from among individuals who by virtue of their training or experience are eminently qualified to carry out the duties of such peer review group. Officers and employees of the United States may not constitute more than 25 percent of the membership of any such group. Such officers and employees may not receive compensation for service on such groups in addition to the compensation otherwise received for these duties carried out as such officers and employees.

“(3) **DURATION.**—Notwithstanding section 14(a) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, peer review groups established under this section may continue in existence until otherwise provided by law.

“(4) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—Members of any peer-review group shall, at a minimum, meet the following requirements:

“(A) Such members shall agree in writing to treat information received, pursuant to their work for the group, as confidential information, except that this subparagraph shall not apply to public records and public information.

“(B) Such members shall agree in writing to recuse themselves from participation in the peer-review of specific applications which present a potential personal conflict of interest or appearance of such conflict, including employment in a directly affected organization, stock ownership, or any financial or other arrangement that might introduce bias in the process of peer-review.

“(d) **AUTHORITY FOR PROCEDURAL ADJUSTMENTS IN CERTAIN CASES.**—In the case of applications for financial assistance whose direct costs will not exceed \$100,000, the Director may make appropriate adjustments in the procedures otherwise established by the Director for the conduct of peer review under this section. Such adjustments may be made for the purpose of encouraging the entry of individuals into the field of research, for the purpose of encouraging clinical practice-oriented or provider-based research, and for such other purposes as the Director may determine to be appropriate.

“(e) **REGULATIONS.**—The Director shall issue regulations for the conduct of peer review under this section.

“SEC. 923. CERTAIN PROVISIONS WITH RESPECT TO DEVELOPMENT, COLLECTION, AND DISSEMINATION OF DATA.

“(a) **STANDARDS WITH RESPECT TO UTILITY OF DATA.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To ensure the utility, accuracy, and sufficiency of data collected by or for the Agency for the purpose described in section 901(b), the Director shall establish standard methods for developing and collecting such data, taking into consideration—

“(A) other Federal health data collection standards; and

“(B) the differences between types of health care plans, delivery systems, health care providers, and provider arrangements.

“(2) **RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER DEPARTMENT PROGRAMS.**—In any case where standards under paragraph (1) may affect the administration of other programs carried out by the Department of Health and Human Services, including the programs under title XVIII, XIX or XXI of the Social Security Act, or may affect health information that is subject to a standard developed under part C of title XI of the Social Security Act, they shall be in the form of recommendations to the Secretary for such program.

“(b) **STATISTICS AND ANALYSES.**—The Director shall—

“(1) take appropriate action to ensure that statistics and analyses developed under this title are of high quality, timely, and duly comprehensive, and that the statistics are specific, standardized, and adequately analyzed and indexed; and

“(2) publish, make available, and disseminate such statistics and analyses on as wide a basis as is practicable.

“(c) **AUTHORITY REGARDING CERTAIN REQUESTS.**—Upon request of a public or private entity, the Director may conduct or support research or analyses otherwise authorized by this title pursuant to arrangements under which such entity will pay the cost of the services provided. Amounts received by the Director under such arrangements shall be available to the Director for obligation until expended.

“SEC. 924. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall—

“(1) without regard to section 501 of title 44, United States Code, promptly publish, make available, and otherwise disseminate, in a form understandable and on as broad a basis as practicable so as to maximize its use, the results of research, demonstration projects, and evaluations conducted or supported under this title;

“(2) ensure that information disseminated by the Agency is science-based and objective and undertakes consultation as necessary to assess the appropriateness and usefulness of the presentation of information that is targeted to specific audiences;

“(3) promptly make available to the public data developed in such research, demonstration projects, and evaluations;

“(4) provide, in collaboration with the National Library of Medicine where appropriate, indexing, abstracting, translating, publishing, and other services leading to a more effective and timely dissemination of information on research, demonstration projects, and evaluations with respect to health care to public and private entities and individuals engaged in the improvement of health care delivery and the general public, and undertake programs to develop new or improved methods for making such information available; and

“(5) as appropriate, provide technical assistance to State and local government and health agencies and conduct liaison activities to such agencies to foster dissemination.

“(b) **PROHIBITION AGAINST RESTRICTIONS.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), the Director may not restrict the publication or dissemination of data from, or the results of, projects conducted or supported under this title.

“(c) **LIMITATION ON USE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.**—No information, if an establishment or person supplying the information or described in it is identifiable, obtained in the course of activities undertaken or supported under this title may be used for any purpose other than the purpose for which it was sup-

plied unless such establishment or person has consented (as determined under regulations of the Director) to its use for such other purpose. Such information may not be published or released in other form if the person who supplied the information or who is described in it is identifiable unless such person has consented (as determined under regulations of the Director) to its publication or release in other form.

“(d) **PENALTY.**—Any person who violates subsection (c) shall be subject to a civil monetary penalty of not more than \$10,000 for each such violation involved. Such penalty shall be imposed and collected in the same manner as civil money penalties under subsection (a) of section 1128A of the Social Security Act are imposed and collected.

“SEC. 925. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS WITH RESPECT TO GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.

“(a) **FINANCIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.**—With respect to projects for which awards of grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts are authorized to be made under this title, the Director shall by regulation define—

“(1) the specific circumstances that constitute financial interests in such projects that will, or may be reasonably expected to, create a bias in favor of obtaining results in the projects that are consistent with such interests; and

“(2) the actions that will be taken by the Director in response to any such interests identified by the Director.

“(b) **REQUIREMENT OF APPLICATION.**—The Director may not, with respect to any program under this title authorizing the provision of grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts, provide any such financial assistance unless an application for the assistance is submitted to the Secretary and the application is in such form, is made in such manner, and contains such agreements, assurances, and information as the Director determines to be necessary to carry out the program involved.

“(c) **PROVISION OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICES IN LIEU OF FUNDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon the request of an entity receiving a grant, cooperative agreement, or contract under this title, the Secretary may, subject to paragraph (2), provide supplies, equipment, and services for the purpose of aiding the entity in carrying out the project involved and, for such purpose, may detail to the entity any officer or employee of the Department of Health and Human Services.

“(2) **CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.**—With respect to a request described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall reduce the amount of the financial assistance involved by an amount equal to the costs of detailing personnel and the fair market value of any supplies, equipment, or services provided by the Director. The Secretary shall, for the payment of expenses incurred in complying with such request, expend the amounts withheld.

“(d) **APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS WITH RESPECT TO CONTRACTS.**—Contracts may be entered into under this part without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529 and 41 U.S.C. 5).

“SEC. 926. CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITIES.

“(a) **DEPUTY DIRECTOR AND OTHER OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.**—

“(1) **DEPUTY DIRECTOR.**—The Director may appoint a deputy director for the Agency.

“(2) **OTHER OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.**—The Director may appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out this title. Except as otherwise provided by law, such officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil service laws and their

compensation fixed in accordance with title 5, United States Code.

“(b) FACILITIES.—The Secretary, in carrying out this title—

“(1) may acquire, without regard to the Act of March 3, 1877 (40 U.S.C. 34), by lease or otherwise through the Administrator of General Services, buildings or portions of buildings in the District of Columbia or communities located adjacent to the District of Columbia for use for a period not to exceed 10 years; and

“(2) may acquire, construct, improve, repair, operate, and maintain laboratory, research, and other necessary facilities and equipment, and such other real or personal property (including patents) as the Secretary deems necessary.

“(c) PROVISION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—The Director, in carrying out this title, may make grants to public and nonprofit entities and individuals, and may enter into cooperative agreements or contracts with public and private entities and individuals.

“(d) UTILIZATION OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL AND RESOURCES.—

“(1) DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—The Director, in carrying out this title, may utilize personnel and equipment, facilities, and other physical resources of the Department of Health and Human Services, permit appropriate (as determined by the Secretary) entities and individuals to utilize the physical resources of such Department, and provide technical assistance and advice.

“(2) OTHER AGENCIES.—The Director, in carrying out this title, may use, with their consent, the services, equipment, personnel, information, and facilities of other Federal, State, or local public agencies, or of any foreign government, with or without reimbursement of such agencies.

“(e) CONSULTANTS.—The Secretary, in carrying out this title, may secure, from time to time and for such periods as the Director deems advisable but in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, the assistance and advice of consultants from the United States or abroad.

“(f) EXPERTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, in carrying out this title, obtain the services of not more than 50 experts or consultants who have appropriate scientific or professional qualifications. Such experts or consultants shall be obtained in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, except that the limitation in such section on the duration of service shall not apply.

“(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Experts and consultants whose services are obtained under paragraph (1) shall be paid or reimbursed for their expenses associated with traveling to and from their assignment location in accordance with sections 5724, 5724a(a), 5724a(c), and 5726(c) of title 5, United States Code.

“(B) LIMITATION.—Expenses specified in subparagraph (A) may not be allowed in connection with the assignment of an expert or consultant whose services are obtained under paragraph (1) unless and until the expert agrees in writing to complete the entire period of assignment, or 1 year, whichever is shorter, unless separated or reassigned for reasons that are beyond the control of the expert or consultant and that are acceptable to the Secretary. If the expert or consultant violates the agreement, the money spent by the United States for the expenses specified in subparagraph (A) is recoverable from the expert or consultant as a statutory obligation owed to the United States. The Secretary may waive in whole or in part a right of recovery under this subparagraph.

“(g) VOLUNTARY AND UNCOMPENSATED SERVICES.—The Director, in carrying out this title, may accept voluntary and uncompensated services.

“SEC. 927. FUNDING.

“(a) INTENT.—To ensure that the United States investment in biomedical research is rapidly translated into improvements in the quality of patient care, there must be a corresponding investment in research on the most effective clinical and organizational strategies for use of these findings in daily practice. The authorization levels in subsections (b) and (c) provide for a proportionate increase in health care research as the United States investment in biomedical research increases.

“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this title, there are authorized to be appropriated \$250,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

“(c) EVALUATIONS.—In addition to amounts available pursuant to subsection (b) for carrying out this title, there shall be made available for such purpose, from the amounts made available pursuant to section 241 (relating to evaluations), an amount equal to 40 percent of the maximum amount authorized in such section 241 to be made available for a fiscal year.

“SEC. 928. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The term ‘Advisory Council’ means the National Advisory Council on Healthcare Research and Quality established under section 921.

“(2) AGENCY.—The term ‘Agency’ means the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

“(3) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.”

(b) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 901(a) of the Public Health Service Act (as added by subsection (a) of this section) applies as a redesignation of the agency that carried out title IX of such Act on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, and not as the termination of such agency and the establishment of a different agency. The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section does not affect appointments of the personnel of such agency who were employed at the agency on the day before such date, including the appointments of members of advisory councils or study sections of the agency who were serving on the day before such date of enactment.

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in law to the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research is deemed to be a reference to the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, and any reference in law to the Administrator for Health Care Policy and Research is deemed to be a reference to the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

SEC. 3. GRANTS REGARDING UTILIZATION OF PREVENTIVE HEALTH SERVICES.

Subpart I of part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following section:

“SEC. 330D. CENTERS FOR STRATEGIES ON FACILITATING UTILIZATION OF PREVENTIVE HEALTH SERVICES AMONG VARIOUS POPULATIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the appropriate agencies of the Public Health Service, shall make grants to public or nonprofit private entities for the establishment and operation of regional centers whose purpose is to develop, evaluate, and disseminate effective strategies, which utilize quality management measures, to assist public and private health care programs and providers in the appropriate utilization of preventive health care services by specific populations.

“(b) RESEARCH AND TRAINING.—The activities carried out by a center under subsection (a) may include establishing programs of research and training with respect to the purpose described in such subsection, including the development of curricula for training individuals in implementing the strategies developed under such subsection.

“(c) PRIORITY REGARDING INFANTS AND CHILDREN.—In carrying out the purpose described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to various populations of infants, young children, and their mothers.

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004.”

SEC. 4. PROGRAM OF PAYMENTS TO CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS THAT OPERATE GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following subpart:

“Subpart IX—Support of Graduate Medical Education Programs in Children's Hospitals

“SEC. 340E. PROGRAM OF PAYMENTS TO CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS THAT OPERATE GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

“(a) PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall make two payments under this section to each children's hospital for each of fiscal years 2000 and 2001, one for the direct expenses and the other for indirect expenses associated with operating approved graduate medical residency training programs.

“(b) AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amounts payable under this section to a children's hospital for an approved graduate medical residency training program for a fiscal year are each of the following amounts:

“(A) DIRECT EXPENSE AMOUNT.—The amount determined under subsection (c) for direct expenses associated with operating approved graduate medical residency training programs.

“(B) INDIRECT EXPENSE AMOUNT.—The amount determined under subsection (d) for indirect expenses associated with the treatment of more severely ill patients and the additional costs relating to teaching residents in such programs.

“(2) CAPPED AMOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The total of the payments made to children's hospitals under paragraph (1)(A) or paragraph (1)(B) in a fiscal year shall not exceed the funds appropriated under paragraph (1) or (2), respectively, of subsection (f) for such payments for that fiscal year.

“(B) PRO RATA REDUCTIONS OF PAYMENTS FOR DIRECT EXPENSES.—If the Secretary determines that the amount of funds appropriated under subsection (f)(1) for a fiscal year is insufficient to provide the total amount of payments otherwise due for such periods under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall reduce the amounts so payable on a pro rata basis to reflect such shortfall.

“(c) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT FOR DIRECT GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount determined under this subsection for payments to a children's hospital for direct graduate expenses relating to approved graduate medical residency training programs for a fiscal year is equal to the product of—

“(A) the updated per resident amount for direct graduate medical education, as determined under paragraph (2); and

“(B) the average number of full-time equivalent residents in the hospital's graduate approved medical residency training programs (as determined under section

1886(h)(4) of the Social Security Act during the fiscal year.

“(2) UPDATED PER RESIDENT AMOUNT FOR DIRECT GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION.—The updated per resident amount for direct graduate medical education for a hospital for a fiscal year is an amount determined as follows:

“(A) DETERMINATION OF HOSPITAL SINGLE PER RESIDENT AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall compute for each hospital operating an approved graduate medical education program (regardless of whether or not it is a children’s hospital) a single per resident amount equal to the average (weighted by number of full-time equivalent residents) of the primary care per resident amount and the non-primary care per resident amount computed under section 1886(h)(2) of the Social Security Act for cost reporting periods ending during fiscal year 1997.

“(B) DETERMINATION OF WAGE AND NON-WAGE-RELATED PROPORTION OF THE SINGLE PER RESIDENT AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall estimate the average proportion of the single per resident amounts computed under subparagraph (A) that is attributable to wages and wage-related costs.

“(C) STANDARDIZING PER RESIDENT AMOUNTS.—The Secretary shall establish a standardized per resident amount for each such hospital—

“(i) by dividing the single per resident amount computed under subparagraph (A) into a wage-related portion and a non-wage-related portion by applying the proportion determined under subparagraph (B);

“(ii) by dividing the wage-related portion by the factor applied under section 1886(d)(3)(E) of the Social Security Act for discharges occurring during fiscal year 1999 for the hospital’s area; and

“(iii) by adding the non-wage-related portion to the amount computed under clause (ii).

“(D) DETERMINATION OF NATIONAL AVERAGE.—The Secretary shall compute a national average per resident amount equal to the average of the standardized per resident amounts computed under subparagraph (C) for such hospitals, with the amount for each hospital weighted by the average number of full-time equivalent residents at such hospital.

“(E) APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL HOSPITALS.—The Secretary shall compute for each such hospital that is a children’s hospital a per resident amount—

“(i) by dividing the national average per resident amount computed under subparagraph (D) into a wage-related portion and a non-wage-related portion by applying the proportion determined under subparagraph (B);

“(ii) by multiplying the wage-related portion by the factor described in subparagraph (C)(ii) for the hospital’s area; and

“(iii) by adding the non-wage-related portion to the amount computed under clause (ii).

“(F) UPDATING RATE.—The Secretary shall update such per resident amount for each such children’s hospital by the estimated percentage increase in the consumer price index for all urban consumers during the period beginning October 1997 and ending with the midpoint of the hospital’s cost reporting period that begins during fiscal year 2000.

“(d) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT FOR INDIRECT MEDICAL EDUCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount determined under this subsection for payments to a children’s hospital for indirect expenses associated with the treatment of more severely ill patients and the additional costs related to the teaching of residents for a fiscal year is equal to an amount determined appropriate by the Secretary.

“(2) FACTORS.—In determining the amount under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(A) take into account variations in case mix among children’s hospitals and the number of full-time equivalent residents in the hospitals’ approved graduate medical residency training programs; and

“(B) assure that the aggregate of the payments for indirect expenses associated with the treatment of more severely ill patients and the additional costs related to the teaching of residents under this section in a fiscal year are equal to the amount appropriated for such expenses for the fiscal year involved under subsection (f)(2).

“(e) MAKING OF PAYMENTS.—

“(1) INTERIM PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall determine, before the beginning of each fiscal year involved for which payments may be made for a hospital under this section, the amounts of the payments for direct graduate medical education and indirect medical education for such fiscal year and shall (subject to paragraph (2)) make the payments of such amounts in 26 equal interim installments during such period.

“(2) WITHHOLDING.—The Secretary shall withhold up to 25 percent from each interim installment for direct graduate medical education paid under paragraph (1).

“(3) RECONCILIATION.—At the end of each fiscal year for which payments may be made under this section, the hospital shall submit to the Secretary such information as the Secretary determines to be necessary to determine the percent (if any) of the total amount withheld under paragraph (2) that is due under this section for the hospital for the fiscal year. Based on such determination, the Secretary shall recoup any overpayments made, or pay any balance due. The amount so determined shall be considered a final intermediary determination for purposes of applying section 1878 of the Social Security Act and shall be subject to review under that section in the same manner as the amount of payment under section 1886(d) of such Act is subject to review under such section.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) DIRECT GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for payments under subsection (b)(1)(A)—

“(i) for fiscal year 2000, \$90,000,000; and

“(ii) for fiscal year 2001, \$95,000,000.

“(B) CARRYOVER OF EXCESS.—The amounts appropriated under subparagraph (A) for fiscal year 2000 shall remain available for obligation through the end of fiscal year 2001.

“(2) INDIRECT MEDICAL EDUCATION.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for payments under subsection (b)(1)(A)—

“(A) for fiscal year 2000, \$190,000,000; and

“(B) for fiscal year 2001, \$190,000,000.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROVED GRADUATE MEDICAL RESIDENCY TRAINING PROGRAM.—The term ‘approved graduate medical residency training program’ has the meaning given the term ‘approved medical residency training program’ in section 1886(h)(5)(A) of the Social Security Act.

“(2) CHILDREN’S HOSPITAL.—The term ‘children’s hospital’ means a hospital described in section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iii) of the Social Security Act.

“(3) DIRECT GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION COSTS.—The term ‘direct graduate medical education costs’ has the meaning given such term in section 1886(h)(5)(C) of the Social Security Act.”

SEC. 5. STUDY REGARDING SHORTAGES OF LICENSED PHARMACISTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the “Secretary”), acting through the appropriate agencies of the Public Health Service, shall conduct a study to determine whether and to what extent there is a shortage of licensed pharmacists. In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall seek the comments of appropriate public and private entities regarding any such shortage.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete the study under subsection (a) and submit to the Congress a report that describes the findings made through the study and that contains a summary of the comments received by the Secretary pursuant to such subsection.

SEC. 6. REPORT ON TELEMEDICINE.

Not later than January 10, 2001, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Congress a report that—

(1) identifies any factors that inhibit the expansion and accessibility of telemedicine services, including factors relating to telemedicine networks;

(2) identifies any factors that, in addition to geographical isolation, should be used to determine which patients need or require access to telemedicine care;

(3) determines the extent to which—

(A) patients receiving telemedicine service have benefited from the services, and are satisfied with the treatment received pursuant to the services; and

(B) the medical outcomes for such patients would have differed if telemedicine services had not been available to the patients;

(4) determines the extent to which physicians involved with telemedicine services have been satisfied with the medical aspects of the services;

(5) determines the extent to which primary care physicians are enhancing their medical knowledge and experience through the interaction with specialists provided by telemedicine consultations; and

(6) identifies legal and medical issues relating to State licensing of health professionals that are presented by telemedicine services, and provides any recommendations of the Secretary for responding to such issues.

SEC. 7. CERTAIN TECHNOLOGIES AND PRACTICES REGARDING SURVIVAL RATES FOR CARDIAC ARREST.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, in consultation with the Administrator of the General Services Administration and other appropriate public and private entities, develop recommendations regarding the placement of automatic external defibrillators in Federal buildings as a means of improving the survival rates of individuals who experience cardiac arrest in such buildings, including recommendations on training, maintenance, and medical oversight, and on coordinating with the system for emergency medical services.

THE YOUTH DRUG AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ACT

FRIST AMENDMENT NO. 2507

Mr. GRAMM (for Mr. FRIST) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 976) to amend title V of the Public Health Service Act to focus the authority of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration on community-based services children and adolescents, to enhance flexibility and accountability, to establish programs

for youth treatment, and to respond to crises, especially those related to children and violence; as follows:

On page 88, strike lines 20 through 24 and insert the following:

“(d) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall prepare and submit, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives, a report that describes the services provided pursuant to this section.

On page 90, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 108. GRANTS FOR STRENGTHENING FAMILIES THROUGH COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS.

Subpart 2 of part B of Title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-21 et seq) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 519A. GRANTS FOR STRENGTHENING FAMILIES.

“(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Prevention Center, may make grants to public and nonprofit private entities to develop and implement model substance abuse prevention programs to provide early intervention and substance abuse prevention services for individuals of high-risk families and the communities in which such individuals reside.

“(b) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to applicants that—

“(1) have proven experience in preventing substance abuse by individuals of high-risk families and reducing substance abuse in communities of such individuals;

“(2) have demonstrated the capacity to implement community-based partnership initiatives that are sensitive to the diverse backgrounds of individuals of high-risk families and the communities of such individuals;

“(3) have experience in providing technical assistance to support substance abuse prevention programs that are community-based;

“(4) have demonstrated the capacity to implement research-based substance abuse prevention strategies; and

“(5) have implemented programs that involve families, residents, community agencies, and institutions in the implementation and design of such programs.

“(c) DURATION OF GRANTS.—The Secretary shall award grants under subsection (a) for a period not to exceed 5 years.

“(d) USE OF FUNDS.—An applicant that is awarded a grant under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) in the first fiscal year that such funds are received under the grant, use such funds to develop a model substance abuse prevention program; and

“(2) in the fiscal year following the first fiscal year that such funds are received, use such funds to implement the program developed under paragraph (1) to provide early intervention and substance abuse prevention services to—

“(A) strengthen the environment of children of high risk families by targeting interventions at the families of such children and the communities in which such children reside;

“(B) strengthen protective factors, such as—

“(i) positive adult role models;

“(ii) messages that oppose substance abuse;

“(iii) community actions designed to reduce accessibility to and use of illegal substances; and

“(iv) willingness of individuals of families in which substance abuse occurs to seek treatment for substance abuse;

“(C) reduce family and community risks, such as family violence, alcohol or drug abuse, crime, and other behaviors that may effect healthy child development and increase the likelihood of substance abuse; and

“(D) build collaborative and formal partnerships between community agencies, institutions, and businesses to ensure that comprehensive high quality services are provided, such as early childhood education, health care, family support programs, parent education programs, and home visits for infants.

“(e) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), an applicant shall prepare and submit to the Secretary an application that—

“(1) describes a model substance abuse prevention program that such applicant will establish;

“(2) describes the manner in which the services described in subsection (d)(2) will be provided; and

“(3) describe in as much detail as possible the results that the entity expects to achieve in implementing such a program.

“(f) MATCHING FUNDING.—The Secretary may not make a grant to a entity under subsection (a) unless that entity agrees that, with respect to the costs to be incurred by the entity in carrying out the program for which the grant was awarded, the entity will make available non-Federal contributions in an amount that is not less than 40 percent of the amount provided under the grant.

“(g) REPORT TO SECRETARY.—An applicant that is awarded a grant under subsection (a) shall prepare and submit to the Secretary a report in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including an assessment of the efficacy of the model substance abuse prevention program implemented by the applicant and the short, intermediate, and long term results of such program.

“(h) EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary shall conduct evaluations, based in part on the reports submitted under subsection (g), to determine the effectiveness of the programs funded under subsection (a) in reducing substance use in high-risk families and in making communities in which such families reside in stronger. The Secretary shall submit such evaluations to the appropriate committees of Congress.

“(i) HIGH-RISK FAMILIES.—In this section, the term ‘high-risk family’ means a family in which the individuals of such family are at a significant risk of using or abusing alcohol or any illegal substance.

“(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 and 2002.”

On page 90, line 9, strike “SEC. 108” and insert “SEC. 109”.

On page 90, strike line 14 and insert “as paragraphs (4) through (14), respectively.”

On page 90, strike lines 17 through 19 and insert the following:

“(2) ensure that emphasis is placed on children and adolescents in the development of treatment programs;

“(3) collaborate with the Attorney General to develop programs to provide substance abuse treatment services to individuals who have had contact with the Justice system, especially adolescents;” and

(3) in paragraph 14 (as so redesignated), by striking “paragraph (11)” and inserting “paragraph (13)”.

On page 90, strike lines 20 through 24 and insert the following:

(b) OFFICE FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION.—Section 515(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-21(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (9) and (10) as (10) and (11);

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8), the following:

“(9) collaborate with the Attorney General of the Department of Justice to develop programs to prevent drug abuse among high risk youth;” and

(3) in paragraph (10) (as so redesignated), by striking “public concerning” and inserting “public, especially adolescent audiences, concerning”.

On page 108, line 1, strike “physical or chemical”.

On page 108, line 3, strike “Physical or chemical restraints” and insert “Restraints”.

Beginning on page 108, strike line 17 and all that follows through page 109, line 18, and insert the following:

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) RESTRAINTS.—The term ‘restraints’ means—

“(A) any physical restraint that is a mechanical or personal restriction that immobilizes or reduces the ability of an individual to move his or her arms, legs, or head freely, not including devices, such as orthopedically prescribed devices, surgical dressings or bandages, protective helmets, or any other methods that involves the physical holding of a resident for the purpose of conducting routine physical examinations or tests or to protect the resident from falling out of bed or to permit the resident to participate in activities without the risk of physical harm to the resident; and

“(B) a drug or medication that is used as a restraint to control behavior or restrict the resident's freedom of movement that is not a standard treatment for the resident's medical or psychiatric condition.

“(2) SECLUSION.—The term ‘seclusion’ means any separation of the resident from the general population of the facility that prevents the resident from returning to such population if he or she desires.

On page 109, line 24, insert “or in seclusion” after “restrained”.

Beginning on page 109, line 25, strike “of the deceased” and all that follows through “placed in seclusion, or” on page 110, line 1, and insert “after the patient has been removed from restraints and seclusion, or”.

On page 111, line 8, strike “582(a)” and insert “592(a)”.

On page 111, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(a) RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT PROGRAMS FOR PREGNANT AND POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—Section 508(r) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-1(r)) is amended to read as follows:

“(r) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to fiscal years 2000 through 2002.”

On page 111, strike line 19 and insert the following:

“(b) PRIORITY SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT.—Section 509 of the Public Health”

On page 112, line 1, strike “508” and insert “509”.

On page 115, strike lines 11 through 17 and insert the following:

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The following sections of the Public Health Service Act are repealed:

(1) Section 510 (42 U.S.C. 290bb-3).

(2) Section 511 (42 U.S.C. 290bb-4).

(3) Section 512 (42 U.S.C. 290bb-5).

(4) Section 571 (42 U.S.C. 290gg).

On page 117, line 8, strike “services” and insert “information and activities”.

Beginning on page 119, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 120, line 20.

On page 120, line 21, strike “(b)” and insert “(a)”.

On page 121, line 3, strike "(c)" and insert "(b)".

On page 121, line 12, strike "(d)" and insert "(c)".

On page 122, line 1, strike "(e)" and insert "(d)".

On page 122, lines 5 and 6, strike "prior to the fiscal year".

On page 122, line 7, strike "(f)" and insert "(e)".

On page 122, line 12, strike "(g)" and insert "(f)".

On page 124, line 1, strike "(h)" and insert "(g)".

On page 129, line 1, strike "(1) TENETS AND TEACHINGS.—A religious or—" and insert "(1) SUBSTANCE ABUSE.—A religious or—".

On page 129, lines 5 through 7, strike "adhere to the religious tenets and teachings of such organization, and such organization may require that those employees".

On page 131, line 17, strike "or agency" and insert ", agency or official".

On page 145, strike line 17, and insert the following: "basis."

"(d) PARTICIPANTS.—The Secretary shall include among those interested groups that participate in the development of the plan consumers of mental health or substance abuse services, providers, representatives of political divisions of States, and representatives of racial and ethnic groups including Native Americans."

THE FEDERAL ERRONEOUS RETIREMENT COVERAGE CORRECTIONS ACT

COCHRAN (AND AKAKA) AMENDMENT NO. 2508

Mr. GRAMM (for Mr. COCHRAN (for himself, and Mr. AKAKA)) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1232) to provide for the correction of retirement coverage errors under chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Federal Erroneous Retirement Coverage Corrections Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Definitions.
- Sec. 3. Applicability.
- Sec. 4. Irrevocability of elections.

TITLE I—DESCRIPTION OF RETIREMENT COVERAGE ERRORS TO WHICH THIS ACT APPLIES AND MEASURES FOR THEIR RECTIFICATION

Subtitle A—Employees and Annuitants Who Should Have Been FERS Covered, but Who Were Erroneously CSRS Covered or CSRS-Offset Covered Instead, and Survivors of Such Employees and Annuitants

Sec. 101. Employees.

Sec. 102. Annuitants and survivors.

Subtitle B—Employee Who Should Have Been FERS Covered, CSRS-Offset Covered, or CSRS Covered, but Who Was Erroneously Social Security-Only Covered Instead

Sec. 111. Applicability.

Sec. 112. Correction mandatory.

Subtitle C—Employee Who Should or Could Have Been Social Security-Only Covered but Who Was Erroneously CSRS-Offset Covered or CSRS Covered Instead

Sec. 121. Employee who should be Social Security-Only covered, but who is erroneously CSRS or CSRS-Offset covered instead.

Subtitle D—Employee Who Was Erroneously FERS Covered

Sec. 131. Employee who should be Social Security-Only covered, CSRS covered, or CSRS-Offset covered and is not FERS-eligible, but who is erroneously FERS covered instead.

Sec. 132. FERS-Eligible Employee Who Should Have Been CSRS Covered, CSRS-Offset Covered, or Social Security-Only Covered, but Who Was Erroneously FERS Covered Instead Without an Election.

Sec. 133. Retroactive effect.

Subtitle E—Employee Who Should Have Been CSRS-Offset Covered, but Who Was Erroneously CSRS Covered Instead

Sec. 141. Applicability.

Sec. 142. Correction mandatory.

Subtitle F—Employee Who Should Have Been CSRS Covered, but Who Was Erroneously CSRS-Offset Covered Instead

Sec. 151. Applicability.

Sec. 152. Correction mandatory.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Identification and notification requirements.

Sec. 202. Information to be furnished to and by authorities administering this Act.

Sec. 203. Service credit deposits.

Sec. 204. Provisions related to Social Security coverage of misclassified employees.

Sec. 205. Thrift Savings Plan treatment for certain individuals.

Sec. 206. Certain agency amounts to be paid into or remain in the CSRDF.

Sec. 207. CSRS coverage determinations to be approved by OPM.

Sec. 208. Discretionary actions by Director.

Sec. 209. Regulations.

TITLE III—OTHER PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Provisions to authorize continued conformity of other Federal retirement systems.

Sec. 302. Authorization of payments.

Sec. 303. Individual right of action preserved for amounts not otherwise provided for under this Act.

TITLE IV—TAX PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Tax provisions.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS RETIREMENT PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Federal Reserve Board portability of service credit.

Sec. 502. Certain transfers to be treated as a separation from service for purposes of the Thrift Savings Plan.

TITLE VI—EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 601. Effective date.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) ANNUITANT.—The term "annuitant" has the meaning given such term under section 8331(9) or 8401(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) CSRS.—The term "CSRS" means the Civil Service Retirement System.+

(3) CSRDF.—The term "CSRDF" means the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund.

(4) CSRS COVERED.—The term "CSRS covered", with respect to any service, means service that is subject to the provisions of subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, other than service subject to section 8334(k) of such title.

(5) CSRS-OFFSET COVERED.—The term "CSRS-Offset covered", with respect to any service, means service that is subject to the

provisions of subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and to section 8334(k) of such title.

(6) EMPLOYEE.—The term "employee" has the meaning given such term under section 8331(1) or 8401(11) of title 5, United States Code.

(7) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The term "Executive Director of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board" or "Executive Director" means the Executive Director appointed under section 8474 of title 5, United States Code.

(8) FERS.—The term "FERS" means the Federal Employees' Retirement System.

(9) FERS COVERED.—The term "FERS covered", with respect to any service, means service that is subject to chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code.

(10) FORMER EMPLOYEE.—The term "former employee" means an individual who was an employee, but who is not an annuitant.

(11) OASDI TAXES.—The term "OASDI taxes" means the OASDI employee tax and the OASDI employer tax.

(12) OASDI EMPLOYEE TAX.—The term "OASDI employee tax" means the tax imposed under section 3101(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance).

(13) OASDI EMPLOYER TAX.—The term "OASDI employer tax" means the tax imposed under section 3111(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance).

(14) OASDI TRUST FUNDS.—The term "OASDI trust funds" means the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund.

(15) OFFICE.—The term "Office" means the Office of Personnel Management.

(16) RETIREMENT COVERAGE DETERMINATION.—The term "retirement coverage determination" means a determination by an employee or agent of the Government as to whether a particular type of Government service is CSRS covered, CSRS-Offset covered, FERS covered, or Social Security-Only covered.

(17) RETIREMENT COVERAGE ERROR.—The term "retirement coverage error" means an erroneous retirement coverage determination that was in effect for a minimum period of 3 years of service after December 31, 1986.

(18) SOCIAL SECURITY-ONLY COVERED.—The term "Social Security-Only covered", with respect to any service, means Government service that—

(A) constitutes employment under section 210 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 410); and

(B)(i) is subject to OASDI taxes; but

(ii) is not subject to CSRS or FERS.

(19) SURVIVOR.—The term "survivor" has the meaning given such term under section 8331(10) or 8401(28) of title 5, United States Code.

(20) THRIFT SAVINGS FUND.—The term "Thrift Savings Fund" means the Thrift Savings Fund established under section 8437 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 3. APPLICABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act shall apply with respect to retirement coverage errors that occur before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) LIMITATION.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, this Act shall not apply to any erroneous retirement coverage determination that was in effect for a period of less than 3 years of service after December 31, 1986.

SEC. 4. IRREVOCABILITY OF ELECTIONS.

Any election made (or deemed to have been made) by an employee or any other individual under this Act shall be irrevocable.

TITLE I—DESCRIPTION OF RETIREMENT COVERAGE ERRORS TO WHICH THIS ACT APPLIES AND MEASURES FOR THEIR RECTIFICATION

Subtitle A—Employees and Annuitants Who Should Have Been FERS Covered, but Who Were Erroneously CSRS Covered or CSRS-Offset Covered Instead, and Survivors of Such Employees and Annuitants

SEC. 101. EMPLOYEES.

(a) **APPLICABILITY.**—This section shall apply in the case of any employee or former employee who should be (or should have been) FERS covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, is (or was) CSRS covered or CSRS-Offset covered instead.

(b) **UNCORRECTED ERROR.**—

(1) **APPLICABILITY.**—This subsection applies if the retirement coverage error has not been corrected before the effective date of the regulations described under paragraph (3). As soon as practicable after discovery of the error, and subject to the right of an election under paragraph (2), if CSRS covered or CSRS-Offset covered, such individual shall be treated as CSRS-Offset covered, retroactive to the date of the retirement coverage error.

(2) **COVERAGE.**—

(A) **ELECTION.**—Upon written notice of a retirement coverage error, an individual may elect to be CSRS-Offset covered or FERS covered, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error. Such election shall be made not later than 180 days after the date of receipt of such notice.

(B) **NONELECTION.**—If the individual does not make an election by the date provided under subparagraph (A), a CSRS-Offset covered individual shall remain CSRS-Offset covered and a CSRS covered individual shall be treated as CSRS-Offset covered.

(3) **REGULATIONS.**—The Office shall prescribe regulations to carry out this subsection.

(c) **CORRECTED ERROR.**—

(1) **APPLICABILITY.**—This subsection applies if the retirement coverage error was corrected before the effective date of the regulations described under subsection (b).

(2) **COVERAGE.**—

(A) **ELECTION.**—

(i) **CSRS-OFFSET COVERED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Office shall prescribe regulations authorizing individuals to elect, during the 18-month period immediately following the effective date of such regulations, to be CSRS-Offset covered, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(ii) **THRIFT SAVINGS FUND CONTRIBUTIONS.**—If under this section an individual elects to be CSRS-Offset covered, all employee contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund made during the period of FERS coverage (and earnings on such contributions) may remain in the Thrift Savings Fund in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Executive Director, notwithstanding any limit that would otherwise be applicable.

(B) **PREVIOUS SETTLEMENT PAYMENT.**—An individual who previously received a payment ordered by a court or provided as a settlement of claim for losses resulting from a retirement coverage error shall not be entitled to make an election under this subsection unless that amount is waived in whole or in part under section 208, and any amount not waived is repaid.

(C) **INELIGIBILITY FOR ELECTION.**—An individual who, subsequent to correction of the retirement coverage error, received a refund of retirement deductions under section 8424 of title 5, United States Code, or a distribution under section 8433 (b), (c), or (h)(1)(A) of title 5, United States Code, may not make an election under this subsection.

(3) **CORRECTIVE ACTION TO REMAIN IN EFFECT.**—If an individual is ineligible to make an election or does not make an election under paragraph (2) before the end of any time limitation under this subsection, the corrective action taken before such time limitation shall remain in effect.

SEC. 102. ANNUITANTS AND SURVIVORS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—This section shall apply in the case of an individual who is—

(1) an annuitant who should have been FERS covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, was CSRS covered or CSRS-Offset covered instead; or

(2) a survivor of an employee who should have been FERS covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, was CSRS covered or CSRS-Offset covered instead.

(b) **COVERAGE.**—

(1) **ELECTION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Office shall prescribe regulations authorizing an individual described under subsection (a) to elect CSRS-Offset coverage or FERS coverage, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(2) **TIME LIMITATION.**—An election under this subsection shall be made not later than 18 months after the effective date of the regulations prescribed under paragraph (1).

(3) **REDUCED ANNUITY.**—

(A) **AMOUNT IN ACCOUNT.**—If the individual elects CSRS-Offset coverage, the amount in the employee's Thrift Savings Fund account under subchapter III of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, on the date of retirement that represents the Government's contributions and earnings on those contributions (whether or not such amount was subsequently distributed from the Thrift Savings Fund) will form the basis for a reduction in the individual's annuity, under regulations prescribed by the Office.

(B) **REDUCTION.**—The reduced annuity to which the individual is entitled shall be equal to an amount which, when taken together with the amount referred to in subparagraph (A), would result in the present value of the total being actuarially equivalent to the present value of an unreduced CSRS-Offset annuity that would have been provided the individual.

(4) **REDUCED BENEFIT.**—If—

(A) a surviving spouse elects CSRS-Offset benefits; and

(B) a FERS basic employee death benefit under section 8442(b) of title 5, United States Code, was previously paid;

then the survivor's CSRS-Offset benefit shall be subject to a reduction, under regulations prescribed by the Office. The reduced annuity to which the individual is entitled shall be equal to an amount which, when taken together with the amount of the payment referred to under subparagraph (B) would result in the present value of the total being actuarially equivalent to the present value of an unreduced CSRS-Offset annuity that would have been provided the individual.

(5) **PREVIOUS SETTLEMENT PAYMENT.**—An individual who previously received a payment ordered by a court or provided as a settlement of claim for losses resulting from a retirement coverage error may not make an election under this subsection unless repayment of that amount is waived in whole or in part under section 208, and any amount not waived is repaid.

(c) **NONELECTION.**—If the individual does not make an election under subsection (b) before any time limitation under this section, the retirement coverage shall be subject to the following rules:

(1) **CORRECTIVE ACTION PREVIOUSLY TAKEN.**—If corrective action was taken before the end of any time limitation under this section, that corrective action shall remain in effect.

(2) **CORRECTIVE ACTION NOT PREVIOUSLY TAKEN.**—If corrective action was not taken before such time limitation, the employee shall be CSRS-Offset covered, retroactive to the date of the retirement coverage error.

Subtitle B—Employee Who Should Have Been FERS Covered, CSRS-Offset Covered, or CSRS Covered, but Who Was Erroneously Social Security-Only Covered Instead

SEC. 111. APPLICABILITY.

This subtitle shall apply in the case of any employee who—

(1) should be (or should have been) FERS covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, is (or was) Social Security-Only covered instead;

(2) should be (or should have been) CSRS-Offset covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, is (or was) Social Security-Only covered instead; or

(3) should be (or should have been) CSRS covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, is (or was) Social Security-Only covered instead.

SEC. 112. CORRECTION MANDATORY.

(a) **UNCORRECTED ERROR.**—If the retirement coverage error has not been corrected, as soon as practicable after discovery of the error, such individual shall be covered under the correct retirement coverage, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(b) **CORRECTED ERROR.**—If the retirement coverage error has been corrected, the corrective action previously taken shall remain in effect.

Subtitle C—Employee Who Should or Could Have Been Social Security-Only Covered but Who Was Erroneously CSRS-Offset Covered or CSRS Covered Instead

SEC. 121. EMPLOYEE WHO SHOULD BE SOCIAL SECURITY-ONLY COVERED, BUT WHO IS ERRONEOUSLY CSRS OR CSRS-OFFSET COVERED INSTEAD.

(a) **APPLICABILITY.**—This section applies in the case of a retirement coverage error in which a Social Security-Only covered employee was erroneously CSRS covered or CSRS-Offset covered.

(b) **UNCORRECTED ERROR.**—

(1) **APPLICABILITY.**—This subsection applies if the retirement coverage error has not been corrected before the effective date of the regulations described in paragraph (3).

(2) **COVERAGE.**—In the case of an individual who is erroneously CSRS covered, as soon as practicable after discovery of the error, and subject to the right of an election under paragraph (3), such individual shall be CSRS-Offset covered, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(3) **ELECTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon written notice of a retirement coverage error, an individual may elect to be CSRS-Offset covered or Social Security-Only covered, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error. Such election shall be made not later than 180 days after the date of receipt of such notice.

(B) **NONELECTION.**—If the individual does not make an election before the date provided under subparagraph (A), the individual shall remain CSRS-Offset covered.

(C) **REGULATIONS.**—The Office shall prescribe regulations to carry out this paragraph.

(c) **CORRECTED ERROR.**—

(1) **APPLICABILITY.**—This subsection applies if the retirement coverage error was corrected before the effective date of the regulations described under subsection (b)(3).

(2) **ELECTION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Office shall prescribe regulations authorizing individuals to elect, during the 18-month period immediately following the effective date of such regulations, to be CSRS-Offset covered

or Social Security-Only covered, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(3) NONELECTION.—If an eligible individual does not make an election under paragraph (2) before the end of any time limitation under this subsection, the corrective action taken before such time limitation shall remain in effect.

Subtitle D—Employee Who Was Erroneously FERS Covered

SEC. 131. EMPLOYEE WHO SHOULD BE SOCIAL SECURITY-ONLY COVERED, CSRS COVERED, OR CSRS-OFFSET COVERED AND IS NOT FERS-ELIGIBLE, BUT WHO IS ERRONEOUSLY FERS COVERED INSTEAD.

(a) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies in the case of a retirement coverage error in which a Social Security-Only covered, CSRS covered, or CSRS-Offset covered employee not eligible to elect FERS coverage under authority of section 8402(c) of title 5, United States Code, was erroneously FERS covered.

(b) UNCORRECTED ERROR.—

(1) APPLICABILITY.—This subsection applies if the retirement coverage error has not been corrected before the effective date of the regulations described in paragraph (2).

(2) COVERAGE.—

(A) ELECTION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon written notice of a retirement coverage error, an individual may elect to remain FERS covered or to be Social Security-Only covered, CSRS covered, or CSRS-Offset covered, as would have applied in the absence of the erroneous retirement coverage determination, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error. Such election shall be made not later than 180 days after the date of receipt of such notice.

(ii) TREATMENT OF FERS ELECTION.—An election of FERS coverage under this subsection is deemed to be an election under section 301 of the Federal Employees Retirement System Act of 1986 (5 U.S.C. 8331 note; Public Law 99-335; 100 Stat. 599).

(B) NONELECTION.—If the individual does not make an election before the date provided under subparagraph (A), the individual shall remain FERS covered, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(3) EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS IN THRIFT SAVINGS FUND.—If under this section, an individual elects to be Social Security-Only covered, CSRS covered, or CSRS-Offset covered, all employee contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund made during the period of erroneous FERS coverage (and all earnings on such contributions) may remain in the Thrift Savings Fund in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Executive Director, notwithstanding any limit under section 8351 or 8432 of title 5, United States Code.

(4) REGULATIONS.—Except as provided under paragraph (3), the Office shall prescribe regulations to carry out this subsection.

(c) CORRECTED ERROR.—

(1) APPLICABILITY.—This subsection applies if the retirement coverage error was corrected before the effective date of the regulations described under paragraph (2).

(2) ELECTION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Office shall prescribe regulations authorizing individuals to elect, during the 18-month period immediately following the effective date of such regulations to remain Social Security-Only covered, CSRS covered, or CSRS-Offset covered, or to be FERS covered, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(3) NONELECTION.—If an eligible individual does not make an election under paragraph (2), the corrective action taken before the end of any time limitation under this subsection shall remain in effect.

(4) TREATMENT OF FERS ELECTION.—An election of FERS coverage under this subsection is deemed to be an election under section 301 of the Federal Employees Retirement System Act of 1986 (5 U.S.C. 8331 note; Public Law 99-335; 100 Stat. 599).

SEC. 132. FERS-ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE WHO SHOULD HAVE BEEN CSRS COVERED, CSRS-OFFSET COVERED, OR SOCIAL SECURITY-ONLY COVERED, BUT WHO WAS ERRONEOUSLY FERS COVERED INSTEAD WITHOUT AN ELECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) FERS ELECTION PREVENTED.—If an individual was prevented from electing FERS coverage because the individual was erroneously FERS covered during the period when the individual was eligible to elect FERS under title III of the Federal Employees Retirement System Act or the Federal Employees' Retirement System Open Enrollment Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-61; 111 Stat. 1318 et seq.), the individual—

(A) is deemed to have elected FERS coverage; and

(B) shall remain covered by FERS, unless the individual declines, under regulations prescribed by the Office, to be FERS covered.

(2) DECLINING FERS COVERAGE.—If an individual described under paragraph (1)(B) declines to be FERS covered, such individual shall be CSRS covered, CSRS-Offset covered, or Social Security-Only covered, as would apply in the absence of a FERS election, effective as of the date of the erroneous retirement coverage determination.

(b) EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS IN THRIFT SAVINGS FUND.—If under this section, an individual declines to be FERS covered and instead is Social Security-Only covered, CSRS covered, or CSRS-Offset covered, as would apply in the absence of a FERS election, all employee contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund made during the period of erroneous FERS coverage (and all earnings on such contributions) may remain in the Thrift Savings Fund in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Executive Director, notwithstanding any limit that would otherwise be applicable.

(c) INAPPLICABILITY OF DURATION OF ERRONEOUS COVERAGE.—This section shall apply regardless of the length of time the erroneous coverage determination remained in effect.

SEC. 133. RETROACTIVE EFFECT.

This subtitle shall be effective as of January 1, 1987, except that section 132 shall not apply to individuals who made or were deemed to have made elections similar to those provided in this section under regulations prescribed by the Office before the effective date of this Act.

Subtitle E—Employee Who Should Have Been CSRS-Offset Covered, but Who Was Erroneously CSRS Covered Instead

SEC. 141. APPLICABILITY.

This subtitle shall apply in the case of any employee who should be (or should have been) CSRS-Offset covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, is (or was) CSRS covered instead.

SEC. 142. CORRECTION MANDATORY.

(a) UNCORRECTED ERROR.—If the retirement coverage error has not been corrected, as soon as practicable after discovery of the error, such individual shall be covered under the correct retirement coverage, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(b) CORRECTED ERROR.—If the retirement coverage error has been corrected before the effective date of this Act, the corrective action taken before such date shall remain in effect.

Subtitle F—Employee Who Should Have Been CSRS Covered, but Who Was Erroneously CSRS-Offset Covered Instead

SEC. 151. APPLICABILITY.

This subtitle shall apply in the case of any employee who should be (or should have been) CSRS covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, is (or was) CSRS-Offset covered instead.

SEC. 152. CORRECTION MANDATORY.

(a) UNCORRECTED ERROR.—If the retirement coverage error has not been corrected, as soon as practicable after discovery of the error, such individual shall be covered under the correct retirement coverage, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(b) CORRECTED ERROR.—If the retirement coverage error has been corrected before the effective date of this Act, the corrective action taken before such date shall remain in effect.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. IDENTIFICATION AND NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

Government agencies shall take all such measures as may be reasonable and appropriate to promptly identify and notify individuals who are (or have been) affected by a retirement coverage error of their rights under this Act.

SEC. 202. INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED TO AND BY AUTHORITIES ADMINISTERING THIS ACT.

(a) APPLICABILITY.—The authorities identified in this subsection are—

(1) the Director of the Office of Personnel Management;

(2) the Commissioner of Social Security; and

(3) the Executive Director of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board.

(b) AUTHORITY TO OBTAIN INFORMATION.—Each authority identified in subsection (a) may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable such authority to carry out its responsibilities under this Act. Upon request of the authority involved, the head of the department or agency involved shall furnish that information to the requesting authority.

(c) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE INFORMATION.—Each authority identified in subsection (a) may provide directly to any department or agency of the United States all information such authority believes necessary to enable the department or agency to carry out its responsibilities under this Act.

(d) LIMITATION; SAFEGUARDS.—Each of the respective authorities under subsection (a) shall—

(1) request or provide only such information as that authority considers necessary; and

(2) establish, by regulation or otherwise, appropriate safeguards to ensure that any information obtained under this section shall be used only for the purpose authorized.

SEC. 203. SERVICE CREDIT DEPOSITS.

(a) CSRS DEPOSIT.—In the case of a retirement coverage error in which—

(1) a FERS covered employee was erroneously CSRS covered or CSRS-Offset covered;

(2) the employee made a service credit deposit under the CSRS rules; and

(3) there is a subsequent retroactive change to FERS coverage;

the excess of the amount of the CSRS civilian or military service credit deposit over the FERS civilian or military service credit deposit, together with interest computed in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 8334(e) of title 5, United States Code, and regulations prescribed by the Office, shall be paid to the employee, the annuitant

or, in the case of a deceased employee, to the individual entitled to lump-sum benefits under section 8424(d) of title 5, United States Code.

(b) FERS DEPOSIT.—

(1) APPLICABILITY.—This subsection applies in the case of an erroneous retirement coverage determination in which—

(A) the employee owed a service credit deposit under section 8411(f) of title 5, United States Code; and

(B)(i) there is a subsequent retroactive change to CSRS or CSRS-Offset coverage; or
(ii) the service becomes creditable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) REDUCED ANNUITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If at the time of commencement of an annuity there is remaining unpaid CSRS civilian or military service credit deposit for service described under paragraph (1), the annuity shall be reduced based upon the amount unpaid together with interest computed in accordance with section 8334(e) (2) and (3) of title 5, United States Code, and regulations prescribed by the Office.

(B) AMOUNT.—The reduced annuity to which the individual is entitled shall be equal to an amount that, when taken together with the amount referred to under subparagraph (A), would result in the present value of the total being actuarially equivalent to the present value of the unreduced annuity benefit that would have been provided the individual.

(3) SURVIVOR ANNUITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If at the time of commencement of a survivor annuity, there is remaining unpaid any CSRS service credit deposit described under paragraph (1), and there has been no actuarial reduction in an annuity under paragraph (2), the survivor annuity shall be reduced based upon the amount unpaid together with interest computed in accordance with section 8334(e) (2) and (3) of title 5, United States Code, and regulations prescribed by the Office.

(B) AMOUNT.—The reduced survivor annuity to which the individual is entitled shall be equal to an amount that, when taken together with the amount referred to under subparagraph (A), would result in the present value of the total being actuarially equivalent to the present value of an unreduced survivor annuity benefit that would have been provided the individual.

SEC. 204. PROVISIONS RELATED TO SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE OF MISCLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term—

(1) “covered individual” means any employee, former employee, or annuitant who—

(A) is or was employed erroneously subject to CSRS coverage as a result of a retirement coverage error; and

(B) is or was retroactively converted to CSRS-Offset coverage, FERS coverage, or Social Security-only coverage; and

(2) “excess CSRS deduction amount” means an amount equal to the difference between the CSRS deductions withheld and the CSRS-Offset or FERS deductions, if any, due with respect to a covered individual during the entire period the individual was erroneously subject to CSRS coverage as a result of a retirement coverage error.

(b) REPORTS TO COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to carry out the Commissioner of Social Security’s responsibilities under title II of the Social Security Act, the Commissioner may request the head of each agency that employs or employed a covered individual to report (in coordination with the Office of Personnel Management) in such form and within such timeframe as the Commissioner may specify, any or all of—

(A) the total wages (as defined in section 3121(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) paid to such individual during each year of the entire period of the erroneous CSRS coverage; and

(B) such additional information as the Commissioner may require for the purpose of carrying out the Commissioner’s responsibilities under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.).

(2) COMPLIANCE.—The head of an agency or the Office shall comply with a request from the Commissioner under paragraph (1).

(3) WAGES.—For purposes of section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401), wages reported under this subsection shall be deemed to be wages reported to the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary’s delegates pursuant to subtitle F of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) PAYMENT RELATING TO OASDI EMPLOYEE TAXES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Office shall transfer from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund to the General Fund of the Treasury an amount equal to the lesser of the excess CSRS deduction amount or the OASDI taxes due for covered individuals (as adjusted by amounts transferred relating to applicable OASDI employee taxes as a result of corrections made, including corrections made before the date of enactment of this Act). If the excess CSRS deductions exceed the OASDI taxes, any difference shall be paid to the covered individual or survivors, as appropriate.

(2) TRANSFER.—Amounts transferred under this subsection shall be determined notwithstanding any limitation under section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(d) PAYMENT OF OASDI EMPLOYER TAXES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each employing agency shall pay an amount equal to the OASDI employer taxes owed with respect to covered individuals during the applicable period of erroneous coverage (as adjusted by amounts transferred for the payment of such taxes as a result of corrections made, including corrections made before the date of enactment of this Act).

(2) PAYMENT.—Amounts paid under this subsection shall be determined subject to any limitation under section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(e) APPLICATION OF OASDI TAX PROVISIONS OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 TO AFFECTED INDIVIDUALS AND EMPLOYING AGENCIES.—A covered individual and the individual’s employing agency shall be deemed to have fully satisfied in a timely manner their responsibilities with respect to the taxes imposed by sections 3101(a), 3102(a), and 3111(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 on the wages paid by the employing agency to such individual during the entire period such individual was erroneously subject to CSRS coverage as a result of a retirement coverage error based on the payments and transfers made under subsections (c) and (d). No credit or refund of taxes on such wages shall be allowed as a result of this subsection.

SEC. 205. THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.

(a) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies to an individual who—

(1) is eligible to make an election of coverage under section 101 or 102, and only if FERS coverage is elected (or remains in effect) for the employee involved; or

(2) is described in section 111, and makes or has made retroactive employee contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund under regulations prescribed by the Executive Director.

(b) PAYMENT INTO THRIFT SAVINGS FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) PAYMENT.—With respect to an individual to whom this section applies, the employing agency shall pay to the Thrift Sav-

ings Fund under subchapter III of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, for credit to the account of the employee involved, an amount equal to the earnings which are disallowed under section 8432a(a)(2) of such title on the employee’s retroactive contributions to such Fund.

(B) AMOUNT.—Earnings under subparagraph (A) shall be computed in accordance with the procedures for computing lost earnings under section 8432a of title 5, United States Code. The amount paid by the employing agency shall be treated for all purposes as if that amount had actually been earned on the basis of the employee’s contributions.

(C) EXCEPTIONS.—If an individual made retroactive contributions before the effective date of the regulations under section 101(c), the Director may provide for an alternative calculation of lost earnings to the extent that a calculation under subparagraph (B) is not administratively feasible. The alternative calculation shall yield an amount that is as close as practicable to the amount computed under subparagraph (B), taking into account earnings previously paid.

(2) ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION.—In cases in which the retirement coverage error was corrected before the effective date of the regulations under section 101(c), the employee involved shall have an additional opportunity to make retroactive contributions for the period of the retirement coverage error (subject to applicable limits), and such contributions (including any contributions made after the date of the correction) shall be treated in accordance with paragraph (1).

(c) REGULATIONS.—

(1) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The Executive Director shall prescribe regulations appropriate to carry out this section relating to retroactive employee contributions and payments made on or after the effective date of the regulations under section 101(c).

(2) OFFICE.—The Office, in consultation with the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, shall prescribe regulations appropriate to carry out this section relating to the calculation of lost earnings on retroactive employee contributions made before the effective date of the regulations under section 101(c).

SEC. 206. CERTAIN AGENCY AMOUNTS TO BE PAID INTO OR REMAIN IN THE CSRDF.

(a) CERTAIN EXCESS AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS TO REMAIN IN THE CSRDF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any amount described under paragraph (2) shall—

(A) remain in the CSRDF; and

(B) may not be paid or credited to an agency.

(2) AMOUNTS.—Paragraph (1) refers to any amount of contributions made by an agency under section 8423 of title 5, United States Code, on behalf of any employee, former employee, or annuitant (or survivor of such employee, former employee, or annuitant) who makes an election to correct a retirement coverage error under this Act, that the Office determines to be excess as a result of such election.

(b) ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT DEDUCTIONS TO BE PAID BY AGENCY.—If a correction in a retirement coverage error results in an increase in employee deductions under section 8334 or 8422 of title 5, United States Code, that cannot be fully paid by a reallocation of otherwise available amounts previously deducted from the employee’s pay as employment taxes or retirement deductions, the employing agency—

(1) shall pay the required additional amount into the CSRDF; and

(2) shall not seek repayment of that amount from the employee, former employee, annuitant, or survivor.

SEC. 207. CSRS COVERAGE DETERMINATIONS TO BE APPROVED BY OPM.

No agency shall place an individual under CSRS coverage unless—

(1) the individual has been employed with CSRS coverage within the preceding 365 days; or

(2) the Office has agreed in writing that the agency's coverage determination is correct.

SEC. 208. DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS BY DIRECTOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management may—

(1) extend the deadlines for making elections under this Act in circumstances involving an individual's inability to make a timely election due to a cause beyond the individual's control;

(2) provide for the reimbursement of necessary and reasonable expenses incurred by an individual with respect to settlement of a claim for losses resulting from a retirement coverage error, including attorney's fees, court costs, and other actual expenses;

(3) compensate an individual for monetary losses that are a direct and proximate result of a retirement coverage error, excluding claimed losses relating to forgone contributions and earnings under the Thrift Savings Plan under subchapter III of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, and all other investment opportunities; and

(4) waive payments required due to correction of a retirement coverage error under this Act.

(b) SIMILAR ACTIONS.—In exercising the authority under this section, the Director shall, to the extent practicable, provide for similar actions in situations involving similar circumstances.

(c) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Actions taken under this section are final and conclusive, and are not subject to administrative or judicial review.

(d) REGULATIONS.—The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe regulations regarding the process and criteria used in exercising the authority under this section.

(e) REPORT.—The Office of Personnel Management shall, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for each year in which the authority provided in this section is used, submit a report to each House of Congress on the operation of this section.

SEC. 209. REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the regulations specifically authorized in this Act, the Office may prescribe such other regulations as are necessary for the administration of this Act.

(b) FORMER SPOUSE.—The regulations prescribed under this Act shall provide for protection of the rights of a former spouse with entitlement to an apportionment of benefits or to survivor benefits based on the service of the employee.

TITLE III—OTHER PROVISIONS**SEC. 301. PROVISIONS TO AUTHORIZE CONTINUED CONFORMITY OF OTHER FEDERAL RETIREMENT SYSTEMS.**

(a) FOREIGN SERVICE.—Sections 827 and 851 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4067 and 4071) shall apply with respect to this Act in the same manner as if this Act were part of—

(1) the Civil Service Retirement System, to the extent this Act relates to the Civil Service Retirement System; and

(2) the Federal Employees' Retirement System, to the extent this Act relates to the Federal Employees' Retirement System.

(b) CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.—Sections 292 and 301 of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act (50 U.S.C. 2141 and 2151) shall apply with respect to this Act in the same manner as if this Act were part of—

(1) the Civil Service Retirement System, to the extent this Act relates to the Civil Service Retirement System; and

(2) the Federal Employees' Retirement System, to the extent this Act relates to the Federal Employees' Retirement System.

SEC. 302. AUTHORIZATION OF PAYMENTS.

All payments authorized or required by this Act to be paid from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, together with administrative expenses incurred by the Office in administering this Act, shall be deemed to have been authorized to be paid from that Fund, which is appropriated for the payment thereof.

SEC. 303. INDIVIDUAL RIGHT OF ACTION PRESERVED FOR AMOUNTS NOT OTHERWISE PROVIDED FOR UNDER THIS ACT.

Nothing in this Act shall preclude an individual from bringing a claim against the Government of the United States which such individual may have under section 1346(b) or chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, or any other provision of law (except to the extent the claim is for any amounts otherwise provided for under this Act).

TITLE IV—TAX PROVISIONS**SEC. 401. TAX PROVISIONS.**

(a) PLAN QUALIFICATION.—No retirement plan of the United States (or any agency thereof) shall fail to be treated as a qualified plan under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by reason of—

(1) any failure to follow plan terms as addressed by this Act; or

(2) any action taken under this Act.

(b) TRANSFERS.—For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, no amount shall be includible in the gross income of any individual in any tax year by reason of any direct transfer under this Act between funds or any Government contribution under this Act to any fund or account in any such tax year.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS RETIREMENT PROVISIONS**SEC. 501. FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD PORTABILITY OF SERVICE CREDIT.**

(a) CREDITABLE SERVICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8411(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “of the preceding provisions” and inserting “other paragraph”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) a period of service (other than any service under any other paragraph of this subsection, any military service, and any service performed in the employ of a Federal Reserve Bank) that was creditable under the Bank plan (as defined in subsection (i)), if the employee waives credit for such service under the Bank plan and makes a payment to the Fund equal to the amount that would have been deducted from pay under section 8422(a) had the employee been subject to this chapter during such period of service (together with interest on such amount computed under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 8334(e)).

Paragraph (5) shall not apply in the case of any employee as to whom subsection (g) (or, to the extent subchapter III of chapter 83 is involved, section 8332(n)) otherwise applies.”.

(2) BANK PLAN DEFINED.—Section 8411 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) For purposes of subsection (b)(5), the term ‘Bank plan’ means the benefit structure—

“(1) in which employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System ap-

pointed on or after January 1, 1984, participate; and

“(2) that is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (and any redesignated or successor version of such benefit structure, if so identified in writing by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for purposes of this chapter).”.

(b) EXCLUSION FROM CHAPTER 84.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 8402(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the matter before subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(2)(A) any employee or Member who has separated from the service after—

“(i) having been subject to—

“(I) subchapter III of chapter 83 of this title;

“(II) subchapter I of chapter 8 of title I of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4041 et seq.); or

“(III) the benefit structure for employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed before January 1, 1984, that is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act; and

“(ii) having completed—

“(I) at least 5 years of civilian service creditable under subchapter III of chapter 83 of this title;

“(II) at least 5 years of civilian service creditable under subchapter I of chapter 8 of title I of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4041 et seq.); or

“(III) at least 5 years of civilian service (other than any service performed in the employ of a Federal Reserve Bank) creditable under the benefit structure for employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed before January 1, 1984, that is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act,

determined without regard to any deposit or redeposit requirement under either such subchapter or under such benefit structure, or any requirement that the individual become subject to either such subchapter or to such benefit structure after performing the service involved; or”.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (d) of section 8402 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(d) Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) shall not apply to an individual who—

“(1) becomes subject to—

“(A) subchapter II of chapter 8 of title I of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4071 et seq.) (relating to the Foreign Service Pension System) pursuant to an election; or

“(B) the benefit structure in which employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed on or after January 1, 1984, participate, which benefit structure is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (and any redesignated or successor version of such benefit structure, if so identified in writing by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for purposes of this chapter); and

“(2) subsequently enters a position in which, but for paragraph (2) of subsection (b), such individual would be subject to this chapter.”.

(c) PROVISIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES.—A former employee of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System who—

(1) has at least 5 years of civilian service (other than any service performed in the employ of a Federal Reserve Bank) creditable

under the benefit structure for employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed before January 1, 1984, that is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act;

(2) was subsequently employed subject to the benefit structure in which employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed on or after January 1, 1984, participate, which benefit structure is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (and any redesignated or successor version of such benefit structure, if so identified in writing by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for purposes of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code); and

(3) after service described in paragraph (2), becomes subject to and thereafter entitled to benefits under chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code,

shall, for purposes of section 302 of the Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986 (5 U.S.C. 8331 note; Public Law 99-335; 100 Stat. 601) be considered to have become subject to chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, pursuant to an election under section 301 of such Act.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), this section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PROVISIONS RELATING TO CREDITABILITY AND CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES.—The amendments made by subsection (a) and the provisions of subsection (c) shall apply only to individuals who separate from service subject to chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) PROVISIONS RELATING TO EXCLUSION FROM CHAPTER.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall not apply to any former employee of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System who, subsequent to his or her last period of service as an employee of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and prior to the date of enactment of this Act, became subject to subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, under the law in effect at the time of the individual's appointment.

SEC. 502. CERTAIN TRANSFERS TO BE TREATED AS A SEPARATION FROM SERVICE FOR PURPOSES OF THE THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 84 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting before section 8432 the following:

“§ 8431. Certain transfers to be treated as a separation

“(a) For purposes of this subchapter, separation from Government employment includes a transfer from a position that is subject to one of the retirement systems described in subsection (b) to a position that is not subject to any such system.

“(b) The retirement systems described in this subsection are—

“(1) the retirement system under this chapter;

“(2) the retirement system under subchapter III of chapter 83; and

“(3) any other retirement system under which individuals may contribute to the Thrift Savings Fund through withholdings from pay.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 84 of title 5, United

States Code, is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 8432 the following:

“8431. Certain transfers to be treated as a separation.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (b) of section 8351 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (8), and by adding at the end the following:

“(9) For the purpose of this section, separation from Government employment includes a transfer described in section 8431.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to transfers occurring before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, except that, for purposes of applying such amendments with respect to any transfer occurring before such date of enactment, the date of such transfer shall be considered to be the date of enactment of this Act. The Executive Director (within the meaning of section 8401(13) of title 5, United States Code) may prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out this subsection.

TITLE VI—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 601. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

HUTCHISON AMENDMENT NO. 2509

Mr. GRAMM (for Mrs. HUTCHISON) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 3194) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—FISCAL YEAR 2000 APPROPRIATIONS FEDERAL FUNDS

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR RESIDENT TUITION SUPPORT

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia for a program to be administered by the Mayor for District of Columbia resident tuition support, subject to the enactment of authorizing legislation for such program by Congress, \$17,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such funds may be used on behalf of eligible District of Columbia residents to pay an amount based upon the difference between in-State and out-of-State tuition at public institutions of higher education, usable at both public and private institutions of higher education: Provided further, That the awarding of such funds may be prioritized on the basis of a resident's academic merit and such other factors as may be authorized: Provided further, That if the authorized program is a nationwide program, the Mayor may expend up to \$17,000,000: Provided further, That if the authorized program is for a limited number of States, the Mayor may expend up to \$11,000,000: Provided further, That the District of Columbia may expend funds other than the funds provided under this heading, including local tax revenues and contributions, to support such program.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR INCENTIVES FOR ADOPTION OF CHILDREN

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia to create incentives to promote the adoption of children in the District of Columbia foster care system, \$5,000,000: Provided, That such funds shall remain available until September 30, 2001 and shall be used in accordance with a program established by the Mayor and the Council of the District of Columbia and approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided further, That funds provided under this heading may be used to cover the costs to the District of Columbia of providing tax credits to offset the costs incurred by individuals in adopting children in the District of Columbia foster care system and in providing for the health care needs of such children, in accordance with legislation enacted by the District of Columbia government.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE CITIZEN COMPLAINT REVIEW BOARD

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia for administrative expenses of the Citizen Complaint Review Board, \$500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

For a Federal payment to the Department of Human Services for a mentoring program and for hotline services, \$250,000.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CORRECTIONS TRUSTEE OPERATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the District of Columbia Corrections Trustee, \$176,000,000 for the administration and operation of correctional facilities and for the administrative operating costs of the Office of the Corrections Trustee, as authorized by section 11202 of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-33; 111 Stat. 712): Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act for the District of Columbia Corrections Trustee shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of other Federal agencies: Provided further, That in addition to the funds provided under this heading, the District of Columbia Corrections Trustee may use a portion of the interest earned on the Federal payment made to the Trustee under the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1998, (not to exceed \$4,600,000) to carry out the activities funded under this heading.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

For salaries and expenses for the District of Columbia Courts, \$99,714,000 to be allocated as follows: for the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, \$7,209,000; for the District of Columbia Superior Court, \$68,351,000; for the District of Columbia Court System, \$16,154,000; and \$8,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001, for capital improvements for District of Columbia courthouse facilities: Provided, That of the amounts available for operations of the District of Columbia Courts, not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be for the design of an Integrated Justice Information System and that such funds shall be used in accordance with a plan and design developed by the courts and approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all amounts under this heading shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of other Federal agencies, with payroll and financial services to be provided on a contractual basis with the General Services Administration (GSA), said services to include the preparation

of monthly financial reports, copies of which shall be submitted directly by GSA to the President and to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

DEFENDER SERVICES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

For payments authorized under section 11-2604 and section 11-2605, D.C. Code (relating to representation provided under the District of Columbia Criminal Justice Act), payments for counsel appointed in proceedings in the Family Division of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia under chapter 23 of title 16, D.C. Code, and payments for counsel authorized under section 21-2060, D.C. Code (relating to representation provided under the District of Columbia Guardianship, Protective Proceedings, and Durable Power of Attorney Act of 1986), \$33,336,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the funds provided in this Act under the heading "Federal Payment to the District of Columbia Courts" (other than the \$8,000,000 provided under such heading for capital improvements for District of Columbia courthouse facilities) may also be used for payments under this heading: Provided further, That in addition to the funds provided under this heading, the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration in the District of Columbia may use a portion (not to exceed \$1,200,000) of the interest earned on the Federal payment made to the District of Columbia courts under the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1999, together with funds provided in this Act under the heading "Federal Payment to the District of Columbia Courts" (other than the \$8,000,000 provided under such heading for capital improvements for District of Columbia courthouse facilities), to make payments described under this heading for obligations incurred during fiscal year 1999 if the Comptroller General certifies that the amount of obligations lawfully incurred for such payments during fiscal year 1999 exceeds the obligational authority otherwise available for making such payments: Provided further, That such funds shall be administered by the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration in the District of Columbia: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, this appropriation shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for expenses of other Federal agencies, with payroll and financial services to be provided on a contractual basis with the General Services Administration (GSA), said services to include the preparation of monthly financial reports, copies of which shall be submitted directly by GSA to the President and to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For salaries and expenses of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, as authorized by the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, (Public Law 105-33; 111 Stat. 712), \$93,800,000, of which \$58,600,000 shall be for necessary expenses of Parole Revocation, Adult Probation, Offender Supervision, and Sex Offender Registration, to include expenses relating to supervision of adults subject to protection orders or provision of services for or related to such persons; \$17,400,000 shall be available to the Public Defender Service; and \$17,800,000 shall be available to the Pretrial Services Agency: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all amounts under this heading shall be appor-

tioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of other Federal agencies: Provided further, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$20,492,000 shall be used in support of universal drug screening and testing for those individuals on pretrial, probation, or parole supervision with continued testing, intermediate sanctions, and treatment for those identified in need, of which \$7,000,000 shall be for treatment services.

CHILDREN'S NATIONAL MEDICAL CENTER

For a Federal contribution to the Children's National Medical Center in the District of Columbia, \$2,500,000 for construction, renovation, and information technology infrastructure costs associated with establishing community pediatric health clinics for high risk children in medically underserved areas of the District of Columbia.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

For payment to the Metropolitan Police Department, \$1,000,000, for a program to eliminate open air drug trafficking in the District of Columbia: Provided, That the Chief of Police shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives by the 15th calendar day after the end of each quarter beginning December 31, 1999, on the status of the project financed under this heading.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS OPERATING EXPENSES DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The following amounts are appropriated for the District of Columbia for the current fiscal year out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, except as otherwise specifically provided.

GOVERNMENTAL DIRECTION AND SUPPORT

Governmental direction and support, \$162,356,000 (including \$137,134,000 from local funds, \$11,670,000 from Federal funds, and \$13,552,000 from other funds): Provided, That not to exceed \$2,500 for the Mayor, \$2,500 for the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, and \$2,500 for the City Administrator shall be available from this appropriation for official purposes: Provided further, That any program fees collected from the issuance of debt shall be available for the payment of expenses of the debt management program of the District of Columbia: Provided further, That no revenues from Federal sources shall be used to support the operations or activities of the Statehood Commission and Statehood Compact Commission: Provided further, That the District of Columbia shall identify the sources of funding for Admission to Statehood from its own locally-generated revenues: Provided further, That all employees permanently assigned to work in the Office of the Mayor shall be paid from funds allocated to the Office of the Mayor: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law now or hereafter enacted, no Member of the District of Columbia Council eligible to earn a part-time salary of \$92,520, exclusive of the Council Chairman, shall be paid a salary of more than \$84,635 during fiscal year 2000.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION

Economic development and regulation, \$190,335,000 (including \$52,911,000 from local funds, \$84,751,000 from Federal funds, and \$52,673,000 from other funds), of which \$15,000,000 collected by the District of Columbia in the form of BID tax revenue shall be paid to the respective BIDs pursuant to the Business Improvement Districts Act of 1996 (D.C. Law 11-134; D.C. Code, sec. 1-2271 et seq.), and the Business Improvement Districts Temporary Amendment Act of 1997 (D.C. Law 12-23): Provided, That such funds are available for acquiring services provided by the General Services

Administration: Provided further, That Business Improvement Districts shall be exempt from taxes levied by the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE

Public safety and justice, including purchase or lease of 135 passenger-carrying vehicles for replacement only, including 130 for police-type use and five for fire-type use, without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, \$778,770,000 (including \$565,511,000 from local funds, \$29,012,000 from Federal funds, and \$184,247,000 from other funds): Provided, That the Metropolitan Police Department is authorized to replace not to exceed 25 passenger-carrying vehicles and the Department of Fire and Emergency Medical Services of the District of Columbia is authorized to replace not to exceed five passenger-carrying vehicles annually whenever the cost of repair to any damaged vehicle exceeds three-fourths of the cost of the replacement: Provided further, That not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available from this appropriation for the Chief of Police for the prevention and detection of crime: Provided further, That the Metropolitan Police Department shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on efforts to increase efficiency and improve the professionalism in the department: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, or Mayor's Order 86-45, issued March 18, 1986, the Metropolitan Police Department's delegated small purchase authority shall be \$500,000: Provided further, That the District of Columbia government may not require the Metropolitan Police Department to submit to any other procurement review process, or to obtain the approval of or be restricted in any manner by any official or employee of the District of Columbia government, for purchases that do not exceed \$500,000: Provided further, That the Mayor shall reimburse the District of Columbia National Guard for expenses incurred in connection with services that are performed in emergencies by the National Guard in a militia status and are requested by the Mayor, in amounts that shall be jointly determined and certified as due and payable for these services by the Mayor and the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard: Provided further, That such sums as may be necessary for reimbursement to the District of Columbia National Guard under the preceding proviso shall be available from this appropriation, and the availability of the sums shall be deemed as constituting payment in advance for emergency services involved: Provided further, That the Metropolitan Police Department is authorized to maintain 3,800 sworn officers, with leave for a 50 officer attrition: Provided further, That no more than 15 members of the Metropolitan Police Department shall be detailed or assigned to the Executive Protection Unit, until the Chief of Police submits a recommendation to the Council for its review: Provided further, That \$100,000 shall be available for inmates released on medical and geriatric parole: Provided further, That commencing on December 31, 1999, the Metropolitan Police Department shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives, quarterly reports on the status of crime reduction in each of the 83 police service areas established throughout the District of Columbia: Provided further, That up to \$700,000 in local funds shall be available for the operations of the Citizen Complaint Review Board.

PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM

Public education system, including the development of national defense education programs, \$867,411,000 (including \$721,847,000 from local funds, \$120,951,000 from Federal funds, and \$24,613,000 from other funds), to be allocated as

follows: \$713,197,000 (including \$600,936,000 from local funds, \$106,213,000 from Federal funds, and \$6,048,000 from other funds), for the public schools of the District of Columbia; \$10,700,000 from local funds for the District of Columbia Teachers' Retirement Fund; \$17,000,000 from local funds, previously appropriated in this Act as a Federal payment, for resident tuition support at public and private institutions of higher learning for eligible District of Columbia residents; \$27,885,000 from local funds for public charter schools: Provided, That if the entirety of this allocation has not been provided as payments to any public charter schools currently in operation through the per pupil funding formula, the funds shall be available for new public charter schools on a per pupil basis: Provided further, That \$480,000 of this amount shall be available to the District of Columbia Public Charter School Board for administrative costs; \$72,347,000 (including \$40,491,000 from local funds, \$13,536,000 from Federal funds, and \$18,320,000 from other funds) for the University of the District of Columbia; \$24,171,000 (including \$23,128,000 from local funds, \$798,000 from Federal funds, and \$245,000 from other funds) for the Public Library; \$2,111,000 (including \$1,707,000 from local funds and \$404,000 from Federal funds) for the Commission on the Arts and Humanities: Provided further, That the public schools of the District of Columbia are authorized to accept not to exceed 31 motor vehicles for exclusive use in the driver education program: Provided further, That not to exceed \$2,500 for the Superintendent of Schools, \$2,500 for the President of the University of the District of Columbia, and \$2,000 for the Public Librarian shall be available from this appropriation for official purposes: Provided further, That none of the funds contained in this Act may be made available to pay the salaries of any District of Columbia Public School teacher, principal, administrator, official, or employee who knowingly provides false enrollment or attendance information under article II, section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved February 4, 1925 (D.C. Code, sec. 31-401 et seq.): Provided further, That this appropriation shall not be available to subsidize the education of any non-resident of the District of Columbia at any District of Columbia public elementary and secondary school during fiscal year 2000 unless the nonresident pays tuition to the District of Columbia at a rate that covers 100 percent of the costs incurred by the District of Columbia which are attributable to the education of the nonresident (as established by the Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools): Provided further, That this appropriation shall not be available to subsidize the education of non-residents of the District of Columbia at the University of the District of Columbia, unless the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia adopts, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, a tuition rate schedule that will establish the tuition rate for non-resident students at a level no lower than the nonresident tuition rate charged at comparable public institutions of higher education in the metropolitan area: Provided further, That the District of Columbia Public Schools shall not spend less than \$365,500,000 on local schools through the Weighted Student Formula in fiscal year 2000: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia shall apportion from the budget of the District of Columbia Public Schools a sum totaling 5 percent of the total budget to be set aside until the current student count for Public and Charter schools has been completed, and that this amount shall be apportioned between the Public and Charter schools based on their respective student population count: Provided further, That the District of Columbia Public Schools

may spend \$500,000 to engage in a Schools Without Violence program based on a model developed by the University of North Carolina, located in Greensboro, North Carolina.

HUMAN SUPPORT SERVICES

Human support services, \$1,526,361,000 (including \$635,373,000 from local funds, \$875,814,000 from Federal funds, and \$15,174,000 from other funds): Provided, That \$25,150,000 of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, shall be available solely for District of Columbia employees' disability compensation: Provided further, That a peer review committee shall be established to review medical payments and the type of service received by a disability compensation claimant: Provided further, That the District of Columbia shall not provide free government services such as water, sewer, solid waste disposal or collection, utilities, maintenance, repairs, or similar services to any legally constituted private nonprofit organization, as defined in section 411(5) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (101 Stat. 485; Public Law 100-77; 42 U.S.C. 11371), providing emergency shelter services in the District, if the District would not be qualified to receive reimbursement pursuant to such Act (101 Stat. 485; Public Law 100-77; 42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.).

PUBLIC WORKS

Public works, including rental of one passenger-carrying vehicle for use by the Mayor and three passenger-carrying vehicles for use by the Council of the District of Columbia and leasing of passenger-carrying vehicles, \$271,395,000 (including \$258,341,000 from local funds, \$3,099,000 from Federal funds, and \$9,955,000 from other funds): Provided, That this appropriation shall not be available for collecting ashes or miscellaneous refuse from hotels and places of business.

RECEIVERSHIP PROGRAMS

For all agencies of the District of Columbia government under court ordered receivership, \$342,077,000 (including \$217,606,000 from local funds, \$106,111,000 from Federal funds, and \$18,360,000 from other funds).

WORKFORCE INVESTMENTS

For workforce investments, \$8,500,000 from local funds, to be transferred by the Mayor of the District of Columbia within the various appropriation headings in this Act for which employees are properly payable.

RESERVE

For a reserve to be established by the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, \$150,000,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE AUTHORITY

For the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, established by section 101(a) of the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995 (109 Stat. 97; Public Law 104-8), \$3,140,000: Provided, That none of the funds contained in this Act may be used to pay any compensation of the Executive Director or General Counsel of the Authority at a rate in excess of the maximum rate of compensation which may be paid to such individual during fiscal year 2000 under section 102 of such Act, as determined by the Comptroller General (as described in GAO letter report B-279095.2).

REPAYMENT OF LOANS AND INTEREST

For payment of principal, interest and certain fees directly resulting from borrowing by the District of Columbia to fund District of Columbia capital projects as authorized by sections 462, 475, and 490 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, approved December 24, 1973, as amended, and that funds shall be allocated for expenses associated with the Wilson Building,

\$328,417,000 from local funds: Provided, That for equipment leases, the Mayor may finance \$27,527,000 of equipment cost, plus cost of issuance not to exceed 2 percent of the par amount being financed on a lease purchase basis with a maturity not to exceed 5 years: Provided further, That \$5,300,000 is allocated to the Metropolitan Police Department, \$3,200,000 for the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department, \$350,000 for the Department of Corrections, \$15,949,000 for the Department of Public Works and \$2,728,000 for the Public Benefit Corporation.

REPAYMENT OF GENERAL FUND RECOVERY DEBT

For the purpose of eliminating the \$331,589,000 general fund accumulated deficit as of September 30, 1990, \$38,286,000 from local funds, as authorized by section 461(a) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (105 Stat. 540; D.C. Code, sec. 47-321(a)(1)).

PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON SHORT-TERM BORROWING

For payment of interest on short-term borrowing, \$9,000,000 from local funds.

CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION

For lease payments in accordance with the Certificates of Participation involving the land site underlying the building located at One Judiciary Square, \$7,950,000 from local funds.

OPTICAL AND DENTAL INSURANCE PAYMENTS

For optical and dental insurance payments, \$1,295,000 from local funds.

PRODUCTIVITY BANK

The Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia, under the direction of the Mayor and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, shall finance projects totaling \$20,000,000 in local funds that result in cost savings or additional revenues, by an amount equal to such financing: Provided, That the Mayor shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate by the 15th calendar day after the end of each quarter beginning December 31, 1999, on the status of the projects financed under this heading.

PRODUCTIVITY BANK SAVINGS

The Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia, under the direction of the Mayor and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, shall make reductions totaling \$20,000,000 in local funds. The reductions are to be allocated to projects funded through the Productivity Bank that produce cost savings or additional revenues in an amount equal to the Productivity Bank financing: Provided, That the Mayor shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate by the 15th calendar day after the end of each quarter beginning December 31, 1999, on the status of the cost savings or additional revenues funded under this heading.

PROCUREMENT AND MANAGEMENT SAVINGS

The Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia, under the direction of the Mayor and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, shall make reductions of \$14,457,000 for general supply schedule savings and \$7,000,000 for management reform savings, in local funds to one or more of the appropriation headings in this Act: Provided, That the Mayor shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate by the 15th calendar day after the end of each quarter beginning December 31, 1999, on the status of the general supply schedule savings and management reform savings projected under this heading.

ENTERPRISE AND OTHER FUNDS
WATER AND SEWER AUTHORITY AND THE
WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT

For operation of the Water and Sewer Authority and the Washington Aqueduct, \$279,608,000 from other funds (including \$236,075,000 for the Water and Sewer Authority and \$43,533,000 for the Washington Aqueduct) of which \$35,222,000 shall be apportioned and payable to the District's debt service fund for repayment of loans and interest incurred for capital improvement projects.

For construction projects, \$197,169,000, as authorized by the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the laying of watermains and service sewers in the District of Columbia, the levying of assessments therefor, and for other purposes" (33 Stat. 244; Public Law 58-140; D.C. Code, sec. 43-1512 et seq.): Provided, That the requirements and restrictions that are applicable to general fund capital improvements projects and set forth in this Act under the Capital Outlay appropriation title shall apply to projects approved under this appropriation title.

LOTTERY AND CHARITABLE GAMES ENTERPRISE
FUND

For the Lottery and Charitable Games Enterprise Fund, established by the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 (95 Stat. 1174 and 1175; Public Law 97-91), for the purpose of implementing the Law to Legalize Lotteries, Daily Numbers Games, and Bingo and Raffles for Charitable Purposes in the District of Columbia (D.C. Law 3-172; D.C. Code, sec. 2-2501 et seq. and sec. 22-1516 et seq.), \$234,400,000: Provided, That the District of Columbia shall identify the source of funding for this appropriation title from the District's own locally generated revenues: Provided further, That no revenues from Federal sources shall be used to support the operations or activities of the Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board.

SPORTS AND ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION

For the Sports and Entertainment Commission, \$10,846,000 from other funds for expenses incurred by the Armory Board in the exercise of its powers granted by the Act entitled "An Act To Establish A District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes" (62 Stat. 339; D.C. Code, sec. 2-301 et seq.) and the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 619; Public Law 85-300; D.C. Code, sec. 2-321 et seq.): Provided, That the Mayor shall submit a budget for the Armory Board for the forthcoming fiscal year as required by section 442(b) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (87 Stat. 824; Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 47-301(b)).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HEALTH AND HOSPITALS
PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

For the District of Columbia Health and Hospitals Public Benefit Corporation, established by D.C. Law 11-212; D.C. Code, sec. 32-262.2, \$133,443,000 of which \$44,435,000 shall be derived by transfer from the general fund and \$89,008,000 from other funds.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RETIREMENT BOARD

For the District of Columbia Retirement Board, established by section 121 of the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act of 1979 (93 Stat. 866; D.C. Code, sec. 1-711), \$9,892,000 from the earnings of the applicable retirement funds to pay legal, management, investment, and other fees and administrative expenses of the District of Columbia Retirement Board: Provided, That the District of Columbia Retirement Board shall provide to the Congress and to the Council of the District of Columbia a quarterly report of the allocations of charges by fund and of expenditures of all funds: Provided further, That the District of Columbia Retirement Board shall provide the Mayor, for transmittal to the Council of the District of Columbia, an itemized accounting of the planned use of appropriated funds in time for each annual budget submission

and the actual use of such funds in time for each annual audited financial report: Provided further, That section 121(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1-711(c)(1)) is amended by striking "the total amount to which a member may be entitled" and all that follows and inserting the following: "the total amount to which a member may be entitled under this subsection during a year (beginning with 1998) may not exceed \$5,000, except that in the case of the Chairman of the Board and the Chairman of the Investment Committee of the Board, such amount may not exceed \$7,500 (beginning with 2000)."

CORRECTIONAL INDUSTRIES FUND

For the Correctional Industries Fund, established by the District of Columbia Correctional Industries Establishment Act (78 Stat. 1000; Public Law 88-622), \$1,810,000 from other funds.

WASHINGTON CONVENTION CENTER ENTERPRISE
FUND

For the Washington Convention Center Enterprise Fund, \$50,226,000 from other funds.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

For construction projects, \$1,260,524,000 of which \$929,450,000 is from local funds, \$54,050,000 is from the highway trust fund, and \$277,024,000 is from Federal funds, and a rescission of \$41,886,500 from local funds appropriated under this heading in prior fiscal years, for a net amount of \$1,218,637,500 to remain available until expended: Provided, That funds for use of each capital project implementing agency shall be managed and controlled in accordance with all procedures and limitations established under the Financial Management System: Provided further, That all funds provided by this appropriation title shall be available only for the specific projects and purposes intended: Provided further, That notwithstanding the foregoing, all authorizations for capital outlay projects, except those projects covered by the first sentence of section 23(a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 827; Public Law 90-495; D.C. Code, sec. 7-134, note), for which funds are provided by this appropriation title, shall expire on September 30, 2001, except authorizations for projects as to which funds have been obligated in whole or in part prior to September 30, 2001: Provided further, That upon expiration of any such project authorization, the funds provided herein for the project shall lapse.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 102. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, all vouchers covering expenditures of appropriations contained in this Act shall be audited before payment by the designated certifying official, and the vouchers as approved shall be paid by checks issued by the designated disbursing official.

SEC. 103. Whenever in this Act, an amount is specified within an appropriation for particular purposes or objects of expenditure, such amount, unless otherwise specified, shall be considered as the maximum amount that may be expended for said purpose or object rather than an amount set apart exclusively therefor.

SEC. 104. Appropriations in this Act shall be available, when authorized by the Mayor, for allowances for privately owned automobiles and motorcycles used for the performance of official duties at rates established by the Mayor: Provided, That such rates shall not exceed the maximum prevailing rates for such vehicles as prescribed in the Federal Property Management Regulations 101-7 (Federal Travel Regulations).

SEC. 105. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for expenses of travel and for the payment of dues of organizations concerned with the work of the District of Columbia government, when authorized by the Mayor: Provided, That in the case of the Council of the District of Columbia, funds may be expended with the authorization of the chair of the Council.

SEC. 106. There are appropriated from the applicable funds of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary for making refunds and for the payment of judgments that have been entered against the District of Columbia government: Provided, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as modifying or affecting the provisions of section 11(c)(3) of title XII of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (70 Stat. 78; Public Law 84-460; D.C. Code, sec. 47-1812.11(c)(3)).

SEC. 107. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for the payment of public assistance without reference to the requirement of section 544 of the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1982 (D.C. Law 4-101; D.C. Code, sec. 3-205.44), and for the payment of the non-Federal share of funds necessary to qualify for grants under subtitle A of title II of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.

SEC. 108. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 109. No funds appropriated in this Act for the District of Columbia government for the operation of educational institutions, the compensation of personnel, or for other educational purposes may be used to permit, encourage, facilitate, or further partisan political activities. Nothing herein is intended to prohibit the availability of school buildings for the use of any community or partisan political group during non-school hours.

SEC. 110. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be made available to pay the salary of any employee of the District of Columbia government whose name, title, grade, salary, past work experience, and salary history are not available for inspection by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the House Committee on Government Reform, the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, and the Council of the District of Columbia, or their duly authorized representative.

SEC. 111. There are appropriated from the applicable funds of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary for making payments authorized by the District of Columbia Revenue Recovery Act of 1977 (D.C. Law 2-20; D.C. Code, sec. 47-421 et seq.).

SEC. 112. No part of this appropriation shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes or implementation of any policy including boycott designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress or any State legislature.

SEC. 113. At the start of the fiscal year, the Mayor shall develop an annual plan, by quarter and by project, for capital outlay borrowings: Provided, That within a reasonable time after the close of each quarter, the Mayor shall report to the Council of the District of Columbia and the Congress the actual borrowings and spending progress compared with projections.

SEC. 114. The Mayor shall not borrow any funds for capital projects unless the Mayor has obtained prior approval from the Council of the District of Columbia, by resolution, identifying the projects and amounts to be financed with such borrowings.

SEC. 115. The Mayor shall not expend any moneys borrowed for capital projects for the operating expenses of the District of Columbia government.

SEC. 116. None of the funds provided under this Act to the agencies funded by this Act, both

Federal and District government agencies, that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2000, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for an agency through a reprogramming of funds which: (1) creates new programs; (2) eliminates a program, project, or responsibility center; (3) establishes or changes allocations specifically denied, limited or increased by Congress in this Act; (4) increases funds or personnel by any means for any program, project, or responsibility center for which funds have been denied or restricted; (5) reestablishes through reprogramming any program or project previously deferred through reprogramming; (6) augments existing programs, projects, or responsibility centers through a reprogramming of funds in excess of \$1,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or (7) increases by 20 percent or more personnel assigned to a specific program, project, or responsibility center; unless the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and House of Representatives are notified in writing 30 days in advance of any reprogramming as set forth in this section.

SEC. 117. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act shall be obligated or expended to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of the District of Columbia government.

SEC. 118. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act shall be obligated or expended to procure passenger automobiles as defined in the Automobile Fuel Efficiency Act of 1980 (94 Stat. 1824; Public Law 96-425; 15 U.S.C. 2001(2)), with an Environmental Protection Agency estimated miles per gallon average of less than 22 miles per gallon: Provided, That this section shall not apply to security, emergency rescue, or armored vehicles.

SEC. 119. (a) CITY ADMINISTRATOR.—The last sentence of section 422(7) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1-242(7)) is amended by striking “, not to exceed” and all that follows and inserting a period.

(b) BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY.—Section 1108(c)(2)(F) of the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-612.8(c)(2)(F)) is amended to read as follows:

“(F) Redevelopment Land Agency board members shall be paid per diem compensation at a rate established by the Mayor, except that such rate may not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level 15 of the District Schedule for each day (including travel time) during which they are engaged in the actual performance of their duties.”.

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the provisions of the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 (D.C. Law 2-139; D.C. Code, sec. 1-601.1 et seq.), enacted pursuant to section 422(3) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (87 Stat. 790; Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 1-242(3)), shall apply with respect to the compensation of District of Columbia employees: Provided, That for pay purposes, employees of the District of Columbia government shall not be subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 121. No later than 30 days after the end of the first quarter of the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall submit to the Council of the District of Columbia the new fiscal year 2000 revenue estimates as of the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 2000. These estimates shall be used in the budget request for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001. The officially revised estimates at midyear shall be used for the midyear report.

SEC. 122. No sole source contract with the District of Columbia government or any agency thereof may be renewed or extended without opening that contract to the competitive bidding

process as set forth in section 303 of the District of Columbia Procurement Practices Act of 1985 (D.C. Law 6-85; D.C. Code, sec. 1-1183.3), except that the District of Columbia government or any agency thereof may renew or extend sole source contracts for which competition is not feasible or practical: Provided, That the determination as to whether to invoke the competitive bidding process has been made in accordance with duly promulgated rules and procedures and said determination has been reviewed and approved by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority.

SEC. 123. For purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (99 Stat. 1037; Public Law 99-177), the term “program, project, and activity” shall be synonymous with and refer specifically to each account appropriating Federal funds in this Act, and any sequestration order shall be applied to each of the accounts rather than to the aggregate total of those accounts: Provided, That sequestration orders shall not be applied to any account that is specifically exempted from sequestration by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 124. In the event a sequestration order is issued pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (99 Stat. 1037; Public Law 99-177), after the amounts appropriated to the District of Columbia for the fiscal year involved have been paid to the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury, within 15 days after receipt of a request therefor from the Secretary of the Treasury, such amounts as are sequestered by the order: Provided, That the sequestration percentage specified in the order shall be applied proportionately to each of the Federal appropriation accounts in this Act that are not specifically exempted from sequestration by such Act.

SEC. 125. (a) An entity of the District of Columbia government may accept and use a gift or donation during fiscal year 2000 if—

(1) the Mayor approves the acceptance and use of the gift or donation: Provided, That the Council of the District of Columbia may accept and use gifts without prior approval by the Mayor; and

(2) the entity uses the gift or donation to carry out its authorized functions or duties.

(b) Each entity of the District of Columbia government shall keep accurate and detailed records of the acceptance and use of any gift or donation under subsection (a) of this section, and shall make such records available for audit and public inspection.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the term “entity of the District of Columbia government” includes an independent agency of the District of Columbia.

(d) This section shall not apply to the District of Columbia Board of Education, which may, pursuant to the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia, accept and use gifts to the public schools without prior approval by the Mayor.

SEC. 126. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act may be used by the District of Columbia to provide for salaries, expenses, or other costs associated with the offices of United States Senator or United States Representative under section 4(d) of the District of Columbia Statehood Constitutional Convention Initiatives of 1979 (D.C. Law 3-171; D.C. Code, sec. 1-113(d)).

SEC. 127. (a) The University of the District of Columbia shall submit to the Mayor, the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority and the Council of the District of Columbia no later than 15 calendar days after the end of each quarter a report that sets forth—

(1) current quarter expenditures and obligations, year-to-date expenditures and obligations, and total fiscal year expenditure projections versus budget broken out on the basis of control center, responsibility center, and object class,

and for all funds, non-appropriated funds, and capital financing;

(2) a list of each account for which spending is frozen and the amount of funds frozen, broken out by control center, responsibility center, detailed object, and for all funding sources;

(3) a list of all active contracts in excess of \$10,000 annually, which contains the name of each contractor; the budget to which the contract is charged, broken out on the basis of control center and responsibility center, and contract identifying codes used by the University of the District of Columbia; payments made in the last quarter and year-to-date, the total amount of the contract and total payments made for the contract and any modifications, extensions, renewals; and specific modifications made to each contract in the last month;

(4) all reprogramming requests and reports that have been made by the University of the District of Columbia within the last quarter in compliance with applicable law; and

(5) changes made in the last quarter to the organizational structure of the University of the District of Columbia, displaying previous and current control centers and responsibility centers, the names of the organizational entities that have been changed, the name of the staff member supervising each entity affected, and the reasons for the structural change.

(b) The Mayor, the Authority, and the Council shall provide the Congress by February 1, 2000, a summary, analysis, and recommendations on the information provided in the quarterly reports.

SEC. 128. Funds authorized or previously appropriated to the government of the District of Columbia by this or any other Act to procure the necessary hardware and installation of new software, conversion, testing, and training to improve or replace its financial management system are also available for the acquisition of accounting and financial management services and the leasing of necessary hardware, software or any other related goods or services, as determined by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority.

SEC. 129. (a) None of the funds contained in this Act may be made available to pay the fees of an attorney who represents a party who prevails in an action, including an administrative proceeding, brought against the District of Columbia Public Schools under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) if—

(1) the hourly rate of compensation of the attorney exceeds 120 percent of the hourly rate of compensation under section 11-2604(a), District of Columbia Code; or

(2) the maximum amount of compensation of the attorney exceeds 120 percent of the maximum amount of compensation under section 11-2604(b)(1), District of Columbia Code, except that compensation and reimbursement in excess of such maximum may be approved for extended or complex representation in accordance with section 11-2604(c), District of Columbia Code.

(b) Notwithstanding the preceding subsection, if the Mayor, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority and the Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools concur in a Memorandum of Understanding setting forth a new rate and amount of compensation, then such new rates shall apply in lieu of the rates set forth in the preceding subsection.

SEC. 130. None of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be expended for any abortion except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or where the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

SEC. 131. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement or enforce the Health Care Benefits Expansion Act of 1992 (D.C. Law 9-114; D.C. Code, sec. 36-1401 et seq.) or to otherwise implement or enforce any system

of registration of unmarried, cohabiting couples (whether homosexual, heterosexual, or lesbian), including but not limited to registration for the purpose of extending employment, health, or governmental benefits to such couples on the same basis that such benefits are extended to legally married couples.

SEC. 132. The Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools shall submit to the Congress, the Mayor, the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, and the Council of the District of Columbia no later than 15 calendar days after the end of each quarter a report that sets forth—

(1) current quarter expenditures and obligations, year-to-date expenditures and obligations, and total fiscal year expenditure projections versus budget, broken out on the basis of control center, responsibility center, agency reporting code, and object class, and for all funds, including capital financing;

(2) a list of each account for which spending is frozen and the amount of funds frozen, broken out by control center, responsibility center, detailed object, and agency reporting code, and for all funding sources;

(3) a list of all active contracts in excess of \$10,000 annually, which contains the name of each contractor; the budget to which the contract is charged, broken out on the basis of control center, responsibility center, and agency reporting code; and contract identifying codes used by the District of Columbia Public Schools; payments made in the last quarter and year-to-date, the total amount of the contract and total payments made for the contract and any modifications, extensions, renewals; and specific modifications made to each contract in the last month;

(4) all reprogramming requests and reports that are required to be, and have been, submitted to the Board of Education; and

(5) changes made in the last quarter to the organizational structure of the District of Columbia Public Schools, displaying previous and current control centers and responsibility centers, the names of the organizational entities that have been changed, the name of the staff member supervising each entity affected, and the reasons for the structural change.

SEC. 133. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools and the University of the District of Columbia shall annually compile an accurate and verifiable report on the positions and employees in the public school system and the university, respectively. The annual report shall set forth—

(1) the number of validated schedule A positions in the District of Columbia public schools and the University of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1999, fiscal year 2000, and thereafter on full-time equivalent basis, including a compilation of all positions by control center, responsibility center, funding source, position type, position title, pay plan, grade, and annual salary; and

(2) a compilation of all employees in the District of Columbia public schools and the University of the District of Columbia as of the preceding December 31, verified as to its accuracy in accordance with the functions that each employee actually performs, by control center, responsibility center, agency reporting code, program (including funding source), activity, location for accounting purposes, job title, grade and classification, annual salary, and position control number.

(b) SUBMISSION.—The annual report required by subsection (a) of this section shall be submitted to the Congress, the Mayor, the District of Columbia Council, the Consensus Commission, and the Authority, not later than February 15 of each year.

SEC. 134. (a) No later than November 1, 1999, or within 30 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs later, and each succeeding year, the Superintendent

of the District of Columbia Public Schools and the University of the District of Columbia shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, the Mayor, the District of Columbia Council, the Consensus Commission, and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, a revised appropriated funds operating budget for the public school system and the University of the District of Columbia for such fiscal year that is in the total amount of the approved appropriation and that realigns budgeted data for personal services and other-than-personal services, respectively, with anticipated actual expenditures.

(b) The revised budget required by subsection (a) of this section shall be submitted in the format of the budget that the Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools and the University of the District of Columbia submit to the Mayor of the District of Columbia for inclusion in the Mayor's budget submission to the Council of the District of Columbia pursuant to section 442 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 47-301).

SEC. 135. The District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, acting on behalf of the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) in formulating the DCPS budget, the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia, the Board of Library Trustees, and the Board of Governors of the University of the District of Columbia School of Law shall vote on and approve the respective annual or revised budgets for such entities before submission to the Mayor of the District of Columbia for inclusion in the Mayor's budget submission to the Council of the District of Columbia in accordance with section 442 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 47-301), or before submitting their respective budgets directly to the Council.

SEC. 136. (a) CEILING ON TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total amount appropriated in this Act for operating expenses for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2000 under the heading "Division of Expenses" shall not exceed the lesser of—

(A) the sum of the total revenues of the District of Columbia for such fiscal year; or

(B) \$5,515,379,000 (of which \$152,753,000 shall be from intra-District funds and \$3,113,854,000 shall be from local funds), which amount may be increased by the following:

(i) proceeds of one-time transactions, which are expended for emergency or unanticipated operating or capital needs approved by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority; or

(ii) after notification to the Council, additional expenditures which the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia certifies will produce additional revenues during such fiscal year at least equal to 200 percent of such additional expenditures, and that are approved by the Authority.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—The Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia and the Authority shall take such steps as are necessary to assure that the District of Columbia meets the requirements of this section, including the apportioning by the Chief Financial Officer of the appropriations and funds made available to the District during fiscal year 2000, except that the Chief Financial Officer may not reprogram for operating expenses any funds derived from bonds, notes, or other obligations issued for capital projects.

(b) ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF GRANTS NOT INCLUDED IN CEILING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Mayor, in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer, during a control year, as defined in section 305(4) of the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management

Assistance Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-8; 109 Stat. 152), may accept, obligate, and expend Federal, private, and other grants received by the District government that are not reflected in the amounts appropriated in this Act.

(2) REQUIREMENT OF CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER REPORT AND AUTHORITY APPROVAL.—No such Federal, private, or other grant may be accepted, obligated, or expended pursuant to paragraph (1) until—

(A) the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia submits to the Authority a report setting forth detailed information regarding such grant; and

(B) the Authority has reviewed and approved the acceptance, obligation, and expenditure of such grant in accordance with review and approval procedures consistent with the provisions of the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995.

(3) PROHIBITION ON SPENDING IN ANTICIPATION OF APPROVAL OR RECEIPT.—No amount may be obligated or expended from the general fund or other funds of the District government in anticipation of the approval or receipt of a grant under paragraph (2)(B) of this subsection or in anticipation of the approval or receipt of a Federal, private, or other grant not subject to such paragraph.

(4) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia shall prepare a quarterly report setting forth detailed information regarding all Federal, private, and other grants subject to this subsection. Each such report shall be submitted to the Council of the District of Columbia, and to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, not later than 15 days after the end of the quarter covered by the report.

(c) REPORT ON EXPENDITURES BY FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE AUTHORITY.—Not later than 20 calendar days after the end of each fiscal quarter starting October 1, 1999, the Authority shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Government Reform of the House, and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate providing an itemized accounting of all non-appropriated funds obligated or expended by the Authority for the quarter. The report shall include information on the date, amount, purpose, and vendor name, and a description of the services or goods provided with respect to the expenditures of such funds.

SEC. 137. If a department or agency of the government of the District of Columbia is under the administration of a court-appointed receiver or other court-appointed official during fiscal year 2000 or any succeeding fiscal year, the receiver or official shall prepare and submit to the Mayor, for inclusion in the annual budget of the District of Columbia for the year, annual estimates of the expenditures and appropriations necessary for the maintenance and operation of the department or agency. All such estimates shall be forwarded by the Mayor to the Council, for its action pursuant to sections 446 and 603(c) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, without revision but subject to the Mayor's recommendations. Notwithstanding any provision of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (87 Stat. 774; Public Law 93-198) the Council may comment or make recommendations concerning such annual estimates but shall have no authority under such Act to revise such estimates.

SEC. 138. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rule, or regulation, an employee of the District of Columbia public schools shall be—

(1) classified as an Educational Service employee;

(2) placed under the personnel authority of the Board of Education; and

(3) subject to all Board of Education rules.

(b) School-based personnel shall constitute a separate competitive area from nonschool-based

personnel who shall not compete with school-based personnel for retention purposes.

SEC. 139. (a) RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF OFFICIAL VEHICLES.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, none of the funds made available by this Act or by any other Act may be used to provide any officer or employee of the District of Columbia with an official vehicle unless the officer or employee uses the vehicle only in the performance of the officer's or employee's official duties. For purposes of this paragraph, the term "official duties" does not include travel between the officer's or employee's residence and workplace (except: (1) in the case of an officer or employee of the Metropolitan Police Department who resides in the District of Columbia or is otherwise designated by the Chief of the Department; (2) at the discretion of the Fire Chief, an officer or employee of the District of Columbia Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department who resides in the District of Columbia and is on call 24 hours a day; (3) the Mayor of the District of Columbia; and (4) the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia).

(b) INVENTORY OF VEHICLES.—The Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia shall submit, by November 15, 1999, an inventory, as of September 30, 1999, of all vehicles owned, leased or operated by the District of Columbia government. The inventory shall include, but not be limited to, the department to which the vehicle is assigned; the year and make of the vehicle; the acquisition date and cost; the general condition of the vehicle; annual operating and maintenance costs; current mileage; and whether the vehicle is allowed to be taken home by a District officer or employee and if so, the officer or employee's title and resident location.

SEC. 140. (a) SOURCE OF PAYMENT FOR EMPLOYEES DETAILED WITHIN GOVERNMENT.—For purposes of determining the amount of funds expended by any entity within the District of Columbia government during fiscal year 2000 and each succeeding fiscal year, any expenditures of the District government attributable to any officer or employee of the District government who provides services which are within the authority and jurisdiction of the entity (including any portion of the compensation paid to the officer or employee attributable to the time spent in providing such services) shall be treated as expenditures made from the entity's budget, without regard to whether the officer or employee is assigned to the entity or otherwise treated as an officer or employee of the entity.

(b) MODIFICATION OF REDUCTION IN FORCE PROCEDURES.—The District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-601.1 et seq.), is further amended in section 2408(a) by striking "1999" and inserting "2000"; in subsection (b), by striking "1999" and inserting "2000"; in subsection (i), by striking "1999" and inserting "2000"; and in subsection (k), by striking "1999" and inserting "2000".

SEC. 141. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not later than 120 days after the date that a District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) student is referred for evaluation or assessment—

(1) the District of Columbia Board of Education, or its successor, and DCPS shall assess or evaluate a student who may have a disability and who may require special education services; and

(2) if a student is classified as having a disability, as defined in section 101(a)(1) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (84 Stat. 175; 20 U.S.C. 1401(a)(1)) or in section 7(8) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 359; 29 U.S.C. 706(8)), the Board and DCPS shall place that student in an appropriate program of special education services.

SEC. 142. (a) COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the funds the entity will comply with the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c).

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.—

(1) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or product that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided using funds made available in this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving the assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products to the greatest extent practicable.

(2) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance using funds made available in this Act, the head of each agency of the Federal or District of Columbia government shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in paragraph (1) by the Congress.

(c) PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS FALSELY LABELING PRODUCTS AS MADE IN AMERICA.—If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 143. None of the funds contained in this Act may be used for purposes of the annual independent audit of the District of Columbia government (including the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority) for fiscal year 2000 unless—

(1) the audit is conducted by the Inspector General of the District of Columbia pursuant to section 208(a)(4) of the District of Columbia Procurement Practices Act of 1985 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1182.8(a)(4)); and

(2) the audit includes a comparison of audited actual year-end results with the revenues submitted in the budget document for such year and the appropriations enacted into law for such year.

SEC. 144. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any office, agency or entity to expend funds for programs or functions for which a reorganization plan is required but has not been approved by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority. Appropriations made by this Act for such programs or functions are conditioned only on the approval by the Authority of the required reorganization plans.

SEC. 145. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rule, or regulation, the evaluation process and instruments for evaluating District of Columbia Public School employees shall be a non-negotiable item for collective bargaining purposes.

SEC. 146. None of the funds contained in this Act may be used by the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel or any other officer or entity of the District government to provide assistance for any petition drive or civil action which seeks to require Congress to provide for voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 147. None of the funds contained in this Act may be used to transfer or confine inmates classified above the medium security level, as defined by the Federal Bureau of Prisons classification instrument, to the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center located in Youngstown, Ohio.

SEC. 148. (a) Section 202(i) of the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-8), as added by section 155 of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1999, is amended to read as follows:

"(j) RESERVE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with fiscal year 2000, the plan or budget submitted pursuant to this Act shall contain \$150,000,000 for a reserve

to be established by the Mayor, Council of the District of Columbia, Chief Financial Officer for the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority.

"(2) CONDITIONS ON USE.—The reserve funds—

"(A) shall only be expended according to criteria established by the Chief Financial Officer and approved by the Mayor, Council of the District of Columbia, and District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, but, in no case may any of the reserve funds be expended until any other surplus funds have been used;

"(B) shall not be used to fund the agencies of the District of Columbia government under court ordered receivership; and

"(C) shall not be used to fund shortfalls in the projected reductions budgeted in the budget proposed by the District of Columbia government for general supply schedule savings and management reform savings.

"(3) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The Authority shall notify the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and House of Representatives in writing 30 days in advance of any expenditure of the reserve funds."

(b) Section 202 of such Act (Public Law 104-8), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(k) POSITIVE FUND BALANCE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The District of Columbia shall maintain at the end of a fiscal year an annual positive fund balance in the general fund of not less than 4 percent of the projected general fund expenditures for the following fiscal year.

"(2) EXCESS FUNDS.—Of funds remaining in excess of the amounts required by paragraph (1)—

"(A) not more than 50 percent may be used for authorized non-recurring expenses; and

"(B) not less than 50 percent shall be used to reduce the debt of the District of Columbia."

SEC. 149. (a) No later than November 1, 1999, or within 30 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs later, the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Mayor, and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority a revised appropriated funds operating budget for all agencies of the District of Columbia government for such fiscal year that is in the total amount of the approved appropriation and that realigns budgeted data for personal services and other-than-personal-services, respectively, with anticipated actual expenditures.

(b) The revised budget required by subsection (a) of this section shall be submitted in the format of the budget that the District of Columbia government submitted pursuant to section 442 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 47-301).

SEC. 150. None of the funds contained in this Act may be used for any program of distributing sterile needles or syringes for the hypodermic injection of any illegal drug.

SEC. 151. (a) RESTRICTIONS ON LEASES.—Upon the expiration of the 60-day period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, none of the funds contained in this Act may be used to make rental payments under a lease for the use of real property by the District of Columbia government (including any independent agency of the District) unless the lease and an abstract of the lease have been filed (by the District of Columbia or any other party to the lease) with the central office of the Deputy Mayor for Economic Development, in an indexed registry available for public inspection.

(b) ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS ON CURRENT LEASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the expiration of the 60-day period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, in the case of a lease described in paragraph (3), none of the funds contained in this Act may be used to make rental

payments under the lease unless the lease is included in periodic reports submitted by the Mayor and Council of the District of Columbia to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate describing for each such lease the following information:

(A) The location of the property involved, the name of the owners of record according to the land records of the District of Columbia, the name of the lessors according to the lease, the rate of payment under the lease, the period of time covered by the lease, and the conditions under which the lease may be terminated.

(B) The extent to which the property is or is not occupied by the District of Columbia government as of the end of the reporting period involved.

(C) If the property is not occupied and utilized by the District government as of the end of the reporting period involved, a plan for occupying and utilizing the property (including construction or renovation work) or a status statement regarding any efforts by the District to terminate or renegotiate the lease.

(2) **TIMING OF REPORTS.**—The reports described in paragraph (1) shall be submitted for each calendar quarter (beginning with the quarter ending December 31, 1999) not later than 20 days after the end of the quarter involved, plus an initial report submitted not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, which shall provide information as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) **LEASES DESCRIBED.**—A lease described in this paragraph is a lease in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act for the use of real property by the District of Columbia government (including any independent agency of the District) which is not being occupied by the District government (including any independent agency of the District) as of such date or during the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 152. (a) MANAGEMENT OF EXISTING DISTRICT GOVERNMENT PROPERTY.—Upon the expiration of the 60-day period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, none of the funds contained in this Act may be used to enter into a lease (or to make rental payments under such a lease) for the use of real property by the District of Columbia government (including any independent agency of the District) or to purchase real property for the use of the District of Columbia government (including any independent agency of the District) or to manage real property for the use of the District of Columbia (including any independent agency of the District) unless the following conditions are met:

(1) The Mayor and Council of the District of Columbia certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that existing real property available to the District (whether leased or owned by the District government) is not suitable for the purposes intended.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, there is made available for sale or lease all real property of the District of Columbia that the Mayor from time-to-time determines is surplus to the needs of the District of Columbia, unless a majority of the members of the Council override the Mayor's determination during the 30-day period which begins on the date the determination is published.

(3) The Mayor and Council implement a program for the periodic survey of all District property to determine if it is surplus to the needs of the District.

(4) The Mayor and Council within 60 days of the date of the enactment of this Act have filed with the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report which provides a comprehensive plan for the management of District of Columbia real

property assets, and are proceeding with the implementation of the plan.

(b) **TERMINATION OF PROVISIONS.**—If the District of Columbia enacts legislation to reform the practices and procedures governing the entering into of leases for the use of real property by the District of Columbia government and the disposition of surplus real property of the District government, the provisions of subsection (a) shall cease to be effective upon the effective date of the legislation.

SEC. 153. Section 603(e)(2)(B) of the Student Loan Marketing Association Reorganization Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-293) is amended—

(1) by inserting “and public charter” after “public”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “Of such amounts and proceeds, \$5,000,000 shall be set aside for use as a credit enhancement fund for public charter schools in the District of Columbia, with the administration of the fund (including the making of loans) to be carried out by the Mayor through a committee consisting of three individuals appointed by the Mayor of the District of Columbia and two individuals appointed by the Public Charter School Board established under section 2214 of the District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995.”

SEC. 154. The Mayor, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, and the Superintendent of Schools shall implement a process to dispose of excess public school real property within 90 days of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 155. Section 2003 of the District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-134; D.C. Code, sec. 31-2851) is amended by striking “during the period” and “and ending 5 years after such date.”

SEC. 156. Section 2206(c) of the District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-134; D.C. Code, sec. 31-2853.16(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “, except that a preference in admission may be given to an applicant who is a sibling of a student already attending or selected for admission to the public charter school in which the applicant is seeking enrollment.”

SEC. 157. (a) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—There is hereby transferred from the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority (hereafter referred to as the “Authority”) to the District of Columbia the sum of \$18,000,000 for severance payments to individuals separated from employment during fiscal year 2000 (under such terms and conditions as the Mayor considers appropriate), expanded contracting authority of the Mayor, and the implementation of a system of managed competition among public and private providers of goods and services by and on behalf of the District of Columbia: Provided, That such funds shall be used only in accordance with a plan agreed to by the Council and the Mayor and approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided further, That the Authority and the Mayor shall coordinate the spending of funds for this program so that continuous progress is made. The Authority shall release said funds, on a quarterly basis, to reimburse such expenses, so long as the Authority certifies that the expenses reduce re-occurring future costs at an annual ratio of at least 2 to 1 relative to the funds provided, and that the program is in accordance with the best practices of municipal government.

(b) **SOURCE OF FUNDS.**—The amount transferred under subsection (a) shall be derived from interest earned on accounts held by the Authority on behalf of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 158. (a) IN GENERAL.—The District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority (hereafter referred to as the “Authority”), working with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Director of the National Park Service, shall carry out a project to

complete all design requirements and all requirements for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act for the construction of expanded lane capacity for the Fourteenth Street Bridge.

(b) **SOURCE OF FUNDS; TRANSFER.**—For purposes of carrying out the project under subsection (a), there is hereby transferred to the Authority from the District of Columbia dedicated highway fund established pursuant to section 3(a) of the District of Columbia Emergency Highway Relief Act (Public Law 104-21; D.C. Code, sec. 7-134.2(a)) an amount not to exceed \$5,000,000.

SEC. 159. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Mayor of the District of Columbia shall carry out through the Army Corps of Engineers, an Anacostia River environmental cleanup program.

(b) **SOURCE OF FUNDS.**—There are hereby transferred to the Mayor from the escrow account held by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority pursuant to section 134 of division A of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277; 112 Stat. 2681-552), for infrastructure needs of the District of Columbia, \$5,000,000.

SEC. 160. (a) PROHIBITING PAYMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS FROM FUND.—Section 16(e) of the Victims of Violent Crime Compensation Act of 1996 (D.C. Code, sec. 3-435(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and administrative costs necessary to carry out this chapter”; and

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, and no monies in the Fund may be used for any other purpose.”

(b) **MAINTENANCE OF FUND IN TREASURY OF THE UNITED STATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 16(a) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 3-435(a)) is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: “The Fund shall be maintained as a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States. All amounts deposited to the credit of the Fund are appropriated without fiscal year limitation to make payments as authorized under subsection (e).”

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 16 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 3-435) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(c) **DEPOSIT OF OTHER FEES AND RECEIPTS INTO FUND.**—Section 16(c) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 3-435(c)) is amended by inserting after “1997,” the second place it appears the following: “any other fines, fees, penalties, or assessments that the Court determines necessary to carry out the purposes of the Fund.”

(d) **ANNUAL TRANSFER OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES TO MISCELLANEOUS RECEIPTS OF TREASURY.**—Section 16 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 3-435), as amended by subsection (b)(2), is further amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) Any unobligated balance existing in the Fund in excess of \$250,000 as of the end of each fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 2000) shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury of the United States not later than 30 days after the end of the fiscal year.”

(e) **RATIFICATION OF PAYMENTS AND DEPOSITS.**—Any payments made from or deposits made to the Crime Victims Compensation Fund on or after April 9, 1997 are hereby ratified, to the extent such payments and deposits are authorized under the Victims of Violent Crime Compensation Act of 1996 (D.C. Code, sec. 3-421 et seq.), as amended by this section.

SEC. 161. CERTIFICATION.—None of the funds contained in this Act may be used after the expiration of the 60-day period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act to pay the salary of any chief financial officer of any office of the District of Columbia government (including any independent agency of the District) who has not filed a certification with the Mayor and the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia that the officer understands the duties

and restrictions applicable to the officer and their agency as a result of this Act.

SEC. 162. The proposed budget of the government of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2001 that is submitted by the District to Congress shall specify potential adjustments that might become necessary in the event that the management savings achieved by the District during the year do not meet the level of management savings projected by the District under the proposed budget.

SEC. 163. In submitting any document showing the budget for an office of the District of Columbia government (including an independent agency of the District) that contains a category of activities labeled as "other", "miscellaneous", or a similar general, nondescriptive term, the document shall include a description of the types of activities covered in the category and a detailed breakdown of the amount allocated for each such activity.

SEC. 164. (a) AUTHORIZING CORPS OF ENGINEERS TO PERFORM REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS.—In using the funds made available under this Act for carrying out improvements to the Southwest Waterfront in the District of Columbia (including upgrading marina dock pilings and paving and restoring walkways in the marina and fish market areas) for the portions of Federal property in the Southwest quadrant of the District of Columbia within Lots 847 and 848, a portion of Lot 846, and the unassessed Federal real property adjacent to Lot 848 in Square 473, any entity of the District of Columbia government (including the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority or its designee) may place orders for engineering and construction and related services with the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army Corps of Engineers. The Chief of Engineers may accept such orders on a reimbursable basis and may provide any part of such services by contract. In providing such services, the Chief of Engineers shall follow the Federal Acquisition Regulations and the implementing Department of Defense regulations.

(b) TIMING FOR AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS UNDER 1999 ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277; 112 Stat. 2681-124) is amended in the item relating to "FEDERAL FUNDS—FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR WATERFRONT IMPROVEMENTS"—

(A) by striking "existing lessees" the first place it appears and inserting "existing lessees of the Marina"; and

(B) by striking "the existing lessees" the second place it appears and inserting "such lessees".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect as if included in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1999.

(c) ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR IMPROVEMENTS CARRIED OUT THROUGH CORPS OF ENGINEERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby transferred from the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority to the Mayor the sum of \$3,000,000 for carrying out the improvements described in subsection (a) through the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

(2) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—The funds transferred under paragraph (1) shall be derived from the escrow account held by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority pursuant to section 134 of division A of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277; 112 Stat. 2681-552), for infrastructure needs of the District of Columbia.

(d) QUARTERLY REPORTS ON PROJECT.—The Mayor shall submit reports to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate on the status of the improvements described in subsection (a) for each calendar quarter occurring until the improvements are completed.

SEC. 165. It is the sense of the Congress that the District of Columbia should not impose or take into consideration any height, square footage, set-back, or other construction or zoning requirements in authorizing the issuance of industrial revenue bonds for a project of the American National Red Cross at 2025 E Street Northwest, Washington, D.C., in as much as this project is subject to approval of the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts pursuant to section 11 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, District of Columbia", approved July 1, 1947 (Public Law 100-637; 36 U.S.C. 300108 note).

SEC. 166. (a) PERMITTING COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY TO CARRY OUT SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION.—Section 11233(c) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (D.C. Code, sec. 24-1233(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION.—The Agency shall carry out sex offender registration functions in the District of Columbia, and shall have the authority to exercise all powers and functions relating to sex offender registration that are granted to the Agency under any District of Columbia law."

(b) AUTHORITY DURING TRANSITION TO FULL OPERATION OF AGENCY.—

(1) AUTHORITY OF PRETRIAL SERVICES, PAROLE, ADULT PROBATION AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION TRUSTEE.—Notwithstanding section 11232(b)(1) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (D.C. Code, sec. 24-1232(b)(1)), the Pretrial Services, Parole, Adult Probation and Offender Supervision Trustee appointed under section 11232(a) of such Act (hereafter referred to as the "Trustee") shall, in accordance with section 11232 of such Act, exercise the powers and functions of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia (hereafter referred to as the "Agency") relating to sex offender registration (as granted to the Agency under any District of Columbia law) only upon the Trustee's certification that the Trustee is able to assume such powers and functions.

(2) AUTHORITY OF METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT.—During the period that begins on the date of the enactment of the Sex Offender Registration Emergency Act of 1999 and ends on the date the Trustee makes the certification described in paragraph (1), the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia shall have the authority to carry out any powers and functions relating to sex offender registration that are granted to the Agency or to the Trustee under any District of Columbia law.

SEC. 167. (a) None of the funds contained in this Act may be used to enact or carry out any law, rule, or regulation to legalize or otherwise reduce penalties associated with the possession, use, or distribution of any schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802) or any tetrahydrocannabinols derivative.

(b) The Legalization of Marijuana for Medical Treatment Initiative of 1998, also known as Initiative 59, approved by the electors of the District of Columbia on November 3, 1998, shall not take effect.

SEC. 168. (a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby transferred from the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority (hereinafter referred to as the "Authority") to the District of Columbia the sum of \$5,000,000 for the Mayor, in consultation with the Council of the District of Columbia, to provide offsets against local taxes for a commercial revitalization program, such program to be available in enterprise zones and low and moderate income areas in the District of Columbia: Provided, That in carrying out such a program, the Mayor shall use Federal commercial revitalization proposals introduced in Congress as a guideline.

(b) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—The amount transferred under subsection (a) shall be derived from interest earned on accounts held by the Authority on behalf of the District of Columbia.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Mayor shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives on the progress made in carrying out the commercial revitalization program.

SEC. 169. Section 456 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (section 47-231 et seq. of the D.C. Code, as added by the Federal Payment Reauthorization Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-373)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking "District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority" and inserting "Mayor"; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "Authority" and inserting "Mayor".

SEC. 170. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The District of Columbia has recently witnessed a spate of senseless killings of innocent citizens caught in the crossfire of shootings. A Justice Department crime victimization survey found that while the city saw a decline in the homicide rate between 1996 and 1997, the rate was the highest among a dozen cities and more than double the second highest city.

(2) The District of Columbia has not made adequate funding available to fight drug abuse in recent years, and the city has not deployed its resources as effectively as possible. In fiscal year 1998, \$20,900,000 was spent on publicly funded drug treatment in the District compared to \$29,000,000 in fiscal year 1993. The District's Addiction and Prevention and Recovery Agency currently has only 2,200 treatment slots, a 50 percent drop from 1994, with more than 1,100 people on waiting lists.

(3) The District of Columbia has seen a rash of inmate escapes from halfway houses. According to Department of Corrections records, between October 21, 1998 and January 19, 1999, 376 of the 1,125 inmates assigned to halfway houses walked away. Nearly 280 of the 376 escapees were awaiting trial including two charged with murder.

(4) The District of Columbia public schools system faces serious challenges in correcting chronic problems, particularly long-standing deficiencies in providing special education services to the 1 in 10 District students needing program benefits, including backlogged assessments, and repeated failure to meet a compliance agreement on special education reached with the Department of Education.

(5) Deficiencies in the delivery of basic public services from cleaning streets to waiting time at Department of Motor Vehicles to a rat population estimated earlier this year to exceed the human population have generated considerable public frustration.

(6) Last year, the District of Columbia forfeited millions of dollars in Federal grants after Federal auditors determined that several agencies exceeded grant restrictions and in other instances, failed to spend funds before the grants expired.

(7) Findings of a 1999 report by the Annie E. Casey Foundation that measured the well-being of children reflected that, with one exception, the District ranked worst in the United States in every category from infant mortality to the rate of teenage births to statistics chronicling child poverty.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that in considering the District of Columbia's fiscal year 2001 budget, the Congress will take into consideration progress or lack of progress in addressing the following issues:

(1) Crime, including the homicide rate, implementation of community policing, the number of police officers on local beats, and the closing down of open-air drug markets.

(2) Access to drug abuse treatment, including the number of treatment slots, the number of

people served, the number of people on waiting lists, and the effectiveness of treatment programs.

(3) Management of parolees and pretrial violent offenders, including the number of halfway house escapes and steps taken to improve monitoring and supervision of halfway house residents to reduce the number of escapes.

(4) Education, including access to special education services and student achievement.

(5) Improvement in basic city services, including rat control and abatement.

(6) Application for and management of Federal grants.

(7) Indicators of child well-being.

SEC. 171. The Mayor, prior to using Federal Medicaid payments to Disproportionate Share Hospitals to serve a small number of childless adults, should consider the recommendations of the Health Care Development Commission that has been appointed by the Council of the District of Columbia to review this program, and consult and report to Congress on the use of these funds.

SEC. 172. GAO STUDY OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM. Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study of the law enforcement, court, prison, probation, parole, and other components of the criminal justice system of the District of Columbia, in order to identify the components most in need of additional resources, including financial, personnel, and management resources; and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the results of the study under paragraph (1).

SEC. 173. Nothing in this Act bars the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel from reviewing or commenting on briefs in private lawsuits, or from consulting with officials of the District government regarding such lawsuits.

SEC. 174. WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS. (a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 7 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, shall—

(1) implement the notice of decision approved by the National Capital Regional Director, dated April 7, 1999, including the provisions of the notice of decision concerning the issuance of right-of-way permits at market rates; and

(2) expend such sums as are necessary to carry out paragraph (1).

(b) ANTENNA APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the receipt of an application, a Federal agency that receives an application submitted after the enactment of this Act to locate a wireless communications antenna on Federal property in the District of Columbia or surrounding area over which the Federal agency exercises control shall take final action on the application, including action on the issuance of right-of-way permits at market rates.

(2) EXISTING LAW.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the applicability of existing laws regarding—

(A) judicial review under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code (the Administrative Procedure Act), and the Communications Act of 1934;

(B) the National Environmental Policy Act, the National Historic Preservation Act and other applicable Federal statutes; and

(C) the authority of a State or local government or instrumentality thereof, including the District of Columbia, in the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities.

SEC. 175. (a)(1) The first paragraph under the heading "Community Development Block Grants" in title II of H.R. 2684 (Public Law 106-74) is amended by inserting after "National American Indian Housing Council," the following: "\$4,000,000 shall be available as a grant for the Special Olympics in Anchorage, Alaska to develop the Ben Boeke Arena and Hilltop Ski Area,"; and

(2) The paragraph that includes the words "Economic Development Initiative (EDI)" under the heading "Community Development Block Grants" in title II of H.R. 2684 (Public Law 106-74) is amended by striking "\$240,000,000" and inserting "\$243,500,000".

(b) The statement of the managers of the committee of conference accompanying H.R. 2684 is deemed to be amended under the heading "Community Development Block Grants" to include in the description of targeted economic development initiatives the following:

"\$1,000,000 for the New Jersey Community Development Corporation for the construction of the New Jersey Community Development Corporation's Transportation Opportunity Center;

"\$750,000 for South Dakota State University in Brookings, South Dakota for the development of a performing arts center;

"\$925,000 for the Florida Association of Counties for a Rural Capacity Building Pilot Project in Tallahassee, Florida;

"\$500,000 for the Osceola County Agriculture Center for construction of a new and expanded agriculture center in Osceola County, Florida;

"\$1,000,000 for the University of Syracuse in Syracuse, New York for electrical infrastructure improvements."; and the current descriptions are amended as follows:

"\$1,700,000 to the City of Miami, Florida for the development of a Homeownership Zone to assist residents displaced by the demolition of public housing in the Model City area," is amended to read as follows:

"\$1,700,000 to Miami-Dade County, Florida for an economic development project at the Opa-locka Neighborhood Center";

"\$250,000 to the Arizona Science Center in Yuma, Arizona for its after-school program for inner-city youth," is amended to read as follows:

"\$250,000 to the Arizona Science Center in Phoenix, Arizona for its after-school program for inner-city youth";

"\$200,000 to the Schuylkill County Fire Fighters Association for a smoke-maze building on the grounds of the firefighters facility in Morea, Pennsylvania," is amended to read as follows:

"\$200,000 to the Schuylkill County Fire Fighters Association for a smoke-maze building and other facilities and improvements on the grounds of the firefighters facility in Morea, Pennsylvania";

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the \$2,000,000 made available pursuant to Public Law 105-276 for Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania to redevelop the Sun Co./LTV Steel Site in Hazelwood, Pennsylvania is available to the Department of Economic Development in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania for the development of a technology based project in the county.

(d) Insert the following new sections at the end of the administrative provisions in title II of H.R. 2684 (Public Law 106-74):

"FHA MULTIFAMILY MORTGAGE CREDIT DEMONSTRATION

"SEC. 226. Section 542 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 is amended—

"(1) in subsection (b)(5) by striking 'during fiscal year 1999' and inserting 'in each of the fiscal years 1999 and 2000'; and

"(2) in the first sentence of subsection (c)(4) by striking 'during fiscal year 1999' and inserting 'in each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000'.

"DRUG ELIMINATION PROGRAM

"SEC. 227. (a) Section 5126(4) of the Public and Assisted Housing Drug Elimination Act of 1990 is amended—

"(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting after '1965,' the following: 'or';

"(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking '1937: or' and inserting '1937: and

"(3) by striking subparagraph (D).

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be construed to have taken effect on October 21, 1998.".

This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2000".

TITLE II—TAX REDUCTION

SEC. 201. COMMENDING REDUCTION OF TAXES BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. The Congress commends the District of Columbia for its action to reduce taxes, and ratifies D.C. Act 13-110 (commonly known as the Service Improvement and Fiscal Year 2000 Budget Support Act of 1999).

SEC. 202. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION. Nothing in this title may be construed to limit the ability of the Council of the District of Columbia to amend or repeal any provision of law described in this title.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, November 3, 1999, in open session, to receive testimony on the lessons learned from the military operations conducted as part of Operation Allied Force, and associated relief operations, with respect to Kosovo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 3, 1999, for purposes of conducting a full committee business meeting which is scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 3, 1999, at 10:30 a.m. to hold a business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 3, 1999, at 2:30 p.m. to hold a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet on Wednesday, November 3, 1999, at 10 a.m. for a business meeting to consider pending committee business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions

be authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 3, 1999, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES, WILDLIFE, AND DRINKING WATER

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Drinking Water be authorized to conduct a hearing Wednesday, November 3, 10 a.m., hearing room (SD-406), to examine solutions to the policy concerns with respect to habitat conservation plans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CALIFORNIA DESERT PROTECTION ACT ANNIVERSARY

• Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, this week marks the fifth anniversary of the California Desert Protection Act, a bill I authored that was signed into law on October 31, 1994. This Act marked a watershed event for California and for the 2.8 million people who visit this pristine national treasure each year. This was the most extensive land-protection bill in U.S. history and protected the largest parcel of land in the continental U.S.

The bill was unique in many ways. It designated national park and Bureau of Land Management wilderness areas comprising more than 7.7 million acres, the highest category of federal protection. It also designated the Death Valley National Park and Joshua Tree National Park in areas that formerly fell under less protected "national monument" status and created the 1.6 million acre Mojave National Preserve.

At the time of its passage, the Desert Protection Act was the centerpiece of a long and contentious battle among a variety of different stakeholders. It faced enormous opposition from groups and individuals concerned about private property rights, grazing permits, mining claims, and access for off-road vehicle use. The bill took nearly eight years to pass over objections from miners, property owners, hunters, ranchers and off-road enthusiasts, who thought the legislation would restrict too much land and hurt business. I worked hard to craft a bill that protected private property rights and safeguarded the region's job base while preserving a treasured resource—the California Desert.

I am proud to say that after 5 years there has not been a single instance of a land transaction that did not involve a willing seller and willing buyer. Grazing has not been impeded and valid mining rights have been upheld. The 25 million acres of California desert remain a place of extraordinary beauty and diverse resources. There are soaring sand dunes, ninety mountain ranges, extinct volcanoes, streams, lakes, wildflowers, the world's largest Joshua Tree forest, waterfalls and cactus gardens.

The land also includes over 100,000 archaeological sites, including the only-known dinosaur tracks in California, believed to be more than 100 million years old. More than 760 different wildlife species call the rugged California desert home. The protected land has aided in the recovery of the desert tortoise and has provided thousands of acres of needed habitat for big horn sheep.

The Death Valley National Park consists of more than 3.3 million acres of spectacular desert scenery, interesting and rare desert wildlife, complex geology, undisturbed wilderness and dozens of historical and cultural interest sites. It contains the lowest point in the Western hemisphere, the Death Valley badwater, which rests 282 feet below sea level. The Joshua Tree National Park comprises two deserts and vividly illustrates the contrast between high and low desert. Below 3000 feet, the eastern half of the park is the land of the creosote bush, smoke trees and occotillo. The higher, cooler and slightly wetter Western part is dominated by Joshua Trees.

But the crown jewel of the California Desert is the Mojave National Preserve whose geographical and wildlife diversity are practically unrivaled. The area contains eleven mountain ranges, four dry lakes, cinder cones, badlands, innumerable washes, mesas, buttes, lava tube caves, alluvial fans and one of California's most complex sand dune systems.

I would like to especially thank Mary Martin, the Mojave National Preserve Superintendent for her diligence and the commendable job she has done balancing the diverse needs of the Preserve with those of all the stakeholders who work and/or use the land.

The desert parks have attracted record numbers of tourists in recent years from across the globe. Tourism has increased the visibility of California's natural resources, created jobs for desert residents and brought additional income. In 1997, the three parks created more than 6,000 jobs and over \$22 million in tax revenue from tourist expenditures.

The passage of the California Desert Protection Act has been one of my proudest accomplishments in the Senate. But there is still more work to be done.

To encourage out nation's westward expansion, in 1864 Congress gave the railroad industry every other section of land in a 50 mile swath in what is now the Mojave National Preserve and Joshua Tree National Park. Most of this remaining checkerboard arrangement of land is owned by the Catellus Development Corporation.

Earlier this year David Myers, the Executive Director of the Wildlands Conservancy, brokered a deal with Catellus to sell these lands at well below market value. Through David's hard work, The Wildlands Conservancy raised \$25.5 million in private funding and donated land. The Catellus Corporation agreed to donate an additional \$16.4 million in land.

Through the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund the U.S. would acquire 487,000 acres of protected land. This includes 150,000 acres of Congressionally designated Wilderness areas, 87,000 acres in the Mojave National Preserve, 18,700 acres in Joshua Tree, land in Big Morongo, San Geronio wilderness, and the Kelso Dunes.

This acquisition would formalize rights-of-way over 165 jeep trails and dirt access roads leading to 3.7 million acres of land used for hunting, hiking, sightseeing, camping and recreational vehicle use.

The land includes the biggest cactus gardens in the world at the Bigelow Cholla Gardens.

The acquisition also includes one hundred miles of scenic lands and historic water stops along historic route 66 and would help to conserve one of the single most intact portions of America's "Mother Road" which provided many Americans their first look at the Golden State and became the source of much of America's western migration folklore.

The purchase is supported by an overwhelming majority of constituents in the 40th Congressional District including Republicans and Democrats alike and a broad coalition of interest groups from the Sierra Club to the National Rifle Association. This transaction would be one of the biggest land acquisitions in California history and one of the most substantial gifts ever to the American people.

It is my hope that we can take advantage of this rare opportunity to purchase these valuable lands and remove any remaining impediments for the millions of hikers, campers, and other recreationists who will continue to visit and enjoy this pristine area in the heart of California.

ASTEROID RESEARCH

• Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to commend a group of New Mexicans who are achieving some phenomenal results. In fact, they're currently battling .500 and more. If they were baseball players they would be acclaimed on every sports page.

But instead of baseball, this group has discovered half of the comets that are currently visible through telescopes. One of their latest comet discoveries may be bright enough to see with binoculars next year. And it's probably safe to guess that the brightest of comets attracts an audience well in excess of those watching major league baseball.

Instead of baseball bats, they are using a telescope at the north end of White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico. This Lincoln Near-Earth Asteroid Research project is run by Lincoln Laboratory of the Massachusetts Institute of technology. A second telescope at the site started operations in the last week—that may boost their discoveries still further.

The project grew out of an Air Force study involving space surveillance. Now space surveillance isn't a new subject, but in this project they're using a new automated system with a highly sensitive electronic camera. It's a great tool for discovering objects that move in the heavens, like comets and asteroids. The performance of their system exceeds any competitor by at least ten times. Today, both the Air Force Office of Scientific Research and NASA provide the funding for this project.

Their asteroid batting average even exceeds their comet batting average. Since the first telescope started operation in March 1998, the project has accounted for about 70 percent of all the near-Earth asteroids that have ever been located. That's especially impressive since astronomers have been searching for such objects for over 60 years.

As they find these asteroids, they also project their future path through the heavens and explore any possibility for an impact with the Earth. In the course of their work, they've found four asteroids that might possibly approach Earth—but so far, careful evaluations of their probable future trajectories have shown that each of these objects should miss us. So, while the dinosaurs may have become extinct after an asteroid impact, so far our coast looks clear.

The project team is headed by Dr. Grant Stokes, a 1977 graduate of Los Alamos High School and a New Mexico native. Dr. Eric Pearce directs the team at White Sands. This team has truly revolutionized the art of finding comets and asteroids. I want to commend Dr. Stokes and Dr. Pearce along with their supporters at the Air Force and NASA. This large group of New Mexicans deserves the title of the world's best comet and asteroid hunting team.●

THE CITY OF BOSTON'S CRUSADE AGAINST CANCER

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to commend the city of Boston's Crusade Against Cancer and I commend our outstanding Mayor, Thomas M. Menino, for his leadership on this excellent program. Donald Gudaitis, the chief executive officer of the American Cancer Society's New England Division, has called the Crusade Against Cancer, "the most visionary public health initiative ever undertaken in any city around the prevention and early detection of cancer."

Through innovative measures such as giving city employees time off for cancer screenings, Boston's Crusade Against Cancer uses a small public investment to create a large public health payoff. It may well serve as a model for communities throughout the nation.

Boston's program provides essential preventive care to the city's low income and minority communities, who

are hit disproportionately hard by the ravages of cancer. Many members of these communities are neglected by HMOs and private insurers and might otherwise never receive a cancer screening.

Nearly a quarter of the women using the program's mobile mammography van were receiving a mammogram for the very first time. Since early detection is a critical factor in the successful treatment of cancer, these preventive screenings are literally a lifesaver for many Bostonians. Boston's program has gained nationwide attention and was described in a recent article in the New York Times. I believe the article will be of great interest to all of us in Congress and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 2, 1999]

BOSTON BATTLES CANCER WITH A CITYWIDE MAILING

(By Carey Goldberg)

BOSTON, NOV. 2—Cities often undertake campaigns to fight crime or litter.

This city is fighting what health officials call its No. 1 killer: cancer.

Over the last few days, every household in Boston, in theory, has been mailed a brochure describing how to prevent cancer and to detect it early if it develops.

The quarter-million English-and-Spanish brochures, Boston's largest public health mailing ever, are the flashiest element of the city's "crusade against cancer," but they are only one of many.

Boston's municipal employees are allowed to take four hours off each year for cancer screening—a rule that city officials say was the only one of its kind until Springfield, Mass., adopted a similar rule last week.

Over the last several months, about 1,600 chemotherapy patients have been given free rides to and from their sessions, thanks to hospitals and taxis participating in the city's crusade.

Other cities and states run anti-cancer programs as does the federal government. But overall, said Donald J. Gudaitis, chief executive officer of the American Cancer Society's New England division, "This is the most visionary public health initiative ever undertaken in any city around prevention and early detection of cancer."

Such a campaign may seem logical at a time when the death rate from heart disease has been dropping and cancer, the nation's No. 2 cause of death, kills more than half a million Americans every year.

But Mr. Gudaitis attributed the anticancer campaign in Boston to a particular asset: a personally interested mayor.

Mayor Thomas M. Menino's father died of prostate cancer, and the mayor, who does not normally play up his personal life, said in a telephone interview that he saw his father "go from a big brawny guy to 70 pounds."

"And you ask yourself, why?" Mayor Menino added. "I want to try to help other people out."

In particular, it seems, he wants to help the poor. Boston, like many other cities, has found that cancer death rates are especially high in poor and minority neighborhoods. Patchy health care makes poor people less likely to have checkups for cancer and thus more likely to die from it.

More than a year ago, Mayor Menino convened a panel of medical experts and cancer survivors to help decide what to do. The process, which led to the crusade against

cancer, is continuing, said John Rich, medical director of the Boston Public Health Commission. But the panel established three initial goals: that all Boston households, receive information on cancer prevention, that all Bostonians receive appropriate screenings and that all cancer patients have transportation to and from treatment sessions.

Transportation may seem minor compared with the first two goals but not to chemotherapy patients, said Maureen Sullivan, vice president of the Massachusetts Bay region of the American Cancer Society who is a cancer survivor. It might not be bad getting to chemotherapy sessions, but, Ms. Sullivan added, "Let me tell you, coming home can be really awful, and not only for you but for everyone else on that bus with you."

Boston has introduced other help on wheels, a mobile mammography van that has been booked solid since it began six months ago. Officials say the city is fighting cancer in small ways as well—supplying sunscreen to its outdoor workers, for example—and in bigger ones: Mayor Menino supported a ban on smoking in Boston restaurants, despite heavy opposition from restaurateurs. The program includes television advertising and a new city agency, the Office of Cancer Prevention.

The campaign costs little, Mr. Menino said, perhaps, \$100,000 for the mammography van, about \$250,000 for the brochures and nothing for the transportation and time off.

Asked why Boston is undertaking an anticancer campaign now, when the disease has killed millions for decades, those involved cited two factors: the accumulation of research finding on cancer prevention and widespread disillusionment with the prevention promise offered by health maintenance organizations.

"If we look at the actual synthesis and explosion, if you will, of information on the relationship between life-style factors and cancer in the last 20 years, it really has moved beyond just smoking as a major cause," said Dr. Graham Colditz, director of education at the Harvard Center for Cancer Prevention, which is participating in the campaign.

Dr. Colditz said the center had determined that at least 50 percent of cancer cases could be prevented through behavioral changes alone. The screenings could also prevent deaths among those whose cancer would be detected early, he said.

The brochure advises people to eat a healthy diet, to get at least 30 minutes of physical activity every day, to keep their weight down, to drink less alcohol, to avoid smoking, to avoid sexually transmitted diseases and to protect themselves from the sun.

None of that was news to Mary Caulfield, a 58-year-old retired resident of the Dorchester section of Boston. But, Ms. Caulfield said, "I think a lot of newcomers, foreigners, probably don't understand even things like immunizations."

The Boston anticancer program is impressive, Sandra Mullin, spokeswoman for the New York City Department of Health, said upon hearing it described. New York does not give municipal employees time off for screenings, Ms. Mullin said, though it periodically includes reminders of the need for screenings in employees' paychecks, and it has a program to encourage exercise at lunch.

While New York has done no blanket mailing and is not as involved in cancer screening, it does provide cancer information through mobile health vans, Ms. Mullin said. The city focuses some of its other anticancer efforts on antismoking programs and on making sure that managed care plans screen Medicaid patients for cancer.

What the Boston campaign will try next remains under discussion. Among some ideas mentioned: persuading private employers to give employees four hours off for cancer screening, making it easier for Bostonians to bicycle or job to work and making programs that help smokers quit available to anyone who wants them.

As for immediate results, Mayor Menino said that the four hours off for screening had already led to the early detection of some cancer and that nearly 5 percent of the women who used the mammography van had found suspicious lumps. Nearly one-fourth of those who used the van said the mammogram was their first, the mayor added.

For the most part, the campaign is expected to yield only gradual results. Certainly, the immediate effect of the brochure mailing seemed a bit underwhelming: Of more than a dozen people interviewed on the streets of Dorchester, most said they had paid little if any attention to the brochure, although some said they had set it aside to read later.

"Sometimes I'm just too tired to read," said Esther Ellis, 72, who nonetheless was having her annual mammogram at a local health center. "I just leave it to God. God respects my body."

Jose Navarro, a flea market vendor, said he did not recall getting the brochure. But when he read it in Spanish on the spot, he expressed surprise at what he learned.

"Drinking?" he exclaimed. "I know it's bad for you, I know it's bad for your liver, but I didn't know it causes cancer."

David Sheets, a 45-year-old friend of Mr. Navarro, said that he had saved the brochure at his South End home to read later but that the idea of cancer "doesn't bother me yet."

"My mother died of it, my father died of it," Mr. Sheets said. "It doesn't faze me."

He smokes and refuses to quit, he said. Then, referring to cancer, he added, "I just think that it won't happen to me."•

RECOGNIZING THE MT. BAKER PTA

• Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I take the floor today to applaud the members and volunteers of the Mt. Baker Parent-Teacher Association that have successfully raised over \$100,000 for its schools. Mt. Baker is a small, rural community just south of the Canadian border that lacks a sufficient tax-base to cover the costs of buying new technology for its schools.

In an effort to raise funds to purchase up-to-date resources for their students, volunteers from the PTA opened a small restaurant with their own time and resources. To date, this venture has provided over \$100,000 to improve education in Mt. Baker. For that reason, I am pleased to present one of my Innovation in Education Awards to the Mt. Baker PTA.

In January of 1989, 20 parents took out a loan and purchased a run-down restaurant booth at the Northwest Washington Fair Grounds. Parents and volunteers spent countless hours cleaning and preparing the restaurant for its opening in March of 1989. For the past 10 years, volunteers and parents have worked at hundreds of community events to feed the fairground visitors, raising money that funded new research and learning equipment for math and science students, field trips across western Washington, and count-

less other tools for learning that have enhanced the education at all Mt. Baker schools.

The volunteers at the Mt. Baker PTA demonstrate that local educators and parents know what their students need to succeed and deserve the freedom and flexibility in the Federal education funds to better educate their children.

The innovative thinking and hard work of the Mt. Baker community teaches its students of the importance of a good education and how a community can work together to achieve a common goal. The Mt. Baker PTA is an example for all of us to follow. I hope that my colleagues will join me in commending the people of this community for their hard work to improve the education for their children.•

IN RECOGNITION OF LUIS ALBERTO ROBLES PADILLA, JR.

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, on September 9, 1999, I had the pleasure to be one of the keynote speakers at the Sixth Annual Scholarship Awards Banquet sponsored by the Hispanic College Fund, Inc. The Hispanic College Fund selects a student among the group of scholarship recipients to convey remarks on their behalf at the Annual Awards Banquet. Mr. Luis Robles, who attends Stanford University, where I attended Law School, spoke to the crowd of over one hundred people which included Members of Congress, Hispanic Business Leaders, friends of the Hispanic College Fund and family members of the award recipients.

Even though Luis is not from my home state of New Mexico, I feel that it is important to recognize the dedication, hard work, and commitment that this young man has undertaken in his academics and in his life despite great adversity. The remarks that Luis made to those in attendance that night left the room in utter silence. His remarks, and those of the teacher who nominated him for the scholarship, show that nothing in life is unattainable. This young man serves as an example that if you believe in yourself, believe in hard work, and believe you can achieve your goals, you can do anything and be anyone you want to be.

Mr. President, I respectfully ask that the attached statement which Mr. Robles made to the Sixth Annual Scholarship Awards Dinner and that of his teacher, Mr. David Layton, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The statement follows:

REMARKS BY LUIS ALBERTO ROBLES

I remember the day well . . . a few weeks after weeks after Thanksgiving in 1986. The gray Seattle morning smelled like drizzle as my father, Luis, and my mother, Maria, escorted me along evergreen-lined 8th street, to the school bus stop for the very first time. The other children laughed and frolicked. But without knowing English, without knowing what they said, my parents and I only stared in wonder.

Next thing I know the enormous school bus is pulling away, with me on

board; frightened and alone. Hot tears streamed down my cheeks. The window was cold against my nose. My parents smiled worriedly, waved, and off I went . . . to Cherry Crest Elementary.

I had no idea what the future held.

I had no idea what graduation was, let alone college.

I had no idea that some day in the distant future I would standing here before you tonight.

Good evening.

Buenas Tardes.

My name is Luis Alberto Robles Padilla, Jr. I am a sophomore majoring in Industrial engineering at Stanford University. I feel very privileged to join you tonight, and am honored to be speaking on behalf on this year's scholarship recipients.

On their and my behalf, I would like to offer a heartfelt thanks to the Hispanic College Fund, the corporate sponsors, the Board of Trustees, and American Airlines.

I would also like to thank the Lockheed Martin Corporation, in particular, for my scholarship. The scholarship is a tremendous help to my family, and I am truly thankful.

I would also like to share a part of my story: personal experiences that have shaped my life, ideas that have shaped what I believe, and people that have made me into the person that I am today. I will begin on December 17th, 1997, my 17th birthday:

"Dr. Johnson. . . . Dr. Johnson. . . ." As I wearily walked down the artificially lit corridor, I realized someone was paging my father's doctor. I turned and ran towards the intensive care unit that I had left only a few minutes ago, towards my terrified mother and toward my father's labored breathing. The sterilized odor of Harrison Memorial Hospital overwhelmed me as I raced through a maze of white walls to confront his death.

After bolting through heavy metal doors, I saw doctors and nurses rushing frantically around the room. I could only hear one sound. It filled the air, was audible above all the commotion, and drowned out the heavy pounding of my heart. The monotonous beep of the monitor meant "Pappy" was gone forever.

While sitting next to him, a body drained of the warmth and energy I had always known, I focused at the crimson drops that stained the yellow linoleum floor and the crisp white sheets; slowly remembering what a terrible ordeal the past six weeks of hospitalization had been. My life had changed forever since the day I sped through traffic, with my Dad shivering in the back seat next to my worried mother. I was scared to death without even knowing that the killer was Leukemia.

Although the chemotherapy proceeded well, it also gradually wore my father away. The first side effects were a loss of appetite, accompanied by nausea and vomiting. His hair fell out next, and I could tell my father's courage was beginning to waver. A look of

pain and anguish had replaced his usual smile, and with each passing day, he looked more like my grandfather. It all seemed like a bad dream, both frightful and surreal.

While packing his belongings, hours after he had passed away, I found a note intended for me. It was in Father's handwriting; blurry scribbles because the medicine made his hands shake. I sat down and cried because it said in Spanish, "ya es tiempo de luchar," which means, "it is time to take up the struggle."

The poem he wrote to me, titled "Oda a mi Hijo," "Ode to my Son" goes like this:

Quiero cantarte una cancion,
(I want to sing you a song)
Desde lo mas profundo de mi alma,
(From the deepest part of my soul)
Brisa suave, que refresca y calma,
(Soft breeze that refreshes and soothes)
Tu tierra fecunda que riega mi oracion.
(Your fertile soil that showers my prayer)
El agua se hizo luz y dio una planta,
(The water turned to light and created a plant)
La tierra hecha vida, dio on rosas con un boton,
(The soil transformed into life and bore a rose in full blossom)
Carne de dos almas hecha con amor,
(Flesh from two souls, made with love)
Fue la suave brisa, que refresca y canta.
(It was the soft breeze that refreshes and sings)
Con el correr de los años, pajarito se volvio,
(As the years passed, it transformed into a bird)
Dejar el nido quiere, hace el intento de volar,
(Yearning to leave the nest, it attempts to fly)
La brisa, el amor, el cielo derramo,
(The breeze, the love, the heavens overflowed)
El destino esta en tus manos, ya es tiempo de luchar.
(Destiny is in your hands, its time to take up the struggle)

I find it hard to understand Dad's absence, and that he left exactly on my seventeenth birthday. But though I miss him everyday, I am grateful for all the time we spent together and everything my father taught me. Through my family's Mexican restaurant, he showed me what Hispanic business leadership is: hard work, dedication, and most importantly, helping others and the community.

My father pointed me in the right direction, and made me believe in myself. There is good in this beautiful world, and life will always receive my best effort. Rather than cause embarrassment, my heritage will always instill pride within me, and I will succeed. I know he is proud of me.

Ultimately, by succeeding I hope to influence other Hispanics. When I look at many of my Hispanic peers, I see them giving up on school, giving up bright futures, and giving up their dreams. Their intellectual capacity has nothing to do with it, and the issue is complicated, yet they also do not have the support or the opportunities.

At this point, I would like to thank my parents for their unending love, my family for their constant encourage-

ment, and all of my friends for their help and support. I would also like to thank Mr. Paul Torno, who worked with me even after retiring. Special thanks to Mr. David Layton . . . even though I lost my father, a great man and teacher, I am lucky to have found another great teacher, another great man. Finally, I thank my mother, an incredibly brave and strong woman. Most of all, however, I thank God all the blessings.

I and the other scholarship recipients, as well as countless other Hispanics, are yearning to fly . . . trying to fly . . . learning to fly . . .

Once again, I would like to thank the Hispanic College Fund, and its sponsors.

We want to demonstrate that anything is possible by working hard and following our dreams.

We want to see more Hispanics graduating from high school and college.

We want to have more Hispanics in business and government positions.

We want to truly thank all of you for helping us strive towards our goals.

Thank you and good night.

March 25, 1999.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN, Luis Robles has asked me to recommend him for acceptance for your scholarship. Few tasks will be as easy for me to do. I have known him as a student for two years in both honors history and honors English classes so I feel quite qualified to speak about his application.

It is impossible for me to recommend Luis without telling his story first. No other student in my 19 years of teaching has accomplished more with such adversity. An only child of immigrants from Mexico, Luis learned more than values from his parents; he learned who he was, who he could become, and what he could give back to his community. His father ran a small restaurant on our island and hired family and friends who needed work; but to keep dreams alive he insisted they go to night school and paid their tuition if they maintained a B. This pride and dignity wrapped in such strong humor are his legacy. Tragically last year his father died of Leukemia in his son's arms on his son's 17th birthday. As the only one who spoke clear English, Luis sold the restaurant, managed his mother's accounts, supported her till she finished her AA degree, and found work at the local hospital.

His commute to Bainbridge is 60-80 minutes each way. But he knew what he wanted—to be blunt we run one of the hardest programs in the state. He has aced every honors or AP course we offer. His maturity is beyond his years. He seeks out criticism and he listens and grows with suggestions. Specifically he has worked hard on his writing knowing that here his voice needs to be clear and purposeful. In both independent and group projects, Luis has had the discipline and creativity to make the connections between ideas, events, and more importantly to things in his own life. His work has shown original thought and a true conviction to understand the complications of individuals struggling to find meaningful solutions to their problems. Luis embodies the belief that this is his life, his chance to make a difference, his chance to give back far more than he takes. Make no mistake, he will take advantage of all you offer.

Luis has shared with my family the poetry his father wrote and the poems he has now written back. It is his genuineness that I

wish to commend most. His 4.0 G.P.A. has been matched, the high marks on the SAT equaled, but none have his vision.

It should be obvious how strongly I feel about Luis; his heart separates him from the rest. If you have the chance to talk with him, you will understand.

Sincerely,

DAVID LAYTON,
Faculty, Honors Program.●

HONORING ANNE KANTEN

● Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I speak today to say a few words about a remarkable farm leader and humanitarian, Anne Kanten.

Anne has served for 18 years on the board of directors of the Farmers Legal Action Group (F.L.A.G.), a non-profit law firm based in St. Paul, Minnesota, and dedicated to helping family farmers obtain economic and social justice. I salute Anne Kanten for her enlightened guidance to F.L.A.G. during her years as a director and her years on the board. But far more than that, I want to take this moment to acknowledge Anne Kanten's lifetime of service to others.

Anne served as Minnesota's Deputy Commissioner of Agriculture and as Chief Administrator of the Minnesota Farm Advocate Program during the years of farm crisis in the 1980's. She was a founding member of the American Agriculture Movement who, with her husband Chuck and son Kent, helped plan and carry out the Washington, DC Tractorcade of 1979. In addition, Anne has been a long time spokesperson for stewardship of the land and its people through her various leadership roles in her church.

Her efforts to achieve justice for farm families continue to this day.

Anne Kanten grew up on an Iowa farm, the daughter of immigrants who came to our country in pursuit of a better life. By her own admission, she longed to escape the 1930's Depression of her rural childhood. After attending college and becoming a teacher, Anne became re-connected to the land when she married Chuck Kanten, a young farmer from Milan, Minnesota. Anne and Chuck Kanten represent the best of American Life. They raised a wonderful family on their farm home. They believe strongly in giving of themselves.

I consider myself honored and fortunate to count Anne Kanten as my friend. I ask the Senate today to join me in recognizing Anne Kanten for her years of service to the Farmers Legal Action Group and to farm families everywhere.●

DELAWARE WELL REPRESENTED AT AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY GOLF CHAMPIONSHIP

● Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to salute four Delaware golfers who continue to make the citizens of my State proud.

Last June, Margaret Butler, Mary Kaczorowski, Joyce Ruddick and Alice Wooldridge played in and won the

American Cancer Society Golf Championship at Maple Dale Country Club in Dover, Delaware. They then advanced to the Mid-Atlantic Championship at The Homestead in Hot Springs, Virginia and won the Delaware State Title in Division 3. And on December 3rd and 4th, they will be representing Delaware and looking to continue their winning ways at the P.G.A. West in LaQuinta, California.

Having talked with members of this foursome on a few occasions, it is clear to me that these women take their golf quite seriously. Together, they embody the spirit of competition and sportsmanship and are fine examples of personal achievement and Delaware pride. But most importantly, these women realize that their participation in this event helps to raise essential funding for cancer research and programs. Millions of Americans suffer from cancer-related illnesses, and events like these give us all hope for finding a cure.

While I acknowledge that I may be a bit biased in my viewpoint, I also know a group of champions when I see them. I, among many, believe that talent is often overrated and that character is the true determining factor for any success one has in life.

I have seen these women drive a golf ball and I can confidently say that both talent and character reign supreme for this team. It is therefore my pleasure to extend to them my deep expression of thanks for having represented Delaware so well this year and, as they prepare for their biggest challenge to date, to wish them continued success in the National tournament.

We in Delaware are very proud of these four women, and we will be rooting for them!•

IN HONOR OF REVEREND MONSIGNOR ANDREW P. LANDI

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to Reverend Monsignor Andrew P. Landi, a son of New York and internationally known humanitarian, who was taken from us this past September. He was 92.

Monsignor Landi was the retired assistant executive director and of Catholic Relief Services in New York City from 1966 to 1979. Upon of his retirement he was named assistant treasurer, a position he held until the time of his death. Monsignor devoted himself to the service of the poor and disposed throughout the world regardless of race, creed, or nationality.

Catholic Relief Services was founded in 1943 by the Catholic Bishops of the United States to alleviate suffering by removing its causes and promoting social justice beyond our borders. Their mission is to aid in the development of people by fostering charity and justice throughout the world. Monsignor Landi's devotion to this mission was ceaseless.

At a time when we are increasingly egocentric, we would do well to remem-

ber a man whose ministry to the disadvantaged was distinguished as a no other for faithful and untiring service. I wish to highlight the central role he played as a petitioner for overseas relief activities to numerous Federal agencies and Congress. He met with nearly every Pope since Pope Pius XII and counted Mother Teresa among his friends.

This champion of the downtrodden was sent to Rome in 1944 to minister to the victims of World War II. He spent the next two decades providing haven to refugees of civil strife and natural disasters. He was named the Regional Director of the Catholic Relief Services for Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa in 1962.

Monsignor Landi began his vocation as a parish priest at Our Lady of the Scapular and St. Stephen's Church in Manhattan in 1934. St. Stephens was at one time the largest Catholic parish in New York City. It is a special New York treasure as it contains several works by 19th century Italian Painter Constantino Brumidi who is best known for having done much of the artwork on display in the United States Capitol.

In 1939, Monsignor Landi became the associate director of Catholic Charities in Brooklyn, NY. As I recently noted, Catholic Charities of the Brooklyn-Queens Diocese is the largest Roman Catholic human services agency in the nation. Perhaps on earth.

One of seven children orphaned after the death of their mother in 1913, he focused his mission toward young people. His benevolence toward the troubled youth of Brooklyn was exceptional.

During Monsignor Landi's 65 years in the priesthood he received numerous honors from several governments and organizations. He was honored by our own New York State Assembly which issued a citation on the his 90th birthday in recognition his humanitarian efforts.

In closing I would like to express my deep gratitude to Monsignor Landi for his life long commitment to ending social injustice especially toward children living in poverty. His distinguished devotion to God and his fellow man is a model to us all.•

TRAGEDY IN ARMENIA

• Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today to express my sorrow at last week's tragedy in the Armenian National Parliament. Prime Minister Sarkissian, Speaker Demirchian, and six other legislators were killed. While we may never know what motivated the gunmen to storm the building, we do know that a single act of terror was directed against individuals who were attempting to build and strengthen Armenia's democratic institutions. Armenia has made positive movement toward widespread democracy and free markets, and the leaders who lost their lives had played important roles in these reforms. As a result, this tragedy

is truly a great loss for the Armenian people. For this reason, I have joined Senator ABRAHAM in introducing a resolution condemning the incident.

After months of progress on a range of issues, from the rule of law, to Nagorno-Karabakh, to fighting corruption, Armenia is faced with a huge obstacle to overcome. Just this past week, Armenia held local elections nationwide that were deemed free and fair by independent observers. These elections were not without minor irregularities, but the overall impact has been to reaffirm and further strengthen the commitment of the Armenian people to an open election process.

On the complex issue of peace in Nagorno-Karabakh, significant progress has been made recently. Bilateral meetings between President Kocharian and President Aliyev have been frequent and intensive in response to our encouragement for greater results. Just hours before the attack, Prime Minister Sarkissian had met with President Kocharian and Deputy Secretary of State Talbott to discuss the peace process. Clearly, it will be difficult for Armenia to move forward without Sarkissian's presence—difficult, but not impossible.

Given the tremendous amount of progress Armenia has made since declaring independence from the Soviet Union, I am confident that the Armenian people will move past this tragic event and continue to build upon their successes. But the key to doing so is ongoing support from the United States. Together, our two countries have built strong ties, focusing upon a prosperous, secure and democratic future. It is critical that, in the midst of such overpowering grief, we renew our support for the people of Armenia and their leaders. As they continue to build upon the principles that the victims had worked to fulfill, the people of Armenia should know that the United States supports their efforts. I hope my colleagues will join me in sending this message to the Armenian people.•

TRIBUTE TO DR. PERCY G. HARRIS

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Dr. Percy G. Harris, a distinguished Iowan from Cedar Rapids who is retiring after forty years of practicing family medicine. His biography is truly a great American story.

Dr. Harris was born into a poor family in Mississippi in 1927. He was orphaned as a teenager and moved to Waterloo, Iowa to live with his aunt. High school was a struggle for Percy Harris, but he finally received his diploma at the age of 19. After that, he was determined to make something of his life, and set his sights on becoming a doctor. He was admitted to medical school at Howard University in Washington, DC. He paid his way by working as an elevator operator and janitor. After he received his medical degree, Dr. Harris returned to Cedar Rapids, Iowa to open a family practice.

His practice grew and flourished over four decades. His patients credit him with the old-fashioned virtue of patience and say he is always willing to spend extra time caring for them. He believes in giving back and is active in the community as a civil rights leader and as a volunteer athletic doctor for Jefferson High School.

Percy Harris's life is a list of firsts. He was the first African-American to hold an internship at St. Luke's Hospital in Cedar Rapids. He served as Linn County, Iowa's first and only medical examiner. In 1977, Governor Robert Ray appointed him to the Iowa Board of Regents where he served two terms as the Board's first African-American member.

Dr. Harris encountered adversity along the way, but he chose to view it as a challenge rather than an obstacle. In 1961, he and his wife, Lileah, decided to build a home for their growing family. They set their sights on a piece of property in one of Cedar Rapids' all white neighborhoods. The neighbors were up in arms, but Percy and Lileah Harris persisted and eventually purchased the property in a dispute that gained national attention. They built their family home on the property and raised 12 fine children, all of whom are now grown and successful in their own right.

Mr. President, Dr. Harris is one in a long American tradition of medical practitioners who put patients before profits, who lead by example, and who dedicate themselves to the well-being of humankind, from their community to their nation. I congratulate him on his many achievements and wish him well in all future endeavors. I know wherever he chooses to put his many talents, he will leave his mark.●

IN HONOR OF TED WINTER'S 50TH BIRTHDAY

● Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I speak today to recognize a very special Minnesotan. Ted Winter will be celebrating his 50th birthday the day after Thanksgiving. Friends and family will be gathering at the American Legion in Fulda, Minnesota, to honor this very good and decent man.

It is very appropriate that this year his birthday falls so close to Thanksgiving because as a Minnesotan I am very thankful that Ted so ably represents the people of Southwestern Minnesota in the State Legislature; I am thankful that Ted continues to be a strong voice for those struggling to maintain their family farms; I am thankful that Ted struggles daily to ensure the vitality of our rural communities and that he is committed to a vision of Minnesota that is rich and diverse.

In the last few years, Ted has been the driving force behind uniting Midwest State Legislators in calling for a change in federal farm policy. He has been central in calling attention to the devastating effect the concentration of power in agriculture is having on family farmers. Day in and day out, Ted spends time away from his own farm to work with farm organizations and other farmers to come up with ways that family farmers can survive to farm another day. He drives throughout the state to make sure that any meeting discussing the future of Minnesota includes a discussion about the future of family farms and rural communities.

I am pleased to be able to speak today to honor my friend, Ted Winter.●

HONORING KAREN LEACH

● Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to honor an outstanding individual who has dedicated her life to the education of our young people. Karen Leach of Johnston, Rhode Island, is retiring from the Providence School Department after nearly thirty years of dedicated service.

Since Karen graduated from Rhode Island College in 1969 with a Bachelor's Degree in Elementary and Special Education, she has received Masters of Education Degrees in both Elementary Education and in Administration for Elementary and Middle Schools. She has also furthered her professional development by achieving certification in many areas.

The capital of Rhode Island, Providence is at the heart of our state's urban center and during her career, Karen has been assigned to several

schools in the District. Karen began her long and accomplished career as a teacher and dedicated her efforts toward Special Education. During her tenure, the field of education has seen tremendous change—from curriculum, to technology, to teaching methods and to administrative practices. Throughout nearly three decades of service, Karen has brought efficiency, expertise and professionalism to her many challenging assignments.

In 1988, Karen was named Supervisor of Elementary/Pre-School Education for the Providence School Department and in 1992, she became Principal of the Sackett Street Elementary School and the Reservoir Avenue Elementary School. Since the 1992-1993 school year, she has been Principal of the Sackett Street Elementary School and she is retiring from her present administration position as Interim Acting Superintendent of Teaching and Learning.

Karen Leach is a person of great integrity, compassion and initiative. She is accomplished and well respected for her many contributions to the Providence School System. She has made a positive impact on the quality of education, and in the lives of students, especially those with special needs. Most recently, Karen's leadership as a Principal and as an Administrator has left a lasting mark on the City of Providence.

So many young people have had their lives enriched by one person's efforts. Karen Leach's commitment and her tangible accomplishments clearly demonstrate that an investment in education is indeed an investment in the future.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Karen Leach for her commitment to educational excellence and for her efforts to improve the overall quality of our education system. Indeed, she has made a tremendous difference in the lives of her students. As Karen Leach leaves the Providence School Department, she plans to continue as a professional educational consultant. I wish her well and remain confident that we will hear more news of this outstanding educator's good works.●

FOREIGN CURRENCY REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following report(s) of standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1, TO SEPT. 30, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Edward Barron:									
Italy	Lira	2,163,819	1,169.00	4,238.15	5,407.15
Croatia	Dollar	548.00	548.00
Macedonia	Dollar	175.00	175.00
Italy	Lira	938,500	507.02	938,500	507.02
France	Dollar	516.00	516.00
Total	2,408.00	4,745.17	7,153.17

RICHARD LUGAR,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, Oct. 20, 1999.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1, TO SEPT. 30, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Patrick J. Leahy:									
Italy	Lira	1,515,897	839.00	1,515,897	839.00
Macedonia	Dollar	175.00	175.00
Croatia	Dollar	548.00	548.00
United States	Dollar	3,642.85	3,642.85
Tim Rieser:									
Macedonia	Dollar	175.00	175.00
Croatia	Dollar	248.00	248.00
United States	Dollar	2,151.00	2,151.00
Senator Ted Stevens:									
Russia	Dollar	450.00	450.00
United States	Dollar	11,258.84	11,258.84
Steve Cortese:									
Russia	Dollar	450.00	450.00
United States	Dollar	5,993.84	5,993.84
Jennifer Chartrand:									
Russia	Dollar	450.00	450.00
United States	Dollar	5,993.84	5,993.84
John Young:									
Papua New Guinea	Dollar	136.00	136.00
Indonesia	Dollar	466.00	466.00
Singapore	Dollar	254.00	254.00
Thailand	Dollar	498.00	498.00
Cambodia	Dollar	200.00	200.00
Vietnam	Dollar	556.00	556.00
Burma	Dollar	292.00	292.00
Laos	Dollar	250.00	250.00
Philippines	Dollar	488.00	488.00
Robin Cleveland:									
Italy	Dollar	300.00	300.00
Serbia	Dollar	300.00	300.00
Macedonia	Dollar	300.00	300.00
Total	7,375.00	29,040.37	36,415.37

TED STEVENS,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Oct. 25, 1999.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1, TO SEPT. 30, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jeff Sessions:									
Macedonia	Dollar		291.00						291.00
David S. Lyles:									
Macedonia	Dollar		121.50						121.50
Richard D. DeBobes:									
Macedonia	Dollar		121.50						121.50
Joseph T. Sixeas:									
Macedonia	Dollar		121.50						121.50
Senator Carl Levin:									
Macedonia	Dollar		233.50						233.50
Senator Jack Reed:									
Macedonia	Dollar		271.50						271.50
Jason Matthews:									
Romania	Dollar		849.00						849.00
Senator Mary Landrieu:									
Macedonia	Dollar		264.25						264.25
Romania	Dollar		225.00						225.00
Joan V. Grimson:									
Russia	Dollar		1,905.00						1,905.00
Sweden	Dollar		246.00						246.00
Senator Jack Reed:									
Indonesia	Dollar		184.00						184.00
United States	Dollar				4,342.08				4,342.08
Elizabeth L. King:									
Indonesia	Dollar		162.00						162.00
United States	Dollar				4,137.08				4,137.08
Cord A. Sterling:									
Ecuador	Dollar		407.00						407.00
Colombia	Dollar		647.00						647.00
Peru	Dollar		819.00						819.00
United States	Dollar				1,758.40				1,758.40
Romie L. Brownlee:									
United States	Dollar				2,110.40				2,110.40
Colombia	Dollar		259.00				22.50		281.50
Edward H. Edens IV:									
Colombia	Dollar		267.00						267.00
United States	Dollar				2,110.40				2,110.40
Total			7,394.75		14,458.36		22.50		21,875.61

JOHN WARNER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Oct. 4, 1999.

November 3, 1999

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S13839

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1, TO SEPT. 30, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Phil Gramm:									
South Korea	Won		594.00						594.00
China	Yuan		514.00						514.00
Japan	Yen		208.29						208.29
Senator Richard Shelby:									
South Korea	Won		594.00						594.00
China	Yuan		514.00						514.00
Japan	Yen		241.05						241.05
Senator Robert Bennett:									
South Korea	Won		594.00						594.00
China	Yuan		514.00						514.00
Japan	Yen		200.10						200.10
Senator Mike Crapo:									
South Korea	Won		594.00						594.00
China	Yuan		514.00						514.00
Japan	Yen		208.29						208.29
Senator Evan Bayh:									
South Korea	Won		594.00						594.00
China	Yuan		514.00						514.00
Japan	Yen		200.10						200.10
James Jochum:									
South Korea	Won		594.00						594.00
China	Yuan		514.00						514.00
Japan	Yen		234.15						234.15
Senator Evan Bayh:									
Portugal	Escudo		837.00		4,084.00				4,921.00
Total			8,776.98		4,084.00				12,860.98

PHIL GRAMM,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,
Oct. 21, 1999.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1, TO SEPT. 30, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Alice Grant:									
Italy	Lira	1,217,000	660.00					1,217,000	660.00
Serbia	Dollar		338.00						338.00
Commercial airfare					5,164.98				5,164.98
Total			998.00		5,164.98				6,162.98

PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, Sept. 30, 1999.

AMENDMENT TO 3RD QUARTER 1998 CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1, TO SEPT. 30, 1998

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ian J. Brzezinski:									
Jordan	Dinar		829.00						829.00
Turkey	Lira		452.00						452.00
Kyrgyzstan	Som		558.00						558.00
Mongolia	Tughrik		354.00						354.00
China	Yuan		552.00						552.00
Korea	Won		524.00						524.00
Total			3,269.00						3,629.00

WILLIAM V. ROTH, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, Sept. 9, 1999.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1, TO SEPT. 30, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Joseph Biden:									
Serbia	Dollar		180.00				54.25		234.25
Bosnia	Dollar		207.00						207.00
Bulgaria	Dollar		182.50						182.50
Romania	Dollar		204.00						204.00
United States	Dollar				5,822.74				5,822.74
Senator Paul Coverdell:									
Colombia	Dollar		486.00						486.00
Senator Chuck Hagel:									
China	Dollar		514.00		332.00				846.00
Vietnam	Dollar		1,112.00		176.00				1,288.00
Thailand	Dollar		398.00						398.00
Singapore	Dollar		204.00						204.00
United States	Dollar				4,867.00				4,867.00
Senator Robert Torricelli:									
North Korea	Dollar		761.00						761.00
China	Dollar		508.00						508.00
United States	Dollar				6,770.40				6,770.40
Alex Albert:									
Colombia	Dollar		486.00						486.00
Marshall Billingslea:									
Austria	Dollar		216.00						216.00
Czech Republic	Dollar		544.00						544.00
Italy	Dollar		802.00						802.00
Netherlands	Dollar		264.00						264.00
United States	Dollar				5,202.75				5,202.75
James Doran:									
Thailand	Dollar		996.00						996.00
Cambodia	Dollar		472.00						472.00
Laos	Dollar		125.00						125.00
United States	Dollar				4,857.40				4,857.40
Debbie Fiddelke:									
Vietnam	Dollar		2,224.00		176.00				2,400.00
United States	Dollar				6,415.00				6,415.00
Heather Flynn:									
Italy	Dollar		380.00						380.00
Egypt	Dollar		800.00						800.00
Macedonia	Dollar		1,020.00						1,020.00
Serbia	Dollar		700.00						700.00
United States	Dollar				6,755.81				6,755.81
Edwin Hall:									
Serbia	Dollar		61.00				54.25		115.25
Bosnia	Dollar		172.00						172.00
Bulgaria	Dollar		232.50						232.50
Romania	Dollar		244.00						244.00
United States	Dollar				4,093.74				4,093.74
Michael Haltzel:									
Romania	Dollar		40.00						40.00
Croatia	Dollar		334.00						334.00
Bosnia	Dollar		702.00						702.00
United States	Dollar				5,514.70				5,514.70
Serbia	Dollar		71.00				54.25		125.25
Bosnia	Dollar		161.00						161.00
Bulgaria	Dollar		181.50						181.50
Romania	Dollar		186.00						186.00
United States	Dollar				4,093.74				4,093.74
Frank Jannuzi:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,735.00						1,735.00
United States	Dollar				4,648.84				4,648.84
Thomas Lewis:									
Serbia	Dollar		85.00				54.25		139.25
Bosnia	Dollar		161.00						161.00
Bulgaria	Dollar		172.50						172.50
Romania	Dollar		202.00						202.00
United States	Dollar				3,273.55				3,273.55
Michael Miller:									
Ethiopia	Dollar		1,421.00						1,421.00
Saudi Arabia	Dollar		166.00						166.00
Eritrea	Dollar		524.00						524.00
United States	Dollar				7,418.38				7,418.38
Roger Noriega:									
Colombia	Dollar		400.00						400.00
Kenneth Peel:									
China	Dollar		514.00		332.00				846.00
Vietnam	Dollar		1,112.00		176.00				1,288.00
Thailand	Dollar		398.00						398.00
Singapore	Dollar		204.00						204.00
United States	Dollar				4,800.00				4,800.00
Maria Pica:									
North Korea	Dollar		761.00						761.00
China	Dollar		508.00						508.00
United States	Dollar				4,323.00				4,323.00
Elizabeth Stewart:									
Italy	Dollar		650.00						650.00
Serbia	Dollar		348.00						348.00
United States	Dollar				5,164.98				5,164.00
Michael Westphal:									
Thailand	Dollar		996.00						996.00
Cambodia	Dollar		472.00						472.00
Laos	Dollar		125.00						125.00
United States	Dollar				4,857.40				4,857.40
Italy	Dollar		650.00						650.00
Serbia	Dollar		348.00						348.00
United States	Dollar				5,164.98				5,164.98
Total									
			28,123.00		95,236.81				123,576.81

JESSE HELMS,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Oct. 26, 1999.

AMENDMENT TO 1ST QUARTER 1999 CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1, TO MAR. 31, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Marshall Billingslea:									
Turkey	Dollar		941.00						941.00
Iraq	Dollar		250.00						250.00
United States	Dollar				4,553.40				4,553.40
Total			1,191.00		4,553.40				5,744.40

JESSE HELMS,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Oct. 26, 1999.

AMENDMENT TO 2ND QUARTER 1999 CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APRIL 1, TO JUNE 30, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Alex Albert:									
Ecuador	Dollar		325.00						325.00
Peru	Dollar		103.00						103.00
Curacao	Dollar		250.00						250.00
Kirsten Madison:									
Ecuador	Dollar		325.00						325.00
Peru	Dollar		103.00						103.00
Aruba	Dollar		55.00						55.00
Curacao	Dollar		195.00						195.00
Roger Noriega:									
Spain	Dollar		2,400.00						2,400.00
United States	Dollar				1,323.84				1,323.84
Danielle Pletka:									
United Kingdom	Dollar		544.00						544.00
United States	Dollar				3,243.50				3,243.50
Total			4,300.00		4,567.34				8,867.34

JESSE HELMS,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Oct. 26, 1999.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1, TO SEPT. 30, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Arlen Specter:									
United States	Dollar		197.03		5,174.96				5,371.99
England	Dollar		224.80						224.80
Netherlands	Dollar		172.00						172.00
Ukraine	Dollar		488.00						488.00
Israel	Dollar		454.00						454.00
Jordan	Dollar		154.00						154.00
Egypt	Dollar		270.00						270.00
Italy	Lira		587.00						587.00
David J. Urban:									
United States	Dollar				4,477.06				4,477.06
Netherlands	Dollar		214.00						214.00
Ukraine	Dollar		750.00						750.00
Israel	Dollar		825.00						825.00
Jordan	Dollar		236.00						236.00
Egypt	Dollar		444.00						444.00
Italy	Lira		708.00						708.00
David K. Brog:									
United States	Dollar		4,477.06		4,477.06				4,477.06
Netherlands	Dollar		214.00						214.00
Ukraine	Dollar		750.00						750.00
Israel	Dollar		825.00						825.00
Jordan	Dollar		236.00						236.00
Egypt	Dollar		444.00						444.00
Italy	Lira		708.00						708.00
Total			8,900.83		14,129.08				23,029.91

ARLEN SPECTER,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Oct. 15, 1999.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1, TO SEPT. 30, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
C. Nicholas Rostow			1,340.86						1,340.86
Arthur Grant			881.00		5,677.52				6,558.52
George K. Johnson			566.00		5,525.62				6,091.62
James Barnett			566.00		5,609.10				6,175.10
Linda Taylor			1,199.00		6,524.28				7,723.28
Senator Richard Lugar			2,755.00		4,337.28				7,092.28

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1, TO SEPT. 30, 1999—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Kenneth Myers			2,798.00		4,337.28				7,135.25
Senator Richard C. Shelby			4,918.00						4,918.00
C. Nicholas Rostow			1,778.00						1,778.00
Anne Caldwell			4,918.00						4,918.00
William Duhnke			3,140.00						3,140.00
C. Nicholas Rostow			505.00						505.00
Senator Pat Roberts			1,938.00						1,938.00
Peter Dorn			2,941.00		5,134.40				8,076.40
Alan McCurry			2,193.00		2,958.20				5,151.20
James Barnett			974.00		4,792.40				5,766.40
Arthur Grant			1,111.00		4,792.40				5,903.40
Paula DeSutter			2,172.00		5,977.14				8,149.14
Total			36,693.86		55,666.62				92,360.48

RICHARD SHELBY,
Chairman, Select Committee on Intelligence, Oct. 20, 1999.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1, TO SEPT. 30, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James Gwartney: United States	Dollar		916.99		471.12		408.29		1,796.40
Total			916.99		471.12		408.29		1,796.40

CONNIE MACK,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee, Oct. 14, 1999.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY MAJORITY LEADER FROM JULY 1, TO SEPT. 30, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mitch Kugler: Russia	Dollar		1,150.00		5,319.02				6,469.02
Dennis McDowell: Russia	Dollar		1,150.00		5,319.02				6,469.02
Dennis Ward: Russia	Dollar		1,150.00		5,319.02				6,469.02
Total			3,450.00		15,957.06				19,407.06

TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader, Oct. 14, 1999.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY DEMOCRATIC LEADER FROM JULY 1, TO SEPT. 30, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Eric Shuffler: United States	Dollar				4,491.40				4,491.40
North Korea	Dollar		508.00						508.00
China	Yuan	6,376.17	771.00					6,376.17	771.00
Senator Patty Murray: Poland	Zloty		952.00						952.00
Hungary	Forint		225.00						225.00
Czech Republic	Dollar		464.00						464.00
United States	Dollar				2,326.41				2,326.41
Carol Cockril: Poland	Zloty		952.00						952.00
Hungary	Forint		225.00						225.00
Czech Republic	Dollar		464.00						464.00
United States	Dollar				2,326.41				2,326.41
Ben McMakin: Poland	Zloty		952.00						952.00
Hungary	Forint		225.00						225.00
Czech Republic	Dollar		464.00						464.00
United States	Dollar				2,019.41				2,019.41
Total			6,202.00		11,163.63				17,365.63

TOM DASCHLE,
Democratic Leader, Sept. 30, 1999.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY DEMOCRATIC LEADER FROM AUG. 13, TO AUG. 15, 1999

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Tom Daschle:									
Cuba	Dollar		500.00						500.00
Senator Byron Dorgan:									
Cuba	Dollar		500.00						500.00
Bradley Van Dam:									
Cuba	Dollar		285.00						285.00
Howard Walgren:									
Cuba	Dollar		300.00						300.00
Sally Walsh:									
Cuba	Dollar		278.00						278.00
Delegation expenses:									
Cuba	Dollar						1,560.58		1,560.58
Total			1,863.00				1,560.58		3,423.58

¹ Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and to the Department of Defense under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

TOM DASCHLE,
Democratic Leader, Sept. 15, 1999.

HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY ACT OF 1999

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 580, and the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 580) to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the Agency for Healthcare Policy and Research.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2506

(Purpose: To provide for a complete substitute)

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, there is a substitute amendment at the desk submitted by Senators FRIST, JEFFORDS, and KENNEDY. I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], for Mr. FRIST, for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. KENNEDY, proposes an amendment numbered 2506.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, ten years ago, Congress created the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research to help us deal more effectively with critical national priorities in health care and research. I introduced the legislation with Senator HATCH, and it passed as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989. It was based on a precursor organization—the National Center for Health Services Research—that was created by President Lyndon Johnson. The Agency's focus is primarily on health services research and other cutting edge methods to improve clinical practice. In its first decade, the Agency has proven its worth time and again by providing valuable information to Congress, health profes-

sionals, patients, businesses, and many others.

This reauthorization begins a new chapter for the Agency. New responsibilities come with its new name, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. While the Agency's intramural and extramural research will remain focused on general outcomes research and assessments of the how well the nation is doing with respect to coverage and provision of health care, there will also be increased activity on research to monitor and improve the quality of care.

The Agency will serve an increasingly important role in the nation's effort to measure and improve the quality of health care, and to expand access to health insurance and health care. Research supported by the Agency provides critical information about the use, cost and quality of health services. As the health care market evolves, these data are necessary for informed decisions to help patients, providers, employers, government administrators, and policymakers. While the Agency is not directly involved in making policy, its research and expertise provide informed guidance to those who are. This legislation will help the Agency maintain and expand its efforts to encourage public-private partnerships at every level of the health care system.

The American people deserve to know that their hard-earned dollars are buying high-quality care. They want to know, as they are voluntarily or involuntarily enrolled in managed care plans, that the quality of care they receive is improving, not declining. Employers deserve to know that their investments in health benefits lead to healthier employees. As a result of the Agency's work, more and more Americans will be able to make the right decisions about their health care.

The Agency also provides an important link between advances in medical research and technology, and adoption of these practices by the public and private sectors. The research conducted and supported by the Agency helps

identify erroneous denials of treatment, and informs the nation about treatments that are the most effective or have the highest quality. While the Agency is not in the business of developing or promoting practice guidelines, its recommendations and research findings lead to significant savings for patients, providers, health plans, and taxpayers, while simultaneously improving the quality of care.

For example, if the Agency's recommendations were applied to even 20 percent of patients, the nation could save hundreds of millions of dollars annually—ranging from \$8.5 million for enhanced prenatal care for diabetic women to \$130 million for therapies that prevent stroke. We should do all we can to see that decision-making on health care is guided by the best available scientific information. The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality will to help us achieve that goal.

The reauthorization of the Agency also provides an opportunity to expand research on health care for those with special needs. Our success in treating these patients is an important measure of the overall effectiveness of the nation's health care system. More needs to be done to evaluate how well our system treats those who need the most, and often the most complex, services. Persons with disabilities are often underrepresented in health services research. Assessing how well our fragmented system cares for a person with mental retardation or spina bifida or paraplegia or a person nearing the end-of-life will enable us to assess where better care can lead to both a higher quality of life and significant savings.

Reliable information about medical technology is an essential component of providing high quality health care to all Americans at a reasonable cost. It is especially important for Congress to be able to compare and understand the effectiveness of different technologies. For this reason, I was a strong supporter of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, which evaluated technologies in a wide range of

scientific disciplines and provided a great deal of useful information to Congress before its funding was cut off in 1995. Fortunately, the Agency is fulfilling this essential role in the area of health care, and its mission is now more important than ever.

The ongoing biomedical revolution is bringing extraordinary benefits to our society. The next century may well be the century of life sciences. Every day, we hear about new medical procedures and technologies. To fulfill their promise, the quality and effectiveness of new procedures and technologies must be carefully evaluated. The Agency is uniquely qualified to meet this challenge, and to provide important information about the value and effectiveness of existing procedures and therapies.

The assessment reports prepared by the Agency are based on sound scientific data. Expanding access to the Agency's findings is an important step toward improving the overall quality of health care for the nation. We need to do all we can to see that the extraordinary discoveries being made in biomedical research are brought as quickly as possible to the bedside of the patient.

This reauthorization puts a new face on the Agency and refocuses and refines its functions. Adequate funding for the Agency is essential, and I look forward to working with the Appropriations Committees and the Administration to achieve these needed and wise investments in better health care for all.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I am pleased that we are witnessing today the passage of legislation that is critical to improving the quality of health care in this country. The "Healthcare Research and Quality Act of 1999," which I introduced on March 10, 1999, will significantly increase our federal investment in health care research and science-based evidence to improve the quality of patient care.

The health care system is a dramatically different system today than a decade ago when the Congress established the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research. The financing and delivery of health care has changed as we have moved to more complex systems such as managed care. At the same time, there has been an explosion of new medical information stemming from our biomedical research advances. As a result, patients and providers face increased difficulty in tracking and understanding the latest scientific findings.

As we have seen in the debate on the Patients' Bill of Rights Act, issues regarding the quality and appropriate use of health care services is a significant public policy concern. Thus, I felt it was important to include S. 580 in the Patients' Bill of Rights Act that passed the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee on March 18, 1999, and subsequently passed the Senate on July 15, 1999. As one of the con-

ferees on the Patients' Bill of Rights, I look forward to working with my colleagues in an effort to improve the quality of health care delivered in this country by passing strong patient protection legislation next year. However, as we have been working on the legislation regarding AHCPH for quite some time—I introduced the first version of the bill, S. 2208, on June 23, 1998—I felt strongly that we pass the legislation reauthorizing the agency this year.

S. 580 reauthorizes the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research for fiscal years 2000–2005, renames the agency the "Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality," and refocuses the agency's mission to become the focal point for supporting federal health care research and quality improvement activities.

The new Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality will: promote quality by sharing information regarding medical advances; build public-private partnerships to advance and share true quality measures; report annually on the state of quality, and cost, of the nation's healthcare; aggressively support improved information systems for health quality; support primary care research, and address issues of access in underserved areas and among priority populations; facilitate innovation in patient care with streamlined evaluation and assessment of new technologies; and coordinate quality improvement efforts of the federal government to avoid disjointed, uncoordinated, or duplicative efforts.

AHCPH fills a vital federal role by investing in health services research to ensure we reap the full rewards of our investment in basic and biomedical research. AHCPH takes these medical advances and helps us understand how to best utilize these advances in daily clinical practice. The Agency has demonstrated their ability to close this gap between basic research and clinical practice.

I believe the Agency can truly make a difference in improving health care quality in this country. The work of the Agency fills a crucial need by translating advances in medicine into what works for me, as a physician, in my daily practice. I think these answers will help us address some of the critical issues raised in the patient protection or quality health care debate. I also believe the work of the Agency is essential for improving the long term stability of the Medicare program and improving the health care system in general by providing the tools we need to assess and improve health care quality.

I would also like to point out that the legislation we are passing today builds upon the good work of our House companion bill, H.R. 2506, introduced and passed by my colleagues Representatives BILIRAKIS, BLILEY, DINGELL, and BROWN. The bill we are considering today, S. 580, has been modified to reflect agreement between the authorizing committees on the House

and Senate passed versions of the bill. I will not list all of the changes we have made, but I would like to highlight a few.

First, I am pleased that our bill has an increased emphasis on research regarding the delivery of health care in inner city and rural areas and of health care issues for priority populations including low-income groups, minority groups, women, children, the elderly, and individuals with special health care needs including individuals with disabilities and individuals who need chronic care or end-of-life health care. The legislation will ensure that individuals with special health care needs will be addressed throughout the research portfolio of the Agency.

A second provision included in the bill which I believe is extremely important for improving the health of our nation's children is the authorization to provide support for payments to children's hospitals for graduate medical education programs. The bill will provide funding to the 59 freestanding children's hospital across the country that do not receive any GME funds today. These 59 hospitals represent over 20% of the total number of children's hospitals in the U.S. and they train nearly 30% of the nation's pediatricians, about 50% of all pediatric specialists, and over 65% of all pediatric specialists. I believe this is a strong addition to our bill which will ensure the training of pediatric physicians to improve the quality of health care for our children.

Mr. President, this legislation would not have come to fruition without the contributions of many individuals. I would like to take this moment to express my gratitude to Senator NICKLES and the entire Health Care Quality Task Force for making this bill a legislative priority. I would also like to thank Senator JEFFORDS, Senator KENNEDY, and all the members of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions committee who helped develop the legislation. The Administration and the Agency have been enormously helpful in providing their technical expertise as we rewrote the current statute, and I would especially like to thank Dr. John Eisenberg and Larry Patton for their tremendous contributions. Finally, I would like to thank my staff for their work on the bill, Andrew Balas, Susan Ramthun, and Anne Phelps. I look forward to working with my House colleagues and President Clinton to witness the enactment of S. 580 into law this year which will greatly improve the quality of health care for all Americans.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today marks an important landmark in our efforts to improve children's health. We are taking the first step toward ensuring that the nation's children's hospitals have the support they need to continue to train physicians to care for children.

Less than one percent of the nation's hospitals are independent children's hospitals. Yet these hospitals train 30 percent of all pediatricians. These free-standing children's hospitals also train more than half of the country's pediatric specialists—the physicians who care for children with cancer, asthma, diabetes and many other chronic diseases and special needs.

In addition to their teaching responsibilities, they care for uninsured children, conduct pediatric research, and provide state-of-the-art specialty care for children in all parts of the nation. The services they provide and the activities they conduct are indispensable. When a child has a rare disease or complicated condition, children's hospitals are the hospitals of choice.

In Massachusetts, Boston Children's Hospital provides excellent care and conducts needed pediatric research and training. It provides the highest quality of care for sick or disabled children from Massachusetts, New England and the world. It is a national resource. The primary care and specialist physicians it trains serve in countless communities in Massachusetts and throughout the country. Boston Children's Hospital has been recognized as a world-class institution. Researchers at the hospital continue to offer new hope for children and adults, as they break new ground in battles to fight pediatric diseases. For example, Dr. Judah Folkman has developed two powerful agents that show great promise in the war on cancer. These agents—angiostatin and endostatin—have been shown to shrink cancerous tumors in animals. Clinical trials are now underway to test the effectiveness of bladder tissue grown in a laboratory, and to treat high-risk heart patients with a tiny device that can close holes in the heart without invasive surgery.

These advances are the result of the teaching hospital environment that is the heart of the mission of Boston Children's Hospital. Senior clinicians and scientists work with new doctors in training. The interns, residents and fellows who train at Boston Children's Hospital and other children's hospitals are the pediatricians, pediatric specialists and pediatric researchers of tomorrow. The federal government should invest in their training, just as we have invested in the training of physicians who care for adults. The benefits to the nation are immeasurable.

In general, graduate medical education activities are supported through Medicare. However, because children's hospitals treat very few Medicare patients, they receive almost no federal support to train physicians. In fact, they receive less than 1/200th per resident compared to other teaching hospitals. The lack of federal support makes no sense. It unintentionally penalizes children's hospitals, and we need to correct this problem as soon as possible.

The legislation accompanying the reauthorization of the Agency for Health

Care Policy and Research authorizes a new discretionary program to provide support for pediatric graduate medical education. It authorizes the funding necessary to provide adequate support—\$280 million in FY 2000 and \$285 million in FY 2001. But this authorization is just a beginning. We need to continue to work together this year and next year to ensure that adequate funds are appropriated for this important new program to succeed.

Adequate and stable funding for pediatric GME activities can best be achieved by a permanent mandatory program. The Senate Finance Committee has agreed to hold a hearing on this important issue next year, and I hope action will quickly follow. Senator BOB KERREY and I have introduced legislation that will create a mandatory program. It has broad bipartisan support in the Senate. Forty senators, evenly divided among Democrats and Republicans, favor this approach, and I am confident that we will prevail in the end.

However, this year we have an opportunity to begin to address this important children's health issue. Today's authorization lays the groundwork for a downpayment in the appropriations for FY2000. The President's budget proposed \$40 million for pediatric graduate medical education. The Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations conference bill includes \$20 million for this program. Congress should follow the President's lead and provide at least \$40 million for next year, while Congress pursues full funding through a long-term solution.

It is an honor to support Boston Children's Hospital and other children's hospitals across the country as they strive to meet the health needs of the nation's children. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House and Senate on this important issue in the coming year.

Mr. GRAMM. I ask unanimous consent the substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill be read a third time and passed as amended, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The substitute amendment (No. 2506) was agreed to.

The bill (S. 580), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

[The bill was not available for printing. It will appear in a future edition of the RECORD.]

YOUTH DRUG AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ACT

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 332, S. 976.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 976) to amend title V of the Public Health Service Act to focus the authority

of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration on community-based services for children and adolescents, to enhance flexibility and accountability, to establish programs for youth treatment, and to respond to crises, especially those related to children and violence.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Youth Drug and Mental Health Services Act".

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PROVISIONS RELATING TO SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS

Sec. 101. Children and violence.

Sec. 102. Emergency response.

Sec. 103. High risk youth reauthorization.

Sec. 104. Substance abuse treatment services for children and adolescents.

Sec. 105. Comprehensive community services for children with serious emotional disturbance.

Sec. 106. Services for children of substance abusers.

Sec. 107. Services for youth offenders.

Sec. 108. General provisions.

TITLE II—PROVISIONS RELATING TO MENTAL HEALTH

Sec. 201. Priority mental health needs of regional and national significance.

Sec. 202. Grants for the benefit of homeless individuals.

Sec. 203. Projects for assistance in transition from homelessness.

Sec. 204. Community mental health services performance partnership block grant.

Sec. 205. Determination of allotment.

Sec. 206. Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986.

Sec. 207. Requirement relating to the rights of residents of certain facilities.

TITLE III—PROVISIONS RELATING TO SUBSTANCE ABUSE

Sec. 301. Priority substance abuse treatment needs of regional and national significance.

Sec. 302. Priority substance abuse prevention needs of regional and national significance.

Sec. 303. Substance abuse prevention and treatment performance partnership block grant.

Sec. 304. Determination of allotments.

Sec. 305. Nondiscrimination and institutional safeguards for religious providers.

Sec. 306. Alcohol and drug prevention or treatment services for Indians and Native Alaskans.

TITLE IV—PROVISIONS RELATING TO FLEXIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Sec. 401. General authorities and peer review.

Sec. 402. Advisory councils.

Sec. 403. General provisions for the performance partnership block grants.

Sec. 404. Data infrastructure projects.

Sec. 405. Repeal of obsolete addict referral provisions.

Sec. 406. Individuals with co-occurring disorders.

Sec. 407. Services for individuals with co-occurring disorders.

TITLE I—PROVISIONS RELATING TO SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS

SEC. 101. CHILDREN AND VIOLENCE.

Title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"PART G—PROJECTS FOR CHILDREN AND VIOLENCE

"SEC. 581. CHILDREN AND VIOLENCE.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Education and the Attorney General, shall carry out directly or through grants, contracts or cooperative agreements with public entities a program to assist local communities in developing ways to assist children in dealing with violence.

"(b) **ACTIVITIES.**—Under the program under subsection (a), the Secretary may—

"(1) provide financial support to enable local communities to implement programs to foster the health and development of children;

"(2) provide technical assistance to local communities with respect to the development of programs described in paragraph (1);

"(3) provide assistance to local communities in the development of policies to address violence when and if it occurs; and

"(4) assist in the creation of community partnerships among law enforcement, education systems and mental health and substance abuse service systems.

"(c) **REQUIREMENTS.**—An application for a grant, contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall demonstrate that—

"(1) the applicant will use amounts received to create a partnership described in subsection (b)(4) to address issues of violence in schools;

"(2) the activities carried out by the applicant will provide a comprehensive method for addressing violence, that will include—

"(A) security;

"(B) educational reform;

"(C) the review and updating of school policies;

"(D) alcohol and drug abuse prevention and early intervention services;

"(E) mental health prevention and treatment services; and

"(F) early childhood development and psycho-social services; and

"(3) the applicant will use amounts received only for the services described in subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F) of paragraph (2).

"(d) **GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION.**—The Secretary shall ensure that grants, contracts or cooperative agreements under subsection (a) will be distributed equitably among the regions of the country and among urban and rural areas.

"(e) **DURATION OF AWARDS.**—With respect to a grant, contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (a), the period during which payments under such an award will be made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years.

"(f) **EVALUATION.**—The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of each project carried out under this section and shall disseminate the results of such evaluations to appropriate public and private entities.

"(g) **INFORMATION AND EDUCATION.**—The Secretary shall establish comprehensive information and education programs to disseminate the findings of the knowledge development and application under this section to the general public and to health care professionals.

"(h) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2001 and 2002.

"SEC. 582. GRANTS TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEMS OF PERSONS WHO EXPERIENCE VIOLENCE RELATED STRESS.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts or cooperative agreements to public and nonprofit private entities, as well as to Indian tribes and tribal organizations, for the purpose of establishing a national and regional centers of excellence on psychological trauma response and for developing knowledge with regard to evidence-based practices for treating psychiatric disorders resulting from witnessing or experiencing such stress.

"(b) **PRIORITIES.**—In awarding grants, contracts or cooperative agreements under sub-

section (a) related to the development of knowledge on evidence-based practices for treating disorders associated with psychological trauma, the Secretary shall give priority to programs that work with children, adolescents, adults, and families who are survivors and witnesses of domestic, school and community violence and terrorism.

"(c) **GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION.**—The Secretary shall ensure that grants, contracts or cooperative agreements under subsection (a) with respect to centers of excellence are distributed equitably among the regions of the country and among urban and rural areas.

"(d) **EVALUATION.**—The Secretary, as part of the application process, shall require that each applicant for a grant, contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) submit a plan for the rigorous evaluation of the activities funded under the grant, contract or agreement, including both process and outcomes evaluation, and the submission of an evaluation at the end of the project period.

"(e) **DURATION OF AWARDS.**—With respect to a grant, contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (a), the period during which payments under such an award will be made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years. Such grants, contracts or agreements may be renewed.

"(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2001 and 2002."

SEC. 102. EMERGENCY RESPONSE.

Section 501 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (o);

(2) by inserting after subsection (l) the following:

"(m) **EMERGENCY RESPONSE.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 504 and except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary may use not to exceed 3 percent of all amounts appropriated under this title for a fiscal year to make noncompetitive grants, contracts or cooperative agreements to public entities to enable such entities to address emergency substance abuse or mental health needs in local communities.

"(2) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Amounts appropriated under part C shall not be subject to paragraph (1).

"(3) **EMERGENCIES.**—The Secretary shall establish criteria for determining that a substance abuse or mental health emergency exists and publish such criteria in the Federal Register prior to providing funds under this subsection.

"(n) **LIMITATION ON THE USE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.**—No information, if an establishment or person supplying the information or described in it is identifiable, obtained in the course of activities undertaken or supported under this title may be used for any purpose other than the purpose for which it was supplied unless such establishment or person has consented (as determined under regulations of the Secretary) to its use for such other purpose. Such information may not be published or released in other form if the person who supplied the information or who is described in it is identifiable unless such person has consented (as determined under regulations of the Secretary) to its publication or release in other form."; and

(3) in subsection (o) (as so redesignated), by striking "1993" and all that follows through the period and inserting "2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 and 2002."

SEC. 103. HIGH RISK YOUTH REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 517(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-23(h)) is amended by striking "\$70,000,000" and all that follows through "1994" and inserting "such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2002".

SEC. 104. SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS.

Subpart 1 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 514. SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to public and private nonprofit entities, including Native Alaskan entities and Indian tribes and tribal organizations, for the purpose of providing substance abuse treatment services for children and adolescents.

"(b) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to applicants who propose to—

"(1) apply evidenced-based and cost effective methods for the treatment of substance abuse among children and adolescents;

"(2) coordinate the provision of treatment services with other social service agencies in the community, including educational, juvenile justice, child welfare, and mental health agencies;

"(3) provide a continuum of integrated treatment services, including case management, for children and adolescents with substance abuse disorders and their families;

"(4) provide treatment that is gender-specific and culturally appropriate;

"(5) involve and work with families of children and adolescents receiving treatment;

"(6) provide aftercare services for children and adolescents and their families after completion of substance abuse treatment; and

"(7) address the relationship between substance abuse and violence.

"(c) **DURATION OF GRANTS.**—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a) for periods not to exceed 5 fiscal years.

"(d) **APPLICATION.**—An entity desiring a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

"(e) **EVALUATION.**—An entity that receives a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall submit, in the application for such grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, a plan for the evaluation of any project undertaken with funds provided under this section. Such entity shall provide the Secretary with periodic evaluations of the progress of such project and such evaluation at the completion of such project as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

"(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2001 and 2002.

"SEC. 514A. EARLY INTERVENTION SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to public and private nonprofit entities, including local educational agencies (as defined in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801)), for the purpose of providing early intervention substance abuse services for children and adolescents.

"(b) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to applicants who demonstrate an ability to—

"(1) screen for and assess substance use and abuse by children and adolescents;

"(2) make appropriate referrals for children and adolescents who are in need of treatment for substance abuse;

"(3) provide early intervention services, including counseling and ancillary services, that are designed to meet the developmental needs of

children and adolescents who are at risk for substance abuse; and

“(4) develop networks with the educational, juvenile justice, social services, and other agencies and organizations in the State or local community involved that will work to identify children and adolescents who are in need of substance abuse treatment services.

“(c) **CONDITION.**—In awarding grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that such grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements are allocated, subject to the availability of qualified applicants, among the principal geographic regions of the United States, to Indian tribes and tribal organizations, and to urban and rural areas.

“(d) **DURATION OF GRANTS.**—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a) for periods not to exceed 5 fiscal years.

“(e) **APPLICATION.**—An entity desiring a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

“(f) **EVALUATION.**—An entity that receives a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall submit, in the application for such grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, a plan for the evaluation of any project undertaken with funds provided under this section. Such entity shall provide the Secretary with periodic evaluations of the progress of such project and such evaluation at the completion of such project as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

“(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2001 and 2002.

“SEC. 514B. YOUTH INTERAGENCY RESEARCH, TRAINING, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS.

“(a) **PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and in consultation with the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall award grants or contracts to public or nonprofit private entities to establish not more than 4 research, training, and technical assistance centers to carry out the activities described in subsection (c).

“(b) **APPLICATION.**—A public or private nonprofit entity desiring a grant or contract under subsection (a) shall prepare and submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(c) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**—A center established under a grant or contract under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) provide training with respect to state-of-the-art mental health and justice-related services and successful mental health and substance abuse-justice collaborations that focus on children and adolescents, to public policymakers, law enforcement administrators, public defenders, police, probation officers, judges, parole officials, jail administrators and mental health and substance abuse providers and administrators;

“(2) engage in research and evaluations concerning State and local justice and mental health systems, including system redesign initiatives, and disseminate information concerning the results of such evaluations;

“(3) provide direct technical assistance, including assistance provided through toll-free telephone numbers, concerning issues such as how to accommodate individuals who are being processed through the courts under the Ameri-

cans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), what types of mental health or substance abuse service approaches are effective within the judicial system, and how community-based mental health or substance abuse services can be more effective, including relevant regional, ethnic, and gender-related considerations; and

“(4) provide information, training, and technical assistance to State and local governmental officials to enhance the capacity of such officials to provide appropriate services relating to mental health or substance abuse.

“(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2001 and 2002.

“SEC. 514C. PREVENTION OF METHAMPHETAMINE AND INHALANT ABUSE AND ADDICTION.

“(a) **GRANTS.**—The Director of the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (referred to in this section as the ‘Director’) may make grants to and enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with public and nonprofit private entities to enable such entities—

“(1) to carry out school-based programs concerning the dangers of methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction, using methods that are effective and evidence-based, including initiatives that give students the responsibility to create their own anti-drug abuse education programs for their schools; and

“(2) to carry out community-based methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction prevention programs that are effective and evidence-based.

“(b) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Amounts made available under a grant, contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall be used for planning, establishing, or administering methamphetamine or inhalant prevention programs in accordance with subsection (c).

“(c) **PREVENTION PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Amounts provided under this section may be used—

“(A) to carry out school-based programs that are focused on those districts with high or increasing rates of methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction and targeted at populations which are most at risk to start methamphetamine or inhalant abuse;

“(B) to carry out community-based prevention programs that are focused on those populations within the community that are most at-risk for methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction;

“(C) to assist local government entities to conduct appropriate methamphetamine or inhalant prevention activities;

“(D) to train and educate State and local law enforcement officials, prevention and education officials, members of community anti-drug coalitions and parents on the signs of methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction and the options for treatment and prevention;

“(E) for planning, administration, and educational activities related to the prevention of methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction;

“(F) for the monitoring and evaluation of methamphetamine or inhalant prevention activities, and reporting and disseminating resulting information to the public; and

“(G) for targeted pilot programs with evaluation components to encourage innovation and experimentation with new methodologies.

“(2) **PRIORITY.**—The Director shall give priority in making grants under this section to rural and urban areas that are experiencing a high rate or rapid increases in methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction.

“(d) **ANALYSES AND EVALUATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Up to \$500,000 of the amount available in each fiscal year to carry out this section shall be made available to the

Director, acting in consultation with other Federal agencies, to support and conduct periodic analyses and evaluations of effective prevention programs for methamphetamine or inhalant abuse and addiction and the development of appropriate strategies for disseminating information about and implementing these programs.

“(2) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—The Director shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Commerce and Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual report with the results of the analyses and evaluation under paragraph (1).

“(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsection (a), \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2001 and 2002.”

SEC. 105. COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY SERVICES FOR CHILDREN WITH SERIOUS EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE.

(a) **MATCHING FUNDS.**—Section 561(c)(1)(D) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290ff(c)(1)(D)) is amended by striking “fifth” and inserting “fifth and sixth”.

(b) **FLEXIBILITY FOR INDIAN TRIBES AND TERRITORIES.**—Section 562 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290ff-1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) **WAIVERS.**—The Secretary may waive 1 or more of the requirements of subsection (c) for a public entity that is an Indian Tribe or tribal organization, or American Samoa, Guam, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of Palau, or the United States Virgin Islands if the Secretary determines, after peer review, that the system of care is family-centered and uses the least restrictive environment that is clinically appropriate.”

(c) **DURATION OF GRANTS.**—Section 565(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290ff-4(a)) is amended by striking “5 fiscal” and inserting “6 fiscal”.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 565(f)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290ff-4(f)(1)) is amended by striking “1993” and all that follows and inserting “2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 and 2002.”

(e) **CURRENT GRANTEES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Entities with active grants under section 561 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290ff) on the date of enactment of this Act shall be eligible to receive a 6th year of funding under the grant in an amount not to exceed the amount that such grantee received in the 5th year of funding under such grant. Such 6th year may be funded without requiring peer and Advisory Council review as required under section 504 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa-3).

(2) **LIMITATION.**—Paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to a grantee only if the grantee agrees to comply with the provisions of section 561 as amended by subsection (a).

SEC. 106. SERVICES FOR CHILDREN OF SUBSTANCE ABUSERS.

(a) **ADMINISTRATION AND ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Section 399D(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “Administrator” and all that follows through “Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration” and inserting “Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration”.

(2) **ACTIVITIES.**—Section 399D(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period and inserting the following: "through youth service agencies, family social services, child care providers, Head Start, schools and after-school programs, early childhood development programs, community-based family resource and support centers, the criminal justice system, health, substance abuse and mental health providers through screenings conducted during regular childhood examinations and other examinations, self and family member referrals, substance abuse treatment services, and other providers of services to children and families; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) to provide education and training to health, substance abuse and mental health professionals, and other providers of services to children and families through youth service agencies, family social services, child care, Head Start, schools and after-school programs, early childhood development programs, community-based family resource and support centers, the criminal justice system, and other providers of services to children and families."

(3) IDENTIFICATION OF CERTAIN CHILDREN.—Section 399D(a)(3)(A) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(a)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking "(i) the entity" and inserting "(i)(I) the entity";

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) by striking "(ii) the entity" and inserting "(II) the entity"; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) the entity will identify children who may be eligible for medical assistance under a State program under title XIX or XXI of the Social Security Act."

(b) SERVICES FOR CHILDREN.—Section 399D(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting "alcohol and drug," after "psychological";

(2) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

"(5) Developmentally and age-appropriate drug and alcohol early intervention, treatment and prevention services."; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (8), the following:

"Services shall be provided under paragraphs (2) through (8) by a public health nurse, social worker, or similar professional, or by a trained worker from the community who is supervised by a professional, or by an entity, where the professional or entity provides assurances that the professional or entity is licensed or certified by the State if required and is complying with applicable licensure or certification requirements."

(c) SERVICES FOR AFFECTED FAMILIES.—Section 399D(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting before the colon the following: "; or by an entity, where the professional or entity provides assurances that the professional or entity is licensed or certified by the State if required and is complying with applicable licensure or certification requirements"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) Aggressive outreach to family members with substance abuse problems.

"(E) Inclusion of consumer in the development, implementation, and monitoring of Family Services Plan.";

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

"(A) Alcohol and drug treatment services, including screening and assessment, diagnosis, detoxification, individual, group and family counseling, relapse prevention, pharmacotherapy treatment, after-care services, and case management.";

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking ", including educational and career planning" and inserting "and counseling on the human immunodeficiency virus and acquired immune deficiency syndrome";

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking "conflict and"; and

(D) in subparagraph (E), by striking "Remedial" and inserting "Career planning and"; and

(3) in paragraph (3)(D), by inserting "which include child abuse and neglect prevention techniques" before the period.

(d) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—Section 399D(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting:

"(d) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The Secretary shall distribute the grants through the following types of entities:";

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking "drug treatment" and inserting "drug early intervention, prevention or treatment; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "; and" and inserting "; or"; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting "or pediatric health or mental health providers and family mental health providers" before the period.

(e) SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION.—Section 399D(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "including maternal and child health" before "mental";

(B) by striking "treatment programs"; and

(C) by striking "and the State agency responsible for administering public maternal and child health services" and inserting ", the State agency responsible for administering alcohol and drug programs, the State lead agency, and the State Interagency Coordinating Council under part H of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; and"; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(f) REPORTS TO THE SECRETARY.—Section 399D(i)(6) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(i)(6)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by adding "and" at the end; and

(2) by striking subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) and inserting the following:

"(C) the number of case workers or other professionals trained to identify and address substance abuse issues.".

(g) EVALUATIONS.—Section 399D(l) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(l)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by adding "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the semicolon and inserting the following: "; including increased participation in work or employment-related activities and decreased participation in welfare programs."; and

(3) by striking paragraphs (5) and (6).

(h) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 399D(m) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(m)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by adding "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by adding "and" at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the semicolon and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E); and

(3) by striking paragraphs (4) and (5).

(i) DATA COLLECTION.—Section 399D(n) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(n)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"The periodic report shall include a quantitative estimate of the prevalence of alcohol and drug problems in families involved in the child welfare system, the barriers to treatment

and prevention services facing these families, and policy recommendations for removing the identified barriers, including training for child welfare workers."

(j) DEFINITION.—Section 399D(o)(2)(B) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(o)(2)(B)) is amended by striking "dangerous".

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 399D(p) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d(p)) is amended to read as follows:

"(p) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2001 and 2002."

(l) GRANTS FOR TRAINING AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 399D of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (f);

(2) by striking subsection (k);

(3) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (g), (h), (i), (j), (l), (m), (n), (o), and (p) as subsections (e) through (o), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subsection (c), the following:

"(d) TRAINING FOR PROVIDERS OF SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.—The Secretary may make a grant under subsection (a) for the training of health, substance abuse and mental health professionals and other providers of services to children and families through youth service agencies, family social services, child care providers, Head Start, schools and after-school programs, early childhood development programs, community-based family resource centers, the criminal justice system, and other providers of services to children and families. Such training shall be to assist professionals in recognizing the drug and alcohol problems of their clients and to enhance their skills in identifying and understanding the nature of substance abuse, and obtaining substance abuse early intervention, prevention and treatment resources.";

(5) in subsection (k)(2) (as so redesignated), by striking "(h)" and inserting "(i)"; and

(6) in paragraphs (3)(E) and (5) of subsection (m) (as so redesignated), by striking "(d)" and inserting "(e)".

(m) TRANSFER AND REDESIGNATION.—Section 399D of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280d), as amended by this section—

(1) is transferred to title V;

(2) is redesignated as section 519; and

(3) is inserted after section 518.

(n) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq.) is amended by striking the heading of part L.

SEC. 107. SERVICES FOR YOUTH OFFENDERS.

Subpart 3 of part B of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–31 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 520C. SERVICES FOR YOUTH OFFENDERS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Center for Mental Health Services, and in consultation with the Director of the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Director of the Special Education Programs, shall award grants on a competitive basis to State or local juvenile justice agencies to enable such agencies to provide aftercare services for youth offenders who have been discharged from facilities in the juvenile or criminal justice system and have serious emotional disturbances or are at risk of developing such disturbances.

"(b) USE OF FUNDS.—A State or local juvenile justice agency receiving a grant under subsection (a) shall use the amounts provided under the grant—

"(1) to develop a plan describing the manner in which the agency will provide services for each youth offender who has a serious emotional disturbance and has been detained or incarcerated in facilities within the juvenile or criminal justice system;

"(2) to provide a network of core or aftercare services or access to such services for each youth offender, including diagnostic and evaluation services, substance abuse treatment services, outpatient mental health care services, medication management services, intensive home-based therapy, intensive day treatment services, respite care, and therapeutic foster care;

"(3) to establish a program that coordinates with other State and local agencies providing recreational, social, educational, vocational, or operational services for youth, to enable the agency receiving a grant under this section to provide community-based system of care services for each youth offender that addresses the special needs of the youth and helps the youth access all of the aforementioned services; and

"(4) using not more than 20 percent of funds received, to provide planning and transition services as described in paragraph (3) for youth offenders while such youth are incarcerated or detained.

"(c) APPLICATION.—A State or local juvenile justice agency that desires a grant under subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

"(d) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section and annually thereafter, a State or local juvenile justice agency receiving a grant under subsection (a) shall submit to the Secretary a report describing the programs carried out pursuant to this section.

"(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) SERIOUS EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE.—The term 'serious emotional disturbance' with respect to a youth offender means an offender who currently, or at any time within the 1-year period ending on the day on which services are sought under this section, has a diagnosable mental, behavioral, or emotional disorder that functionally impairs the offender's life by substantially limiting the offender's role in family, school, or community activities, and interfering with the offender's ability to achieve or maintain 1 or more developmentally-appropriate social, behavior, cognitive, communicative, or adaptive skills.

"(2) COMMUNITY-BASED SYSTEM OF CARE.—The term 'community-based system of care' means the provision of services for the youth offender by various State or local agencies that in an interagency fashion or operating as a network addresses the recreational, social, educational, vocational, mental health, substance abuse, and operational needs of the youth offender.

"(3) YOUTH OFFENDER.—The term 'youth offender' means an individual who is 21 years of age or younger who has been discharged from a State or local juvenile or criminal justice system, except that if the individual is between the ages of 18 and 21 years, such individual has had contact with the State or local juvenile or criminal justice system prior to attaining 18 years of age and is under the jurisdiction of such a system at the time services are sought.

"(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2001 and 2002."

SEC. 108. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) DUTIES OF THE CENTER FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT.—Section 507(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (12) as paragraphs (3) through (13), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1), the following:

"(2) ensure that emphasis is placed on children and adolescents in the development of treatment programs;"

(b) DUTIES OF THE OFFICE FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION.—Section 515(b)(9) of the

Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-2(b)(9)) is amended by striking "public concerning" and inserting "public, especially adolescent audiences, concerning".

(c) DUTIES OF THE CENTER FOR MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.—Section 520(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-3(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (14) as paragraphs (4) through (15), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2), the following:

"(3) collaborate with the Department of Education and the Department of Justice to develop programs to assist local communities in addressing violence among children and adolescents;"

TITLE II—PROVISIONS RELATING TO MENTAL HEALTH

SEC. 201. PRIORITY MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS OF REGIONAL AND NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 520A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-32) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 520A. PRIORITY MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS OF REGIONAL AND NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

"(a) PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall address priority mental health needs of regional and national significance (as determined under subsection (b)) through the provision of or through assistance for—

"(1) knowledge development and application projects for prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation, and the conduct or support of evaluations of such projects;

"(2) training and technical assistance programs;

"(3) targeted capacity response programs; and

"(4) systems change grants including statewide family network grants and client-oriented and consumer run self-help activities.

The Secretary may carry out the activities described in this subsection directly or through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements with States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes and tribal organizations, other public or private nonprofit entities.

"(b) PRIORITY MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS.—

"(1) DETERMINATION OF NEEDS.—Priority mental health needs of regional and national significance shall be determined by the Secretary in consultation with States and other interested groups. The Secretary shall meet with the States and interested groups on an annual basis to discuss program priorities.

"(2) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—In developing program priorities described in paragraph (1), the Secretary, in conjunction with the Director of the Center for Mental Health Services, the Director of the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, and the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall give special consideration to promoting the integration of mental health services into primary health care systems.

"(c) REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Recipients of grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements under this section shall comply with information and application requirements determined appropriate by the Secretary.

"(2) DURATION OF AWARD.—With respect to a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement awarded under this section, the period during which payments under such award are made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years.

"(3) MATCHING FUNDS.—The Secretary may, for projects carried out under subsection (a), require that entities that apply for grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under this section provide non-Federal matching funds, as determined appropriate by the Secretary, to ensure the institutional commitment of the entity to the projects funded under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement. Such non-Federal match-

ing funds may be provided directly or through donations from public or private entities and may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services.

"(4) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—With respect to activities for which a grant, contract or cooperative agreement is awarded under this section, the Secretary may require that recipients for specific projects under subsection (a) agree to maintain expenditures of non-Federal amounts for such activities at a level that is not less than the level of such expenditures maintained by the entity for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the entity receives such a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.

"(d) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate each project carried out under subsection (a)(1) and shall disseminate the findings with respect to each such evaluation to appropriate public and private entities.

"(e) INFORMATION AND EDUCATION.—The Secretary shall establish information and education programs to disseminate and apply the findings of the knowledge development and application, training, and technical assistance programs, and targeted capacity response programs, under this section to the general public, to health care professionals, and to interested groups. The Secretary shall make every effort to provide linkages between the findings of supported projects and State agencies responsible for carrying out mental health services.

"(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$300,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 and 2002.

"(2) DATA INFRASTRUCTURE.—If amounts are not appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out section 1971 with respect to mental health, then the Secretary shall make available, from the amounts appropriated for such fiscal year under paragraph (1), an amount equal to the sum of \$6,000,000 and 10 percent of all amounts appropriated for such fiscal year under such paragraph in excess of \$100,000,000, to carry out such section 1971."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 303 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242a) is repealed.

(2) Section 520B of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-33) is repealed.

(3) Section 612 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa-3 note) is repealed.

SEC. 202. GRANTS FOR THE BENEFIT OF HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS.

Section 506 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa-5) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 506. GRANTS FOR THE BENEFIT OF HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts and cooperative agreements to community-based public and private nonprofit entities for the purposes of providing mental health and substance abuse services for homeless individuals. In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall consult with the Interagency Council on the Homeless, established under section 201 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11311).

"(b) PREFERENCES.—In awarding grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give a preference to—

"(1) entities that provide integrated primary health, substance abuse, and mental health services to homeless individuals;

"(2) entities that demonstrate effectiveness in serving runaway, homeless, and street youth;

"(3) entities that have experience in providing substance abuse and mental health services to homeless individuals;

"(4) entities that demonstrate experience in providing housing for individuals in treatment

for or in recovery from mental illness or substance abuse; and

“(5) entities that demonstrate effectiveness in serving homeless veterans.

“(c) SERVICES FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—In awarding grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall not—

“(1) prohibit the provision of services under such subsection to homeless individuals who are suffering from a substance abuse disorder and are not suffering from a mental health disorder; and

“(2) make payments under subsection (a) to any entity that has a policy of—

“(A) excluding individuals from mental health services due to the existence or suspicion of substance abuse; or

“(B) has a policy of excluding individuals from substance abuse services due to the existence or suspicion of mental illness.

“(d) TERM OF THE AWARDS.—No entity may receive a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) for more than 5 years.

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 and 2002.”.

SEC. 203. PROJECTS FOR ASSISTANCE IN TRANSITION FROM HOMELESSNESS.

(a) WAIVERS FOR TERRITORIES.—Section 522 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290cc-22) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) WAIVER FOR TERRITORIES.—With respect to the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, Palau, the Marshall Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Secretary may waive the provisions of this part that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—Section 535(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290cc-35(a)) is amended by striking “1991 through 1994” and inserting “2000 through 2002”.

SEC. 204. COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES PERFORMANCE PARTNERSHIP BLOCK GRANT.

(a) CRITERIA FOR PLAN.—Section 1912(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-2(b)) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (12) and inserting the following:

“(1) COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY-BASED MENTAL HEALTH SYSTEMS.—The plan provides for an organized community-based system of care for individuals with mental illness and describes available services and resources in a comprehensive system of care, including services for dually diagnosed individuals. The description of the system of care shall include health and mental health services, rehabilitation services, employment services, housing services, educational services, substance abuse services, medical and dental care, and other support services to be provided to individuals with Federal, State and local public and private resources to enable such individuals to function outside of inpatient or residential institutions to the maximum extent of their capabilities, including services to be provided by local school systems under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The plan shall include a separate description of case management services and provide for activities leading to reduction of hospitalization.

“(2) MENTAL HEALTH SYSTEM DATA AND EPIDEMIOLOGY.—The plan contains an estimate of the incidence and prevalence in the State of serious mental illness among adults and serious emotional disturbance among children and presents quantitative targets to be achieved in the implementation of the system described in paragraph (1).

“(3) CHILDREN'S SERVICES.—In the case of children with serious emotional disturbance, the plan—

“(A) subject to subparagraph (B), provides for a system of integrated social services, edu-

cational services, juvenile services, and substance abuse services that, together with health and mental health services, will be provided in order for such children to receive care appropriate for their multiple needs (such system to include services provided under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act);

“(B) provides that the grant under section 1911 for the fiscal year involved will not be expended to provide any service under such system other than comprehensive community mental health services; and

“(C) provides for the establishment of a defined geographic area for the provision of the services of such system.

“(4) TARGETED SERVICES TO RURAL AND HOMELESS POPULATIONS.—The plan describes the State's outreach to and services for individuals who are homeless and how community-based services will be provided to individuals residing in rural areas.

“(5) MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS.—The plan describes the financial resources, staffing and training for mental health providers that is necessary to implement the plan, and provides for the training of providers of emergency health services regarding mental health. The plan further describes the manner in which the State intends to expend the grant under section 1911 for the fiscal year involved.

Except as provided for in paragraph (3), the State plan shall contain the information required under this subsection with respect to both adults with serious mental illness and children with serious emotional disturbance.”.

(b) REVIEW OF PLANNING COUNCIL OF STATE'S REPORT.—Section 1915(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-4(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and the report of the State under section 1942(a) concerning the preceding fiscal year” after “to the grant”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the period “and any comments concerning the annual report”.

(c) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—Section 1915(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-4(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1), the following:

“(2) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FUNDS.—The Secretary may exclude from the aggregate State expenditures under subsection (a), funds appropriated to the principle agency for authorized activities which are of a non-recurring nature and for a specific purpose.”.

(d) APPLICATION FOR GRANTS.—Section 1917(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-6(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) the plan is received by the Secretary not later than September 1 of the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year for which a State is seeking funds, and the report from the previous fiscal year as required under section 1941 is received by December 1 of the fiscal year of the grant;”.

(e) WAIVERS FOR TERRITORIES.—Section 1917(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-6(b)) is amended by striking “whose allotment under section 1911 for the fiscal year is the amount specified in section 1918(c)(2)(B)” and inserting in its place “except Puerto Rico”.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—Section 1920 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-9) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “\$450,000,000” and all that follows through the end and inserting “\$450,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 and 2002.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “section 505” and inserting “sections 505 and 1971”.

SEC. 205. DETERMINATION OF ALLOTMENT.

Section 1918(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-7(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) MINIMUM ALLOTMENTS FOR STATES.—With respect to fiscal year 2000, and subsequent fiscal years, the amount of the allotment of a State under section 1911 shall not be less than the amount the State received under such section for fiscal year 1998.”.

SEC. 206. PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY FOR MENTALLY ILL INDIVIDUALS ACT OF 1986.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—The first section of the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-319) is amended to read as follows:

“SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

“This Act may be cited as the ‘Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act’.”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 102 of the Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act (as amended by subsection (a)) (42 U.S.C. 10802) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, except as provided in section 104(d),” after “means”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “(i) who” and inserting “(i)(I) who”; and

(ii) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as subclauses (II) and (III);

(iii) in subclause (III) (as so redesignated), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) who satisfies the requirements of subparagraph (A) and lives in a community setting, including their own home.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) The term ‘American Indian consortium’ means a consortium established under part C of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 6042 et seq.).”.

(c) USE OF ALLOTMENTS.—Section 104 of the Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act (as amended by subsection (a)) (42 U.S.C. 10804) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) The definition of ‘individual with a mental illness’ contained in section 102(4)(B)(iii) shall apply, and thus an eligible system may use its allotment under this title to provide representation to such individuals, only if the total allotment under this title for any fiscal year is \$30,000,000 or more, and in such case, an eligible system must give priority to representing persons with mental illness as defined in subparagraphs (A) and (B)(i) of section 102(4).”.

(d) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—Paragraph (2) of section 112(a) of the Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act (as amended by subsection (a)) (42 U.S.C. 10822(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2)(A) The minimum amount of the allotment of an eligible system shall be the product (rounded to the nearest \$100) of the appropriate base amount determined under subparagraph (B) and the factor specified in subparagraph (C).

“(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the appropriate base amount—

“(i) for American Samoa, Guam, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of Palau, and the Virgin Islands, is \$139,300; and

“(ii) for any other State, is \$260,000.

“(C) The factor specified in this subparagraph is the ratio of the amount appropriated under section 117 for the fiscal year for which the allotment is being made to the amount appropriated under such section for fiscal year 1995.

“(D) If the total amount appropriated for a fiscal year is at least \$25,000,000, the Secretary shall make an allotment in accordance with subparagraph (A) to the eligible system serving the American Indian consortium.”.

(e) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 112(a) of the Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act (as amended by subsection (a)) (42 U.S.C. 10822(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking "Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands" and inserting "Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of Palau"; and

(f) by striking paragraph (3).

(f) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 117 of the Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act (as amended by subsection (a)) (42 U.S.C. 10827) is amended by striking "1995" and inserting "2002".

SEC. 207. REQUIREMENT RELATING TO THE RIGHTS OF RESIDENTS OF CERTAIN FACILITIES.

Title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"PART H—REQUIREMENT RELATING TO THE RIGHTS OF RESIDENTS OF CERTAIN FACILITIES

"SEC. 591. REQUIREMENT RELATING TO THE RIGHTS OF RESIDENTS OF CERTAIN FACILITIES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—A public or private general hospital, nursing facility, intermediate care facility, residential treatment center, or other health care facility, that receives support in any form from any program supported in whole or in part with funds appropriated to any Federal department or agency shall protect and promote the rights of each resident of the facility, including the right to be free from physical or mental abuse, corporal punishment, and any physical or chemical restraints or involuntary seclusions imposed for purposes of discipline or convenience.

"(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Physical or chemical restraints and seclusion may only be imposed on a resident of a facility described in subsection (a) if—

"(1) the restraints or seclusion are imposed to ensure the physical safety of the resident, a staff member, or others; and

"(2) the restraints or seclusion are imposed only upon the written order of a physician, or other licensed independent practitioner permitted by the State and the facility to order such restraint or seclusion, that specifies the duration and circumstances under which the restraints are to be used (except in emergency circumstances specified by the Secretary until such an order could reasonably be obtained).

"(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting the use of restraints for medical immobilization, adaptive support, or medical protection.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) CHEMICAL RESTRAINT.—The term 'chemical restraint' means the non-therapeutic use of a medication that—

"(A) is unrelated to the patient's medical condition; and

"(B) is imposed for disciplinary purposes or the convenience of staff.

"(2) PHYSICAL RESTRAINT.—The term 'physical restraint' means any mechanical or personal restriction that immobilizes or reduces the ability of an individual to move his or her arms, legs, or head freely. Such term does not include devices, such as orthopedically prescribed devices, surgical dressings or bandages, protective helmets, and other methods involving the physical holding of a resident for the purpose of conducting routine physical examinations or tests or to protect the patient from falling out of bed or to permit a patient to participate in activities without the risk of physical harm to the patient.

"(3) SECLUSION.—The term 'seclusion' means any separation of the resident from the general population of the facility that prevents the resident from returning to such population when he or she desires.

"SEC. 592. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Each facility to which the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986 applies shall notify the appropriate agency, as determined by the Secretary, of each death that occurs at each such

facility while a patient is restrained, of each death occurring within 24 hours of the deceased patient being restrained or placed in seclusion, or where it is reasonable to assume that a patient's death is a result of such seclusion or restraint. A notification under this section shall include the name of the resident and shall be provided not later than 7 days after the date of the death of the individual involved.

"(b) FACILITY.—In this section, the term 'facility' has the meaning given the term 'facilities' in section 102(3) of the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 10802(3))."

"SEC. 593. REGULATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT.

"(a) TRAINING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this part, the Secretary, after consultation with appropriate State and local protection and advocacy organizations, physicians, facilities, and other health care professionals and patients, shall promulgate regulations that require facilities to which the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 10801 et seq.) applies, to meet the requirements of subsection (b).

"(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations promulgated under subsection (a) shall require that—

"(1) facilities described in subsection (a) ensure that there is an adequate number of qualified professional and supportive staff to evaluate patients, formulate written individualized, comprehensive treatment plans, and to provide active treatment measures;

"(2) appropriate training be provided for the staff of such facilities in the use of restraints and any alternatives to the use of restraints; and

"(3) such facilities provide complete and accurate notification of deaths, as required under section 582(a).

"(c) ENFORCEMENT.—A facility to which this part applies that fails to comply with any requirement of this part, including a failure to provide appropriate training, shall not be eligible for participation in any program supported in whole or in part by funds appropriated to any Federal department or agency."

TITLE III—PROVISIONS RELATING TO SUBSTANCE ABUSE

SEC. 301. PRIORITY SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT NEEDS OF REGIONAL AND NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 508 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-1) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 508. PRIORITY SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT NEEDS OF REGIONAL AND NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

"(a) PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall address priority substance abuse treatment needs of regional and national significance (as determined under subsection (b)) through the provision of or through assistance for—

"(1) knowledge development and application projects for treatment and rehabilitation and the conduct or support of evaluations of such projects;

"(2) training and technical assistance; and

"(3) targeted capacity response programs.

The Secretary may carry out the activities described in this section directly or through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements with States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes and tribal organizations, other public or nonprofit private entities.

"(b) PRIORITY SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT NEEDS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Priority substance abuse treatment needs of regional and national significance shall be determined by the Secretary after consultation with States and other interested groups. The Secretary shall meet with the States and interested groups on an annual basis to discuss program priorities.

"(2) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—In developing program priorities under paragraph (1), the Sec-

retary, in conjunction with the Director of the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, the Director of the Center for Mental Health Services, and the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall give special consideration to promoting the integration of substance abuse treatment services into primary health care systems.

"(c) REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Recipients of grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under this section shall comply with information and application requirements determined appropriate by the Secretary.

"(2) DURATION OF AWARD.—With respect to a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement awarded under this section, the period during which payments under such award are made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years.

"(3) MATCHING FUNDS.—The Secretary may, for projects carried out under subsection (a), require that entities that apply for grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under that project provide non-Federal matching funds, as determined appropriate by the Secretary, to ensure the institutional commitment of the entity to the projects funded under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement. Such non-Federal matching funds may be provided directly or through donations from public or private entities and may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services.

"(4) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—With respect to activities for which a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement is awarded under this section, the Secretary may require that recipients for specific projects under subsection (a) agree to maintain expenditures of non-Federal amounts for such activities at a level that is not less than the level of such expenditures maintained by the entity for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the entity receives such a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.

"(d) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate each project carried out under subsection (a)(1) and shall disseminate the findings with respect to each such evaluation to appropriate public and private entities.

"(e) INFORMATION AND EDUCATION.—The Secretary shall establish comprehensive information and education programs to disseminate and apply the findings of the knowledge development and application, training and technical assistance programs, and targeted capacity response programs under this section to the general public, to health professionals and other interested groups. The Secretary shall make every effort to provide linkages between the findings of supported projects and State agencies responsible for carrying out substance abuse prevention and treatment programs.

"(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$300,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 and 2002."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The following sections of the Public Health Service Act are repealed:

(1) Section 509 (42 U.S.C. 290bb-2).

(2) Section 510 (42 U.S.C. 290bb-3).

(3) Section 511 (42 U.S.C. 290bb-4).

(4) Section 512 (42 U.S.C. 290bb-5).

(5) Section 571 (42 U.S.C. 290gg).

SEC. 302. PRIORITY SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION NEEDS OF REGIONAL AND NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 516 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-1) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 516. PRIORITY SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION NEEDS OF REGIONAL AND NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

"(a) PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall address priority substance abuse prevention needs of regional and national significance (as determined under subsection (b)) through the provision of or through assistance for—

“(1) knowledge development and application projects for prevention and the conduct or support of evaluations of such projects;

“(2) training and technical assistance; and

“(3) targeted capacity response programs.

The Secretary may carry out the activities described in this section directly or through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements with States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes and tribal organizations, or other public or nonprofit private entities.

“(b) PRIORITY SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION NEEDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Priority substance abuse prevention needs of regional and national significance shall be determined by the Secretary in consultation with the States and other interested groups. The Secretary shall meet with the States and interested groups on an annual basis to discuss program priorities.

“(2) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—In developing program priorities under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give special consideration to—

“(A) applying the most promising strategies and research-based primary prevention approaches; and

“(B) promoting the integration of substance abuse prevention services into primary health care systems.

“(c) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Recipients of grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements under this section shall comply with information and application requirements determined appropriate by the Secretary.

“(2) DURATION OF AWARD.—With respect to a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement awarded under this section, the period during which payments under such award are made to the recipient may not exceed 5 years.

“(3) MATCHING FUNDS.—The Secretary may, for projects carried out under subsection (a), require that entities that apply for grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under that project provide non-Federal matching funds, as determined appropriate by the Secretary, to ensure the institutional commitment of the entity to the projects funded under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement. Such non-Federal matching funds may be provided directly or through donations from public or private entities and may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services.

“(4) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—With respect to activities for which a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement is awarded under this section, the Secretary may require that recipients for specific projects under subsection (a) agree to maintain expenditures of non-Federal amounts for such activities at a level that is not less than the level of such expenditures maintained by the entity for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the entity receives such a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.

“(d) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate each project carried out under subsection (a)(1) and shall disseminate the findings with respect to each such evaluation to appropriate public and private entities.

“(e) INFORMATION AND EDUCATION.—The Secretary shall establish comprehensive information and education programs to disseminate the findings of the knowledge development and application, training and technical assistance programs, and targeted capacity response programs under this section to the general public and to health professionals. The Secretary shall make every effort to provide linkages between the findings of supported projects and State agencies responsible for carrying out substance abuse prevention and treatment programs.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$300,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 and 2002.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 518 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-24) is repealed.

SEC. 303. SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT PERFORMANCE PARTNERSHIP BLOCK GRANT.

(a) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Section 1921(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-21(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A funding agreement for a grant under subsection (a) is that, subject to section 1931, the State involved shall expend the grant only for the purpose of—

“(A) planning, carrying out, and evaluating activities to prevent and treat substance abuse in accordance with this subpart and for related activities authorized in section 1924; and

“(B) screening and testing for HIV, tuberculosis, hepatitis C, sexually transmitted diseases, mental health disorders, and other screening and testing necessary to determine a comprehensive substance abuse treatment plan.

“(2) SCREENING AND TESTING.—A State may not use more than 2 percent of a State allotment for a fiscal year to carry out activities under paragraph (1)(B), except that the State shall be considered the payer of last resort and may not expend such funds for such activities to the extent that payment has been made, or can reasonably be expected to be made, with respect to such service under any Federal or State program, an insurance policy, or a Federal or State health benefits program (including programs established under title XVIII or XIX of the Social Security Act), or by an entity that provides health services on a prepaid basis.”

(b) ALLOCATION REGARDING ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS.—Section 1922 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-22) is amended by—

(1) striking subsection (a); and

(2) redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (a) and (b).

(c) GROUP HOMES FOR RECOVERING SUBSTANCE ABUSERS.—Section 1925(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-25(a)) is amended by striking “For fiscal year 1993” and all that follows through the colon and inserting the following: “A State, using funds available under section 1921, may establish and maintain the ongoing operation of a revolving fund in accordance with this section to support group homes for recovering substance abusers as follows.”

(d) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—Section 1930 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-30) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d) respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a), the following:

“(b) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FUNDS.—The Secretary may exclude from the aggregate State expenditures under subsection (a), funds appropriated to the principle agency for authorized activities which are of a non-recurring nature and for a specific purpose.”

(e) APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS.—Section 1932(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-32(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) the application is received by the Secretary not later than October 1 of the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year for which the State is seeking funds.”

(f) WAIVER FOR TERRITORIES.—Section 1932(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-32(c)) is amended by striking “whose allotment under section 1921 for the fiscal year is the amount specified in section 1933(c)(2)(B)” and inserting “except Puerto Rico”.

(g) WAIVER AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1932 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-32) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) WAIVER AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of a State, the Secretary may waive the requirements of all or part of the sections described in para-

graph (2) using objective criteria established by the Secretary by regulation after consultation with the States and other interested parties including consumers and providers.

“(2) SECTIONS.—The sections described in paragraph (1) are sections 1922(c), 1923, 1924 and 1928.

“(3) DATE CERTAIN FOR ACTING UPON REQUEST.—The Secretary shall approve or deny a request for a waiver under paragraph (1) and inform the State of that decision not later than 120 days after the date on which the request and all the information needed to support the request are submitted.

“(4) ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall annually report to the general public on the States that receive a waiver under this subsection.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Effective upon the publication of the regulations developed in accordance with section 1932(e)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-32(d))—

(A) section 1922(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-22(c)) is amended by—

(i) striking paragraph (2); and

(ii) redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(B) section 1928(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-28(d)) is repealed.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—Section 1935 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-35) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “\$1,500,000,000” and all that follows through the end and inserting “\$2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 and 2002.”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “section 505” and inserting “sections 505 and 1971”;

(3) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “1949(a)” and inserting “1948(a)”;

(4) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) CORE DATA SET.—A State that receives a new grant, contract, or cooperative agreement from amounts available to the Secretary under paragraph (1), for the purposes of improving the data collection, analysis and reporting capabilities of the State, shall be required, as a condition of receipt of funds, to collect, analyze, and report to the Secretary for each fiscal year subsequent to receiving such funds a core data set to be determined by the Secretary in conjunction with the States.”

SEC. 304. DETERMINATION OF ALLOTMENTS.

Section 1933(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-33(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) MINIMUM ALLOTMENTS FOR STATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to fiscal year 2000, and each subsequent fiscal year, the amount of the allotment of a State under section 1921 shall not be less than the amount the State received under such section for the previous fiscal year increased by an amount equal to 30.65 percent of the percentage by which the aggregate amount allotted to all States for such fiscal year exceeds the aggregate amount allotted to all States for the previous fiscal year.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a State shall not receive an allotment under section 1921 for a fiscal year in an amount that is less than an amount equal to 0.375 percent of the amount appropriated under section 1935(a) for such fiscal year.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—In applying subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall ensure that no State receives an increase in its allotment under section 1921 for a fiscal year (as compared to the amount allotted to the State in the prior fiscal year) that is in excess of an amount equal to 300 percent of the percentage by which the amount appropriated under section 1935(a) for such fiscal year exceeds the amount appropriated for the prior fiscal year.

“(3) DECREASE IN OR EQUAL APPROPRIATIONS.—If the amount appropriated under section 1935(a) for a fiscal year is equal to or less than the amount appropriated under such section for the prior fiscal year, the amount of the State allotment under section 1921 shall be equal to the amount that the State received under section 1921 in the prior fiscal year decreased by the percentage by which the amount appropriated for such fiscal year is less than the amount appropriated or such section for the prior fiscal year.”

SEC. 305. NONDISCRIMINATION AND INSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARDS FOR RELIGIOUS PROVIDERS.

Subpart III of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–51 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following: **“SEC. 1955. SERVICES PROVIDED BY NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.**

“(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

“(1) to prohibit discrimination against nongovernmental organizations and certain individuals on the basis of religion in the distribution of government funds to provide substance abuse services under this title and title V, and the receipt of services under such titles; and

“(2) to allow the organizations to accept the funds to provide the services to the individuals without impairing the religious character of the organizations or the religious freedom of the individuals.

“(b) RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS INCLUDED AS NONGOVERNMENTAL PROVIDERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State may administer and provide substance abuse services under any program under this title or title V through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to provide assistance to beneficiaries under such titles with nongovernmental organizations.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—A State that elects to utilize nongovernmental organizations as provided for under paragraph (1) shall consider, on the same basis as other nongovernmental organizations, religious organizations to provide services under substance abuse programs under this title or title V, so long as the programs under such titles are implemented in a manner consistent with the Establishment Clause of the first amendment to the Constitution. Neither the Federal Government nor a State or local government receiving funds under such programs shall discriminate against an organization that provides services under, or applies to provide services under, such programs, on the basis that the organization has a religious character.

“(c) RELIGIOUS CHARACTER AND INDEPENDENCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A religious organization that provides services under any substance abuse program under this title or title V shall retain its independence from Federal, State, and local governments, including such organization's control over the definition, development, practice, and expression of its religious beliefs.

“(2) ADDITIONAL SAFEGUARDS.—Neither the Federal Government nor a State or local government shall require a religious organization—

“(A) to alter its form of internal governance; or

“(B) to remove religious art, icons, scripture, or other symbols;

in order to be eligible to provide services under any substance abuse program under this title or title V.

“(d) EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—

“(1) TENETS AND TEACHINGS.—A religious organization that provides services under any substance abuse program under this title or title V may require that its employees providing services under such program adhere to the religious tenets and teachings of such organization, and such organization may require that those employees adhere to rules forbidding the use of drugs or alcohol.

“(2) TITLE VII EXEMPTION.—The exemption of a religious organization provided under section

702 or 703(e)(2) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–1, 2000e–2(e)(2)) regarding employment practices shall not be affected by the religious organization's provision of services under, or receipt of funds from, any substance abuse program under this title or title V.

“(e) RIGHTS OF BENEFICIARIES OF ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If an individual described in paragraph (3) has an objection to the religious character of the organization from which the individual receives, or would receive, services funded under any substance abuse program under this title or title V, the appropriate Federal, State, or local governmental entity shall provide to such individual (if otherwise eligible for such services) within a reasonable period of time after the date of such objection, services that—

“(A) are from an alternative provider that is accessible to the individual; and

“(B) have a value that is not less than the value of the services that the individual would have received from such organization.

“(2) NOTICE.—The appropriate Federal, State, or local governmental entity shall ensure that notice is provided to individuals described in paragraph (3) of the rights of such individuals under this section.

“(3) INDIVIDUAL DESCRIBED.—An individual described in this paragraph is an individual who receives or applies for services under any substance abuse program under this title or title V.

“(f) NONDISCRIMINATION AGAINST BENEFICIARIES.—A religious organization providing services through a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under any substance abuse program under this title or title V shall not discriminate, in carrying out such program, against an individual described in subsection (e)(3) on the basis of religion, a religious belief, a refusal to hold a religious belief, or a refusal to actively participate in a religious practice.

“(g) FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), any religious organization providing services under any substance abuse program under this title or title V shall be subject to the same regulations as other nongovernmental organizations to account in accord with generally accepted accounting principles for the use of such funds provided under such program.

“(2) LIMITED AUDIT.—Such organization shall segregate government funds provided under such substance abuse program into a separate account. Only the government funds shall be subject to audit by the government.

“(h) COMPLIANCE.—Any party that seeks to enforce such party's rights under this section may assert a civil action for injunctive relief exclusively in an appropriate Federal or State court against the entity or agency that allegedly commits such violation.

“(i) LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—No funds provided through a grant or contract to a religious organization to provide services under any substance abuse program under this title or title V shall be expended for sectarian worship, instruction, or proselytization.

“(j) EFFECT ON STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS.—If a State or local government contributes State or local funds to carry out any substance abuse program under this title or title V, the State or local government may segregate the State or local funds from the Federal funds provided to carry out the program or may commingle the State or local funds with the Federal funds. If the State or local government commingles the State or local funds, the provisions of this section shall apply to the commingled funds in the same manner, and to the same extent, as the provisions apply to the Federal funds.

“(k) TREATMENT OF INTERMEDIATE CONTRACTORS.—If a nongovernmental organization (referred to in this subsection as an ‘intermediate organization’), acting under a contract or other

agreement with the Federal Government or a State or local government, is given the authority under the contract or agreement to select nongovernmental organizations to provide services under any substance abuse program under this title or title V, the intermediate organization shall have the same duties under this section as the government but shall retain all other rights of a nongovernmental organization under this section.”

SEC. 306. ALCOHOL AND DRUG PREVENTION OR TREATMENT SERVICES FOR INDIANS AND NATIVE ALASKANS.

Part D of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 544. ALCOHOL AND DRUG PREVENTION OR TREATMENT SERVICES FOR INDIANS AND NATIVE ALASKANS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to public and private nonprofit entities, including Native Alaskan entities and Indian tribes and tribal organizations, for the purpose of providing alcohol and drug prevention or treatment services for Indians and Native Alaskans.

“(b) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to applicants that—

“(1) propose to provide alcohol and drug prevention or treatment services on reservations;

“(2) propose to employ culturally-appropriate approaches, as determined by the Secretary, in providing such services; and

“(3) have provided prevention or treatment services to Native Alaskan entities and Indian tribes and tribal organizations for at least 1 year prior to applying for a grant under this section.

“(c) DURATION.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a) for a period not to exceed 5 years.

“(d) APPLICATION.—An entity desiring a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

“(e) EVALUATION.—An entity that receives a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall submit, in the application for such grant, a plan for the evaluation of any project undertaken with funds provided under this section. Such entity shall provide the Secretary with periodic evaluations of the progress of such project and such evaluation at the completion of such project as the Secretary determines to be appropriate. The final evaluation submitted by such entity shall include a recommendation as to whether such project shall continue.

“(f) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall prepare and submit, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, a report describing the services provided pursuant to this section.

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2001 and 2002.

“SEC. 545. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established a commission to be known as the Commission on Indian and Native Alaskan Health Care that shall examine the health concerns of Indians and Native Alaskans who reside on reservations and tribal lands (hereafter in this section referred to as the ‘Commission’).

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission established under subsection (a) shall consist of—

“(A) the Secretary;

“(B) 15 members who are experts in the health care field and issues that the Commission is established to examine; and

“(C) the Director of the Indian Health Service and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who shall be nonvoting members.

“(2) APPOINTING AUTHORITY.—Of the 15 members of the Commission described in paragraph (1)(B)—

“(A) 2 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

“(B) 2 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives;

“(C) 2 shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate;

“(D) 2 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate; and

“(E) 7 shall be appointed by the Secretary.

“(3) LIMITATION.—Not fewer than 10 of the members appointed to the Commission shall be Indians or Native Alaskans.

“(4) CHAIRPERSON.—The Secretary shall serve as the Chairperson of the Commission.

“(5) EXPERTS.—The Commission may seek the expertise of any expert in the health care field to carry out its duties.

“(c) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

“(d) DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.—The Commission shall—

“(1) study the health concerns of Indians and Native Alaskans; and

“(2) prepare the reports described in subsection (i).

“(e) POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.—

“(1) HEARINGS.—The Commission may hold such hearings, including hearings on reservations, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such information as the Commission considers advisable to carry out the purpose for which the Commission was established.

“(2) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out the purpose for which the Commission was established. Upon request of the Chairperson of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

“(f) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), each member of the Commission may be compensated at a rate not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time), during which that member is engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Commission.

“(2) LIMITATION.—Members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall receive no additional pay on account of their service on the Commission.

“(g) TRAVEL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

“(h) COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in accordance with rules established by the Commission, may select and appoint a staff director and other personnel necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its duties.

“(2) COMPENSATION OF PERSONNEL.—The Secretary, in accordance with rules established by the Commission, may set the amount of compensation to be paid to the staff director and any other personnel that serve the Commission.

“(3) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and the detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

“(4) CONSULTANT SERVICES.—The Chairperson of the Commission is authorized to procure the temporary and intermittent services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title.

“(i) REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Youth Drug and Mental Health Services Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, a report that shall—

“(A) detail the health problems faced by Indians and Native Alaskans who reside on reservations;

“(B) examine and explain the causes of such problems;

“(C) describe the health care services available to Indians and Native Alaskans who reside on reservations and the adequacy of such services;

“(D) identify the reasons for the provision of inadequate health care services for Indians and Native Alaskans who reside on reservations, including the availability of resources;

“(E) develop measures for tracking the health status of Indians and Native Americans who reside on reservations; and

“(F) make recommendations for improvements in the health care services provided for Indians and Native Alaskans who reside on reservations, including recommendations for legislative change.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—In addition to the report required under paragraph (1), not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Youth Drug and Mental Health Services Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, a report that describes any alcohol and drug abuse among Indians and Native Alaskans who reside on reservations.

“(j) PERMANENT COMMISSION.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Commission.

“(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2001 and 2002.”.

TITLE IV—PROVISIONS RELATING TO FLEXIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 401. GENERAL AUTHORITIES AND PEER REVIEW.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITIES.—Paragraph (1) of section 501(e) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa(e)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There may be in the Administration an Associate Administrator for Alcohol Prevention and Treatment Policy to whom the Administrator may delegate the functions of promoting, monitoring, and evaluating service programs for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism and alcohol abuse within the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment and the Center for Mental Health Services, and coordinating such programs among the Centers, and among the Centers and other public and private entities. The Associate Administrator also may ensure that alcohol prevention, education, and policy strategies are integrated into all programs of the Centers that address substance abuse prevention, education, and policy, and that the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention addresses the Healthy People 2010 goals and the National Dietary Guidelines of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Agriculture related to alcohol consumption.”.

(b) PEER REVIEW.—Section 504 of the Public Health Service (42 U.S.C. 290aa-3) is amended as follows:

“SEC. 504. PEER REVIEW.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, after consultation with the Administrator, shall require

appropriate peer review of grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts to be administered through the agency which exceed the simple acquisition threshold as defined in section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act.

“(b) MEMBERS.—The members of any peer review group established under subsection (a) shall be individuals who by virtue of their training or experience are eminently qualified to perform the review functions of the group. Not more than ¼ of the members of any such peer review group shall be officers or employees of the United States.

“(c) ADVISORY COUNCIL REVIEW.—If the direct cost of a grant or cooperative agreement (described in subsection (a)) exceeds the simple acquisition threshold as defined by section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, the Secretary may make such a grant or cooperative agreement only if such grant or cooperative agreement is recommended—

“(1) after peer review required under subsection (a); and

“(2) by the appropriate advisory council.

“(d) CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may establish limited exceptions to the limitations contained in this section regarding participation of Federal employees and advisory council approval. The circumstances under which the Secretary may make such an exception shall be made public.”.

SEC. 402. ADVISORY COUNCILS.

Section 502(e) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa-1(e)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “3 times” and inserting “2 times”.

SEC. 403. GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR THE PERFORMANCE PARTNERSHIP BLOCK GRANTS.

(a) PLANS FOR PERFORMANCE PARTNERSHIPS.—Section 1949 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-59) is amended as follows:

“SEC. 1949. PLANS FOR PERFORMANCE PARTNERSHIPS.

“(a) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary in conjunction with States and other interested groups shall develop separate plans for the programs authorized under subparts I and II for creating more flexibility for States and accountability based on outcome and other performance measures. The plans shall each include—

“(1) a description of the flexibility that would be given to the States under the plan;

“(2) the common set of performance measures that would be used for accountability, including measures that would be used for the program under subpart II for pregnant addicts, HIV transmission, tuberculosis, and those with a co-occurring substance abuse and mental disorders, and for programs under subpart I for children with serious emotional disturbance and adults with serious mental illness and for individuals with co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders;

“(3) the definitions for the data elements to be used under the plan;

“(4) the obstacles to implementation of the plan and the manner in which such obstacles would be resolved;

“(5) the resources needed to implement the performance partnerships under the plan; and

“(6) an implementation strategy complete with recommendations for any necessary legislation.

“(b) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the plans developed under subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives.

“(c) INFORMATION.—As the elements of the plans described in subsection (a) are developed, States are encouraged to provide information to the Secretary on a voluntary basis.”.

(b) AVAILABILITY TO STATES OF GRANT PROGRAMS.—Section 1952 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-62) is amended as follows:

"SEC. 1952. AVAILABILITY TO STATES OF GRANT PAYMENTS.

"Any amounts paid to a State for a fiscal year under section 1911 or 1921 shall be available for obligation and expenditure until the end of the fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the amounts were paid."

SEC. 404. DATA INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.

Part C of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300y et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking the headings for part C and subpart I and inserting the following:

"PART C—CERTAIN PROGRAMS REGARDING MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE**"Subpart I—Data Infrastructure Development";**

(2) by striking section 1971 (42 U.S.C. 300y) and inserting the following:

"SEC. 1971. DATA INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to, and enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with States for the purpose of developing and operating mental health or substance abuse data collection, analysis, and reporting systems with regard to performance measures including capacity, process, and outcomes measures.

"(b) PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall establish criteria to ensure that services will be available under this section to States that have a fundamental basis for the collection, analysis, and reporting of mental health and substance abuse performance measures and States that do not have such basis. The Secretary will establish criteria for determining whether a State has a fundamental basis for the collection, analysis, and reporting of data.

"(c) CONDITION OF RECEIPT OF FUNDS.—As a condition of the receipt of an award under this section a State shall agree to collect, analyze, and report to the Secretary within 2 years of the date of the award on a core set of performance measures to be determined by the Secretary in conjunction with the States.

"(d) DURATION OF SUPPORT.—The period during which payments may be made for a project under subsection (a) may be not less than 3 years nor more than 5 years.

"(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2000, 2001 and 2002.

"(2) ALLOCATION.—Of the amounts appropriated under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, 50 percent shall be expended to support data infrastructure development for mental health and 50 percent shall be expended to support data infrastructure development for substance abuse."

SEC. 405. REPEAL OF OBSOLETE ADDICT REFERRAL PROVISIONS.

(a) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT AUTHORITIES.—Part E of title III (42 U.S.C. 257 et seq.) is repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE NARA AUTHORITIES.—Titles III and IV of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-793) are repealed.

(c) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE TITLE 28 AUTHORITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 175 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents to part VI of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking the items relating to chapter 175.

SEC. 406. INDIVIDUALS WITH CO-OCCURRING DISORDERS.

The Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting after section 503 (42 U.S.C. 290aa-2) the following:

"SEC. 503A. REPORT ON INDIVIDUALS WITH CO-OCCURRING MENTAL ILLNESS AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE DISORDERS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the

Secretary shall, after consultation with organizations representing States, mental health and substance abuse treatment providers, prevention specialists, individuals receiving treatment services, and family members of such individuals, prepare and submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives, a report on prevention and treatment services for individuals who have co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders.

"(b) REPORT CONTENT.—The report under subsection (a) shall be based on data collected from existing Federal and State surveys regarding the treatment of co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders and shall include—

"(1) a summary of the manner in which individuals with co-occurring disorders are receiving treatment, including the most up-to-date information available regarding the number of children and adults with co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders and the manner in which funds provided under sections 1911 and 1921 are being utilized, including the number of such children and adults served with such funds;

"(2) a summary of improvements necessary to ensure that individuals with co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders receive the services they need;

"(3) a summary of practices for preventing substance abuse among individuals who have a mental illness and are at risk of having or acquiring a substance abuse disorder; and

"(4) a summary of evidenced-based practices for treating individuals with co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders and recommendations for implementing such practices.

"(c) FUNDS FOR REPORT.—The Secretary may obligate funds to carry out this section with such appropriations as are available."

SEC. 407. SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH CO-OCCURRING DISORDERS.

Subpart III of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-51 et seq.) (as amended by section 305) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 1956. SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH CO-OCCURRING DISORDERS.

"States may use funds available for treatment under sections 1911 and 1921 to treat persons with co-occurring substance abuse and mental disorders as long as funds available under such sections are used for the purposes for which they were authorized by law and can be tracked for accounting purposes."

AMENDMENT NO. 2507

(Purpose: To provide a grant program for strengthening families and to modify other provisions, and to make various technical corrections)

Mr. GRAMM. Senator FRIST has an amendment at the desk. I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], for Mr. FRIST, proposes an amendment numbered 2507.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I am pleased that the United States Senate will pass today, S. 976, the "Youth Drug and Mental Health Services Act," which I introduced on May 6, 1999. This action follows the overwhelming endorsement of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, which

passed this bill by a vote of 17 to 1 on July 28, 1999.

S. 976 represents a comprehensive attempt to address the tragedy of increasing drug use by our children. The 1998 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, conducted by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) estimated that nearly 9.9 percent of 12-17 year olds used drugs in the past month, which is dramatically higher than the 1992 rate of 5.3 percent. An estimated 8.3 percent of 12 to 17 year olds have used marijuana in the past month and nearly a quarter of our 8th graders and about half of all high school seniors have tried marijuana.

Let us not forget about the drug of choice for our youth and adolescents, alcohol. Although the legal drinking age is 21 in all States, SAMHSA reports that more than 50 percent of young adults age eighteen to twenty are consuming alcohol and more than 25 percent report having five or more drinks at one time during the past month.

There are many factors for this increase in youth substance abuse, but the factor that I, as a father, am most concerned with is the overall decline of the disapproval of drug use and the decline of the perception of the risk of drug use among our youth.

To help address this problem, the "Youth Drug" bill reauthorizes and improves SAMHSA by placing a renewed focus on youth and adolescent substance abuse and mental health services, while providing greater flexibility for States and new accountability in the use of funds based on performance.

SAMHSA, formerly known as the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Services Administration (ADAMHA) was created in 1992 by the Public Law 102-321, the ADAMHA Reorganization Act. SAMHSA's purpose is to assist States in addressing the importance of reducing the incidence of substance abuse and mental illness by supporting programs for prevention and treatment. SAMHSA provides funds to States for alcohol and drug abuse prevention and treatment programs and activities, and mental health services through the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment and the Community Mental Health Services Block Grants.

SAMHSA's block grants are a major portion of this nation's response to substance abuse and mental health service needs, accounting for 40 percent and 15 percent respectively of all substance abuse and community mental health services funding in the States. In my own State of Tennessee, SAMHSA provides over 70 percent of overall funding for the Tennessee Department of Health's Bureau of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services, which is headed by Dr. Stephanie Perry.

Last year Tennessee received over \$25 million from the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant to spend on treatment and prevention activities. With this funding the Tennessee Bureau of Alcohol and Drug

Abuse Services provides funding to community-based programs that offer a wide range of services throughout the State. In all, the block grant funds provided under this bill permits nearly 6,500 Tennesseans to receive the substance abuse treatment they desperately need.

Today, we in part finish an effort in the Senate that began several years ago to reform and improve our Nation's substance abuse and mental health services. While working on this effort, I have targeted six main goals which I am pleased to report has been accomplished by this legislation. These goals include: promoting State flexibility in block grant and discretionary funding by eliminating or stripping back the numerous outdated or unneeded requirements which Congress has mandated on the States in their expenditure of Federal block grant and discretionary funds; ensuring accountability for the expenditure of Federal funds by beginning the process of moving away from the inefficiency of a system based on expenditure of funds to a performance based system determined in consultation with the States and based upon States' needs; developing and supporting youth and adolescent substance abuse prevention and treatment initiatives by including provisions to provide substance abuse treatment services and early intervention substance abuse services for children and adolescents; developing and supporting mental health initiatives that are designed to prevent and respond to incidents of teen violence by authorizing provisions that will assist local communities in developing ways to treat violent youth and minimize outbreaks of youth violence by forming partnerships among the schools, law enforcement and mental health services; ensuring the availability of Federal funding for substance abuse or mental health emergencies by giving the Secretary the authority to use up to 3 percent of discretionary funding to respond to substance abuse or mental health emergencies, such as an outbreak of methamphetamine activity, without having to go through the peer review process which adds countless weeks and months to the agency's ability to respond; and supporting programs targeted for the homeless in treating mental health and substance abuse by reauthorizing programs which develop and expand mental health and substance abuse treatment services for homeless individuals, including outreach, screening and treatment, habilitation and rehabilitation to homeless individuals suffering from substance abuse or mental illness.

In addition to meeting these six goals, the bill that the Senate passed today addresses several additional important substance abuse and mental health issues.

S. 976 addresses the very crucial issue of how to treat individuals with a co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorder. There has been consid-

erable debate on how to treat these individuals, and I am pleased that the National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors and the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors reached a consensus on this issue. This agreement includes language which acknowledges that both substance abuse and mental health block grant funds can be used to treat individuals with co-occurring disorders as long as the funds used can be tracked to show that substance abuse dollars were used for substance abuse services and mental health dollars were used for mental health services.

Another very important issue that is addressed in S. 976 is the proper and safe use of restraints and seclusions in mental health facilities. I would like to acknowledge the important work done on this issue by Senator DODD, who drafted the provisions included in the bill. He has been a true leader on this issue in the Senate and should be commended for bringing this issue to our attention.

There are also provisions in S. 976 to address the inadequacy of substance abuse services for American Indians and Native Alaskans. The bill establishes a Commission on Indian and Native Alaskan Health Care that shall carry out a comprehensive examination of the health concerns of Indians and Native Alaskans living on reservations or tribal lands.

And last, but not least, the bill has an important provision called "charitable choice." This provision would permit religious organizations which provide substance abuse services to be eligible for Federal assistance either through the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant or discretionary grants through SAMHSA. "Charitable choice" acknowledges that no one approach works for everyone who needs and wants substance abuse treatment and that faith-based programs have strong records of successful rehabilitation. Despite this success, faith-based programs are currently not allowed to receive to federal funds. The "charitable choice" provisions in this bill will not allow the Federal government to continue to discriminate against faith-based providers regarding substance abuse services. I will not outline all the provisions of the amendment at this time, but would instead like to point out that this provision is similar to the charitable choice provisions that Senator ASHCROFT offered to the Welfare Reform Act of 1996. I would like to thank the leadership of Senators ASHCROFT and ABRAHAM on this critical issue, and especially thank the hard work and dedication of Annie Billings of Senator ASHCROFT's staff.

I would like to thank all the Members of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee and their staffs for their help on this bipartisan piece of legislation, especially Senator KENNEDY and his staff Dr. David Polack, Debra DeBruin and David Nexon

who have been instrumental in helping to draft this legislation. I would also like to thank the contributions of the Chairman of the Committee, Senator JEFFORDS, and his staff members Philo Hall and Sean Donohue, Senator DEWINE and his staff member Karla Carpenter, Senator GREGG and his staff Alan Gilbert and Shalla Ross, Senator DODD and his staff Jeanne Ireland and Jim Fenton, Senator HARKIN and his staff Bryan Johnson, Senator MIKULSKI and her staff, Rhonda Richards, Senator BINGAMAN and his staff Dr. Robert Mendoza, Senator REED and his staff Rebecca Morley and Lisa German, and Senator WELLSTONE and his staff Ellen Gerrity and John Gilman. I would also like to thank my staff, Anne Phelps, the Staff Director of my Subcommittee on Public Health, and Dave Larson, my Health Policy Analyst, for their efforts on this bill. I would also like to thank Daphne Edwards of the Office of Legislative Counsel and Julia Christensen of the Congressional Budget Office for their contributions. Finally, I would like to thank an individual who has worked tirelessly in assisting us in getting this process to where we are today, Joe Faha, the Director of Legislation and External Affairs for SAMHSA.

Mr. President, the bill we passed today will ensure that Tennessee and other states will continue to receive critically needed Federal funds for community based programs to help individuals with substance abuse and mental health disorders. The changes within this bill will dramatically increase State flexibility in the use of Federal funds and ensure that each State is able to address its unique needs. The bill will also provide a much needed focus on the troubling issue of the recent increase in drug use by our youth and address how we can be helpful to local communities in regard to the issue of children and violence. I am pleased to see this bill pass the Senate and I look forward to its ultimate enactment into law.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this bill is the result of a concerted and cooperative bipartisan effort. It is an important and timely piece of legislation that is long overdue, and I urge the Senate to support it.

Mental illness and substance abuse are national problems that need comprehensive and compassionate attention. These conditions do not respect party affiliation or race or age. They are equal opportunity destroyers, but they don't have to destroy at all.

States and local communities provide some of the most critical and ongoing services for persons who struggle with mental illness and substance abuse. This bill enables these dedicated providers to do an even better job with limited resources to accomplish their prevention and treatment goals.

Since we passed the original authorizing legislation for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration in 1992, a number of major

clinical and service delivery issues have emerged which require legislative attention. Now we have crafted a bill that accomplishes a great deal and that includes significant compromises on a number of key issues.

The bill addresses three important clinical issues that have emerged in recent years: the growing problem of co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders, the distressing and pervasive impact of psychological trauma especially on our younger citizens, and the important relationship between mental health or substance abuse and primary care providers. It also places much greater emphasis on preventing and treating mental health and substance abuse problems in children and adolescents.

The provisions for children demonstrate the breadth and depth of this bill. It contains a children and violence initiative, centers of excellence for psychological trauma, grants for persons who experience violence-related stress, comprehensive substance abuse prevention and treatment for children and adolescents, special attention for children of substance abusers, wrap-around services for youth offenders, and special training centers to increase the sensitivity and competency of staff who work on these issues in the juvenile justice system.

The bill also addresses special problems that adults face. It maintains and expands support for critical programs that serve the homeless, extends its protection to persons who are served in community-based facilities, limits the use of seclusion and restraints in psychiatric facilities, and addresses the special circumstances of Native Americans.

I am particularly pleased with the initiatives to meet the intense service needs of persons with co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders. Often, they need innovative treatment approaches, including integrated mental health and addiction treatment facilities. Over the next two years, the Secretary will compile a report that establishes the best practices for helping this very challenging but treatable group.

The bill authorizes the Secretary to provide additional funding for projects on the increasingly important ties linking mental health or substance abuse and primary care. Family physicians and other primary care providers see many patients with a wide range of psychiatric and psychological problems. Too often, however, they do not recognize the mental health problems of their patients. Even if they do, they are often ill-prepared to provide adequate treatment or counseling. We can do much more to help primary care physicians do a better job of caring for patients with serious mental illnesses. This bill seeks to do that.

The bill also accomplishes several important organizational goals. It gives States more flexibility in administering their grant funds, and removes

a number of bureaucratic obstacles to greater efficiency. In exchange for this easing of certain mandates, the States will enter into a cooperative agreement with the Administration in developing outcomes-based accountability measures.

The bill also gives the SAMHSA Administrator greater authority in managing discretionary grant funds. It enables the Administrator to make emergency grants to deal with immediate problems that cannot be addressed by the standard grant-making process.

In spite of the many excellent features in this bill, one provision is seriously flawed. The section that allows religious organizations to compete for public funds for the provision of substance abuse services violates the prohibition against certain forms of discrimination. I recognize the valuable role that faith-based organizations can play in helping to address a wide array of social problems. However, the recent proliferation of charitable choice provisions in federal social service programs runs the risk of creating a religious litmus test for those who provide these services, thus barring many trained, qualified professionals from providing services for faith-based organizations. We need to do more to avoid that discrimination.

Our goal is to help many of those in communities across the country who have received inadequate care in the past. The many excellent provisions in this bill will help to ensure that these children and adults will finally receive the care they need and deserve—without stigma or shame, but with dignity and respect—and America will be a better nation because of it.

I commend my colleagues for this important action to reauthorize the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. I want to thank Senator FRIST and his Republican colleagues and their staffs for their skillful work for this genuine bipartisan achievement. I commend Senator DODD, who worked effectively on children's issues and the seclusion and restraint provision. Senator HARKIN contributed his important initiative on methamphetamine and inhalant abuse, and Senator DURBIN contributed his critical provision on residential treatment for pregnant women and women who have given birth. Senators BINGAMAN, WELLSTONE, and REED effectively collaborated on a series of significant child and adolescent provisions, and Senator BINGAMAN worked effectively on the needs of Native Americans. Senators MIKULSKI and MURRAY provided excellent counsel on many issues, especially the mental health and substance abuse treatment needs of women. I thank Joe Faha, SAMHSA's Director of Legislation, for his generous assistance throughout the process, as well as Nelba Chavez, the Administrator of SAMHSA. I especially thank David Pollack, David Nexon and Debra DeBruin on my staff, for their dedication and excellent work in bringing this bill to passage.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 976, Youth Drug and Mental Health Services Act, and to express my appreciation for the leadership that Senator FRIST has shown in moving this long-overdue legislation forward. At a time when so many other worthy legislative efforts have been derailed by partisan politics, the unanimous support for this measure in the Senate is particularly noteworthy.

Substance abuse and mental illness take a terrible toll on individuals, families and on society at-large. Each year, approximately 5.5 million Americans are disabled by severe mental illness and an estimated 4.1 million individuals are addicted to drugs, including 1.1 million of our children. In Connecticut alone, an estimated 130,000 adults suffer from severe mental illness and 224,000 are in need of substance abuse treatment. Among Connecticut's youth, an estimated 23,000 have a serious emotional or behavioral disorder.

Given that so many of our Nation's most intransigent social ills—poverty, violence, child abuse, premature death, and homelessness—have their roots in untreated substance abuse and mental illness, it is critical that we do all that we can to ensure that states, communities and families have the resources they need to combat these devastating conditions. This reauthorization of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Act (SAMHSA) represents an important step in expanding and improving early intervention, prevention, and treatment services. Through S. 976, States are given the flexibility to develop innovative systems of care for substance abuse and mental health, but will also be required to improve accountability by developing performance measures and enhancing their data collection efforts.

I am particularly pleased that this reauthorization contains legislation that I introduced earlier this year, the Compassionate Care Act, which will address a critical issue that a Hartford Courant series brought to national attention last year—the inappropriate use of seclusion and restraint within mental health care facilities. The 5-day investigative series documented more than 140 deaths directly attributable to abusive seclusion and restraint practices. An additional investigation conducted by the General Accounting Office determined that 24 deaths of individuals with mental illnesses resulted from restraint or seclusion. However, both the Hartford Courant and the GAO report determined that these figures most likely represent just the tip of the iceberg of restraint and seclusion related deaths. In fact, the Harvard Center for Risk Analysis estimated that as many as 100–150 deaths each year may be caused by the inappropriate use of restraint and seclusion. This is a tragedy that must be stopped.

The Compassionate Care Act creates tough new limits on the use of potentially lethal restraints—whether physical or chemical in nature—sets rules

for training mental health care workers; and increases the likelihood that a wrongful death of a mental health patient will be investigated and prosecuted—not ignored. The legislation simply seeks to put an end to a shameful record of neglect and abuse of some of our Nation's most vulnerable and least cared for individuals. Specifically, the Compassionate Care Act will ensure that physical restraints are no longer used for discipline or for the convenience of mental health facility staff by extending to the mental health population a standard that has been demonstrated to be effective in reducing the use of restraints and seclusion in nursing homes. This legislation will ensure that restraint and seclusion will only be used when a mentally ill individual poses an imminent threat either to himself or others.

Further, this legislation will require that all restraint and seclusion related deaths be reported to an appropriate oversight agency as determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. Presently, there is no standard federal reporting requirement for deaths as result of seclusion or restraint. The simple reporting measure in this legislation will greatly aid the federal government, as well as state and local oversight agencies, in tracking and investigating abusive treatment practices. The Compassionate Care Act will also require mental health care facilities to maintain adequate staffing levels and provide appropriate training for mental health care staff, who are often the least paid and least trained of all health care workers. These safeguards will hopefully prevent further harm to individuals who may be unable to protect themselves from abuse by those entrusted with their care. I thank Senator FRIST for working closely with my office in crafting this critically important part of SAMHSA's reauthorization.

I am also pleased that S. 976 incorporates legislation that I have cosponsored with Senator JEFFORDS, the Children of Substance Abusers Act (COSA). Children with substance abusing parents face serious health risks, including congenital birth defects and psychological, emotional, and developmental problems. We also know that substance abuse plays a major role in child abuse and neglect. In fact, it is estimated that children whose parents abuse drugs and/or alcohol are three times more likely to be abused and four times more likely to be neglected than children whose parents are not substance abusers. In an effort to lessen the terrible toll that substance abuse takes on children, COSA will promote aggressive outreach, early intervention, prevention, and treatment services to families struggling with addiction. In addition, COSA will strengthen the systems which provide these services by training professionals serving children and families in recognizing and addressing substance abuse.

I am also grateful that Senator FRIST agreed to include my Teen Substance

Abuse Treatment Act of 1999 within this reauthorization. Each year, 400,000 teens and their families, including 7,000 in the state of Connecticut alone, will seek substance abuse treatment but find that it is either unavailable or unaffordable. At best only 20 percent of adolescents with severe alcohol and drug treatment problems who ask for help will receive any form of treatment. Without help, substance abuse puts young people's health at risk and exacerbates anti-social and violent behaviors. This legislation will provide grants to give youth substance abusers access to effective, age-appropriate treatment. It will also address the particular issues of youth involved with the juvenile justice system and those with mental health or other special needs. In short, this legislation will go a long way toward ensuring that no young person who seeks substance abuse treatment will be denied help.

I would also like to thank Senator FRIST for working with me and Senator GREGG on the Strengthening Families through Community Partnerships program, which will promote healthy early childhood development by intervening with at-risk families with young children and their communities. This legislation will support demonstrations to test the efficacy of deterring substance use and abuse and other high risk behaviors through a comprehensive substance abuse prevention program that targets the child's family.

I do have reservations, however, on one aspect of this legislation. While I support the ability of faith-based organizations to provide substance abuse services, I am concerned about provisions in this legislation that would allow religiously based facilities providing substance abuse services to hire only adherents to their own religion. The ability of faith-based providers to participate in providing valuable federally funded programs is a laudable goal. I firmly believe that faith-based substance abuse services can offer critical help in overcoming drug dependency. However, the ability of religiously based entities to provide federally funded programs within this legislation should not be allowed to blur the line between church and state and to erode crucial anti-discrimination protections.

S. 976 represents a bipartisan commitment to reducing the devastating impact of substance abuse and mental illness of our Nation's families. I want to again applaud Senator FRIST, Senator KENNEDY, Senator JEFFORDS, and other members of the Health and Education committee and their staffs for their efforts in developing this legislation and urge the House of Representatives to follow the Senate's lead by acting on this bill expeditiously.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the members of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee for their efforts in

crafting S. 976, the "Youth Drug and Mental Health Services Act," which reauthorizes programs under the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. In particular, I want to recognize the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health, the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. FRIST, for his tremendous leadership in drafting this legislation.

I am especially pleased that this legislation contains the Charitable Choice provision—modeled after my Charitable Choice provision in the 1996 welfare reform law—which will expand the opportunities for religious organizations to provide substance abuse treatment services with SAMHSA block grant funds. This provision is also very similar to language contained in Senator ABRAHAM's legislation, the "Faith-Based Drug Treatment Enhancement Act."

While government substance abuse programs have not succeeded very well in helping people break free from addictions, faith-based drug treatment programs have been transforming shattered lives for years by addressing the deeper needs of people—by instilling hope and values which change destructive behavior and attitudes.

What results have they achieved? We have heard countless stories of the efficiency and effectiveness of these faith-based programs. Teen Challenge has shown that 86% of its graduates remain drug-free. These are individuals who finally broke free of addictions after being routed through a number of government drug treatment programs. The Bowery Mission in New York City has had the most effective free-standing substance abuse shelter in the city-wide system. Bowery also serves its clients at approximately 42% of the cost of some other city-sponsored men's substance abuse shelters. Mel Trotter Ministries in Grand Rapids, Michigan, named for its former alcoholic founder, has an astounding 70 percent long-term success rate in its faith-based rehabilitation program. According to director Thomas Laymon, government programs leave addicts without "spiritual support." Worse, addicts "are not held accountable for addictions, and they have no incentive to change their behavior." Meanwhile, Trotter Ministries provides guidance, a supportive community, and integration into a life beyond drugs. San Antonio's Victory Fellowship, run by Pastor Freddie Garcia, has saved thousands of addicts in some of the city's toughest neighborhoods. The program offers addicts a safe haven, a chance to recover, job training, and a chance to provide for themselves and their families. It has served more than 13,000 people and has a success rate of over 80%.

USA Today cited a study from Georgetown University Medical Center regarding recovery from opiate addiction. The study found that 45% of those who participated in a religious program were drug-free after one year,

while only 5% of those who participated in a non-religious program remained drug-free after a year.

Why are faith-based organizations successful? Because they see those they serve as people, not profiles. They come at this with a holistic approach. They address the moral and spiritual cause of the problems rather than simply dealing with the symptoms.

While some states may already collaborate with religious and charitable organizations in the area of substance abuse programs, Charitable Choice is intended to expand the use of these partnerships by clarifying to government officials and religious organizations alike what the constitutional ground rules are for these partnerships. If we know that faith-based substance abuse programs are successful in helping people break destructive addictions, government should encourage their expanded use. That is precisely what this legislation does.

The Charitable Choice provision in this legislation makes clear that states may direct SAMHSA block grant funds to religious organizations through contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements to provide substance abuse treatment services to beneficiaries. The provision reflects our belief in Congress that government should exercise neutrality when inviting the participation of non-governmental organizations to be service providers by considering all organizations—even religious ones—on an equal basis, and by focusing on whether the organization can provide the requested service, rather than on the religious or non-religious character of the organization.

Unfortunately, in the past, many faith-based organizations have been afraid—often rightfully so—of accepting governmental funds in order to help the poor and downtrodden. They fear that participation in government programs would not only require them to alter their buildings, internal governance, and employment practices, but also make them compromise the very religious character which motivates them to reach out to people in the first place.

Charitable Choice is intended to allay such fears and to prevent government officials from misconstruing constitutional law by banning faith-based organizations from the mix of private providers for fear of violating the Establishment Clause. Even when religious organizations are permitted to participate, government officials have often gone overboard by requiring such organizations to sterilize buildings or property of religious character and to remove any sectarian connections from their programs. This discrimination can destroy the character of many faith-based programs and diminish their effectiveness in helping people climb from despair and dependence to dignity and independence.

Charitable Choice embodies existing U.S. Supreme Court case precedents in an effort to clarify to government offi-

cials and charitable organizations alike what is constitutionally permissible when involving religiously-affiliated institutions. Based upon these precedents, the legislation provides specific protections for religious organizations when they provide services with government funds. For example, the government cannot discriminate against an organization on the basis of its religious character. A participating faith-based organization also retains its religious character and its control over the definition, development, practice, and expression of its religious beliefs.

Additionally, the government cannot require a religious organization to alter its form of internal governance or remove religious art, icons, or symbols to be eligible to participate. Finally, religious organizations may consider religious beliefs and practices in their employment decisions. I have been told by numerous faith-based entities and attorneys representing them that autonomy in employment decisions is crucial in maintaining an organization's mission and character.

Charitable Choice also states that funds going directly to religious organizations cannot be used for sectarian worship, instruction, or proselytization. Government dollars are to be used for the secular purpose of the legislation: providing effective treatment for substance abuse problems.

The Charitable Choice provision also contains important and necessary protections for beneficiaries of services, ensuring that they may not be discriminated against on the basis of religion. Also, if a beneficiary objects to receiving services from a religious provider, he has the right to demand that the State provide him with services from an alternative provider.

Mr. President, the Charitable Choice provision is truly bipartisan in nature. Shortly after passage of the federal welfare law, Texas Governor Bush signed an executive order directing "all pertinent executive branch agencies to take all necessary steps to implement the 'charitable choice' provision of the federal welfare law." And earlier this year, Vice President GORE stated that Charitable Choice should be extended "to other vital services where faith-based organizations can play a role, such as drug treatment, homelessness, and youth violence." The Vice President described why faith-based approaches have shown special promise with challenges such as drug addiction. He said that overcoming these types of problems "takes something more than money or assistance—it requires an inner discipline and courage, deep within the individual. I believe that faith in itself is sometimes essential to spark a personal transformation—and to keep that person from falling back into addiction, delinquency, or dependency."

Mr. President, I am pleased to say that today we are responding to the Vice President's call for expanding

Charitable Choice to drug treatment programs. We are ready to provide people with resources needed to experience a personal transformation and break free from drug or alcohol addiction. Through the bipartisan effort of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, we have legislation that will provide greater opportunities to those in our society who are fighting to overcome substance abuse problems.

Again, I want to thank Senator FRIST, his staff, Chairman JEFFORDS, and the rest of the Committee for their fine work on this legislation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I would like to express my disappointment about a provision that the Majority chose to include in the Youth Drug and Mental Health Services Act, S.976. In Section 305 of the Act, the "Charitable Choice" provision permits all religious institutions, including pervasively religious organizations, such as churches and other houses of worship, to use taxpayer dollars to advance their religious mission. Given the Supreme Court precedent, I believe this provision is Constitutionally suspect and be subject to greater review when this bill goes to Conference with its House counterpart.

Although charitable choice has already become law as a part of welfare reform and the Community Services Block Grant, CSBG, portion of the Human Services Reauthorization Act, efforts are being made to expand this change to every program that receives federal financial assistance. The inclusion of charitable choice in this legislation is particularly disturbing since, unlike its application to the intermittent services provided under Welfare Reform and CSBG, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) funds are used to provide substance abuse treatment which is ongoing, involves direct counseling of beneficiaries and is often clinical in nature. In the context of these programs it would be difficult if not impossible to segregate religious indoctrination from the social service.

I agree with the Majority that faith-based organizations have an important and necessary role to play in combating many of our nation's social ills, including youth violence, homelessness, and substance abuse. In fact, I have seen first-hand the impact that faith-based organizations such as Catholic Charities have on delivering certain services to people in need in my own state. By enabling faith-based organizations to join in the battle against substance abuse, we add another powerful tool in our ongoing efforts to help people move from dependence to independence.

However, although there are great benefits that come with allowing religious organizations to provide social services with federal funds, the Vice President recently reminded us that "clear and strict safeguards" must exist to ensure that the dividing line

between church and state is not erased. Even the front runner for the Republican Presidential nomination, Governor George W. Bush, acknowledged to the New York Times that these safeguards are necessary: "Bush said . . . that federal money would pay for services delivered by faith-based groups, not for the religious teachings espoused by the groups."

In my home state of Rhode Island there is a tradition of religious tolerance and respect for the boundaries of religion and government. Indeed, Roger Williams, who was banished from the Massachusetts Bay Colony for his religious beliefs, founded Providence in 1636. The colony served as a refuge where all could come to worship as their conscience dictated without interference from the state. Understandably, Rhode Islanders remain mindful of mixing religion with its political system.

Mr. President, I am particularly concerned that without proper safeguards, well-intentioned proposals to help religious organizations aid needy populations, might actually harm the First Amendment's principle of separation of church and state. For example, the charitable choice provision creates a disturbing new avenue for employment discrimination and proselytization in programs funded by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Under current law, many religiously-affiliated nonprofit organizations already provide government-funded social services without employment discrimination and without proselytization. However, the legislation before us extends title VII's religious exemption to cover the hiring practices of organizations participating in SAMHSA funded programs. As the Majority's report language points out, even if the organization is solely funded by SAMHSA, it may "make employment decisions based upon religious reasons."

For example, a federally funded substance abuse treatment program run by a church could fire or refuse to hire an individual who has remarried without properly validating his or her second marriage in the eyes of that church—even if he or she is a well-trained and successful substance abuse counselor.

This is not an entirely hypothetical example. In *Little v. Wuerl*, 929 F.2d 944 (3d Cir. 1991) the Court held that "Congress intended the explicit exemptions to title VII to enable religious organizations to create and maintain communities composed solely of individuals faithful to their doctrinal practices, whether or not every individual plays a direct role in the organization's religious activities." The Court concluded that "the permission to employ persons 'of a particular religion' includes permission to employ only persons whose beliefs and conduct are consistent with the employer's religious precepts." This may be acceptable when the religious organization is

using its own money, but when it is using federal funds, with explicit prohibitions against proselytization, this kind of discrimination is a cause of considerable concern.

During markup, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced an amendment that would have addressed this issue by including important safeguards and protections for beneficiaries and employees of SAMHSA funded programs.

The Reed-Kennedy amendment would have removed the bill's provision that allows religious organizations to require that employees hired for SAMHSA funded programs must subscribe to the organization's religious tenets and teachings. Since section 305 prohibits religious organizations from proselytizing in conjunction with the dissemination of social services under SAMHSA programs, it is contradictory to permit religious organizations to require that their employees subscribe to the organization's tenets and teachings. Second, the amendment would have eliminated the bill's provision that extends title VII's religious exemption to cover the hiring practices of organizations participating in SAMHSA funded programs.

Ultimately, the modest proposal would not have reduced the ability of religious groups to hire co-religionists or more actively participate in SAMHSA funded programs. It merely would have eliminated the explicit ability to discriminate in taxpayer funded employment and left to the courts the decision of whether employees who work on, or are paid through, government grants or contracts are exempt from the prohibition on religious employment discrimination. Unfortunately, the Majority chose to vote against including the important safeguards proposed in the Reed-Kennedy amendment.

For the last 30 years, federal civil rights laws have expanded employment opportunities and sought to counter discrimination in the workplace. I recognize that we need the assistance of religious organizations in the battle against substance abuse, but without a far more robust and informed debate must be far more circumspect of efforts to expand current exemptions to title VII.

Mr. President, I believe we should enlist the assistance of religious organizations without undermining constitutional principles and civil rights law. Accordingly, I am concerned that the charitable choice provision, though laudable in concept, would have disturbing practical and constitutional consequences. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that letters expressing the view of the Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations and the American Jewish Committee be printed in the RECORD so my colleagues may become more aware of these organizations' views on this matter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT AND
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, November 2, 1999.

Hon. JACK REED,
U.S. Senate, 320 Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REED: I write on behalf of the American Jewish Committee, the nation's oldest human relations organization with more than 100,000 members and supporters, to urge you to place a hold on S. 976, the Substance Abuse Mental Health Reauthorization Act, which includes "charitable choice" provisions that are both constitutionally flawed and bad public policy.

The "charitable choice" provisions in S. 976 constitute an unacceptable breach in the separation of church and state that has played so crucial a role in ensuring the strength of religion in America, and places a risk the quality of healthcare services provided to individuals with chemical abuse and dependency behavioral disorders.

To be sure, the history of social services in this country began with religious institutions, and the partnership between religiously affiliated institutions and government in the provision of those services is a venerable one. Catholic Charities, not to mention many Jewish agencies across this land, have engaged in such partnerships for many years. Far from objecting to that partnership, the American Jewish Committee, in its 1990 Report on Sectarian Social Services and Public Funding, termed the involvement of the religious sector in publicly-funded social service provision as "desirable to the extent it is consistent with the Establishment Clause. It creates options for those who wish to receive the services, involves agencies and individuals motivated to provide the services, and helps to avoid making the government the sole provider of social benefits."

What is new in the "charitable choice" arena is not the notion of a partnership of faith-based organizations and government. Rather the innovation of a "charitable choice" as a structure that seeks to ignore binding constitutional law, not to mention sound public policy, by permitting pervasively religious institutions, such as churches and other houses of worship, to receive taxpayer dollars for programs that have not been made discrete and institutionally separate. In so doing, and in failing to include other appropriate church-state safeguards, "charitable choice" opens the door to publicly funded programs in which recipients of social services may be proselytized. "Charitable choice" also creates a real possibility of creating rifts among the various faith groups as they compete for public funding and allows religious providers to engage in religious discrimination against employers who are paid with taxpayers dollars. (Although religious institutions are permitted to hire co-religionists in the context of private religious activity, it is simply improper for taxpayer dollars to be used to fund religious discrimination.)

There is yet another aspect of the "charitable choice" initiative that is cause for concern. With government dollars comes government oversight. But this kind of intrusion into the affairs of religious organizations, at least in the case of pervasively sectarian organizations, is exactly the type of entanglement of religious and state against which the Constitution guards. Such intrusion can have no effect but to undermine the distinctiveness, indeed the very mission, of religious institutions.

In addition to the foregoing, we are greatly concerned by the portion of S. 976's "charitable choice" provisions that allow sectarian providers of treatment for chronic substance abuse conditions, such as alcoholism, and

drug addiction, to avoid clinically based certification and licensure standards. This legislation should not be allowed to go forward without necessary improvements to the bill to provide essential church-state protections, and without closer examination of the consequences of allowing sectarian care providers to avoid compliance with applicable state education, training and credentialing standards.

Thank you for your consideration of our views on this very important matter.

Sincerely,

RICHARD T. FOLTIN,
Legislative Director and Counsel.

UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST
ASSOCIATION OF CONGREGATIONS,
Washington, DC, November 2, 1999.

STATEMENT OF THE UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST
ASSOCIATION OF CONGREGATIONS OPPOSITION
TO THE "CHARITABLE CHOICE" PROVISIONS OF
S. 976

The Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations has a long, proud record of support for both religious freedom and the separation of church and state. Our General Assembly has issued 10 resolutions since 1961 to this effect. It is thus with little hesitation that we voice our strong opposition to the "Charitable Choice" provisions of S. 976, SAMHSA, the Youth, Drug, and Mental Health Services Act.

These and other similar Charitable Choice provisions undermine the separation of church and state by (1) promoting excessive entanglement between church and state; and (2) privileging certain religions and religious institutions above others.

It does this in the following ways:

By channeling government money into "pervasively sectarian" institutions. The Supreme Court has already clearly ruled that the government cannot fund "pervasively sectarian" institutions.

By fostering inappropriate competition among religious groups for government money. With limited funding available for any one service, governments will be required to decide which religious institutions will receive funding and which will not. This necessarily puts those governments in the wholly un-Constitutional position of discriminating among religious groups.

By allowing government-funded institutions to discriminate in their employment on the basis of religion. This amounts to federally-funded employment discrimination, thus violating myriad employment and civil rights laws.

By subjecting service-recipients to government-sanctioned proselytization and religious oppression. Individuals receiving government services should not have "religious strings" attached to those services.

By encouraging religious institutions to "follow the dollars" when deciding what type of social services to provide. As a result, it may encourage these organizations to move away from their historic commitment to providing social services designed to meet basic human needs. We believe that religious groups are better suited to address these urgent human needs than they are to deal with the more complex mental and other health services that require trained professionals. These services are best left to government agencies or institutions closely regulated by governments.

We in the faith community speak often of "right relationship." We strive for "right relationship" in the world on many levels, both personal (such as between worshipper and God) and political (such as between church and state). To the Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations, Charitable Choice legislation violates the right relationship between church and state.

In our vision of "right" church-state relations, "pervasively sectarian" institutions have the freedom to provide whatever services they chose with their own financial resources. "Religiously affiliated" institutions can accept government funding to provide basic human needs services, so long as they do so with no "religious strings" attached.

If mental and other health-related human needs are not being met by government agencies, than those agencies should adopt new strategies and approaches. Rather than throwing money at religious groups—who are not situated to handle such needs—adequate freedom and resources should be given to the relevant government agencies so that they may innovate and expand in the necessary ways.

Many Americans struggle with disease, drug addiction, hunger, and poverty. Both religious groups and the government have a responsibility to help those in need. Each is best suited to provide a particular kind of service. Rather than blurring the lines of responsibility, each should re-examine how it can do better what it is better suited to do.

The information available now indicates that very few religious institutions are pursuing funding under the "Charitable Choice" provisions of the 1996 Welfare Reform Law. Wisely, they are wary of the problems associated with government funding of religious institutions. Congress should take this as a clear sign that "Charitable Choice" is not an appropriate answer to the problems of adequate service provision.

Like others in the religious world, the Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations is fully committed to helping those in need. We are concerned, however, that the public policies relating to these issues are good ones—appropriate and responsible—that fully respect both the needs and rights of those people receiving services. For the reasons stated above, we do not believe that "Charitable Choice" provisions are appropriate or responsible policy.

The Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations opposes "Charitable Choice" and urges Congress to do the same.

Sincerely,

ROB CAVENAUGH,
Legislative Director.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be agreed to, the committee substitute be agreed to, the bill be read a third time and passed as amended, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statement relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2507) was agreed to.

The committee substitute amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 976), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

CELEBRATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF GENEVA CONVENTIONS OF 1949

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H. Con. Res. 102 be discharged from the Judiciary Committee and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 102) celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and recognizing humanitarian safeguards these treaties provide in times of armed conflict.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 102) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

FEDERAL ERRONEOUS RETIREMENT COVERAGE CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 309, S. 1232.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1232) to provide for the correction of retirement coverage errors under chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2508

(Purpose: To provide for the correction of retirement coverage errors under chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code)

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, Senators COCHRAN and AKAKA have a substitute amendment at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] for Mr. COCHRAN, for himself and Mr. AKAKA, proposes an amendment numbered 2508.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2508) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, as amended, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1232), as amended, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1232

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 "Federal Erroneous Retirement Coverage Corrections Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Definitions.
- Sec. 3. Applicability.
- Sec. 4. Irrevocability of elections.

TITLE I—DESCRIPTION OF RETIREMENT COVERAGE ERRORS TO WHICH THIS ACT APPLIES AND MEASURES FOR THEIR RECTIFICATION

Subtitle A—Employees and Annuitants Who Should Have Been FERS Covered, but Who Were Erroneously CSRS Covered or CSRS-Offset Covered Instead, and Survivors of Such Employees and Annuitants

- Sec. 101. Employees.
- Sec. 102. Annuitants and survivors.

Subtitle B—Employee Who Should Have Been FERS Covered, CSRS-Offset Covered, or CSRS Covered, but Who Was Erroneously Social Security-Only Covered Instead

- Sec. 111. Applicability.
- Sec. 112. Correction mandatory.

Subtitle C—Employee Who Should or Could Have Been Social Security-Only Covered but Who Was Erroneously CSRS-Offset Covered or CSRS Covered Instead

- Sec. 121. Employee who should be Social Security-Only covered, but who is erroneously CSRS or CSRS-Offset covered instead.

Subtitle D—Employee Who Was Erroneously FERS Covered.

- Sec. 131. Employee who should be Social Security-Only covered, CSRS covered, or CSRS-Offset covered and is not FERS-eligible, but who is erroneously FERS covered instead.

- Sec. 132. FERS-Eligible Employee Who Should Have Been CSRS Covered, CSRS-Offset Covered, or Social Security-Only Covered, but Who Was Erroneously FERS Covered Instead Without an Election.

- Sec. 133. Retroactive effect.

Subtitle E—Employee Who Should Have Been CSRS-Offset Covered, but Who Was Erroneously CSRS Covered Instead

- Sec. 141. Applicability.
- Sec. 142. Correction mandatory.

Subtitle F—Employee Who Should Have Been CSRS Covered, but Who Was Erroneously CSRS-Offset Covered Instead

- Sec. 151. Applicability.
- Sec. 152. Correction mandatory.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 201. Identification and notification requirements.
- Sec. 202. Information to be furnished to and by authorities administering this Act.
- Sec. 203. Service credit deposits.
- Sec. 204. Provisions related to Social Security coverage of misclassified employees.
- Sec. 205. Thrift Savings Plan treatment for certain individuals.
- Sec. 206. Certain agency amounts to be paid into or remain in the CSRDF.
- Sec. 207. CSRS coverage determinations to be approved by OPM.
- Sec. 208. Discretionary actions by Director.
- Sec. 209. Regulations.

TITLE III—OTHER PROVISIONS

- Sec. 301. Provisions to authorize continued conformity of other Federal retirement systems.
- Sec. 302. Authorization of payments.
- Sec. 303. Individual right of action preserved for amounts not otherwise provided for under this Act.

TITLE IV—TAX PROVISIONS

- Sec. 401. Tax provisions.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS RETIREMENT PROVISIONS

- Sec. 501. Federal Reserve Board portability of service credit.
- Sec. 502. Certain transfers to be treated as a separation from service for purposes of the Thrift Savings Plan.

TITLE VI—EFFECTIVE DATE

- Sec. 601. Effective date.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

- (1) ANNUITANT.—The term “annuitant” has the meaning given such term under section 8331(9) or 8401(2) of title 5, United States Code.

- (2) CSRS.—The term “CSRS” means the Civil Service Retirement System.

- (3) CSRDF.—The term “CSRDF” means the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund.

- (4) CSRS COVERED.—The term “CSRS covered”, with respect to any service, means service that is subject to the provisions of subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, other than service subject to section 8334(k) of such title.

- (5) CSRS-OFFSET COVERED.—The term “CSRS-Offset covered”, with respect to any service, means service that is subject to the provisions of subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and to section 8334(k) of such title.

- (6) EMPLOYEE.—The term “employee” has the meaning given such term under section 8331(1) or 8401(11) of title 5, United States Code.

- (7) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The term “Executive Director of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board” or “Executive Director” means the Executive Director appointed under section 8474 of title 5, United States Code.

- (8) FERS.—The term “FERS” means the Federal Employees’ Retirement System.

- (9) FERS COVERED.—The term “FERS covered”, with respect to any service, means service that is subject to chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code.

- (10) FORMER EMPLOYEE.—The term “former employee” means an individual who was an employee, but who is not an annuitant.

- (11) OASDI TAXES.—The term “OASDI taxes” means the OASDI employee tax and the OASDI employer tax.

- (12) OASDI EMPLOYEE TAX.—The term “OASDI employee tax” means the tax imposed under section 3101(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance).

- (13) OASDI EMPLOYER TAX.—The term “OASDI employer tax” means the tax imposed under section 3111(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance).

- (14) OASDI TRUST FUNDS.—The term “OASDI trust funds” means the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund.

- (15) OFFICE.—The term “Office” means the Office of Personnel Management.

- (16) RETIREMENT COVERAGE DETERMINATION.—The term “retirement coverage determination” means a determination by an employee or agent of the Government as to whether a particular type of Government service is CSRS covered, CSRS-Offset covered, FERS covered, or Social Security-Only covered.

- (17) RETIREMENT COVERAGE ERROR.—The term “retirement coverage error” means an erroneous retirement coverage determination that was in effect for a minimum period of 3 years of service after December 31, 1986.

- (18) SOCIAL SECURITY-ONLY COVERED.—The term “Social Security-Only covered”, with respect to any service, means Government service that—

- (A) constitutes employment under section 210 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 410); and

- (B)(i) is subject to OASDI taxes; but
- (ii) is not subject to CSRS or FERS.

- (19) SURVIVOR.—The term “survivor” has the meaning given such term under section 8331(10) or 8401(28) of title 5, United States Code.

- (20) THRIFT SAVINGS FUND.—The term “Thrift Savings Fund” means the Thrift Savings Fund established under section 8437 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 3. APPLICABILITY.

- (a) IN GENERAL.—This Act shall apply with respect to retirement coverage errors that occur before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

- (b) LIMITATION.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, this Act shall not apply to any erroneous retirement coverage determination that was in effect for a period of less than 3 years of service after December 31, 1986.

SEC. 4. IRREVOCABILITY OF ELECTIONS.

- Any election made (or deemed to have been made) by an employee or any other individual under this Act shall be irrevocable.

TITLE I—DESCRIPTION OF RETIREMENT COVERAGE ERRORS TO WHICH THIS ACT APPLIES AND MEASURES FOR THEIR RECTIFICATION

Subtitle A—Employees and Annuitants Who Should Have Been FERS Covered, but Who Were Erroneously CSRS Covered or CSRS-Offset Covered Instead, and Survivors of Such Employees and Annuitants

SEC. 101. EMPLOYEES.

- (a) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply in the case of any employee or former employee who should be (or should have been) FERS covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, is (or was) CSRS covered or CSRS-Offset covered instead.

- (b) UNCORRECTED ERROR.—

- (1) APPLICABILITY.—This subsection applies if the retirement coverage error has not been corrected before the effective date of the regulations described under paragraph (3). As soon as practicable after discovery of the error, and subject to the right of an election under paragraph (2), if CSRS covered or CSRS-Offset covered, such individual shall be treated as CSRS-Offset covered, retroactive to the date of the retirement coverage error.

- (2) COVERAGE.—

- (A) ELECTION.—Upon written notice of a retirement coverage error, an individual may elect to be CSRS-Offset covered or FERS covered, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error. Such election shall be made not later than 180 days after the date of receipt of such notice.

- (B) NONELECTION.—If the individual does not make an election by the date provided under subparagraph (A), a CSRS-Offset covered individual shall remain CSRS-Offset covered and a CSRS covered individual shall be treated as CSRS-Offset covered.

- (3) REGULATIONS.—The Office shall prescribe regulations to carry out this subsection.

- (c) CORRECTED ERROR.—

- (1) APPLICABILITY.—This subsection applies if the retirement coverage error was corrected before the effective date of the regulations described under subsection (b).

- (2) COVERAGE.—

- (A) ELECTION.—

- (i) CSRS-OFFSET COVERED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this

Act, the Office shall prescribe regulations authorizing individuals to elect, during the 18-month period immediately following the effective date of such regulations, to be CSRS-Offset covered, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(ii) **THRIFT SAVINGS FUND CONTRIBUTIONS.**—If under this section an individual elects to be CSRS-Offset covered, all employee contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund made during the period of FERS coverage (and earnings on such contributions) may remain in the Thrift Savings Fund in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Executive Director, notwithstanding any limit that would otherwise be applicable.

(B) **PREVIOUS SETTLEMENT PAYMENT.**—An individual who previously received a payment ordered by a court or provided as a settlement of claim for losses resulting from a retirement coverage error shall not be entitled to make an election under this subsection unless that amount is waived in whole or in part under section 208, and any amount not waived is repaid.

(C) **INELIGIBILITY FOR ELECTION.**—An individual who, subsequent to correction of the retirement coverage error, received a refund of retirement deductions under section 8424 of title 5, United States Code, or a distribution under section 8433 (b), (c), or (h)(1)(A) of title 5, United States Code, may not make an election under this subsection.

(3) **CORRECTIVE ACTION TO REMAIN IN EFFECT.**—If an individual is ineligible to make an election or does not make an election under paragraph (2) before the end of any time limitation under this subsection, the corrective action taken before such time limitation shall remain in effect.

SEC. 102. ANNUITANTS AND SURVIVORS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—This section shall apply in the case of an individual who is—

(1) an annuitant who should have been FERS covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, was CSRS covered or CSRS-Offset covered instead; or

(2) a survivor of an employee who should have been FERS covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, was CSRS covered or CSRS-Offset covered instead.

(b) **COVERAGE.**—

(1) **ELECTION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Office shall prescribe regulations authorizing an individual described under subsection (a) to elect CSRS-Offset coverage or FERS coverage, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(2) **TIME LIMITATION.**—An election under this subsection shall be made not later than 18 months after the effective date of the regulations prescribed under paragraph (1).

(3) **REDUCED ANNUITY.**—

(A) **AMOUNT IN ACCOUNT.**—If the individual elects CSRS-Offset coverage, the amount in the employee's Thrift Savings Fund account under subchapter III of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, on the date of retirement that represents the Government's contributions and earnings on those contributions (whether or not such amount was subsequently distributed from the Thrift Savings Fund) will form the basis for a reduction in the individual's annuity, under regulations prescribed by the Office.

(B) **REDUCTION.**—The reduced annuity to which the individual is entitled shall be equal to an amount which, when taken together with the amount referred to in subparagraph (A), would result in the present value of the total being actuarially equivalent to the present value of an unreduced CSRS-Offset annuity that would have been provided the individual.

(4) **REDUCED BENEFIT.**—If—

(A) a surviving spouse elects CSRS-Offset benefits; and

(B) a FERS basic employee death benefit under section 8442(b) of title 5, United States Code, was previously paid;

then the survivor's CSRS-Offset benefit shall be subject to a reduction, under regulations prescribed by the Office. The reduced annuity to which the individual is entitled shall be equal to an amount which, when taken together with the amount of the payment referred to under subparagraph (B) would result in the present value of the total being actuarially equivalent to the present value of an unreduced CSRS-Offset annuity that would have been provided the individual.

(5) **PREVIOUS SETTLEMENT PAYMENT.**—An individual who previously received a payment ordered by a court or provided as a settlement of claim for losses resulting from a retirement coverage error may not make an election under this subsection unless repayment of that amount is waived in whole or in part under section 208, and any amount not waived is repaid.

(c) **NONELECTION.**—If the individual does not make an election under subsection (b) before any time limitation under this section, the retirement coverage shall be subject to the following rules:

(1) **CORRECTIVE ACTION PREVIOUSLY TAKEN.**—If corrective action was taken before the end of any time limitation under this section, that corrective action shall remain in effect.

(2) **CORRECTIVE ACTION NOT PREVIOUSLY TAKEN.**—If corrective action was not taken before such time limitation, the employee shall be CSRS-Offset covered, retroactive to the date of the retirement coverage error.

Subtitle B—Employee Who Should Have Been FERS Covered, CSRS-Offset Covered, or CSRS Covered, but Who Was Erroneously Social Security-Only Covered Instead

SEC. 111. APPLICABILITY.

This subtitle shall apply in the case of any employee who—

(1) should be (or should have been) FERS covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, is (or was) Social Security-Only covered instead;

(2) should be (or should have been) CSRS-Offset covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, is (or was) Social Security-Only covered instead; or

(3) should be (or should have been) CSRS covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, is (or was) Social Security-Only covered instead.

SEC. 112. CORRECTION MANDATORY.

(a) **UNCORRECTED ERROR.**—If the retirement coverage error has not been corrected, as soon as practicable after discovery of the error, such individual shall be covered under the correct retirement coverage, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(b) **CORRECTED ERROR.**—If the retirement coverage error has been corrected, the corrective action previously taken shall remain in effect.

Subtitle C—Employee Who Should or Could Have Been Social Security-Only Covered but Who Was Erroneously CSRS-Offset Covered or CSRS Covered Instead

SEC. 121. EMPLOYEE WHO SHOULD BE SOCIAL SECURITY-ONLY COVERED, BUT WHO IS ERRONEOUSLY CSRS OR CSRS-OFFSET COVERED INSTEAD.

(a) **APPLICABILITY.**—This section applies in the case of a retirement coverage error in which a Social Security-Only covered employee was erroneously CSRS covered or CSRS-Offset covered.

(b) **UNCORRECTED ERROR.**—

(1) **APPLICABILITY.**—This subsection applies if the retirement coverage error has not been corrected before the effective date of the regulations described in paragraph (3).

(2) **COVERAGE.**—In the case of an individual who is erroneously CSRS covered, as soon as

practicable after discovery of the error, and subject to the right of an election under paragraph (3), such individual shall be CSRS-Offset covered, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(3) **ELECTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon written notice of a retirement coverage error, an individual may elect to be CSRS-Offset covered or Social Security-Only covered, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error. Such election shall be made not later than 180 days after the date of receipt of such notice.

(B) **NONELECTION.**—If the individual does not make an election before the date provided under subparagraph (A), the individual shall remain CSRS-Offset covered.

(C) **REGULATIONS.**—The Office shall prescribe regulations to carry out this paragraph.

(c) **CORRECTED ERROR.**—

(1) **APPLICABILITY.**—This subsection applies if the retirement coverage error was corrected before the effective date of the regulations described under subsection (b)(3).

(2) **ELECTION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Office shall prescribe regulations authorizing individuals to elect, during the 18-month period immediately following the effective date of such regulations, to be CSRS-Offset covered or Social Security-Only covered, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(3) **NONELECTION.**—If an eligible individual does not make an election under paragraph (2) before the end of any time limitation under this subsection, the corrective action taken before such time limitation shall remain in effect.

Subtitle D—Employee Who Was Erroneously FERS Covered

SEC. 131. EMPLOYEE WHO SHOULD BE SOCIAL SECURITY-ONLY COVERED, CSRS COVERED, OR CSRS-OFFSET COVERED AND IS NOT FERS-ELIGIBLE, BUT WHO IS ERRONEOUSLY FERS COVERED INSTEAD.

(a) **APPLICABILITY.**—This section applies in the case of a retirement coverage error in which a Social Security-Only covered, CSRS covered, or CSRS-Offset covered employee not eligible to elect FERS coverage under authority of section 8402(c) of title 5, United States Code, was erroneously FERS covered.

(b) **UNCORRECTED ERROR.**—

(1) **APPLICABILITY.**—This subsection applies if the retirement coverage error has not been corrected before the effective date of the regulations described in paragraph (2).

(2) **COVERAGE.**—

(A) **ELECTION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon written notice of a retirement coverage error, an individual may elect to remain FERS covered or to be Social Security-Only covered, CSRS covered, or CSRS-Offset covered, as would have applied in the absence of the erroneous retirement coverage determination, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error. Such election shall be made not later than 180 days after the date of receipt of such notice.

(ii) **TREATMENT OF FERS ELECTION.**—An election of FERS coverage under this subsection is deemed to be an election under section 301 of the Federal Employees Retirement System Act of 1986 (5 U.S.C. 8331 note; Public Law 99-335; 100 Stat. 599).

(B) **NONELECTION.**—If the individual does not make an election before the date provided under subparagraph (A), the individual shall remain FERS covered, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(3) **EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS IN THRIFT SAVINGS FUND.**—If under this section, an individual elects to be Social Security-Only covered, CSRS covered, or CSRS-Offset covered,

all employee contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund made during the period of erroneous FERS coverage (and all earnings on such contributions) may remain in the Thrift Savings Fund in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Executive Director, notwithstanding any limit under section 8351 or 8432 of title 5, United States Code.

(4) **REGULATIONS.**—Except as provided under paragraph (3), the Office shall prescribe regulations to carry out this subsection.

(c) **CORRECTED ERROR.**—

(1) **APPLICABILITY.**—This subsection applies if the retirement coverage error was corrected before the effective date of the regulations described under paragraph (2).

(2) **ELECTION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Office shall prescribe regulations authorizing individuals to elect, during the 18-month period immediately following the effective date of such regulations to remain Social Security-Only covered, CSRS covered, or CSRS-Offset covered, or to be FERS covered, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(3) **NOELECTION.**—If an eligible individual does not make an election under paragraph (2), the corrective action taken before the end of any time limitation under this subsection shall remain in effect.

(4) **TREATMENT OF FERS ELECTION.**—An election of FERS coverage under this subsection is deemed to be an election under section 301 of the Federal Employees Retirement System Act of 1986 (5 U.S.C. 8331 note; Public Law 99-335; 100 Stat. 599).

SEC. 132. FERS-ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE WHO SHOULD HAVE BEEN CSRS COVERED, CSRS-OFFSET COVERED, OR SOCIAL SECURITY-ONLY COVERED, BUT WHO WAS ERRONEOUSLY FERS COVERED INSTEAD WITHOUT AN ELECTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **FERS ELECTION PREVENTED.**—If an individual was prevented from electing FERS coverage because the individual was erroneously FERS covered during the period when the individual was eligible to elect FERS under title III of the Federal Employees Retirement System Act or the Federal Employees' Retirement System Open Enrollment Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-61; 111 Stat. 1318 et seq.), the individual—

(A) is deemed to have elected FERS coverage; and

(B) shall remain covered by FERS, unless the individual declines, under regulations prescribed by the Office, to be FERS covered.

(2) **DECLINING FERS COVERAGE.**—If an individual described under paragraph (1)(B) declines to be FERS covered, such individual shall be CSRS covered, CSRS-Offset covered, or Social Security-Only covered, as would apply in the absence of a FERS election, effective as of the date of the erroneous retirement coverage determination.

(b) **EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS IN THRIFT SAVINGS FUND.**—If under this section, an individual declines to be FERS covered and instead is Social Security-Only covered, CSRS covered, or CSRS-Offset covered, as would apply in the absence of a FERS election, all employee contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund made during the period of erroneous FERS coverage (and all earnings on such contributions) may remain in the Thrift Savings Fund in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Executive Director, notwithstanding any limit that would otherwise be applicable.

(c) **INAPPLICABILITY OF DURATION OF ERRONEOUS COVERAGE.**—This section shall apply regardless of the length of time the erroneous coverage determination remained in effect.

SEC. 133. RETROACTIVE EFFECT.

This subtitle shall be effective as of January 1, 1987, except that section 132 shall not apply to individuals who made or were deemed to have made elections similar to those provided in this section under regulations prescribed by the Office before the effective date of this Act.

Subtitle E—Employee Who Should Have Been CSRS-Offset Covered, but Who Was Erroneously CSRS Covered Instead

SEC. 141. APPLICABILITY.

This subtitle shall apply in the case of any employee who should be (or should have been) CSRS-Offset covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, is (or was) CSRS covered instead.

SEC. 142. CORRECTION MANDATORY.

(a) **UNCORRECTED ERROR.**—If the retirement coverage error has not been corrected, as soon as practicable after discovery of the error, such individual shall be covered under the correct retirement coverage, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(b) **CORRECTED ERROR.**—If the retirement coverage error has been corrected before the effective date of this Act, the corrective action taken before such date shall remain in effect.

Subtitle F—Employee Who Should Have Been CSRS Covered, but Who Was Erroneously CSRS-Offset Covered Instead

SEC. 151. APPLICABILITY.

This subtitle shall apply in the case of any employee who should be (or should have been) CSRS covered but, as a result of a retirement coverage error, is (or was) CSRS-Offset covered instead.

SEC. 152. CORRECTION MANDATORY.

(a) **UNCORRECTED ERROR.**—If the retirement coverage error has not been corrected, as soon as practicable after discovery of the error, such individual shall be covered under the correct retirement coverage, effective as of the date of the retirement coverage error.

(b) **CORRECTED ERROR.**—If the retirement coverage error has been corrected before the effective date of this Act, the corrective action taken before such date shall remain in effect.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. IDENTIFICATION AND NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

Government agencies shall take all such measures as may be reasonable and appropriate to promptly identify and notify individuals who are (or have been) affected by a retirement coverage error of their rights under this Act.

SEC. 202. INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED TO AND BY AUTHORITIES ADMINISTERING THIS ACT.

(a) **APPLICABILITY.**—The authorities identified in this subsection are—

(1) the Director of the Office of Personnel Management;

(2) the Commissioner of Social Security; and

(3) the Executive Director of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board.

(b) **AUTHORITY TO OBTAIN INFORMATION.**—Each authority identified in subsection (a) may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable such authority to carry out its responsibilities under this Act. Upon request of the authority involved, the head of the department or agency involved shall furnish that information to the requesting authority.

(c) **AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE INFORMATION.**—Each authority identified in subsection (a) may provide directly to any department or agency of the United States all information such authority believes necessary to enable

the department or agency to carry out its responsibilities under this Act.

(d) **LIMITATION; SAFEGUARDS.**—Each of the respective authorities under subsection (a) shall—

(1) request or provide only such information as that authority considers necessary; and

(2) establish, by regulation or otherwise, appropriate safeguards to ensure that any information obtained under this section shall be used only for the purpose authorized.

SEC. 203. SERVICE CREDIT DEPOSITS.

(a) **CSRS DEPOSIT.**—In the case of a retirement coverage error in which—

(1) a FERS covered employee was erroneously CSRS covered or CSRS-Offset covered;

(2) the employee made a service credit deposit under the CSRS rules; and

(3) there is a subsequent retroactive change to FERS coverage;

the excess of the amount of the CSRS civilian or military service credit deposit over the FERS civilian or military service credit deposit, together with interest computed in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 8334(e) of title 5, United States Code, and regulations prescribed by the Office, shall be paid to the employee, the annuitant or, in the case of a deceased employee, to the individual entitled to lump-sum benefits under section 8424(d) of title 5, United States Code.

(b) **FERS DEPOSIT.**—

(1) **APPLICABILITY.**—This subsection applies in the case of an erroneous retirement coverage determination in which—

(A) the employee owed a service credit deposit under section 8411(f) of title 5, United States Code; and

(B)(i) there is a subsequent retroactive change to CSRS or CSRS-Offset coverage; or

(ii) the service becomes creditable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **REDUCED ANNUITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If at the time of commencement of an annuity there is remaining unpaid CSRS civilian or military service credit deposit for service described under paragraph (1), the annuity shall be reduced based upon the amount unpaid together with interest computed in accordance with section 8334(e) (2) and (3) of title 5, United States Code, and regulations prescribed by the Office.

(B) **AMOUNT.**—The reduced annuity to which the individual is entitled shall be equal to an amount that, when taken together with the amount referred to under subparagraph (A), would result in the present value of the total being actuarially equivalent to the present value of the unreduced annuity benefit that would have been provided the individual.

(3) **SURVIVOR ANNUITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If at the time of commencement of a survivor annuity, there is remaining unpaid any CSRS service credit deposit described under paragraph (1), and there has been no actuarial reduction in an annuity under paragraph (2), the survivor annuity shall be reduced based upon the amount unpaid together with interest computed in accordance with section 8334(e) (2) and (3) of title 5, United States Code, and regulations prescribed by the Office.

(B) **AMOUNT.**—The reduced survivor annuity to which the individual is entitled shall be equal to an amount that, when taken together with the amount referred to under subparagraph (A), would result in the present value of the total being actuarially equivalent to the present value of an unreduced survivor annuity benefit that would have been provided the individual.

SEC. 204. PROVISIONS RELATED TO SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE OF MISCLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the term—

(1) “covered individual” means any employee, former employee, or annuitant who—

(A) is or was employed erroneously subject to CSRS coverage as a result of a retirement coverage error; and

(B) is or was retroactively converted to CSRS-offset coverage, FERS coverage, or Social Security-only coverage; and

(2) “excess CSRS deduction amount” means an amount equal to the difference between the CSRS deductions withheld and the CSRS-Offset or FERS deductions, if any, due with respect to a covered individual during the entire period the individual was erroneously subject to CSRS coverage as a result of a retirement coverage error.

(b) **REPORTS TO COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to carry out the Commissioner of Social Security’s responsibilities under title II of the Social Security Act, the Commissioner may request the head of each agency that employs or employed a covered individual to report (in coordination with the Office of Personnel Management) in such form and within such timeframe as the Commissioner may specify, any or all of—

(A) the total wages (as defined in section 3121(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) paid to such individual during each year of the entire period of the erroneous CSRS coverage; and

(B) such additional information as the Commissioner may require for the purpose of carrying out the Commissioner’s responsibilities under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.).

(2) **COMPLIANCE.**—The head of an agency or the Office shall comply with a request from the Commissioner under paragraph (1).

(3) **WAGES.**—For purposes of section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401), wages reported under this subsection shall be deemed to be wages reported to the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary’s delegates pursuant to subtitle F of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) **PAYMENT RELATING TO OASDI EMPLOYEE TAXES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Office shall transfer from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund to the General Fund of the Treasury an amount equal to the lesser of the excess CSRS deduction amount or the OASDI taxes due for covered individuals (as adjusted by amounts transferred relating to applicable OASDI employee taxes as a result of corrections made, including corrections made before the date of enactment of this Act). If the excess CSRS deductions exceed the OASDI taxes, any difference shall be paid to the covered individual or survivors, as appropriate.

(2) **TRANSFER.**—Amounts transferred under this subsection shall be determined notwithstanding any limitation under section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(d) **PAYMENT OF OASDI EMPLOYER TAXES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each employing agency shall pay an amount equal to the OASDI employer taxes owed with respect to covered individuals during the applicable period of erroneous coverage (as adjusted by amounts transferred for the payment of such taxes as a result of corrections made, including corrections made before the date of enactment of this Act).

(2) **PAYMENT.**—Amounts paid under this subsection shall be determined subject to any limitation under section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(e) **APPLICATION OF OASDI TAX PROVISIONS OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 TO**

AFFECTED INDIVIDUALS AND EMPLOYING AGENCIES.—A covered individual and the individual’s employing agency shall be deemed to have fully satisfied in a timely manner their responsibilities with respect to the taxes imposed by sections 3101(a), 3102(a), and 3111(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 on the wages paid by the employing agency to such individual during the entire period such individual was erroneously subject to CSRS coverage as a result of a retirement coverage error based on the payments and transfers made under subsections (c) and (d). No credit or refund of taxes on such wages shall be allowed as a result of this subsection.

SEC. 205. THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.

(a) **APPLICABILITY.**—This section applies to an individual who—

(1) is eligible to make an election of coverage under section 101 or 102, and only if FERS coverage is elected (or remains in effect) for the employee involved; or

(2) is described in section 111, and makes or has made retroactive employee contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund under regulations prescribed by the Executive Director.

(b) **PAYMENT INTO THRIFT SAVINGS FUND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **PAYMENT.**—With respect to an individual to whom this section applies, the employing agency shall pay to the Thrift Savings Fund under subchapter III of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, for credit to the account of the employee involved, an amount equal to the earnings which are disallowed under section 8432a(a)(2) of such title on the employee’s retroactive contributions to such Fund.

(B) **AMOUNT.**—Earnings under subparagraph (A) shall be computed in accordance with the procedures for computing lost earnings under section 8432a of title 5, United States Code. The amount paid by the employing agency shall be treated for all purposes as if that amount had actually been earned on the basis of the employee’s contributions.

(C) **EXCEPTIONS.**—If an individual made retroactive contributions before the effective date of the regulations under section 101(c), the Director may provide for an alternative calculation of lost earnings to the extent that a calculation under subparagraph (B) is not administratively feasible. The alternative calculation shall yield an amount that is as close as practicable to the amount computed under subparagraph (B), taking into account earnings previously paid.

(2) **ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION.**—In cases in which the retirement coverage error was corrected before the effective date of the regulations under section 101(c), the employee involved shall have an additional opportunity to make retroactive contributions for the period of the retirement coverage error (subject to applicable limits), and such contributions (including any contributions made after the date of the correction) shall be treated in accordance with paragraph (1).

(c) **REGULATIONS.**—

(1) **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.**—The Executive Director shall prescribe regulations appropriate to carry out this section relating to retroactive employee contributions and payments made on or after the effective date of the regulations under section 101(c).

(2) **OFFICE.**—The Office, in consultation with the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, shall prescribe regulations appropriate to carry out this section relating to the calculation of lost earnings on retroactive employee contributions made before the effective date of the regulations under section 101(c).

SEC. 206. CERTAIN AGENCY AMOUNTS TO BE PAID INTO OR REMAIN IN THE CSRDF.

(a) **CERTAIN EXCESS AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS TO REMAIN IN THE CSRDF.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any amount described under paragraph (2) shall—

(A) remain in the CSRDF; and

(B) may not be paid or credited to an agency.

(2) **AMOUNTS.**—Paragraph (1) refers to any amount of contributions made by an agency under section 8423 of title 5, United States Code, on behalf of any employee, former employee, or annuitant (or survivor of such employee, former employee, or annuitant) who makes an election to correct a retirement coverage error under this Act, that the Office determines to be excess as a result of such election.

(b) **ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT DEDUCTIONS TO BE PAID BY AGENCY.**—If a correction in a retirement coverage error results in an increase in employee deductions under section 8334 or 8422 of title 5, United States Code, that cannot be fully paid by a reallocation of otherwise available amounts previously deducted from the employee’s pay as employment taxes or retirement deductions, the employing agency—

(1) shall pay the required additional amount into the CSRDF; and

(2) shall not seek repayment of that amount from the employee, former employee, annuitant, or survivor.

SEC. 207. CSRS COVERAGE DETERMINATIONS TO BE APPROVED BY OPM.

No agency shall place an individual under CSRS coverage unless—

(1) the individual has been employed with CSRS coverage within the preceding 365 days; or

(2) the Office has agreed in writing that the agency’s coverage determination is correct.

SEC. 208. DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS BY DIRECTOR.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management may—

(1) extend the deadlines for making elections under this Act in circumstances involving an individual’s inability to make a timely election due to a cause beyond the individual’s control;

(2) provide for the reimbursement of necessary and reasonable expenses incurred by an individual with respect to settlement of a claim for losses resulting from a retirement coverage error, including attorney’s fees, court costs, and other actual expenses;

(3) compensate an individual for monetary losses that are a direct and proximate result of a retirement coverage error, excluding claimed losses relating to forgone contributions and earnings under the Thrift Savings Plan under subchapter III of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, and all other investment opportunities; and

(4) waive payments required due to correction of a retirement coverage error under this Act.

(b) **SIMILAR ACTIONS.**—In exercising the authority under this section, the Director shall, to the extent practicable, provide for similar actions in situations involving similar circumstances.

(c) **JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—Actions taken under this section are final and conclusive, and are not subject to administrative or judicial review.

(d) **REGULATIONS.**—The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe regulations regarding the process and criteria used in exercising the authority under this section.

(e) **REPORT.**—The Office of Personnel Management shall, not later than 180 days after

the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for each year in which the authority provided in this section is used, submit a report to each House of Congress on the operation of this section.

SEC. 209. REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the regulations specifically authorized in this Act, the Office may prescribe such other regulations as are necessary for the administration of this Act.

(b) FORMER SPOUSE.—The regulations prescribed under this Act shall provide for protection of the rights of a former spouse with entitlement to an apportionment of benefits or to survivor benefits based on the service of the employee.

TITLE III—OTHER PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. PROVISIONS TO AUTHORIZE CONTINUED CONFORMITY OF OTHER FEDERAL RETIREMENT SYSTEMS.

(a) FOREIGN SERVICE.—Sections 827 and 851 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4067 and 4071) shall apply with respect to this Act in the same manner as if this Act were part of—

(1) the Civil Service Retirement System, to the extent this Act relates to the Civil Service Retirement System; and

(2) the Federal Employees' Retirement System, to the extent this Act relates to the Federal Employees' Retirement System.

(b) CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.—Sections 292 and 301 of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act (50 U.S.C. 2141 and 2151) shall apply with respect to this Act in the same manner as if this Act were part of—

(1) the Civil Service Retirement System, to the extent this Act relates to the Civil Service Retirement System; and

(2) the Federal Employees' Retirement System, to the extent this Act relates to the Federal Employees' Retirement System.

SEC. 302. AUTHORIZATION OF PAYMENTS.

All payments authorized or required by this Act to be paid from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, together with administrative expenses incurred by the Office in administering this Act, shall be deemed to have been authorized to be paid from that Fund, which is appropriated for the payment thereof.

SEC. 303. INDIVIDUAL RIGHT OF ACTION PRESERVED FOR AMOUNTS NOT OTHERWISE PROVIDED FOR UNDER THIS ACT.

Nothing in this Act shall preclude an individual from bringing a claim against the Government of the United States which such individual may have under section 1346(b) or chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, or any other provision of law (except to the extent the claim is for any amounts otherwise provided for under this Act).

TITLE IV—TAX PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. TAX PROVISIONS.

(a) PLAN QUALIFICATION.—No retirement plan of the United States (or any agency thereof) shall fail to be treated as a qualified plan under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by reason of—

(1) any failure to follow plan terms as addressed by this Act; or

(2) any action taken under this Act.

(b) TRANSFERS.—For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, no amount shall be includible in the gross income of any individual in any tax year by reason of any direct transfer under this Act between funds or any Government contribution under this Act to any fund or otherwise in any such tax year.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS RETIREMENT PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD PORTABILITY OF SERVICE CREDIT.

(a) CREDITABLE SERVICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8411(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “of the preceding provisions” and inserting “other paragraph”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) a period of service (other than any service under any other paragraph of this subsection, any military service, and any service performed in the employ of a Federal Reserve Bank) that was creditable under the Bank plan (as defined in subsection (i)), if the employee waives credit for such service under the Bank plan and makes a payment to the Fund equal to the amount that would have been deducted from pay under section 8422(a) had the employee been subject to this chapter during such period of service (together with interest on such amount computed under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 8334(e)).

Paragraph (5) shall not apply in the case of any employee as to whom subsection (g) (or, to the extent subchapter III of chapter 83 is involved, section 8332(n)) otherwise applies.”.

(2) BANK PLAN DEFINED.—Section 8411 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) For purposes of subsection (b)(5), the term ‘Bank plan’ means the benefit structure—

“(1) in which employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed on or after January 1, 1984, participate; and

“(2) that is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (and any redesignated or successor version of such benefit structure, if so identified in writing by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for purposes of this chapter).”.

(b) EXCLUSION FROM CHAPTER 84.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 8402(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the matter before subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(2)(A) any employee or Member who has separated from the service after—

“(i) having been subject to—

“(I) subchapter III of chapter 83 of this title;

“(II) subchapter I of chapter 8 of title I of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4041 et seq.); or

“(III) the benefit structure for employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed before January 1, 1984, that is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act; and

“(ii) having completed—

“(I) at least 5 years of civilian service creditable under subchapter III of chapter 83 of this title;

“(II) at least 5 years of civilian service creditable under subchapter I of chapter 8 of title I of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4041 et seq.); or

“(III) at least 5 years of civilian service (other than any service performed in the employ of a Federal Reserve Bank) creditable under the benefit structure for employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed before January 1, 1984, that is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act,

determined without regard to any deposit or redeposit requirement under either such sub-

chapter or under such benefit structure, or any requirement that the individual become subject to either such subchapter or to such benefit structure after performing the service involved; or”.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (d) of section 8402 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(d) Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) shall not apply to an individual who—

“(1) becomes subject to—

“(A) subchapter II of chapter 8 of title I of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4071 et seq.) (relating to the Foreign Service Pension System) pursuant to an election; or

“(B) the benefit structure in which employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed on or after January 1, 1984, participate, which benefit structure is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (and any redesignated or successor version of such benefit structure, if so identified in writing by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for purposes of this chapter); and

“(2) subsequently enters a position in which, but for paragraph (2) of subsection (b), such individual would be subject to this chapter.”.

(c) PROVISIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES.—A former employee of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System who—

(1) has at least 5 years of civilian service (other than any service performed in the employ of a Federal Reserve Bank) creditable under the benefit structure for employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed before January 1, 1984, that is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act;

(2) was subsequently employed subject to the benefit structure in which employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed on or after January 1, 1984, participate, which benefit structure is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (and any redesignated or successor version of such benefit structure, if so identified in writing by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for purposes of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code); and

(3) after service described in paragraph (2), becomes subject to and thereafter entitled to benefits under chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code,

shall, for purposes of section 302 of the Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986 (5 U.S.C. 8331 note; Public Law 99-335; 100 Stat. 601) be considered to have become subject to chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, pursuant to an election under section 301 of such Act.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), this section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PROVISIONS RELATING TO CREDITABILITY AND CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES.—The amendments made by subsection (a) and the provisions of subsection (c) shall apply only to individuals who separate from service subject to chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) PROVISIONS RELATING TO EXCLUSION FROM CHAPTER.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall not apply to any former employee of the Board of Governors of the

Federal Reserve System who, subsequent to his or her last period of service as an employee of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and prior to the date of enactment of this Act, became subject to subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, under the law in effect at the time of the individual's appointment.

SEC. 502. CERTAIN TRANSFERS TO BE TREATED AS A SEPARATION FROM SERVICE FOR PURPOSES OF THE THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 84 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting before section 8432 the following:

“§ 8431. Certain transfers to be treated as a separation

“(a) For purposes of this subchapter, separation from Government employment includes a transfer from a position that is subject to one of the retirement systems described in subsection (b) to a position that is not subject to any such system.

“(b) The retirement systems described in this subsection are—

“(1) the retirement system under this chapter;

“(2) the retirement system under subchapter III of chapter 83; and

“(3) any other retirement system under which individuals may contribute to the Thrift Savings Fund through withholdings from pay.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 8432 the following:

“8431. Certain transfers to be treated as a separation.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (b) of section 8351 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (8), and by adding at the end the following:

“(9) For the purpose of this section, separation from Government employment includes a transfer described in section 8431.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to transfers occurring before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, except that, for purposes of applying such amendments with respect to any transfer occurring before such date of enactment, the date of such transfer shall be considered to be the date of enactment of this Act. The Executive Director (within the meaning of section 8401(13) of title 5, United States Code) may prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out this subsection.

TITLE VI—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 601. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

ESTABLISHING A CHIEF AGRICULTURAL NEGOTIATOR

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 185 and the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 185) to establish a Chief Agricultural Negotiator in the Office of United States Trade Representative.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 185) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 185

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

SECTION 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.

EXPORT APPLE ACT

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 609 be discharged from the Banking Committee and, further, that the Senate now proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title. The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 609) to amend the Export Apple and Pear Act to limit the applicability of the Act to apples.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 609) was read the third time and passed.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 77, S. 688.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 688) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to reauthorize the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 688) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 688

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF OPIC AUTHORITIES.

Section 235(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2195(A)(2)) is amended by striking “1999” and inserting “2003”.

HONORING WALTER JERRY PAYTON

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 219, submitted earlier by Senators FITZGERALD, DURBIN, LOTT, COCHRAN, and HELMS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 219) recognizing and honoring Walter Jerry Payton and expressing the condolences of the Senate to his family on his death.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and, finally, any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 219) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 219

Whereas Walter Payton was a hero, a leader, and a role model both on and off the field; Whereas for 13 years, Walter Payton thrilled Chicago Bears' fans as the National Football League's (NFL's) all-time leading rusher—and as one of the greatest running backs ever to play the game—culminating with his induction into the Professional Football Hall of Fame;

Whereas after retiring from professional football in 1987, Payton continued to touch the lives of both his fellow Chicagoans and citizens of his native state of Mississippi, as a businessman and a community leader;

Whereas Walter Payton was born in 1954 to Mrs. Alyne Payton and the late Mr. Edward Payton, and his historic career began as a star running back at Columbia High School in his native hometown of Columbia, Mississippi, which he called “a child's paradise.” He went on to choose Jackson State University over 100 college offers, and to set nine

university football records, eventually scoring more points than any other football player in the history of the National Collegiate Athletic Association;

Whereas the first choice in the 1975 NFL draft, Payton—or “Sweetness” as he was known to his fans—became the NFL’s all-time leader in running and combined net yards and scored 110 touchdowns during his career with the Bears;

Whereas Walter Payton made the Pro Bowl nine times and was named the league’s Most Valuable Player twice, in 1977 and 1985;

Whereas in 1977, Payton rushed for a career-high 1,852 yards and carried the Bears to the playoffs for the first time since 1963;

Whereas Payton broke Jim Brown’s longstanding record in 1984 to become the league’s all-time leading rusher, and finished his career with a record 16,726 total rushing yards;

Whereas in 1985–86, Walter Payton led the Bears to an unforgettable 15–1 season and Super Bowl victory—the first and only Super Bowl win in Bears’ history;

Whereas Payton was inducted into the Pro Football Hall of Fame in 1993, and was selected this year as the Greatest All-Time NFL Player by more than 200 players from the NFL Draft Class of 1999;

Whereas Walter Payton matched his accomplishments on the football field with his selfless actions off the field on behalf of those in need. He excelled academically as well as athletically, earning a degree in special education from Jackson State University in just three and one half years, and going on to undertake additional graduate study. Payton worked throughout his adult life to improve the lives of others through personal involvement with many charitable organizations. He was particularly active in working with children facing physical, mental, or economic challenges. In 1988, he established the Halas/Payton Foundation, which continues his legacy of community involvement to help educate Chicago’s youth;

Whereas Walter Payton was a dedicated man of faith and principle, who, as a lifelong Baptist, was known for his deep reverence for God; and, as a gracious and selfless citizen, was a devoted father with sterling personal integrity and a warm sense of humor. Walter Payton will always be remembered as a true gentleman with a heart full of genuine and active concern for others;

Whereas Walter Payton was truly an American hero in every sense of the term;

Whereas the members of the Senate extend our deepest sympathies to Walter Payton’s family and the host of friends that he had across the country; and

Whereas Walter Payton died tragically on November 1, 1999, at age 45, but his legacy will live in our hearts and minds forever: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) hereby recognizes and honors Walter Jerry Payton

(A) as one of the greatest football players of all time; and

(B) for his many contributions to the Nation, especially to children, throughout his lifetime; and

(2) extends its deepest condolences to Walter Payton’s wife, Connie; his two children, Jarrett and Brittny; his mother, Alynne; his brother, Eddie; his sister, Pam; and other members of his family.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of H.R. 3194, the D.C. appropriations bill. I

further ask consent that a substitute amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD. I further ask consent that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The substitute amendment (No. 2509) was agreed to.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today’s RECORD under “Amendments Submitted.”)

The bill (H.R. 3194), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. BROWNBACK) appointed Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1999

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, November 4. I further ask consent that on Thursday, 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 resume consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 900, the financial services modernization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. GRAMM. For the information of all Senators, at 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, the Senate will immediately resume debate on the conference report to accompany the financial services modernization bill. At that point, Senator WELLSTONE will be recognized. He has an hour under the unanimous consent agreement. There are approximately 6 hours of debate remaining under the order. Therefore, Senators can expect a vote on the adoption of the conference report tomorrow afternoon.

I remind my colleagues of the ceremony to swear in the newest Member of the Senate, Senator Lincoln Chafee. I encourage all Senators to be in the Senate Chamber at 11:30 a.m. to give him a warm senatorial welcome.

For the rest of the day and week, the Senate may be ready to consider any available appropriations conference reports or may begin consideration of the bankruptcy reform bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before

the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:11 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, November 4, 1999, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 3, 1999:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

IRWIN BELK, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FIFTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN, OF ILLINOIS, TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO SAMOA.

EARL ANTHONY WAYNE, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS AFFAIRS), VICE ALAN PHILIP LARSON.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE AGENCIES INDICATED FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED, AND ALSO FOR THE OTHER APPOINTMENTS INDICATED HEREWITH:

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS TWO, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RITA D. JENNINGS, OF MARYLAND

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

JO ANN ZEALL HOWD, OF VIRGINIA
JEAN ELIZABETH MANES, OF FLORIDA
CAROLYN A. SMITH, OF WISCONSIN

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

YVONNE ANNETTE BARBER, OF MARYLAND
JENNIFER N. M. COLE, OF WYOMING
J. JORJA-HOOPER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
DEBRA L. SMOKER-ALI, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND STATE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND/OR SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AS INDICATED:

CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

CLAY ADLER, OF CALIFORNIA
PATRICIA AGUILERA, OF TEXAS
ROBERT H. ARBUCKLE, OF FLORIDA
DAVID ATKINSON, OF NEW MEXICO
MARY ALICE AUSTIN, OF MARYLAND
BUSHRA A. AZAD, OF MICHIGAN
DANA LYNN BANKS, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ALISON T. BARR, OF MONTANA
ALEXANDER LUCIAN BARRASSO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BRUCE W. BECK, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH J. BEDESSEM, OF VIRGINIA
SCOTT ANDREW BLOMQUIST, OF TEXAS
TOMEKAH L. BURL, OF ARKANSAS
SITA LIAN CHAKRAWARTI, OF MISSOURI
YAN CHANG, OF GEORGIA
MIKAEL CLEVERLY, OF CALIFORNIA
DAVID N. COHEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KIA JEANNINE COLEMAN, OF MARYLAND
CRAIG M. CONWAY, OF NEVADA
ELIZABETH DETTER, OF MARYLAND
LILLIAN GERMAINE DEVALCOURT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CYNTHIA A. EBEID, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DANIEL J. FENNELL, OF PENNSYLVANIA
NICOLAS ANTOINE FETCHKO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

STEPHEN T. FRAHM, OF UTAH
ANN E. GABRIELSON, OF MINNESOTA
KENDRA LEANN GATHER, OF VIRGINIA
VIRGINIA TUTTUP GEORGE, OF ILLINOIS
BRIDGET F. GERSTEN, OF ARIZONA
RICHARD H. GLENN, OF CALIFORNIA
STEPHEN PAUL GOLDRUP, OF VIRGINIA
EMMA D. GORDON, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN GORKOWSKI, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER LEE GREEN, OF TEXAS
CYNTHIA GREGG, OF ALABAMA
JASON BAIRD GRUBB, OF VIRGINIA
HENRY HAGGARD, OF WASHINGTON
CRAIG L. HALL, OF FLORIDA
MORGAN C. HALL, OF NEW YORK
DANIEL O'CONNELL HAMILTON, OF MISSOURI
JULIA HARLAN, OF INDIANA
ANDREW L. HARROP, OF VIRGINIA

IDA EVE HECKENBACH, OF LOUISIANA
 PATRICK WYNTERS HORNBUCKLE, OF NEW YORK
 DARREN WILLIAM HULTMAN, OF CALIFORNIA
 DEBRA IRENE JOHNSON, OF VIRGINIA
 RONALD ANGELO JOHNSON, OF TEXAS
 DARRAGH THERESA JONES, OF OREGON
 MATTHEW E. KEENE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 MARTIN T. KELLY, OF MARYLAND
 STEVEN JAY LABENSKY, OF ARIZONA
 JAMES GORDON LAND, OF FLORIDA
 CYNTHIA S. LAWRENCE, OF VIRGINIA
 CLAIRE LE CLAIRE, OF MINNESOTA
 NANCY W. LEOU, OF CALIFORNIA
 CHRISTOPHER M. LIVACCARI, OF NEW YORK
 VICTORIA CATHERINE MALZONE, OF MASSACHUSETTS
 ASHLY ALLEN MAPLES, OF TEXAS
 DARRYN A. MARTIN, OF OHIO
 JOHN MCINTYRE, OF MISSOURI
 DAVID MICHAEL MERON, OF FLORIDA
 EMILY MESTETSKY, OF NEW JERSEY
 JOSEPH B. MOLES III, OF VIRGINIA
 MITCHELL ROLAND MOSS, OF TEXAS
 CARLA MUDGETT, OF VERMONT
 PERLITA W. MUIRURI, OF VIRGINIA
 ADRIENNE B. NUTZMAN, OF TEXAS
 CYNTHIA S. O'CONNELL, OF VIRGINIA
 ORLA J. O'CONNOR, OF NEW YORK
 KEVIN LAWRENCE OLBRYSH, OF THE DISTRICT OF CO-
 LUMBIA
 CHARLES R. OLIVER, OF VIRGINIA
 ROBERT J. PALLADINO, JR., OF FLORIDA
 JOHN BENTON PARKER, OF FLORIDA
 SUSAN PARKER-BURNS, OF MASSACHUSETTS
 MONICA ANN PATAKI, OF CALIFORNIA
 LEE PERNA, OF VIRGINIA
 LISA J. PITTMAN, OF CALIFORNIA
 MARK N. PLANTY, OF VIRGINIA
 WILLIAM WAYNE POPP, OF VIRGINIA
 PAMELA SPIRITO PORTER, OF VIRGINIA
 ROBERT G. PORTER, OF VIRGINIA
 JONATHAN PETER POST, OF CALIFORNIA
 JONATHAN GOODALE PRATT, OF CALIFORNIA
 ERWIN A. QUIROGA, OF VIRGINIA
 LUCIA RAWLS, OF VIRGINIA
 JOHN MICHAEL REITTMAN, OF TEXAS
 CORY L. REPP, OF VIRGINIA
 DANIEL J. RICCI, OF CALIFORNIA
 HOWARD G. RICHARDS, OF VIRGINIA
 LEIGH A. RIEDER, OF VIRGINIA
 BRUCE L. ROBERT, JR., OF VIRGINIA
 CHRISTOPHER M. ROSSOMONDO, OF VIRGINIA
 ANNE B. SEATOR, OF VIRGINIA
 SUZANNE A. SHELDON, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IAN MARK SHERIDAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 SHELBY V.V. SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
 TIMOTHY LYLE SMITH, OF MICHIGAN
 TRACY ALLEN SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
 KATHI A. SOHN, OF MARYLAND
 KATHRYN ALLENE TAYLOR, OF NORTH CAROLINA
 CHRISTOPHER TEAL, OF MARYLAND
 DAVID JONATHAN TESSLER, OF NEW YORK
 CELESTE M. THOMAS, OF VIRGINIA
 GRACE H. TUNG, OF MARYLAND
 EDWARD R. TUSKENIS, OF ILLINOIS
 MICHELLE MARIE ULRICH, OF NEW YORK
 INGRID VALTIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 JANA L. VONFELDT, OF MINNESOTA
 LISA M. WALKER, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 ERIC WATNIK, OF CALIFORNIA
 MICAH L. WATSON, OF MARYLAND
 HANS F. WECHSEL, OF IDAHO
 DANIEL R. WENDELL, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 DAVID NATHANIEL GARTLAND WHITING, OF SOUTH DA-
 KOTA
 FRANK JOSEPH WIERICHS, III, OF FLORIDA
 DANA RENEE WILLIAMS, OF TEXAS
 MICHAEL J. WILLIAMS, OF VIRGINIA
 MICHELLE ELIZABETH WOLLAM, OF CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE
 FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR
 PROMOTION IN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE AS INDI-
 CATED, EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 11, 1998:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE
 OF THE UNITED STATES OF MERICA, CLASS OF COUN-
 SELOR:

CAROL LYNN DORSEY, OF TEXAS

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

REVIUS O. ORTIQUE, JR., OF LOUISIANA, TO BE AN AL-
 TERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF
 AMERICA TO THE FIFTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE GEN-
 ERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

BOBBY L. ROBERTS, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER
 OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND IN-
 FORMATION SCIENCE FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 19,
 2003. (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

MICHAEL G. ROSSMANN, OF INDIANA, TO BE A MEMBER
 OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE

FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2006, VICE
 EVE L. MENDER.

DANIEL SIMBERLOFF, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEM-
 BER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL
 SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10,
 2006, VICE SANFORD D. GREENBERG.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE
 ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ALAN G. LACKEY, 0000
 RITA A. PRICE, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER TO
 THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE
 CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

KARL G. HARTENSTINE, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES
 NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

LYNNE M. HICKS, 0000

To be commander

ROGER R. BOUCHER, 0000

To be lieutenant commander

KERWIN J. LEFRERE, 0000
 TROY D. TERRONEZ, 0000
 WILLIAM D. WATSON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JOHN R. DALY, JR., 0000

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OBSERVING NATIONAL HOSPICE MONTH

HON. JOE SCARBOROUGH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, November is National Hospice Month. I rise today to praise the efforts of the associated Hospice programs and the care that they provide to hundreds of thousands of terminally ill patients each year. In the First District of Florida, Hospice of Northwest Florida will celebrate its 15th year of service and will help meet the medical, emotional, and spiritual needs of over 2000 patients this year.

Since the modern Hospice movement began in the early 1970s to mainly care for those with terminal cancer, millions of patients and their families have benefitted from hospice care's unique and compassionate role in America. Hospices have continued to expand and last year alone, hospices served over 300,000 terminally ill people. Ninety percent of all patient care was provided for patients at home.

I recently came across some fascinating numbers on just how important Hospice care has become in America. In 1998, hospices cared for patients in one-in-three-cancer-related deaths and AIDS-related deaths in America. There are about 3,000 Hospices in the U.S., two-thirds of which are Medicare certified. 98% of Hospice programs accept persons with AIDS.

Perhaps the most impressive statistic of all is the tremendous contribution volunteers make to hospice care. In fact, approximately 70,000 people from all walks of life, volunteer with hospice programs, providing over 5 million hours of direct care and services each year. It is these men and women that deserve the lion's share of recognition for the success of hospice care in America.

Mr. Speaker, an increase in public awareness and understanding of Hospice care will better serve the families of our communities who are faced with a life limiting illness. Therefore, I invite all of my colleagues to join the hundreds of cities, counties, and states in observing the month of November as National Hospice Month. We will actively encourage the support of friends, neighbors, family, and fellow citizens in associated Hospice activities and programs now and throughout the year.

TRIBUTE TO ROY AND GEORGETTE ENGLER

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary contributions that Roy and Georgette Engler made over the

course of their lives to benefit mentally disabled children in Northwest Ohio. Their story poignantly recounts the love and patience that characterized one family's heroic struggle with mental retardation. Though both passed away in the 1970's, their legacy lives on in the form of Sunshine Inc. of Northwest Ohio, a first-rate facility that provides assistance to hundreds of developmentally disabled individuals and their families. Loved and cherished by many, Roy and Georgette are remembered as selfless humanitarians who sought to help those shunned by the rest of society. Their efforts are truly worthy of recognition and praise. On behalf of Ohio's lawmakers and citizens, I invite my colleagues to join me in honoring these two wonderful people.

Roy and Georgette Engler did not have an easy life. Both were high school drop-outs who struggled to make ends meet. Roy worked 12-hour shifts, 7 days a week as a railroad telegraph operator while Georgette, just 16 when she married, helped out at her parents' bar, grille, and country store. The situation became substantially more difficult, though, when it became apparent that all five of their children (two girls and three boys) were mentally retarded. Teachers told the Englers that their 2nd grade daughters would have to leave school because they were simply too slow. The boys, moreover, were less capable than their sisters, even having trouble relating with each other. The situation was bleak. Roy confided in a friend, "No one will ever understand what it is like to sit around the table at meal time and look at your children and know that they will never be independent."

The Englers visited several institutions but realized it would be best to keep the children at home, where they would be loved and properly cared for. The magnitude of this responsibility took its toll, though. Roy was forced to work night shifts at the telegraph office and take odd jobs in the morning. He was hospitalized seven times for depression and stress. Georgette was thus forced to remain at home, day after day, caring for the five children. She contemplated suicide, though she fortunately never acted on these impulses. The total commitment to their children was robbing them of life. The Englers had long since abandoned their hopes and dreams, resigning themselves to the fact that they would have to care for their children the rest of their lives. As the children reached their twenties, though, Roy and Georgette realized that they needed to ensure acceptable care for their children when they passed on.

The Englers knew from experience that institutions were an unacceptable choice. They believed their children, as well as other mentally disabled youths, would benefit from an organization that placed an emphasis on individual care, love and simple pleasures. Roy and Georgette started Sunshine Inc. in 1949 and 50 years later it serves hundreds of developmentally challenged individuals with a budget of over \$13 million. Moreover, Sunshine manages 14 group homes, operates a sum-

mer day camp and supervises adults that live on their own. The Superintendent of the Lucas County Board of Mental Retardation says they are among the best facilities in Ohio.

John Milton wrote "freely we serve, because we freely love." This is thoroughly exemplified by the actions of Roy and Georgette Engler. Through their unselfish dedication, mankind has advanced and come to understand more about the range of crippling illnesses and brain disorders that afflict millions of people. Let us hope medical science in this generation will unlock the mysteries of human development, but until then, let us be forever grateful for the lifetime of sacrifice Roy and Georgette dedicated through love and uncommon valor. I would also like to extend a warm thanks to Tahree Lane of the Toledo Blade for writing such a wonderful article that brought this touching story to my attention.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DAVID PITCAIRN

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who dedicated a significant part of his life to the service of our great nation. David Vincent Pitcairn, a devoted husband and father, distinguished himself as a man who repeatedly put the well being of his family and friends before that of his own. Sadly, Mr. Pitcairn passed away on October 19, 1999.

Born in New Haven, Connecticut in 1947, Dave entered the United States Army at an early age and quickly established himself as an exemplary soldier. Sergeant David Pitcairn distinguished himself with the first platoon, B Company, 39th Infantry, 9th Infantry Division near Saigon, Vietnam. Serving as both platoon leader and machine gunner for his platoon, his leadership, extraordinary bravery and repeated exposure to enemy fire served as an inspiration to the entire company. It bears mentioning that while in Vietnam, Dave earned numerous medals and commendations which included: the Bronze Star, the Combat Infantry Badge, the National Defense Service Medal and the Army Commendation Medal.

More than three decades ago, while maneuvering in the rice paddies of South Vietnam, Dave inspired his fellow soldiers with his unique exuberance for life. To be around Dave was fun and challenging, often exciting, yet always comforting. He had the strength to carry those around him through the turmoil with his bright attitude. His valorous and intrepid conduct reflect the utmost credit on him and upholds the noble traditions of the United States Army.

Mr. Speaker, Dave truly represented the best America has to offer. He will be sorely missed.

• 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE MCINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 1, 1999 I was unavoidably absent and therefore missed rollcall votes 550 through 552. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote 550, "yes" on rollcall vote 551, and "yes" on rollcall vote 552.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF VIRGINIA PRISCILLA WOOTEN

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor and profound sadness that I rise to pay tribute to the life of Virginia Priscilla Wooten of Jacinto City, Texas. After living a remarkably accomplished life that spanned 72 years, Mrs. Wooten passed away on July 1, 1999. She was born in Lynn, Massachusetts, on January 1, 1927.

Even as we mourn her passing, everyone who knew Virginia should take comfort in the truly incredible life she led. We extend our heart-felt sorrow to her loving husband, Hershel Wooten.

Virginia was preceded in death by parents Shirley and Dorothy Bates; sisters Shirley Barbour and Diane Bates; brothers Jack Bates, Lawrence Bates, Aubrey Bates, Francis Bates, Edwin Bates and Reginald Bates.

She is survived by husband Hershel Wooten; sons Robert Wooten, Ronnie Wooten and David Wooten; daughters Linda Wooten and Carol Wooten; brother Randy Bates; sisters Irene Poole, Barbara Calef, Sally Brown, Sandra Richards, Ilene Gallo and Joan Bradley; five grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren.

It has been said that the ultimate measure of a person's life is the extent to which they made the world a better place. If this is the measure of worth in life, Virginia Wooten's friends and family can attest to the success of the life she led.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all the Members of the House to join me in paying tribute to the life of Virginia Priscilla Wooten. She touched our lives and our hearts, and she will be greatly missed.

CONGRATULATING JAMES L. ANDERSON

HON. JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of James L. Anderson of Maine to the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary.

Mr. Anderson is a native of Brewer, Maine, and a graduate of Brewer High School. Like so many other residents of Maine, Mr. Anderson has served countless hours as a member

of the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary, which was created by Congress in 1939 as a civilian, non-military division of the Coast Guard.

As one of the 35,000 men and women in the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary, Mr. Anderson has helped to save lives by teaching boating safety and ensuring that our waterways are secure from hazards.

In recognition of his service, commitment and outstanding leadership skills, Mr. Anderson has been elected Commodore of the Coast Guard Auxiliary's First District, which encompasses New England. The Change of Watch ceremony officially installing him into this prestigious role will be held on January 8, 2000.

For 60 years, the Coast Guard Auxiliary has assisted the Coast Guard and the boating public. The Auxiliary's work is based on four cornerstones: courtesy vessel examinations to ensure safety; educational activities including National Safe Boating week; operations support for the Coast Guard's non-military functions; and the fellowship engendered in the Auxiliary's activities.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak on behalf of all Maine citizens and those members of the Auxiliary who serve with him when I salute Mr. Anderson for his service to our nation and for his election as the First District Commodore. He will help to lead the Coast Guard Auxiliary into the 21st Century, and I know that the Auxiliary, the Coast Guard and the boating public will benefit from his efforts.

I am proud of the role that Mr. Anderson will be playing, and am pleased to offer my congratulations to him today. I know that my colleagues join me in saying to Commodore Anderson, "Welcome aboard, Sir."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MAX SANDLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, due to unforeseen official business in my district, I was unable to cast my vote yesterday on H.R. 348, H.R. 2737, and H.R. 1710. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: Rollcall vote 550: Yea; Rollcall vote 551: Yea; and Rollcall vote 552: Yea.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALBERT RUSSELL WYNN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 1999, I missed rollcall votes 550 to 552, due to a minor illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall votes 550 and 551 and "no" on rollcall vote 552.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES ELLIOTT WILLIAMS, AN AMERICAN HERO

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a great American, Medal of

Honor Recipient James Elliott Williams, who recently passed away at the age of 68. The most decorated American serviceman of the Vietnam Conflict and the most decorated enlisted man in the history of the United States Navy, Petty Officer First Class Williams was truly an American hero.

A native South Carolinian, Elliott Williams began his twenty-year career in the Navy at the age of 16. During the Vietnam Conflict, commanding high-speed river patrol boats, known as PBRs, Elliott Williams exhibited great valor when faced with overwhelming forces. In 1966, Elliott Williams, without reinforcement, led eight men on two boats through intense enemy fire in a three hour firefight that resulted in the destruction of more than fifty-seven enemy boats, more than 1,000 enemy casualties, and the interception of classified documents. In 1967, just four months before Elliott Williams was to retire, the boat under his command and another United States boat was attacked along a branch of the Mekong River by four hundred soldiers from three North Vietnamese heavy weapons companies. While protecting the other boat, which was disabled, Elliott Williams continued to fight, even though he was wounded. The outcome of this incident was nearly forty enemy casualties and nine of their boats being destroyed.

For his service in the Vietnam Conflict, Elliott Williams received the Medal of Honor, the Navy Cross, two Silver Stars, the Navy and Marine Corps Medal, three Bronze Stars, three Purple Hearts, and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry. He also served in the Korean Conflict.

After retiring from the Navy, Elliott Williams became the first United States Marshal to be appointed by President Nixon, in 1969. He served in a number of positions with the United States Marshals Service before retiring. He was also a Past President of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society and a former member of the Board of Directors of the Patriots Point Development Authority, in Mount Pleasant, South Carolina. Largely through the efforts of Elliott Williams, the Congressional Medal of Honor Society moved its headquarters from the *Intrepid*, in New York, to the *Yorktown*, at Patriots Point. In 1997, Navy Special Boat Unit 20, honored Elliott Williams by naming its new headquarters, in Little Creek, Virginia, for him.

Elliott Williams was a member of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Purple Heart Club, the Fleet Reserve Association, the Hammerton Masonic Lodge, and the Omar Shrine Temple. He was active in community affairs and enjoyed speaking to civic groups about his experiences during his career in the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of knowing Elliott Williams for more than thirty years. He was a valiant warrior and a true patriot, who inspired many to do their best. He was also a wonderful husband and father. He will be greatly missed.

CONGRATULATING THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEPHROLOGY

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the tremendous work performed by

a group of dedicated and tireless professionals: the members of the American Society of Nephrology (ASN). Many members, including those from the 7th Congressional District of Illinois, are gathering at the ASN's 32nd Annual Meeting. I rise to congratulate the ASN for its achievements.

For some, Nephrology is not an everyday word. However, there is no doubt that we are all too familiar with terms like "diabetes" and "hypertension." These two diseases, Mr. Speaker, happen to be the leading two causes of total kidney failure, or End Stage Renal Disease (ESRD). In 1997, approximately 361,000 Americans suffered from ESRD and required life-saving dialysis or kidney transplants. While we know the terrible human suffering ESRD imposes on thousands across the country, the economic costs are staggering as well. Recent statistics show that the direct economic cost of health care for kidney failure, stemming largely from the Federal Government, is more than \$15 billion per year.

Unfortunately, ESRD represents only the tip of the iceberg. It is estimated that 12.5 million Americans have lost at least 50% of their normal kidney function. Further, it must also be mentioned that renal disease affects certain populations disproportionately. For example, African Americans, Native Americans, Latinos and people over the age of 50 are at higher risk for developing kidney disease. This must change.

There is no cure for kidney disease. But there is room for hope. Medical research offers us great promise to reduce the human suffering and enormous costs imposed by ESRD and kidney disease. As a result, I have long supported increased funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Further, in order to draw attention to important health care issues in my own district, I staged a series of town hall meetings this past summer. These meetings proved that our citizens are actively concerned about issues like health care. Furthermore, my town meetings demonstrated that we owe it to our constituents to continue to work to provide them important information because, as the saying goes, "Knowledge is power." The same is true for research.

While kidney disease does have a devastating impact on our citizens, research has found that the progression of the disease can be slowed if diagnosed and managed early. Some more good news centers on the fact that there are dedicated individuals who are focused on finding ways to beat this disease. Recently, these researchers and experts in the field of Nephrology met to discuss and identify research priorities and obstacles that could impede us from reaching our goals. These discussions were summarized and drafted in the recently released paper, "Progress and Priorities: Renal Disease Research Plan." This project, sponsored by the National Institutes of Health's (NIH) National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIDDK), was made possible through the work of the American Society of Nephrology and other members of the Council of American Kidney Societies (CAKS). I urge all my colleagues to read through this seminal report and to share copies with their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for providing me this opportunity to acknowledge the work performed by the American Society of Nephrology (ASN).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RONNIE SHOWS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, because of unanticipated delays in my flight from Jackson, Mississippi, on Monday, November 1, 1999, I was unable to cast recorded votes on rollcalls 550, 551, and 552.

Had I been present for rollcall 550, I would have voted "yea" to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 348, a bill to authorize the construction of a monument to honor those who have served the Nation's civil defense and emergency management programs.

On rollcall 551, I would have voted "yea" to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2737, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Illinois certain Federal land associated with the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail to be used as an historic and interpretive site along the trail.

On rollcall 552, I would have voted "nay" against suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1714, a bill to facilitate the use of electronic records and signatures in interstate or foreign commerce.

BURNING POPE IN EFFIGY SHOWS INDIA'S RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the recent act of burning the Pope in effigy by a Hindu fundamentalist group in India. My friend Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan, brought this disgraceful act to my attention. It was reported in India Abroad.

An organizer of the march criticized the Delhi Archbishop for contacting the Pope about religious persecution in India. The Pope is visiting India soon and the Hindu militants demand that the Pope declare all religions the same.

This follows the rapes of four nuns in India by individuals described by the Vishwa Hindu Parishad as "patriotic youth." Hindu fundamentalists have murdered four priests. Hindu fundamentalists also killed Australian missionary Graham Staines and his two little boys by surrounding their Jeep and setting it on fire. They have burned churches, prayer halls, and Christian schools.

Sikhs, Muslims, and others have also suffered from similar treatment. They, too, have seen their religious shrines desecrated and attacked and religious leaders kidnapped, tortured, and murdered by the Indian authorities and their Hindu fundamentalist allies. These are people who espouse total Hindu domination of every facet of life in India. In this light, is it any wonder that so many of the minorities in India's multinational empire, such as Christian Nagaland, the Sikhs of Punjab, Khalistan, the Kashmiri Muslims, and so many others seek independence from India?

It is time for Congress to encourage freedom for people of the subcontinent. I submit the Council of Khalistan's press release on the burning of the Pope's effigy into the RECORD.

HINDU ACTIVISTS BURN EFFIGY OF POPE, MARCH TO PROTEST CHRISTIAN ACTIVITY

THERE IS NO RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN INDIA

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 28, 1999.—Fundamentalist Hindu militants burned an effigy of Pope John Paul II on October 22 during a Goa-to-Delhi march to protest Christian religious activity in India, according to a report in the October 29 issue of India Abroad. The Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP), a branch of the Rashtriya Swayamsewak Sangh (RSS), a pro-Fascist, Hindu fundamentalist organization organized the march. The ruling BJP, which leads the 24-party governing coalition in India, is the political arm of the RSS.

Marchers are protesting large-scale conversions by Christians, according to the article. They are demanding that the Pope proclaim all religions equal during his visit to India next month.

Subhash Velingkar, an organizer of the march, condemned religious conversions. In the eyes of many Hindu activists, all conversions from Hinduism are "forced" conversions. Velingkar attacked the Archbishop of Delhi, Alain de Lastic, for communicating with the Vatican about the persecution of Christians in India. "Why should people from India complain to the Vatican?" he demanded.

Recently a nun named Sister Ruby was abducted by militant Hindus and forced to drink their urine on the threat of being raped. Four other nuns were raped last year. The VHP called the nuns "antithetical elements" and described the rapists as "patriotic youth." Another priest was recently murdered in India, joining four other priests who were murdered last year.

Christians have been subjected to a wave of violence since Christmas Day. Churches have been burned and schools and prayer halls have been destroyed. Missionary Graham Staines and his two sons, ages 8 and 10, were burned to death while they slept in their van by a mob of Hindus who surrounded the jeep and chanted "Victory to Lord Ram."

"We strongly condemn this march and the burning in effigy of the Pope," said Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan, the organization leading the Sikh Nation's struggle for independence from India. "The ordeal that the Christians are enduring is reminiscent of what the Sikhs, Muslims, and other religious minorities in India go through," he said. "There is no religious freedom in India," he said. "The VHP openly proclaimed that anybody living in India should be a Hindu or subservient to the Hindus."

March organizer Velingkar said, "Christians are brothers of the same blood." Dr. Aulakh dismissed that statement. "The Hindu fundamentalists say the same things about Sikhs being brothers of Hindus," he said. "If that is the case, then why do they continue to murder Sikhs, Christians, Muslims, and others in large numbers?"

India has murdered over 250,000 Sikhs since 1984, over 200,000 Christians in Nagaland since 1988, more than 65,000 Muslims in Kashmir since 1988, and tens of thousands of Asamese, Manipuris, Tamils, Dalits, and others. It continues to hold tens of thousands of members of these groups as political prisoners without charge or trial, according to a report by Amnesty International. Thousands have been illegally detained for as long as 15 years.

"Clearly there is no place for religious minorities in democratic, secular India," said Dr. Aulakh. "This only makes the case for freedom for all the minority nations of South Asia stronger," he said. "I call on President Clinton and the Pope to bring up the issues of religious freedom and self-determination on their visits to India," he said.

HONORING BARBARA WHEELER
FOR HER SERVICE TO PUBLIC
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC
SCHOOLS IN DOWNERS GROVE,
ILLINOIS

HON. JUDY BIGGERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Barbara Wheeler for her invaluable contributions to the children of DuPage County and the State of Illinois over the past 25 years.

Since 1974, Ms. Wheeler has been a dedicated member of the Community High School District Board of Education, DuPage County. She served in leadership roles as president of the school board for 15 years and vice president for 5 years. Throughout her career, she has made it a priority to ensure that the school board sets attainable goals to raise student achievement and to build a consensus among business, educators, and the community at large.

Ms. Wheeler is an active board member of the National School Boards Association (NSBA), serving as chair of the NSBA Central Region, a member of the Policies and Resolutions Committee, Secretary-Treasurer and President Elect. She served as President of the NSBA in 1998, when she championed a nationwide campaign to make our schools safer.

Besides her extensive work in the educational field, Ms. Wheeler is an energetic and committed community leader. She is a volunteer for the Illinois Department on Aging, George Williams College, the Downers Grove Chamber of Commerce, and the Downers Grove YMCA.

An Illinois native, Ms. Wheeler attended St. Dominic College, Northern Illinois University and the DePaul University College of Law. She is an active member of the Chicago and Illinois State Bar Associations and the American Bar Association. She has served as Assistant State's Attorney, Cook County, Illinois, and is in private law practice with the firm Wheeler, Wheeler and Wheeler in Westmont, Illinois.

I have had the privilege to know Barbara Wheeler for many years, and greatly respect her for the unwavering commitment she has made to excellence in education. While I can confidently say that the citizens of DuPage County wish her much success in her future endeavors, we must recognize that her wisdom and years of experience will be sorely missed by the school board, as well as by parents and students. DuPage County, the State of Illinois, and our nation are better places because Ms. Barbara Wheeler dedicated a portion of her life to the education of our children.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3064,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1999

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the DC/Labor-HHS Appropriations

conference report. There are many reasons to oppose this measure. Among the worst of the provisions contained in this conference report is the irresponsible across-the-board 1-percent cut in discretionary spending fashioned by the House Republican leadership.

It is the worst kind of cynicism to claim that a 1-percent across-the-board cut will correct waste and fraud in government programs. I'm strongly opposed to cutting the funding for veterans' medical care just approved by Congress. The majority whip has issued a press release that claims the cut in Veterans' medical care funding he is recommending would not affect health care for America's veterans. Veterans know better. You can't cut health care funding without cutting health care.

Congressman DELAY sent a press release to the leadership of major veterans service organizations defending the 1.4-percent cut in appropriations he originally supported, which affected veterans, among other discretionary programs. Let me state that three years of straight-line funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) has left the agency struggling to meet the increasing costs of medical care for the growing number of enrolled veterans it treats.

Now the Republican leadership claims a \$190 million cut in veterans' medical care funding would do no harm. They maintain these funds can be squeezed out of the budget and be found in "mismanagement and waste." What the Republican leadership fails to acknowledge is the tremendous changes VA has already made to be more efficient. In the last few years, VA has closed thousands of beds, eliminated thousands of staff positions, and strengthened many of their auditing systems.

House Democrats have strongly supported proposals all year that would have added sums ranging from \$2 to \$3 billion to the President's initial proposal for veterans' medical care. Indeed we have all worked hard to improve funding for veterans. Veterans service organizations have called on Congress to appropriate up to \$3 billion more than the administration's original budget proposal for veterans' health care. Now many veterans services organizations have vehemently denounced the Republican leadership's proposed across-the-board cut. I quote from a letter signed by the executive directors of AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S. regarding these cuts: "It seems disingenuous at best for Congress to recognize a problem in funding for veterans health care, provide the dollars with one hand to help solve that problem, and then take dollars away with the other. No one is fooled by this budget sleight-of-hand."

Mr. Speaker, no one is going to be fooled by this belated and disingenuous concern about government inefficiency. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this abrogation of responsibility. Vote "no" on this conference report.

It is already evident VA will struggle, even to deal with the unprecedented increase Congress has enacted and the President has signed into law. How will this affect the VA health care system? In many parts of the country, veterans must wait up to six months just to see a primary care doctor. VA has also unraveled mental health and long-term care programs which were once hallmarks of the

VA system. There are now even complaints that VA's highly-regarded special emphasis programs for which there is supposedly congressional protection—such as spinal cord injury and blind rehabilitation—are under attack.

VA has done much to streamline its services in recent years. Over five years, VA has reduced its workforce by almost 10 percent, closed hundreds of beds throughout the system, reduced its inpatient census by almost 30 percent and eliminated 37 percent of its inpatient treatments per year. It has integrated or consolidated 50 medical centers. In testimony before the Veterans' Affairs Committee this April, four Veterans Integrated Service Network (VISN) directors, commenting on the proposed future efficiency-derived savings, concurred that "all the low-hanging fruit has been picked." Savings available to the system in the future, the directors said, will be harder fought and more disruptive.

The Republican leadership has contended that VA could absorb further cuts "without having any effect on health care to veterans," citing figures from studies that were challenged earlier this year. For example, the majority whip's release contended VA could save a million dollars a day by eliminating some of its overhead in capital assets. But whether savings of this magnitude could be realized in the immediate future with significantly uprooting current VA programs is highly questionable. Even without the Republican budget cuts, "there isn't enough money in the budget now to tear down or renovate underutilized buildings, let alone to replace them with new, modern, smaller clinics. Any savings here will require investment, not magic, and will not come quickly."

Likewise, DELAY's release pointed to a report suggesting \$17 million is lost each year in fraudulent or improper workers compensation claims. Actually, testimony at the March 24 Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing demonstrated that VA's workers compensation costs are not unusual, and that the answer is in heading off injuries and helping employees with rehabilitation. In fact, VA has been cutting these costs since 1994, and is completing automation of its claims system for better management, but savings are already part of the FY 2000 budget.

The DeLay release also noted his plan would not affect benefits checks. Of course, it wouldn't. That, at least, is still out of Mr. DELAY's reach. It's troubling that he would even mention compensation for service-connected disabilities and his restraint with regard to compensation for service-connected disabilities.

ON WALTER PAYTON'S PASSING

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join in remembering an extraordinary athlete and person, Mr. Walter Payton.

Walter Payton was a hero on and off the football field. Throughout his life, he epitomized courage, determination and dignity. Self-motivated by a standard of excellence, he used his intelligence and God-given ability to excel in his professional and personal life. As

you know, this standard of excellence is detailed in the numerous stats, and records he accumulated throughout his football career.

In thirteen years of playing professional football, Walter set 28 Bears records and 7 NFL records. The All time NFL leader in total rushing yards (16,726) and combined net yardage (21,803), Payton was truly one of the greatest running backs who ever played the game. He rushed for 1,000 yards in 10 of his seasons, and set the longstanding record for most rushing yards gained in a single game. I still recall Walter's historic performance against the Minnesota Vikings, where he rushed for 275 yards, and carried the ball 40 times. Furthermore, I am sure that if a record existed for endurance, Walter would have set that as well. Payton only missed one game in his entire career, which spanned 13 seasons and 190 games.

I recall many moments watching Walter and being in awe of his numerous athletic feats. His sheer will, determination and courage will forever be a measure for athletic and personal excellence. Throughout his thirteen stellar years with the Chicago Bears, I cannot recall a single time when Walter chose to run the ball into the sidelines, rather than run straight into an opposing defender or group of defenders. He displayed courage when confronted with any obstacle. Even while facing the toughest obstacle in his life, Walter bravely announced to the world his battle with the liver disorder and cancer, that would claim his life.

On occasions that Walter visited me in my office, his humility and down to earth approach always impressed me. It was refreshing. It was those qualities that became even more evident during these last few months.

"Sweetness," graceful, courageous, electrifying and charming are just a few of the characteristics that Walter embodied throughout his life. I am deeply saddened by Walter Payton's passing. My prayers are with his loving wife and children. In closing, I will forever treasure the many memories Walter Payton has left behind, and I hope his family and his many friends rest assured knowing that he has found comfort in God's hands.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CARTER G. WOODSON HOME NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE STUDY ACT OF 1999

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Carter G. Woodson Home National Historic Site Study Act of 1999. The legislation would honor the great American historian, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, by authorizing the Department of the Interior to study the feasibility and suitability of designating his home at 1538 Ninth Street, NW., Washington, DC, as a national historic site within the National Park Service.

Carter G. Woodson was born on December 19, 1875, in New Canton, VA. Public education was not available to blacks in New Canton, and the young Woodson did not begin his formal education until 1895, after he had relocated to Huntington, West Virginia. Dr. Woodson obtained his high school diploma in 1895 and then entered Berea College in Ken-

tucky, where he received his B.L. degree in 1897. Woodson continued his education at the University of Chicago, where he earned his A.B. and M.A. degrees. In 1912, Woodson earned a Ph.D. degree from Harvard University, following W.E.B. Du Bois as the second black American to receive a doctorate from that institution. During the period between entering Berea College and his Harvard graduation in 1912, Woodson also held several teaching positions in the United States and abroad.

Woodson took a special interest in the widespread ignorance and scanty information concerning African American life and history during his extensive studies. He saw the great need to educate the American public about the contributions of black Americans in the formation of the nation's history and culture, and he especially perceived that a concerted effort was needed to counter the extensive influence of Jim Crow and the pervasively negative portrayals of African Americans prevalent at the time. To correct this situation, on September 9, 1915, Dr. Woodson founded the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History (ASNLH), since renamed the Association for the Study of African-American Life and History. Through ASNLH, Dr. Woodson would dedicate his life to educating the American public about the contributions of black Americans in the formation of the nation's history and culture.

Among its enduring accomplishments, ASNLH instituted Negro History Week in 1926 to enlighten all levels of the general populace regarding the contributions of black Americans to society. Celebrated annually during the second week of February, this weeklong observance gradually gained national support and participation of schools, colleges, and other organizations across the country. Eventually, Negro History Week evolved into Black History Month and is widely celebrated and used to educate Americans about African American life, history, and achievement.

Under Dr. Woodson's stewardship, ASNLH in 1920 also founded the Associated Publishers, Inc. to handle the publication of research on African American history. Dr. Woodson published his seminal work *The Negro in Our History* (1922) and many others under Associated Publishers, and the publishing company provided an outlet for scholarly works by numerous other black scholars. ASNLH also circulated two periodicals: the *Negro History Bulletin*, designed for mass consumption, and the *Journal of Negro History*, which was primarily directed to the academic community.

Dr. Woodson directed ASNLH's operations out of his home at 1538 Ninth Street, NW., Washington, DC. From there, he trained researchers and staff and managed the organization's budget and fundraising efforts, while at the same time pursuing his own study of African American history. This Victorian style house, built in 1890, is already listed as a National Historic Landmark. I am now introducing a bill which I hope will lead to the Woodson home achieving national historic site designation so that the resources of the National Park Service will be available to preserve and maintain this national treasure.

FEMA AND CIVIL DEFENSE MONUMENT ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1999

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill authorizing the construction of a monument honoring those hard-working individuals who have served the nation's civil defense and emergency management programs.

I personally understand their sacrifice and the sacrifice of the thousands of similar individuals who rise to the occasion when called upon by disaster. In my family, there are 16 firefighters. My cousins, uncles, and in-laws who have dedicated their lives to responding to emergencies have set a standard not met by many today.

FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, has played a key role in assisting Americans in their time of need. Many of us can hardly imagine the emotional and physical devastation a natural disaster reaps upon a community. When we see a news story on television or in the paper, we might pause and feel sorry for the unknown victims who have had their lives ripped apart. But then we move on with our daily lives, never giving a second thought to what these poor individuals and families must go through after we have moved on. There are notable exceptions, of course: the most recent and continuing efforts to help North Carolina flood victims; the outpouring of assistance for the victims of the F-5 tornado that ripped through a small town in central Texas called Jarrell in 1997.

We have memorials that honor a host of wars and conflicts and those men and women who sacrificed their lives for these world-changing events. But there are other individuals, our civil defense and emergency personnel, who make an equally large contribution. These honorable citizens deserve to be recognized, too, for the day-to-day "battles" for which they risk their lives.

H.R. 348 proposes such a monument to be situated upon land owned by FEMA. I think it is appropriate and timely that we authorize this monument as we head into the 21st century. I therefore urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

HONORING DR. GEORGE RIEVESCHL, JR. AS THE CINCINNATI ART MUSEUM INAUGURATES THE GEORGE RIEVESCHL MEDAL FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend and distinguished constituent, Dr. George Rieveschl, Jr., as he receives the first George Rieveschl Medal for Distinguished Service from the Cincinnati Art Museum. This important new award will recognize individuals who demonstrate unselfish

leadership, philanthropy, advocacy and innovation in service to one of America's premier art museums.

Through Dr. Rieveschl's leadership, the Museum has regained its stature throughout the nation. His influence has touched all areas of the museum—management, governance, fundraising, and acquisitions. Dr. Rieveschl's leadership has resulted in such monumental achievements as the creation of the Founders Society to provide a core group of individual support; the capital campaign for gallery renovations and outreach programs; and the current initiative to acquire important art objects of Cincinnati collectors as millennium gifts. Dr. Rieveschl has led by example, generously assisting the Museum with his own philanthropy.

Dr. Rieveschl graduated from the Ohio Mechanics Institute with a degree in Commercial Art in 1933. He received his A.B. with High Honors in Chemistry from the University of Cincinnati in 1937, and went on to earn his M.S. and Ph.D. from U.C. In 1940, he began as an Instructor in Chemical Engineering at U.C. His loyalty and dedication to U.C. resulted in his selection to be Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the University of Cincinnati Foundation, a position from which he retired in 1981. During his career, Dr. Rieveschl held scientific research positions with Parke, Davis and the Carborundum Company. Dr. Rieveschl's laboratory research at U.C. resulted in the world's first effective antihistamine—named Benadryl by Dr. Rieveschl—which was approved for prescription sale in 1946. By the early 1960s, Benadryl's sales rose to \$6 million per year. Benadryl was approved for over-the-counter sale in the 1980s.

In 1970, he returned to the University of Cincinnati to become Vice President for Research and Development and Adjunct Professor of Materials, and in 1972 became Vice President for Special Projects. The University of Cincinnati presented him with an honorary Doctor of Science degree in 1956.

We congratulate Dr. Rieveschl on receiving this landmark honor, and are grateful for his many important contributions to medicine, to the Greater Cincinnati area, and to the Cincinnati Art Museum.

TRIBUTE TO U.S. NAVY FIRE
CONTROLMAN CHIEF (SURFACE
WARFARE) LAWRENCE ERIC
EVANS

HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize U.S. Navy Fire Controlman Chief (Surface Warfare) Lawrence Eric Evans upon his retirement from the United States Navy after 24 years of honorable service which will occur on the Thirty-First day of October, Nineteen Hundred Ninety Nine.

Chief Evans has been supported in his service this great nation by his wife, Michele Karen (Gudyka) Evans; his son, Lawrence William Evans and his daughter, Lauryn Michele Evans.

Chief Evans was born 28 June 1956 in Ruislip, England to 1stLT Larry Earl Evans, U.S. Air Force and Ada Mary (Georges)

Evans. He graduated from Spring Woods Senior High School in May 1974 and entered Recruit Training Center, Orlando, Florida in August 1975 where he remained until October 1975. He then received basic Fire Control and Advanced Systems training from November 1975 to May 1977. He then served aboard U.S.S. *Saipan* (LHA 2) pre-commissioning command from June 1977 to August 1981 as Work Center Supervisor of AN/SPS-52B RADAR; the ship was commissioned 15 October 1977.

Chief Evans was discharged from the U.S. Navy 15 August 1981. He attended Howard College, Big Spring, Texas in the Fall Semester of 1981 and worked briefly for Sperry Gyroscope in Clearwater, Florida from February 1982 to May 1982. He enlisted in the U.S. Navy Ready Reserves from June 1982 to October 1983 and worked for Vitro Laboratories in Washington, D.C. until October 1983. He attended Montgomery College, Rockville, Maryland in the Fall Semester 1982 and in the Spring Semester 1983.

Chief Evans re-Enlisted in the U.S. Navy (Active) 13 October 1983 and entered the Recruit Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois in October 1983. He received advanced Fire Control systems training from January 1984 to July 1984. He served aboard U.S.S. *Whidbey Island* (LSD 41) pre-commissioning command from August 1984 to November 1988 as Leading Weapons Petty Officer Navy Close In Weapons System; as the Command Shipboard Non-classified Automated Processing (SNAP) Coordinator; and as a Navy Small Arms and Weapons Instructor. The ship was commissioned 09 February 1985.

Chief Evans earned an Associate of Science degree from Mohegan College, Connecticut in May 1987. He was transferred to Naval Recruiting District at Richmond, Virginia October 1988 to December 1991 and recruited 84 new Sailors from Culpeper & Fredericksburg, Virginia. He then received advanced Fire Control systems training from January 1992 to August 1992.

Chief Evans served aboard U.S.S. *Supply* (AOE 6) pre-commissioning command from 09 September 1992 to August 1996 as Leading Weapons Chief NATO SeaSparrow Guided Missile System, Close In Weapons System, and Target Acquisition System; as the Command Information Systems Security Officer; and as the Command Material Maintenance Management (3M) Coordinator. The ship was Commissioned 26 February 1994.

Finally, Chief Evans transferred to Fleet Combat Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia from August 1996 to October 1999 as the Command LAN Administrator and Leading Chief of Information Technologies where he ends his career.

Chief Evans is proud to wear many ribbons and medals: Navy "E" (one for each ship on which he served); Sea Service; Meritorious Unit Commendations; Recruiting; Expeditionary; Humanitarian; and National Defense. These are the awards of his teamwork and commitment to his commands' overall missions.

Chief Evans has also personally earned three commendation letters for recruiting excellence; a letter of commendation for his service aboard the U.S.S. *Whidbey Island*; awards for weapons Marksmanship—most notably expert pistol marksmanship; and finally medals for both Achievement and Commendation for service aboard U.S.S. *Supply* (AOE 6).

Chief Evans completes his naval career with many happy memories having served with honor, upholding his oath:

I promise to defend the Constitution of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic; and hold true allegiance to the same.

It is with great pride that I congratulate Chief Evans upon his retirement, express appreciation for his service and wish him and his family all the best as they move on to face new challenges and rewards in the next exciting chapter in their lives.

INTRODUCTION OF THE EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY ACT

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Education for Democracy Act and have my Subcommittee Chairman, Representative CASTLE, join me in this effort today. The legislation we are introducing would continue two vitally important and highly regarded education programs: The We the People * * * program and the International Education Program. Both of these programs are up for reauthorization this year.

For well over a decade the We the People * * * program has involved elementary, middle and secondary school students throughout America in an innovative approach to learning about the U.S. Constitution, Bill of Rights and the principles of democratic government. More than 26.5 million students in some 24,000 elementary and secondary schools in every congressional district in the United States have participated in this important program. It has directly involved more than 82,000 teachers, and as a result of this program, more than 80,000 sets of civics education textbooks have been distributed free to schools throughout our Nation.

The We the People * * * program is widely acclaimed as a highly successful and effective education program. Washington Post columnist David Broder described its national finals as "the place to have your faith in the younger generation restored." The International Education Program, while only five years old, has produced dramatic results in providing civic education assistance to emerging democracies in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

Currently, educators in 15 U.S. states are linked with more than 17 fragile democracies in programs on the principles of democracy and the responsibilities of living in a free society. This year alone the program has reached 225,000 students and more than 2,000 educators in the emerging democracies and more than 56,000 students and more than 550 educators here in the United States. As a result, students in the new democracies and here at home learn the importance, difficulties, and rewards of building and sustaining a democratic government.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that these programs be continued, and not be allowed to languish. Inclusion in a block grant such as the Dollars to the Classroom Act would be the death knell. While a few districts might spend some of their block grant funds on civic education, the plain fact is that we would lose a

national focus and international focus on civic education.

Gone would be the national competition on knowledge and understanding of our Constitution and Bill of Rights; gone would be the free distribution of textbooks; and gone would be the regional teacher training institutes. Gone would be civic education assistance we provide to emerging democracies and gone would be the program where U.S. students learn firsthand about the difficulties of building and sustaining a democracy in the modern world.

As the ranking minority member of the subcommittee that will have the responsibility of reauthorizing these programs, I can assure my colleagues that I will work hard to see that these programs remain where and how they are. They are not large programs, but they are highly effective ones. They are worth the small amount we spend. They are a critically important investment in the future strength and welfare of democracy both here at home and in the emerging democracies abroad. They are worthy of our support.

TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Professor Marilyn Repsher, a mathematics teacher at the University of Jacksonville, who was awarded the Professor of the year award for 1999. Out of 400 competing professorial nominees representing institutions of higher learning across the nation, and on behalf of the city of Jacksonville, I am proud to commend Professor Repsher of her receipt of this award.

Professor Repsher had been teaching for over a decade when she was honored as one of the four national professors of the Year.

This award, the most prestigious national recognition in college teaching, is granted annually by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and the Council of Advancement and Support of Education.

Marilyn Repsher began her 30 year teaching career at Jacksonville University in 1969. The daughter of a high school math teacher, Professor Repsher was honored and indeed, elated, upon the award announcement.

Presently, even though Professor Repsher serves as the Head of the mathematics department, she still manages to devote 75% of her time to teaching, and interacting directly with students.

A few years ago Professor Repsher decided to change the way she taught math courses. Originating from a desire to teach students in a more down-to-earth fashion after listening to student complaints about their professors' teaching methods, and the lack of practicality of the material being taught, she realized that students were being forced to study theoretical concepts in math before studying math's every day life applications.

With her colleagues and this new way of teaching, Dr. Repsher completely revolutionized the way in which mathematics is taught at Jacksonville University. She now focuses on practical equations in her classes first, and then moves on to theory afterwards, but only after the students already have a grasp of the

practical ways in which this material can be applied in concrete situations.

As an example of her new teaching methods can be seen in her introductory Algebra course. In this course, she begins the semester by teaching basic algebraic concepts, while at the same time plotting the growth of a puppy on a computer screen. In more advanced math classes such as calculus, the students use the same technology to create visual displays on the data.

It is for this reason that Dr. Repsher is given credit for being a true innovator in utilizing technology in the classrooms of Jacksonville University, an idea that is quickly catching on in other university departments. In fact, she won two teaching awards at the university, both for projects involving the use of computer technology.

Some of Dr. Repsher's former and current students have described her lectures as "anything but long and arduous," while another said: "she keeps the class involved and is very focused."

I congratulate you, Dr. Repsher, on the receipt of this award, and am proud to have such outstanding role models like yourself in my district in the great state of Florida.

EBENEZER AME CHURCH, 117 YEARS OF COMMUNITY SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great admiration that I rise today to pay tribute to a great institution in my hometown of Evanston, Ebenezer African Methodist Episcopal Church.

Ebenezer AME Church is celebrating its 117 years of worship and service in our community. I want to congratulate Pastor and Mrs. James C. Wade, the congregation, and all those who have helped make Ebenezer a shining light in our community. I also send my best wishes to all those enjoying this year's celebration, "Catch the Vision," especially the young men and women from all across Chicago.

Under Pastor Wade's leadership, the church has reached out to the Evanston community and beyond. Their activities have had a profound impact on the lives of countless individuals. Their commitment to civic service knows no bounds. The church continues to lead by example, helping those in need, including senior citizens who need affordable housing, and positively influencing the lives of our youth.

Having worked closely with Pastor Wade, it is clear to me and to all in our community that the Pastor is an ambassador of good will. He reaches out to all those that he meets and forms lasting bonds that help to strengthen the spiritual bridge between human beings.

The success of Ebenezer and the AME community is a testament to all those who have contributed and continue to give their energy to this worthy cause.

I consider myself blessed to have attended many services at Ebenezer, and I am honored to call Pastor Wade and the Ebenezer community my friends. We have formed close ties over the years and our partnership will only flourish in the next millennium.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, due to the death last week of my mother I missed twenty votes. Had I been present I would have voted on each of these follows:

MONDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1999

Rollcall No. 533. Journal: Agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of Thursday, October 22 by yea and nay vote of 349 yeas to 41 nays with one voting "present." Yea.

Rollcall No. 534. 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 nay vote of 390 yeas to 2 nays). Yea.

Rollcall No. 535. History of the House Awareness and Preservation Act: H.R. 2302, amended, to direct the Librarian of Congress to prepare the history of the House of Representatives (passed by a yeas and nay vote of 388 yeas to 7 nays). Yea.

Rollcall No. 536. 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 nay vote of 391 yeas with none voting "nay"). Yea.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1999

Rollcall No. 537. Urging a Moratorium on Tariffs and Taxation of Electronic Commerce: H. Con. Res. 190, amended, urging the United States to seek a global consensus supporting a moratorium on tariffs and on special, multiple, and discriminatory taxation of electronic commerce (agreed to by a yeas and nay vote of 423 yeas with 1 voting "nay"). Yea.

Rollcall No. 538. Sense of Congress Against Increasing Federal Taxes to Fund Additional Government Spending: H. Con. Res. 208, expressing the sense of Congress that there should be no increase in Federal taxes in order to fund additional Government spending (agreed to by a yeas and nay vote of 371 yeas to 48 nays with 3 voting "present"). Yea.

Rollcall No. 539. Celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the Geneva Convention: H. Con. Res. 102, celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Geneva Conventions in 1949 and recognizing the humanitarian safeguards these treaties provide in times of armed conflict (agreed to by a yeas and nay vote of 423 yeas with none voting "nay"). Yea.

Roll call No. 540. Commending Greece and Turkey for Their Response to the Recent Earthquakes: 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 (agreed to by a yeas and nay vote of 424 yeas with none voting "nay"). Yea.

Rollcall No. 541. Locating and Securing the Return of Zachary Baumel and Others: Agreed to the Senate amendments to H.R. 1175, to locate and secure the return of Zachary Baumel, an American citizen, and other Israeli soldiers missing in action (agreed to by a yeas and nay vote of 421 yeas with none voting "nay"). Yea.

WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 27, 1999

Rollcall No. 542. The Scott Amendment that sought to strike Section 101 that reinforces the existing standard for the legitimate use of controlled substances (rejected by a recorded vote of 160 ayes to 278 noes). Pain Relief Promotion Act. Yea.

Rollcall No. 543. The Johnson of Connecticut Amendment that sought to enhance professional education in palliative care; reduce excessive regulatory scrutiny; and carry out the Congressional opposition to physician-assisted suicide (rejected by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 239 noes). Pain Relief Promotion Act. Yea.

Rollcall No. 544. House passed H.R. 2260, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to promote pain management and palliative care without permitting assisted suicide and euthanasia by a recorded vote of 271 ayes to 156 noes. Pain Relief Promotion Act. No.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1999

Rollcall No. 545. Journal Vote: Agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of Wednesday, October 27, by a yea and nay vote of 370 yeas to 49 nays, with one voting "present." Yea.

Rollcall No. 546. Further Continuing Appropriations. The House passed H.J. Res. 73, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000 by a yea and nay vote of 424 yeas to 2 nays. Yea.

Rollcall No. 547. DC/Labor/HHS—H. Res. 345, the rule that waived points of order against the conference report, was agreed to by a yea and nay vote of 221 yeas to 206 nays. Nay.

Rollcall No. 548. CD/Labor/HHS—Rejected the Hoyer motion to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers by a yea and nay vote of 11 yeas to 417 nays with 1 voting "present." Nay.

Rollcall No. 549. DC/Labor/HHS—The House agreed to the conference report on H.R. 3064, making appropriations for the District of Columbia, and for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000 by a yea and nay vote of 218 yeas to 211 nays. Nay.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1999

Rollcall No. 550. (Suspension) H.R. 348, to authorize the construction of a monument to honor those who have served the Nation's civil defense and emergency management programs. 349 yeas, 4 nays. Yea.

Rollcall No. 551. (Suspension) H.R. 2737, Land Conveyance, Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail, Illinois. 355 yeas. Yea.

Rollcall No. 552. (Suspension) H.R. 1714, Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, 234 yeas to 122 nays. Nay.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 3163, THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my colleagues Ranking Member JIM OBERSTAR, Chairman of the Subcommittee on

Ground Transportation, Mr. TOM PETRI, and Ranking Member Mr. NICK RAHALL, I am introducing, by request, the Administration's proposed legislation to reauthorize the Surface Transportation Board.

I evaluate the Administration's proposed changes to the law governing the Surface Transportation Board against the background of extensive hearings on these issues conducted by my Committee last year—over 1000 pages of testimony in 4 days of hearings.

The two clearest realities to emerge from those hearings were (1) the rail industry's resurgence and traffic growth since deregulation has made capacity constraints on their infrastructure a major problem for the first time in 3 decades; (2) to fund these huge infrastructure needs, the railroads must spend billions of dollars raised in private capital markets, but they are not attracting even the average earnings-multiples of industry at large on Wall Street.

A number of interests, some merely short-sighted and others opportunistic, have tried to use the reauthorization of the STB as a means to force down rail rates by legislative fiat. This effort occurs despite repeated authoritative findings by the General Accounting Office that rail rates have declined sharply, even in constant dollars, in recent years.

I am very disappointed that the Administration seems to have joined this effort. Instead of promoting the capital flow that will benefit both railroads and shippers through improved infrastructure, the Administration has sent to the Congress a bill that includes major portions of the "re-regulation" agenda.

By forcing mandatory access by one railroad over another's tracks in several types of situations, the bill would endanger the vital capital flow upon which the future prosperity of railroads, shippers, and rail labor depends.

Much of the effort that went into the ICC Termination Act four years ago was focused on streamlining federal regulation of railroads. Yet the proposed legislation would take a major step backward; it proposes to balkanize the authority to approve or disapprove rail mergers among multiple federal agencies. Even worse, the Administration's proposal sows the seeds of many debilitating disputes under state and local law, even for mergers that have received full federal approval.

Although the bill pays lip service to "small" shippers, it could literally destroy a major segment of American small business—the short-line railroads that serve so many smaller cities and towns. That is because the Administration wants to fund the entire \$17 million STB budget out of the so-called "user fees." The STB already defrays \$1.6 million of its costs through filing fees, and we have received numerous complaints about those charges from shippers. Now the Administration would impose more than 10 times that burden on "users." We don't know who the users are, since the bill doesn't even attempt to identify them.

We had some experience with such fees imposed on our small railroads several years ago by the Federal Railroad Administration. Our Committee found that these small companies—the ones that literally are the only way to keep rail service in small communities—were paying up to 17 percent of net income in so-called "user fees"—on top of their state and federal taxes. That's why we ended those FRA fees, and I see no reason to impose a

similar burden on struggling small businesses through STB fees, as the Administration now proposes.

While I cannot endorse much of what the Administration has proposed in its STB bill, I remain hopeful that a compromise can be reached on the contentious issues that have prevented an STB reauthorization bill from being enacted.

HONORING JOHN PAKCHOIAN, GROWER OF THE YEAR

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John Pakchoian, as American Vineyard's Grower of the Year for 1999. Mr. Pakchoian began farming in 1938 in a vineyard near Fowler, California. He is 82 years old and still farming.

John Pakchoian's favorite thing to talk about is farming. He was born into a farming family where he learned the responsibilities of hard work at the young age of six, after his father died. Pakchoian was the oldest child and the only boy. He worked before school and after school to help support the family.

John Pakchoian enlisted in the Marine Corps when World War II broke out. As Private First Class, Pakchoian belonged to the 26th Regiment, 5th Marine Division. His heroic performance in Saesbo, Japan on July 21, 1944 earned him a Bronze Medal.

The raisin industry went through a tough time at the start of World War II, prices were deteriorating and growers were losing hope. Raisin growers were called upon to produce raisins for the troops overseas, which boosted prices. In 1937 under the Federal Marketing Order Act, a federal marketing order for raisins was formed in 1949.

It has been 50 years since the marketing order was formed, and the raisin industry has come a long way, facing many challenges along the way. These challenges prompted Pakchoian to get involved in industry issues. He along with Ernie Bedrosian and Dick Mitchell helped draft the by-laws of the Raisin Bargaining Association, RBA. John Pakchoian was the fifth chairman of RBA and served on the Fresno County Farm Bureau Raisin Committee for 10 years.

John and Clyde Nef were the driving force behind the Raisin Industry Diversion Program in the mid 80's, known as RID. Pakchoian said the industry needed RID because too much raisin tonnage was being sold for cattle feed. In recent years there hasn't been a need for RID. The focus of the market now is to hold on to its markets and explore new ones.

Pakchoian has grown every crop you can grow in the San Joaquin Valley and the only ones that have carried him through were the table grapes, wine grapes and raisins. Raisins have been the one crop that has kept John in business all of these years. Pakchoian likes nothing more than farming.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Mr. John Pakchoian as Grower of the Year, 1999. He has worked hard to promote the raisin industry and bring it to where it is today. I urge my colleagues to join me in wishing John Pakchoian many more years of continued success.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE FRANCIS
WHITAKER

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell you of a man who epitomizes the values and traditions that this country was built upon. Francis Whitaker was known nationally for his accomplishments as a blacksmith and locally for his contributions to the community. Though he is gone, he will live in the hearts of all who knew him and be remembered for many years by those who have heard his amazing story.

The life accomplishments of Francis Whitaker are many. He was named a National Heritage Fellow by the National Endowment of the Arts, the nation's highest traditional arts award. In 1995, he received the Governors Award for Excellence in the Arts as a Master Folk Artist. In 1989, Colorado Rocky Mountain School dedicated the Blacksmithing School with its six forges and library to Francis Whitaker. The former Governor of Colorado, Roy Romer, nominated him for the 1998 National Living Treasure Award, for which he was one three finalists. He has published three books on blacksmithing and has appeared on television several times.

Although his professional accomplishments will long be remembered and admired, most who knew him well will remember Francis Whitaker, above all else, as a friend. It is clear that the multitude of those who have come to know Francis as a friend will be worse off in his absence. However, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that, in spite of this profound loss, the students, family and friends of Francis Whitaker can take solace in the knowledge that each is a better person for having known him.

SUPPORTING GIFTED AND
TALENTED PROGRAMS

HON. DAVID M. McINTOSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend my colleagues for voting to expand gifted and talented programs. On October 21, we passed H.R. 2, the Student Results Act, which reauthorized the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Act.

When I spoke before the Indiana Association for the Gifted last year I stated I was going to make gifted and talented programs one of my highest priorities. I want to thank my colleagues who voted for proposal and pledged their support for gifted and talented children.

The Javits program supports national research efforts and awards grants to school corporations, state departments of education, institutions of higher education, and other public and private agencies and organizations to help meet the needs of gifted and talented students in elementary and secondary schools.

Several of my colleagues and I on the Education Committee led the effort to expand this program and succeeded in adding a significant

state component. During the drafting state of the Student Results Act, we included provisions from the Gifted and Talented Students Education Act, a bill we co-sponsored earlier this year. This important legislation provides grants to states to help them implement successful research findings and model projects funded by the Javits program over the past ten years.

Mr. Speaker, gifted and talented programs are a proven method of helping children to meet their potential, while preventing drop-outs and other risk behaviors. Gifted children greatly benefit from being exposed to challenging and enriched curricula taught by trained staff who understand their special needs.

In Indiana, we have some very talented educators working with gifted and talented children. Indiana is one of only a few states that has a two year public residential high school for high-ability students, the Indiana Academy for Science, Mathematics and Humanities located at Ball State University in Muncie Indiana. In addition, Indiana has summer and week-end programs for these students.

In several school districts such as Southwest Allen County located in Fort Wayne Indiana we are fortunate to have a comprehensive program for gifted students, beginning in kindergarten. This type of K-12 program is unique and provides a model for other school districts.

While there are many excellent programs in Indiana, not all schools offer programs or services to meet the educational needs of gifted and talented students. The Javits program will provide Hoosiers with additional funds to reach out to students who currently do not have access to gifted and talented programs.

I greatly appreciate those who have joined me in opening up opportunities for gifted children.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3064,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. MELVIN L. WATT

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1999

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on fiscal year 2000 appropriations bill for the District of Columbia and the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Let me first say that the process by which this bill came to the floor is very troubling. We are here today voting on a conference report for fiscal year 2000 for Labor-HHS and Education when the bill was never considered or voted on by the House of Representatives. This unheard of procedure has not provided sufficient time for debate and consideration of amendments to allow us to participate in the process. Bypassing the normal procedures has shut Members out of having any opportunity to assist in crafting and improving this bill.

I am also troubled by some of the funding levels included in this bill. This bill makes funding cuts to programs which are vital to the

well being of many American families. The people most hurt by this bill are the very people who need our assistance and support the most. This bill would cut funding by over \$1 billion to social service programs for the elderly and low-income Americans; would not provide funding to immunize over 300,000 children against childhood diseases; and would cut funding for over 5,000 teachers who provide educational assistance to disadvantaged children.

Perhaps my biggest concern with this bill is that it does not include emergency assistance for those people in the eastern part of my state who are suffering from the floods of Hurricane Floyd. Thousands of people in North Carolina are still dealing with the aftermath of the floods. Entire towns have been destroyed, thousands have lost their homes, and many farmers have lost all of their crops and livestock. While this bill includes over \$2 billion in emergency spending, it cuts out the \$508 million in emergency assistance for agricultural damaged caused by Hurricane Floyd. This assistance would have been a start in providing people in North Carolina with the opportunity to begin to rebuild and recover. This bill represents an opportunity lost. I urge my colleagues to oppose the conference report.

WIND HAZARD REDUCTION
CAUCUS.

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to alert my colleagues to the formation last month of a very important new organization, the Wind Hazard Reduction Caucus. The caucus is cochaired by our colleagues, Representative DENNIS MOORE of Kansas, and Representative WALTER B. JONES of North Carolina. Both of these gentlemen have a great deal of first hand experience in helping their neighbors recover from the ravages of tornadoes and hurricanes. These Members are to be commended for their efforts to sensitize their colleagues to the extent to which the problems these storms cause are avoidable with proper planning. This caucus will be dedicated to achieving a 75 percent reduction in damage from windstorms by the end of the coming decade. Remarks of Mr. James E. Davis, executive director of the American Society of Civil Engineers and also the remarks of Congressmen JONES and MOORE, which were made last week at a reception celebrating the formation of the caucus are found below.

WIND HAZARD REDUCTION CAUCUS RECEPTION
REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE DENNIS MOORE
(D-KS) CAUCUS CO-CHAIR

October 27, 1999

To paraphrase Mark Twain, everybody talks about the weather but *this caucus* does something about it. All 50 states are vulnerable to the hazards of windstorms. During Hurricane Floyd alone, North Carolina lost 48 lives, more than twice the number of deaths along the entire Eastern Coast for the 1998 hurricane season and is now faced with staggering economic damages in the billions of dollars. In 1992, Hurricane Andrew resulted in \$26.5 billion in losses and 61 fatalities. In 1989, Hurricane Hugo resulted in \$7

billion in losses and 86 fatalities. In 1998, a calm year according to experts, due to wind related storms there was more than \$5.5 billion in damages, and at least 186 fatalities.

The federal government invests \$5 million to develop and promote knowledge, practices, and policies that seek to reduce and where possible eliminate losses from wind related disasters. In contrast the federal government invests nearly \$100 million per year in reducing earthquake losses through the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program. A federal investment in Wind Hazard Reduction will pay significant dividends in lives saved and decreased property damage.

The Wind Hazard Reduction Caucus or "Big Wind" will develop a program to reduce loss of life and property by 75% by 2010. Damage can be substantially reduced through the development and implementation of an effective National Wind Hazard Reduction Program. This program will address better: design and construction methods and practices; emergency response; use of modern technology for early-warning systems; building codes enforcement; and public education and involvement programs.

We are focused on increasing the awareness of Members of Congress about the public safety and economic loss issues associated with wind, increasing public safety and decreasing the economic losses associated with tropical storms, thunderstorms, and tornadoes.

In my own hometown of Wichita, Kansas, a tornado rated F4 intensity, plowed through the suburb of Haysville on May 3, 1999. It was responsible for 6 deaths, 150 injuries and over 140 million dollars in damage.

Tornadoes are one of nature's most violent storms. In an average year, 800 tornadoes are reported across the United States, resulting in 80 deaths and over 1,500 injuries. A tornado is a violently rotating column of air extending from a thunderstorm to the ground. The most violent tornadoes are capable of tremendous destruction with wind speeds of 250 mph or more. Damage paths can be in excess of one mile wide and 50 miles long.

Through we still can not control the weather, with this caucus we will at least be able to do something about it. Thank you for coming to the kick-off reception for the Wind Hazard Reduction Caucus. I also want to thank the American Society of Civil Engineers especially Brian Pallasch and Martin Hight for their insight into the development of this caucus along with Jim Turner, Democratic staff of the Science Committee. Legislation is not created in a vacuum; Congressman Jones and I look forward to working with all of you in the months to come.

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE WALTER JONES
(D-NC)

Thank you for your warm welcome. I am pleased to be a co-chair of the Wind Hazard Reduction Caucus, also known as Big Wind. My district and many other districts in North Carolina are extremely vulnerable to the hazards presented by windstorms. The most recent string of hurricanes to sweep the Eastern seaboard is testament to the severity of these storms.

In North Carolina alone, Hurricane Floyd took 48 lives, more than twice the total number of deaths along the entire eastern coast during the 1998 hurricane season. And it is predicted that the economic damages will reach well into the billions of dollars. Still we have yet to realize the full impact of these hurricanes, both financially and environmentally. For these reasons I am pleased to be part of the Big Wind Caucus. It is vitally important to increase awareness for public safety and decrease the enormous economic loss associated with wind hazards. I

look forward to working with Congressman Moore and the members of this caucus to increase public education and the use of effective prevention measures to deal with windstorms.

On that note, I would like to introduce my distinguished colleague and co-chair, Congressman Dennis Moore. He has first hand experience dealing with the devastation of wind hazards, as he represents a district frequently struck by tornadoes. I applaud his efforts and enthusiasm to make this Caucus a reality.

REMARKS BY MR. JAMES E. DAVIS

Good evening, and welcome to the Inaugural Event of the Congressional Wind Hazard Reduction Caucus. I am Jim Davis, Executive director of the American Society of Civil Engineers, one of the sponsors of tonight's event. We are very pleased to be working with the many Members of Congress, here tonight, on reducing the hazards associated with tornadoes, thunderstorms and hurricanes.

Representatives, Walter Jones Jr., of North Carolina and Dennis Moore of Kansas have taken the lead and created the bipartisan Wind Hazard Reduction Caucus of the U.S. House of Representatives. To support the Caucus efforts, ASCE will organize and lead a Wind Hazard Reduction Coalition of related professional societies, research organizations, industry groups and individual companies to leverage research and development activities. These groups to date include the following: Structural Engineering Institute of ASCE, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Portland Cement Alliance, Anderson Window Corporation, Applied Research Associates, Clemson University, International Code Council, and Texas Tech University.

Again, thank you all for being here, and we look forward to working with all of you to increase Congressional awareness of the public safety and economic loss issues associated with tornadoes, hurricanes, tropical storms and thunderstorms, and to develop and implement an effective National Wind Hazard Reduction Program.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JOHN VOELKER

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask that we all pause for a moment to remember a man who will live forever in the hearts of all that knew him and many that didn't. John Voelker was a man who stood out to those around him. Friends remember him as a man who gave selflessly to the community. But, most of all, he enjoyed his family and friends. His wife, Louise, and two sons brought him endless joy. He was known as a good and upright man.

People enjoyed working with him. He had many new ideas, he was willing to work hard and was regarded as a first class person in everything he did. Mr. Voelker was a civic leader. He presented new and innovative ideas for ways to make the community a better place. Recently, he had taken on a pet project which would have connected low-income residents to LEAP, a state program which helps them pay for utilities. Charity was his passion. For thirty or so years he has been involved in everything from the local civic

boards to environmental groups which fought for preservation and deregulation.

Tragically, when John Voelker was on his way to Egypt for a sightseeing trip, his plane EgyptAir flight 990 crashed just off the coast of Massachusetts.

John Voelker is someone who will be missed by many. His friends and family will miss the man that they all enjoyed spending time with. The rest of us will miss the man who exemplified the selfless dignity that so few truly possess. It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that we say goodbye to a great American. He will be greatly missed.

EMPOWERMENT ZONES/ENTERPRISE COMMUNITIES ENHANCEMENT ACT

HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to indicate my intent to cosponsor H.R. 2170, the Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities Enhancement Act of 1999. The bill is an important step toward fulfilling the promise made to areas designated as Round II Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities.

I strongly support the concept of Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities. Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities are designed to reverse the downward economic trends in urban and rural areas alike. Through the utilization of tax credits and social service credits, designated areas are able to undertake initiatives to spur long-term economic revitalization. In my state of North Dakota, the Griggs/Steele Empowerment Zone in eastern North Dakota was designated last year as a Round II Empowerment Zone. At that time, a commitment was made by the federal government to assist this area and others in creating jobs and economic opportunity. However, Round II Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities have yet to be fully funded, and as a result, these designated areas have been unable to reach their fullest potential.

I believe we have the responsibility to fulfill the commitment by fully funding Round II Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities. Even though I have concerns about the differences in funding levels between rural and urban Empowerment Zones, I believe we must move forward to provide these areas with the needed assistance to accomplish economic revitalization. However, I hope that as this legislation moves forward we can address the differences in funding between rural and urban areas to ensure each area is provided with the resources necessary to accomplish the economic revitalization the federal government promised.

LACK OF SLEEP CAN KILL

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, while physicians and patients now pay attention to the

adverse health impacts of poor nutrition and inadequate exercise, too few people pay attention to the harm that can result from inadequate sleep.

Sleep scientists have linked such ailments as high blood pressure, cardiovascular disease, and brain damage to inadequate sleep. We are all aware that drivers who fall asleep at the wheel can kill; not enough of us realize that inadequate sleep can cause severe physical ailments. The article "Can't Sleep," published in the summer 1998 edition of *Stanford Today*, outlines the severity of that threat. It should be read by every physician and patient in America.

[From *Stanford Today*, July/Aug. 1998]

CAN'T SLEEP—ONE OF AMERICA'S LEADING SLEEP EXPERTS REVEALS SHOCKING FACTS ABOUT YOUR SLEEPLESS NIGHTS

(By Chris Vaughan)

It was 1972, and the pediatricians at Stanford Hospital were stumped. Raymond S., an 11-year-old boy with an array of odd symptoms, had been referred to Stanford because his doctors in the East Bay didn't know what to do. Raymond's blood pressure was so dangerously—and inexplicably—high that the 6th-grader was in danger of damage to his internal organs. Because the boy was also pathologically sleepy during the day, he was sent over to the Stanford Sleep Disorders Clinic, the first and only one of its kind in the world then.

The clinic directors—Drs. William Dement and Christian Guilleminault—diagnosed the boy's disorder as a condition they had only recently named: sleep apnea. As Raymond slept, he would literally stop breathing for anywhere between 30 and 60 seconds at a time, they found. Worse still, this would happen hundreds of times each night. When the boy stopped breathing, his brain would panic, interpreting his body's action as suffocation. The result: His blood pressure shot up, his heart pounded, and he awoke just enough to begin breathing again, but still not enough to remember the incident in the morning. Hence his excruciating daytime drowsiness. Raymond was always sleepy because he was not getting any real sleep at night.

None of the pediatricians consulted would buy the sleep clinic's diagnosis. Raymond's condition grew worse. When the boy started showing signs of heart and kidney failure, his skeptical doctors finally allowed sleep clinic physicians to cut a breathing hole in the boy's throat. The difference was fast: The boy's blood pressure dropped and his overall condition improved dramatically.

Dement would have counted this as a victory, except that the boy's primary physicians still refused to acknowledge the problem. After a few months, they wanted to close up the hole. "They still didn't understand that the hole was saving his life," Dement said. Raymond kept the breathing hole and Dement kept in touch with him for a few years. Eventually Dement lost track of him, but he expects that current practices must have allowed Raymond to have the hole closed and to use alternate therapies.

Since then Americans have learned a lot more about the importance of sleep and dangers of sleep disorders to the nation's health. Since the discovery of Rapid Eye Movement (REM) sleep 45 years ago, Dement, 69, has played a part in nearly every major development in sleep research and has attracted star students and researchers, and the money to fund their work. Former Stanford students and fellows have spread the gospel and started their own clinics and research centers around the world. Before Congress and corporations, and on national radio and tele-

vision talk shows, Dement has brought an unwavering message: "Sleep disorders are killing people, and yet they are tremendously under-diagnosed."

In a report for the House Subcommittee on Health and Environment last year, he declared that sleep disorders represent one of the nation's most serious health problems, and that the need for sleep research is virtually ignored.

The numbers are stunning. More than half of Americans have suffered from a sleep disorder at some time, accordingly to a survey ordered last year by the National Sleep Foundation in Washington, D.C. Approximately 30 percent of adult Americans suffer from moderate to severe sleep disorders, and less than 5 percent are diagnosed and treated. More than 18 million people—7 percent of the population—stop breathing or struggle for breath in their sleep more than five times every hour. In the worst cases, sleepers stop breathing more than 30 times each hour, often for more than a minute. Under these conditions the heart can stop beating for 10 or 15 seconds at a time, and blood oxygen can drop to about one-fifth of normal, equivalent to that of a climber at the summit of Mt. Everest. Patients with such severe apnea can get cardiovascular disease and brain damage.

One would think that such a prevalent and dangerous disorder would receive a lot of attention and be treated aggressively. Yet Dement says that when he used a computer to scan 10 million coded patient records, he found a total of only 72 patients who were diagnosed with apnea. "I couldn't believe it," Dement says. "So I hired people to read over 11,000 written patient records." They found not one diagnosed sleep problem.

Apnea is only one of many sleep problems that are unrecognized or ignored. Sleep specialists estimate that physicians detect only about 2 percent of all sleep disorders, and most people have basic misconceptions about the mechanics of their own sleep. Put it in another context and the danger is clear. "It's almost as if no one had ever heard of diabetes," Dement says. "What if we didn't know that the blindness, nerve damage and other health problems in one part of the population were due to one treatable disease?"

Hundreds of sleep-disorders sufferers have testified in Congress for the National Commission on Sleep Disorders Research about the shambles made of their lives from apnea, narcolepsy (sudden attacks of sleep and paralysis), insomnia and restless legs syndrome—an infuriatingly frustrating syndrome in which people can't fall asleep because they must constantly stretch their legs. Statistics from a study by the government's National Transportation Safety Board show that sleep deprivation contributes to approximately 72,000 accidents on the roadways each year. The total cost of drowsy driving amounts to \$12.4 million a year. The study also established that sleep deprivation was a major cause of the grounding of the *Exxon Valdez* oil tanker in Alaska.

Even without a diagnosis, many people are sleep deprived and never know it. Over millions of years, our bodies have evolved to awaken and to sleep with the rise and fall of the sun. But the invention of electric lights has given us an artificial sun and provided a basis for our busy 24-hour society. As a result, people now get about 20 percent less sleep than they did a century ago. No wonder we're sleepy. A study by the National Sleep Foundation reveals that 64 percent of people in the United States sleep fewer than the recommended 8 hours a night, while 32 percent sleep fewer than 6 hours a night. Not surprisingly, sleep deprivation is extremely high among the nation's college students.

Society has been slow to recognize sleep disorders because of major misconceptions

about what sleep exactly is. People traditionally considered sleep a time when the body and brain simply turned off. Physicians thought that nothing happened in sleep; that sleep could not be a source of health problems.

Overturning such scientific and popular misconceptions about sleep has been a major activity for Dement, his colleagues and students since the start of the era of modern sleep research in 1953. In that year, University of Chicago physiologist Nathaniel Kleitman and graduate student Eugene Aserinsky discovered that the body and brain do not shut down during sleep. Instead, they experience periods of rapid eye movement. Dement joined Kleitman's lab shortly after and helped demonstrate that intense brain activity and dreaming accompanied these REM periods of the sleeper. After completing his medical degree, Dement carried on his own research at the Mount Sinai Medical Center in New York where he took the next step, demonstrating that everyone has REM sleep.

By the time Dement moved to Stanford in 1962, he was working on a seemingly rare sort of epilepsy—called narcolepsy—that caused people to feel weak in the knees, collapse or fall instantly asleep when they laughed or got otherwise excited. These narcoleptic patients could even find themselves dreaming while awake, unable to tell which images were real and which were dreams. Dement had come across only five such patients in New York. But when he placed an advertisement in the *San Francisco Chronicle* describing narcolepsy's symptoms and asking for people to call if they fit that description, he found 50 new patients.

In 1965, sleep apnea had been described in a few obese patients by French researchers, but the discovery had been practically ignored because no one realized that the disorder could be so severe, or that slender people could suffer from it. The disorder was called Pickwickian syndrome after "Joe, the fat boy," a lad in Dickens' *The Pickwick Papers* who could fall asleep standing up.

Apnea occurs when the muscles relax during sleep, narrowing the throat where the back of the tongue is anchored. As air is pulled into the lungs, the suction collapses the throat and halts breathing. "When straws were made of paper, I used to say it was like trying to suck a milkshake through a wet straw," Dement says, laughing about his antiquated illustration. "Students now have grown up with plastic straws, and they don't know what I'm talking about."

If the air passage is almost closed off, breathing results in loud snoring as the throat tissue vibrates. Loud snoring (i.e., easily heard through a wall or closed door) is a danger sign that someone has apnea or soon might get it. Apnea is especially debilitating because it deprives the sleeper of the most important phases of sleep—REM sleep and deep non-REM sleep—when the muscles are most relaxed.

Although tracheostomy (a hole in the throat) used to be the only treatment for apnea, there are now a number of treatments, including surgery to trim throat tissue, and machines that provide positive pressure in the airway to keep it open during sleep. A new technique has just received approval from the Food and Drug Administration: zapping the throat with a carefully calibrated dose of microwaves to painlessly shrink the tissue and open the airway.

Research at the Stanford Sleep Center eventually led to the isolation of a gene for narcolepsy in dogs that experts expect will help in the search for a human gene. In 1972, sleep experts realized that when people complained about being sleep during the day, it was their sleep that should be examined. The

Stanford Sleep Clinic was opened to diagnose and treat sleep problems.

Dement's terminology is probably his most famous contribution to public awareness of sleep disorders. "Gentlemen," he declared before a House committee in 1985, "the national sleep debt is more important than the national monetary debt." He estimates that sleep disorders cost the economy \$100 billion a year in lost productivity.

In the late 1970s, Dement and Stanford researcher Mary Carskadon (now a professor at Brown University) discovered a way to quantify sleepiness. They developed the multiple sleep latency test, still the standard in the field, which proved that sleepiness increased as sleep was curtailed. If they were surprised to find that the body kept track of each hour of sleep missed, they were astonished to realize that the only way to pay back this "sleep debt" and alleviate daytime sleepiness was to get exactly that many hours of extra sleep on subsequent nights.

In addition, we are tremendously bad judges of our own sleep debt's size. A study by Thomas Roth, director of the Henry Ford Sleep Disorders Center at the Henry Ford Hospital in Detroit, revealed that even among average people who are pathologically drowsy, as sleepy as those with narcolepsy, most do not think they have a problem with daytime sleepiness.

Despite advances in the field Dement worries over the inability of general practitioners to recognize and diagnose sleep problems—even among those close to home. Dement tells of a time when he became so frustrated by the lack of referrals from Stanford doctors that he walked into a waiting room at the hospital and offered people sitting there the chance to get a free sleep test worth \$1,000. Of the five who accepted, three turned out to have apnea.

Although surveys show that the public is more aware of sleep disorders, they are still tremendously under-diagnosed. Dement is currently studying how primary care doctors recognize and treat sleep disorders in small towns. He still gets shocked by the results: Practically zero cases of apnea were diagnosed by the physicians, although further investigation has shown that one in five patients had apnea. "I had one doctor who had 200 patients with apnea, and he didn't even know it," says Dement with exasperation. "There are 200,000 more doctors like him out there."

The most recent data are even more shocking: 80 percent of those diagnosed with apnea in the survey town of Moscow, Idaho, have a very severe form that usually leads to death from heart attack or stroke within 10 years. "I almost couldn't believe the data myself, but it is solid," Dement says.

"I don't like medical malpractice suits," Dement says with anger, "but some day, some smart lawyer is going to realize all these people are dying because of an obvious, but missed, diagnosis, and is going to make a fortune in wrongful death cases. The signs are so obvious, a 6-year-old could make a diagnosis."

NOISY IS THE NIGHT

(By Lisa Sonne)

Hi, my name is Lisa, and I am married to an apneac.

Don't think I'm unhappy. Victor is a great guy—a Stanford man, smart, funny, kind, a wonderful husband and friend . . . and he did warn me. But for the first six months of our marriage, we have been taking life "one night at a time."

Every evening, we settle in as newlyweds for our sweet dreams. But then the snoring starts. In order to sleep, I create Walter Mitty-like scenarios. My husband is Paul

Bunyan—with a power saw—and he's turning already-felled trees into boards for Habitat for Humanity, or my husband is a dentist with an intermittent drill helping the mouths of needy children. I fall asleep with a smile on my face.

Then, his snoring stops with an eerie, breath-defying silence, and I bolt awake in emergency mode with adrenaline pumping. I watch helplessly as he begins his nightly ritual of raspy gasping and groping for air with his whole chest heaving. Just when I'm ready to shake him to make him breathe, he inhales a huge gulp of air and goes back to snoring. I lie there awake, waiting for the next frightening silence.

Apneacs usually don't wake up enough to be cognizant of their body's betrayal, but those sleeping next to them often do. And both have been snatched away from deep rest and finished dreams. I took Dr. Dement's "Sleep and Dreams" class years ago and remember the dangers of sleep deprivation and REM robbery. In the battle against exhaustion, naps have become acts of survival for us, not lazy indulgences or luxuriant escapes.

Fortunately, my apneac is not in denial. He is tired of being tired, and says he is "willing to do anything to be better in bed." Determined to move beyond apnea, Victor endured laser surgery in the spring of 1997 to reduce soft tissue in his palate that may have been obstructing his night breathing. He then underwent three separate rounds with an experimental procedure called somnoplasty. But in March 1998, another sleep study revealed quantitatively that Victor's apnea had gotten worse. One hundred eighty-four times during the night, his breathing was obstructed enough to disrupt his sleep and threaten the supply of oxygen to his brain. And his was only a "moderate" case. My heart goes out to the apneac and spouse of a "serious" case.

A series of doctors in New York recommended major surgery to further reduce his soft palate, but their predictions for success ranged from a high of 80 percent to a low of 50 percent. How can you decide what to do when your brain is sleep impaired? I wonder if "no rest for the weary" was coined by an apneac. I suggested that Victor try getting some uninterrupted dream time with a CPAP machine. It uses continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) to force air into your lungs through a face mask while you sleep. This was not the paraphernalia we had imagined during the honeymoon phase of our lives. But sometimes the route to "good dreams" takes a surprising turn.

For me, the CPAP machine's loud hum was a lullaby compared to the usual snoring and gulping, but for my spouse, wearing the mask "is like standing up in a convertible going 80 miles an hour with your mouth open." Exhausted from the apnea, he was able to fall asleep under the air assault, and it worked—for a while. The continuing blast hurt his sinuses and he would rip the mask off in his sleep. Clearly this was not a long-term solution for us.

So, at last, in our quest for deep sleep, we came to Stanford's renowned pioneer in sleep surgery, Dr. Nelson Powell. He spent two hours with us, conducted tests, asked and answered a wide range of questions. We learned that we are part of an unrecognized epidemic. Powell thinks that sleep disorders may be the cause of depression, impotence and accidents for tens of thousands of people. And then there are the spouses. He said motor response tests actually found the spouse worse off than the apneac. Friends of mine started sharing their nocturnal woes (years of spouses sleeping in separate rooms) and diurnal daze (nap fantasies and chronic exhaustion).

We're ready to end this nightmare. My husband is scheduled for surgery at Stanford: Moving his tongue forward to enlarge his airway may be the solution. He should be out of the hospital in two days. Then, when we settle in for sweet dreams—we may finally be able to finish them!

We look at it this way: We spend one-third of our lives (eight of every 24 hours) sleeping . . . or trying to. We hope to be married at least 45 years. That means 15 years of our future will be spent in bed together. We don't want to have to wait until we die to rest in peace.

LET SLEEPING DOGS LIE

Why do we sleep? Believe it or not, the question remains an enigma. Part of the answer, though, may rest with a brood of Dobermans at Stanford University. These dogs are generally energetic and friendly, but if they get excited about special food or a new toy they flop to the ground, completely paralyzed. They suffer from narcolepsy. Their narcoleptic attacks last just minutes, and then they rise as if nothing had happened.

"A normal dog can eat a dish of food in a few minutes, but it might take a narcoleptic dog an hour because he keeps collapsing," says researcher Emmanuel Mignot. The dogs are not hurt or suffering, merely afflicted by cataplexy, a paralysis or muscle weakness that is part of the narcolepsy syndrome. The dogs can fall asleep briefly during this cataplectic attack, or they can remain conscious but unable to move.

Narcolepsy is the only sleeping disorder known to arise from a glitch in a primary sleep mechanism. By looking at the disorder in dogs, scientists hope to discover how the brain puts itself to sleep and what sleep does for the body in humans with narcolepsy. Recently, Mignot isolated the gene for narcolepsy—*canarc-1*—in these dogs and found that it is a variant of a normal immunoglobulin gene. Immunoglobulins are proteins that the immune system creates to scavenge invading microbes. At this point, researchers don't know why an immune gene causes sleep attacks. Mignot and colleagues speculate that narcolepsy may be an autoimmune disorder, like lupus or multiple sclerosis. But narcoleptic dogs and people lack other signs that usually accompany autoimmune disorders.

A more tantalizing possibility is that normal sleep is somehow related to the operation of the immune system.

Mignot and his colleagues are now using their work with the dogs and other research to search for a human gene for narcolepsy. Mignot feels he will have it soon, in six months to two years, and hopes that the discovery will clarify what causes narcolepsy and suggest a possible cure.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF RAC

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Raisin Administrative Committee, RAC, for 50 years of service. The California raisin industry members remember trying times after World War II.

During the war, the raisin industry had been given the opportunity to introduce California raisins overseas when the agriculture industry was called upon to produce a plentiful food and fiber supply not only for the United States, but for our allies.

When the war ended, California raisin industry members wanted to maintain the demand for their product overseas, but times were hard. It was time to plan for the future. A. "Sox" Setrakian is a leader in the industry who will forever be remembered for his dedication to the California raisin industry. He was the driving force behind the California Raisin Administrative Committee's implementation.

"Sox" arrived in the United States from Izmir, Turkey, with little more than the clothes on his back. He became one of the most influential raisin industry leaders of all time. He was involved in the grape and raisin industry sharing the concern for more markets to accommodate the raisin production.

Raisin growers agreed that they needed to create a demand for the raisin supply. Things began to change in 1949 when the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and the California Marketing Act of 1937, the federal marketing order was made effective in August of 1949. It would be managed under its administrative body known as the Raisin Administrative Committee, RAC. This is what the industry needed to expand its presence in the world. The purpose of RAC is to control the administration of California raisins.

It has been 50 years since RAC's implementation and it is stronger than ever. Today the industry credits "Sox" Setrakian who was the first chairman of RAC, leading the industry forward and opening new markets for California raisins.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the Raisin Administrative Committee, RAC, for leading the way for California raisins. I urge my colleagues to join me in wishing RAC many more years of continued success.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE TOM
McCULLOCH

HON. SCOTT MCINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask that we all pause for a moment to remember a man who will live forever in the hearts of all that knew him and many that didn't. Tom McCulloch was a man who stood out to those around him. Friends remember him as a man who enjoyed the soil and the outdoors. But, most of all, he enjoyed his family and friends. His two sons, Kevin and Lance, and daughter Barbara brought him endless joy. He was known as a good and upright man.

His history in the Durango, Colorado area dates all the way back to the 1890's when his family homesteaded the ranch that is known today as one of the most beautiful in the country. Working the land was his passion; a friend of his, Arthur Isgar, said it was his pride and joy. When he was not working on his ranch he was at his medical practice in Durango. Friends contend that no one knew medicine better than Tom.

Tragically, when Dr. McCulloch was on his way to Egypt for a sightseeing trip, his plane EgyptAir flight 990 crashed just off the coast of Massachusetts.

Tom McCulloch is someone who will be missed by many. His friends and family will miss the man that they all enjoyed spending time with. The rest of us will miss the man

who exemplified the selflessness that so few truly possess. It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I say goodbye to a great American. He will be greatly missed.

ANTITRUST TECHNICAL
CORRECTIONS ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1801, the Antitrust Technical Corrections Act of 1999, which I have introduced with Ranking Member CONYERS. H.R. 1801 makes four separate technical corrections to our antitrust laws. Three of these corrections repeal outdated provisions of the law: the requirement that depositions in antitrust cases brought by the government be taken in public; the prohibition on violators of the antitrust laws passing through the Panama Canal; and a redundant and rarely used jurisdiction and venue provision. The last one clarifies a long existing ambiguity regarding the application of Section 2 of the Sherman Act to the District of Columbia and the territories.

The Committee has informally consulted the antitrust enforcement agencies, the antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Competition of the Federal Trade Commission, and the agencies have indicated that they do not object to any of these changes. In response to written questions following the Committee's November 5, 1997 oversight hearing on the antitrust enforcement agencies, the Department of Justice recommended two of the repeals and the clarification contained in this bill. The other repeal was recommended to the Committee by the House Legislative Counsel. In addition, the Antitrust Section of the American Bar Association supports the bill, and I ask unanimous consent to insert their comments in the RECORD.

First, H.R. 1801 repeals the Act of March 3, 1913. That act requires that all depositions taken in Sherman Act equity cases brought by the government be conducted in public. In the early days, the courts conducted such cases by deposition without any formal trial proceeding. Thus, Congress required that the depositions be open as a trial would be. Under the modern practice of broad discovery, depositions are generally taken in private and then made public if they are used at trial. Under our system, this act causes three problems: (1) it sets up a special rule for a narrow class of cases when the justification for that rule has disappeared; (2) it makes it hard for a court to protect proprietary information that may be at issue in an antitrust case; and (3) it can create a circus atmosphere in the deposition of a high profile figure. In a recent decision, the D.C. Circuit invited Congress to repeal this law.

Second, H.R. 1801 repeals the antitrust provision in the Panama Canal Act. Section 11 of the Panama Canal Act provides that no vessel owned by someone who is violating the antitrust laws may pass through the Panama Canal. The Committee has not been able to determine why this provision was added to the Act or whether it has ever been used. How-

ever, with the return of the Canal to Panamanian sovereignty at the end of 1999, it is appropriate to repeal this outdated provision. The Committee has consulted informally with the House Committee on Armed Services, which has jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Act. Chairman SPENCE has indicated that the Committee has no objection to this repeal, and the Committee has waived its secondary referral. I thank Chairman SPENCE for his cooperation.

Third, H.R. 1801 clarifies that Section 2 of the Sherman Act applies to the District and the territories. Two of the primary provisions of antitrust law are Section 1 and Section 2 of the Sherman Act. Section 1 prohibits conspiracies in restraint of trade, and Section 2 prohibits monopolization, attempts to monopolize, and conspiracies to monopolize. Section 3 of the Sherman Act was intended to apply these provisions to the District of Columbia and the various territories of the United States. Unfortunately, however, ambiguous drafting in Section 3 leaves it unclear whether Section 2 applies to those areas. The Committee is aware of at least one instance in which the Department of Justice declined to bring an otherwise meritorious Section 2 claim in a Virgin Island case because of this ambiguity. This bill clarifies that both Section 1 and Section 2 apply to the District and the Territories. All of the congressional representatives of the District and the Territories are cosponsors of the bill.

Finally, H.R. 1801 repeals a redundant antitrust jurisdictional provision in Section 77 of the Wilson Tariff Act. In 1955, Congress modernized the jurisdictional and venue provisions relating to antitrust suits by amending Section 4 of the Clayton Act. At that time, it repealed the redundant jurisdictional provision in Section 77 of the Sherman Act, but not the one contained in Section 77 of the Wilson Tariff Act. It appears that this was an oversight because Section 77 was never codified and has rarely been used. Repealing Section 77 will not diminish any jurisdictional or venue rights because Section 4 of the Clayton Act provides any potential plaintiff with the same jurisdiction and venue rights that Section 77 does and it also provides broader rights. Rather, the repeal simply rids the law of a confusing, redundant, and little used provision.

Since the Committee on the Judiciary ordered this bill reported, we discovered two drafting errors that we have corrected in the current managers' amendment that is before the House. One change corrects an incorrect reference to the United States Code. Secondly, we discovered that the language describing the scope of commerce covered by the territorial provision did not precisely parallel that in the existing section 3 of the Sherman Act, and we have changed that language so that the new subsection 3(b) will parallel the existing law.

In addition, we realized after reporting the bill that it would be helpful to clarify the effect of these changes on pending cases. Because the public deposition matter does not affect the litigants' substantive rights, we have made that change apply to pending cases. The other three changes could affect the substantive rights of litigants. For that reason, we have not made those changes apply to pending cases, although we believe that it is unlikely that there are any pending cases that are affected.

I believe that all of these provisions are non-controversial, and they will help to clean up some underbrush in the antitrust laws. I recommend that the House suspend the rules

and pass the bill as amended by the managers' amendment.

VETERANS DAY, 1999—HONORING
THE SERVICE OF VIETNAM AND
VIETNAM-ERA VETERANS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in a little more than a week, we will once again observe Veterans Day—the date a grateful Nation sets aside to honor the men and women who have served our nation as members of its military forces.

It is particularly poignant that we observe this occasion. First designated to commemorate Armistice Day and the restoration of peace, Veterans Day today is the occasion on which we appreciate the accomplishments and the sacrifices of untold scores of individuals. It is a day on which we acknowledge the role these individuals played in writing the history of the United States—a history that, in this century alone, has evolved from isolation to world leadership.

Underscoring its importance and the value of the ceremonies we observe today is the fact that a smaller percentage of Americans have now served in the Armed Forces of the United States than at any time in our recent history. This of course, reflects the unprecedented peace the United States has enjoyed. But, it also reminds us not to be lulled into complacency—into believing that future generations will not be called to arms.

Though we pray in our hearts they won't be called, we know in our heads that one day they may.

Like others before us, my generation was also called to arms. Most of us responded, notwithstanding the controversy and turmoil the war caused. The images of Vietnam are still vivid in our individual and collective memories. But, what's most surprising is the passage of time since the war and the fact that next year will mark the 25th anniversary of the departure of the last U.S. servicemen from Vietnam—a departure that closed the Vietnam-era and, for many of us, closed an important chapter in our lives.

Between 1961 and 1975, more than 2,590,000 Americans served in the Armed Forces in Vietnam. Untold thousands served in support roles elsewhere in Southeast Asia. At the same time, millions more protected U.S. national security interests in the other far regions of the world. And let us not forget the millions of civilians who also contributed to our nation's defense at a time tensions were growing between world superpowers.

Recently, the Commander's Council, the Allied Council, and the Administration and staff at the California Veterans Home in Yountville suggested to me that our nation celebrate this year's Veterans Day by marking the service of those who served in and during the Vietnam-era. On the eve of the 25th anniversary of that war's end, such a tribute is indeed appropriate and, as such, I would like to read the text of a resolution the Yountville Veterans Home residents and staff suggested:

RESOLUTION ENCOURAGING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO COMMEMORATE AND RECOGNIZE THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF THOSE WHO DURING THE VIETNAM ERA SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES OR IN CIVILIAN CAPACITIES IN SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA AND ELSEWHERE IN THE WORLD

Whereas the United States Armed Forces conducted military operations in Southeast Asia during the period (known as the "Vietnam era") from February 28, 1961, to May 7, 1975;

Whereas during the Vietnam era more than 2,590,000 American military personnel served in the Republic of Vietnam or elsewhere in Southeast Asia in support of United States military operations in Vietnam, while millions more provided for the Nation's defense in other parts of the world;

Whereas during the Vietnam era untold numbers of civilian personnel also served in support of United States operations in Southeast Asia and elsewhere in the world;

Whereas May 7, 2000, marks the 25th anniversary of the closing of the period known as the Vietnam era;

Whereas citizens throughout the United States traditionally commemorate the service and sacrifice of the Nation's veterans on November 11th each year, the date designated by law as "Veterans Day", and

Whereas Veterans Day, 1999 would be an appropriate occasion to begin a period for observance of that anniversary and to recognize and appreciate the individuals who served the Nation in Southeast Asia and elsewhere in the world during the Vietnam era: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American people are encouraged through appropriate ceremonies and activities, to recognize and appreciate the selfless sacrifice of the men and women, both military and civilian, who during the Vietnam era served the Nation in the Republic of Vietnam and elsewhere in Southeast Asia or otherwise served in support of United States operations in Vietnam and in support of United States interests throughout the world.

I commend the resolution to all Americans and thank the individuals at the California Veterans Home in Yountville for proposing it as part of this year's Veterans Day observance.

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL J. "DUKE"
MCVEY

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I wish to recognize the outstanding achievements of Daniel J. "Duke" McVey, of Jefferson City, Missouri. McVey, who has been president of the Missouri AFL-CIO since 1982, will retire at the end of the year.

Duke McVey has been a truly outstanding civic leader for the AFL-CIO and for the State of Missouri. McVey has been a Member of Pipefitters Local 562, St. Louis, Missouri, since 1954. In 1978, he was elected Secretary-Treasurer of the Missouri State Labor Council for the AFL-CIO, a position he served until 1982. McVey was then elected President of the Missouri AFL-CIO in 1982. In the 17 years he has headed the Missouri AFL-CIO, he has raised the level of involvement by unions in governmental affairs.

In addition to his service in the AFL-CIO, McVey has been a leader in his community by

serving on various councils and committees. He currently serves on the Missouri Training and Employment Council, and has been a member of Trustees of Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri since 1992. McVey serves on the Missouri Business Council, the Missouri Task Force on Workers Compensation, the Commission on Management and Productivity, and the Missouri State Council on Vocational Education. Since 1994, McVey has served on Missourians for Equal Justice, the Governor's partnership on the Transition from School to Work, and Goals 2000 State Panel. McVey served as the Literacy Investment for Tomorrow (LIFT) Board President in 1995, and he is a member of the Missouri Global Partnership, the Children's Trust Fund, and the Commission on the Future of the South.

Duke McVey has been an extraordinary leader for labor, for his community, and for his State. I know the House will join me in paying tribute to this outstanding leader and wishing him and his family—his wife Arlene, and his children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren—all the best in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO KATHERINE L.
PHELPS

HON. SCOTT MCINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the career of one of Colorado's leading ladies, and distinguished member of the Bayfield School District Board of Education, Katherine L. Phelps. In doing so, I would like to honor this individual who, for many years, has exhibited dedication and experience in the education system of Bayfield, Colorado.

Throughout the course of her distinguished career, Katherine's dedication to our children has been unparalleled. She has consistently worked with the board, the district, and the community to make the Bayfield schools the best they could be.

Aside from her involvement in the school district, she also takes on an active role in the community. She is a member of the School Accountability Committee, the 4-H club, the booster club, and numerous sports programs.

Together with her husband, Arvin, she has five children: Sharla, Rick, Trent, Dion, and Wendy. She also has seven grandchildren and one on the way. Undoubtedly, these fine young people will carry the torch of dedication and leadership that their mother embraces so diligently.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I say thank you to Katherine Phelps for her exceptional service on the Bayfield School District Board of Education. Because of Mrs. Phelps' dedicated service, it is clear that Colorado is a better place. For many years to come, her legacy of hard work and dedication will be remembered. I wish her all the best in her well deserved retirement and in all future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. J.C. WATTS, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on personal family business on the evening of November 1, 1999, when the vote on the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail Land Conveyance Act, H.R. 2737, was cast. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of this measure.

In addition, I was unavoidably detained on personal family business on the evening of November 1, 1999, when the vote on the FEMA and Civil Defense Monument Act, H.R. 348, was cast. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of this measure.

In addition, I was unavoidably detained on personal family business on the evening of November 1, 1999, when the vote on the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, H.R. 1714, was cast. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of this measure.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD NORTH KOREA

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express concern over some of the findings of the Republican task force formed to examine U.S. policy toward North Korea.

Most troubling to me is its assertion that there have been significant diversions of food aid we have donated in response to that country's famine. All evidence suggests that this is just not true. Moreover, it is clear—to me, to our military stationed in South Korea, to policymakers in Washington, Seoul and Tokyo, and to attentive observers—that U.S. food aid to North Koreans is thawing 50 years of icy hostility toward Americans. Our wheat and corn, and our aid workers, are putting the lie to decades of Pyongyang's propaganda about American intentions. We are proving by our presence to all who see us and our sacks of food that Americans are compassionate people who will not stand by while innocent Koreans starve and suffer.

As you know, I have visited North Korea five times—not out of any particular interest in the country, but because their people are suffering. It is a famine that, I believe, history will mark as one of this decade's worst.

In my trips, I always have brought my own translator as well as a member of our armed forces. Other members of my delegations have included a Marine who served in the Korean War—Congressional medal of honor winner General Ray Davis; a doctor from the Centers for Disease Control; reporters from USA Today and the Washington Post; an agriculture expert; and a Korean-American economist who specializes in humanitarian aid.

During every trip, I have met with Western aid workers working in North Korea. In all, I have spoken with scores of them over the past three years. These are people with expertise on hunger and the diseases that prey

on hungry people—and with experience working in challenging situations. None of them has any cause to lie to me, and every reason to raise concerns that I can use to press North Korea officials on. And yet, in five visits I have not found a single aid worker who said food aid is being diverted from hungry people.

The General Accounting Office report turns up no such diversion either; nor does any other U.S. Government agency. Even counting an incident in early 1998, where food sent to a county that later was closed to monitors, the record in North Korea is well within the two percent average loss rate that the United Nations World Food Programme maintains in its operations worldwide. Compared to other difficult situations—such as in Haiti, where more than 10 percent of food was lost in the last reporting period, or Honduras, where the rate was 6 percent—the 1.7 percent loss rate in North Korea is not bad. That incident should not be dismissed, because it was serious enough to provoke WFP to increase restrictions on its aid. But it should be kept in perspective.

It is not only my own experience, and the experiences of knowledgeable aid workers, that refute the allegation that there have been serious diversions of food. Common sense dictates that such a conclusion is off-base, because North Korea has its own harvest and the considerable gifts it receives from China to draw upon to feed its soldiers and government officials. There simply is no reason for North Korea to raid international aid shipments—and every incentive to see that this food reaches those in need.

Mr. Speaker, I don't doubt the conviction of Members of this task force. Since the United States first began to engage North Korea five years ago, there have been doubts by some in Congress about the wisdom of this initiative. But there is equal conviction by others in Congress and the Administration that engaging North Korea, an approach begun under President Reagan, is the wisest course available to us.

There is also broad support for it among U.S. military leaders, and our South Korean and Japanese allies. And there is support among Korean Americans; I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD the statement of a group of notable Korean American citizens and organizations whose views have helped to inform our policy and should be respected as we continue to refine it.

The task force's findings on North Korea's involvement in narcotics trafficking, missile proliferation, possible nuclear development in violation of the Agreed Framework, and other activities are serious and deserve our attention. It is tempting to instead focus our attention on concerns about food aid, because that is easier to do something about. But cutting off food aid—whether we do it outright, or by tightening the monitoring requirements so much that the effect is to cut off food aid—would not solve these other problems. All it would do is prevent us from saving millions of lives, and prove to North Korea's people that its government was right about America all along.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe the task force's quarrel over U.S. policy toward North Korea does not center on our efforts to feed its suffering people. At a hearing last week. Chairman GILMAN said, "no one—I repeat no one—wants to cut off food aid to North

Korea." I share his concerns that our food aid be monitored to ensure it reaches those in need, and his read of public support for a humanitarian policy that refuses to use food as a weapon—even against North Koreans.

Mr. Speaker, I can't tell you and others who would like to see it that, after this crisis passes, North Korea's people will overthrow their government. History shows that people who survive a famine sometimes do that, and sometimes do not. But I can guarantee you that Koreans—in North Korea, in South Korea, and in our own country—will remember how we respond in this time of crisis. They will remember who helped those who were suffering; and they will never forget those who found excuses to do too little to save the many who died.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to focus on the serious concerns about North Korea that this task force has highlighted; but to remember as we debate our policy toward North Korea, that—in the words of President Reagan—"a hungry child knows no politics."

Our food aid is making the difference between life and death for hundreds of thousands of children and other vulnerable people in North Korea. The private organization's aid workers, and the staff and leaders of the World Food Programme and other U.N. agencies, are doing everything they can to ensure that our food gets to those in need. We should support their work, and seize the historic opportunity that our humanitarian aid has put within our reach: to end the Cold War in this last, desperate outpost, and to secure a lasting peace on the Korean Peninsula.

KOREAN AMERICANS WEIGH IN ON U.S. POLICY TOWARD NORTH KOREA

WASHINGTON.—Korean Americans are important stakeholders in U.S. policy toward North Korea because many in our community still have families, relatives, friends and other interests in the Korean peninsula.

We believe that our voices must be considered in the formulating policy toward North Korea, and set forth positions that we believe must be an integral part of the U.S. policy.

U.S. POLICY MUST FURTHER THE PROSPECT OF LASTING PEACE WHILE AVOIDING THE POSSIBILITY OF ARMED CONFLICT

Korean Americans recognize and appreciate the long history of leadership demonstrated by the United States in tackling difficult foreign policy issues with firm commitment to peace. We first and foremost believe that any U.S. policy on North Korea must be formulated so as to encourage peace and reduce the chance of armed conflicts on the Korean peninsula. Koreans have already experienced decades of devastating losses as a result of military actions on the peninsula. We therefore cannot stand any stronger in opposition to the consideration of military action, no matter how limited in scope, as one of the viable U.S. policy options.

U.S. POLICY SHOULD SUPPORT MONITORED HUMANITARIAN AID TO NORTH KOREA FOR DISTRIBUTION TO THE FAMINE VICTIMS

As we all know, monitoring the distribution of food and medical aid in North Korea is less than satisfactory, due to the unwillingness of North Korean authority to let monitors travel freely. The lack of freedom of travel there, however, is not limited to the monitors but to all people in the country. While it is practically impossible to prove that food aid are not diverted, most documents by U.N. organization and PVOs which provide humanitarian aid report that

there is not much evidence that they are diverted. In this regard, we are concerned that the recent report by GAO exaggerates the diversion and their conclusion was based on flimsy and narrowly selected surveys and reports. No policy should be built on a study that is not comprehensive.

U.S. POLICY ON NORTH KOREA SHOULD REFLECT THE RECOMMENDATIONS BY DR. WILLIAM PERRY

Korean Americans believe that Dr. Perry's policy review and evaluation process was comprehensive, produced many beneficial results and his recommendation is fair and well balanced. Throughout the review, Dr. Perry consulted with experts, both in and out of the U.S. Government. He also exchanged views with officials from many countries with interest on the issues. As a result, the review process itself pushed the issues of North Korea as one of the high priority policy agenda of the U.S. and North East Asia. It also developed a close work relationship between the U.S. and key interested parties, particularly our important allies, South Korea and Japan.

Korean Americans believe that Dr. Perry's recommended alternative is a comprehensive and integrated approach to U.S. negotiation with the North Korea. We also believe that his recommendation provides the best choice for the U.S. Government and is consistent with the policies of other interested countries, including South Korea. We therefore recommend his recommendation for the United States to move step-by-step on a path to a comprehensive normalization of relations, including the establishment of a permanent peace in the Korean Peninsula, be given serious consideration.

"Korean American Voice on North Korea Policy" is a coalition formed by concerned Korean American individuals and organizations throughout the United States. Its members are listed on the attached page.

MEMBERS OF KAV (IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER, 10/26/99)

Mrs. Joyce Naomi Ahn; Chairman, Korean Americans for Global Action.

Ms. Mimi Hong Allen; President, Korean Cultural Foundation of Greater Miami.

Ms. Jennifer Arndt; President, Rainbow World Inc.

Mr. Young-Soo Bahk; Board of Directors, The Peace Corn Foundation.

Mr. Young D. Cha, President, League of Korean Americans.

Mr. Young Chang Chae, Vice President, Korean Literary Association of Washington Metropolitan Area.

Dr. Keum Seop Chin, Board Director, Korean American Sharing Movement-Washington Baltimore; Elder, The Korean Central Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Byung Il Cho, President, The Federation of Korean Dry-Cleaners Associations, USA.

Dr. Man Cho, Director, Korean American Sharing Movement-Washington Baltimore.

Master Soo Se Cho, President, Korean American Association of S. Florida.

Rev. Young Jin Cho, Senior Pastor, Korean United Methodist Church of Greater Washington.

Dr. Scott Cha-Choe, Chairman, Honolulu Korean Junior Chamber.

Mr. Daniel Choi, Senior Vice President, The Federation of Korean Associations, USA.

Dr. Seung Hoon Choi; Executive Director, Korean American Sharing Movement-Boston.

Dr. Dong Yui Chough; Chairman, Korean American Education Foundation.

Rev. Simon Kang H. Chung; Pastor, The Korean Central Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Myong Y. Jueh, Chairman, Korean American Political Action Committee.

Mr. Abraham Kang, Chairman, Korean American Automobile Association.

Dr. Jun Hee Kang, MD, Korean Central Presbyterian Church.

Rev. Paul (Synn Kwon) Kang; President, Cohen University, CA.

Ms. Grace Kim; Executive Secretary, Korean Americans for Global Action New York, NY.

Mr. Hong Kim; Vice President, League of Korean Americans, USA.

Mr. Pyohng Choon Kim; Chief Financial Officer, Central Missionary Fellowship, International; Elder, The Korean Central Presbyterian Church.

Wayne Kim; Elder, Korean Central Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Jong Yui Lee; President, Korean Association of Northern Virginia.

Rev. Oh Yeon Lee; Executive Director, Korean American Sharing Movement—Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA.

Mr. Sang Hoon Lee; Chairman-elect, Korean American Sharing Movement—USA; Chairman, KASM: Washington-Baltimore.

Mrs. Sook Won Lee; President, Korean American Association of State of Maryland.

Dr. Stephen H. Lee; President, The Society for Korean Root.

Rev. Won Sang Lee; Senior Pastor, The Korean Central Presbyterian Church.

Mr. John Lim, Senator, State of Oregon.

Mrs. Kim Miller, President, League of Korean Americans, USA.

Mr. Myung Kun Moon, President, Miami Korean Chamber of Commerce.

Rev. Do Hyun Paik, President, Korean Pastors Association of South Florida.

Rev. Hee Min Park, Chairman, Korean American Sharing Movement, USA, Los Angeles, CA.

Dr. Jong Ahn Park; Senior Director for Policy and Planning, Korean American Sharing Movement—USA.

Mr. Sang Kuen Park; Attorney at Law, Advocates for the Rights of Korean Americans. Dr. Chang Mook Sohn, Executive Director, Office of the Forecasting Council, State of Washington.

Rev. Kyung Sup Shin; President, WDCT Radio, Virginia.

Mr. Paul Shin; Senator, State of Washington.

Mr. Peter Hyun Shin, Chairman, League of Korean Americans, USA.

Rev. Sung John Shin; Chairman, Korean American Sharing Movement—Los Angeles.

Mr. Jie Kyung Song, President, Korean American Association of Washington Metropolitan Area.

Mr. Shin Hern Song, Vice Chairman, Korean American Education Foundation.

Mr. Sang Y. Whang, Chairman, Korean American Community Relations Council.

Ms. Ilyon Woo; Korean Americans for Global Action, New York, NY.

Mr. Ki Ho Yi; President, Royal Food Inc.

Mr. Hee Soon Yim; Hana News; Mr. Howard Pokhyong Yu; President, Yu Farm, Earlimart, California.

SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD RECOMMEND ACTIONS FOR RELIEVING VICTIMS OF HURRICANE FLOYD

SPEECH OF

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman

from North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR, and commend all the Members from the 11 States, which continue to suffer the affects of Hurricane Floyd, who have come together to bring H. Res. 349 to the floor. This measure represents the tragedy that many of us have experienced in our congressional districts; and reflects the dismay of the thousands of suffering individuals, families, businesses and communities, who have been working to rebuild their communities for the past 6 weeks without sufficient Federal aid.

Throughout my home State of New York, the devastating affects of Hurricane Floyd are continuing to be felt. Homes have been flooded, businesses shut down, and the agricultural community, which has been devastated by high winds and drought over three of the past 4 years, is once again struggling to rebound. Numerous municipalities throughout Orange, Rockland and Westchester counties have sustained significant infrastructure damage and are looking to the Federal Government to provide them with assistance.

Accordingly, we have introduced H. Res. 349, to express the sense of the House that the President should immediately recommend to Congress actions, including appropriations offsets, to provide relief and assistance to victims of Hurricane Floyd.

The citizens, who have come together to rebuild their broken communities, deserve our aid. Hurricane Floyd was one of the worst natural disasters in American history. However, we have placed the burden of recovery on those who have suffered the most.

Accordingly, we stand today to send a message to the President and the people that we must address this tragedy and provide adequately for our injured homes.

TRIBUTE TO KEN BECK

HON. SCOTT MCINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the career of one of Colorado's most dedicated civic leaders, Ken Beck. In doing so, I would like to honor an individual who, for so many years, has exemplified the notion of public service and civic duty. Soon he will retire from the Bayfield School District Board of Education and it is clear that his leadership on the School Board will be greatly missed and difficult to replace.

While on the board, Ken has had a solid focus on the basics of education: reading, writing, and arithmetic. He felt these were the fundamental aspects of education. The financial status of the school district also improved greatly as the result of his leadership. Also, he has seen to the well being of the faculty. No one has lost their job due to a reduction in force or mismanagement.

Beyond his work on the school board, Ken has put in countless hours in an array of other community activities, including the Boy Scouts of America, Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and the La Plata 4-H.

While his personal accomplishments are many, none are more weighty than the remarkable legacy he has in his family. Together with his wife, Wendy, who is equally distinguished in her reputation, they have five children: Kali, Beau, Sara, Lacy, and Shay. These

fine young people will undoubtedly carry on their father's tradition of hard work and dedication well into the future.

Mr. Speaker, very few people serve as selflessly as did Ken Beck. His career embodied so many civic ideals. He is a model that each of us should emulate.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I say thank you to Ken Beck on behalf of the people of western Colorado and wish him well in his much deserved retirement.

CONGRATULATING COMMUNITY
MAGNET SCHOOL ON RECEIVING
THE NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON
SCHOOLS AWARD

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my heartfelt congratulations to the Community Magnet School on receiving the National Blue Ribbon Schools Award from the United States Department of Education.

Community Magnet School is one of only 226 schools in the nation, and the only school in Los Angeles, to have received this prestigious award in 1999. The award recognizes Community Magnet Schools' exemplary work in student achievement, community and parent involvement, and ongoing teacher and staff training. The school provides its students with a variety of innovative educational experiences, including the Caring Adults Teaching Children How (CATCH) one-on-one academic mentoring program and the Getty-Annenberg Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge, an integrated arts curriculum.

The 32nd Congressional District of California is fortunate to be home to such an outstanding institution. Community Magnet School's emphasis on the study of the humanities and the social sciences through a multicultural perspective will enrich the lives of its students and our community for years to come. I commend Community Magnet School for being a recipient of the National Blue Ribbon Schools Award and wish them continued success.

RECOGNIZING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHARTERING OF
UAW LOCAL #599 LOCATED IN
FLINT, MICHIGAN

HON. DEBBIE STABENOW

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the members of United Auto Workers (UAW) Local #599, located in Flint, Michigan, on the 60th Anniversary of its charter. I would like to commend the 23 members of the local that received the 19th annual Walter P. Reuther Award for Distinguished Service. I will list the recipients at the end of my remarks.

Local #599 was chartered on January 10, 1939, and has been an integral part of the great accomplishments of the labor movement during this century. It is important to remem-

ber that not long ago in this country, laborers, including children, toiled in squalid factory conditions for pitiful wages. Within a generation, dramatic strides were made to greatly improve the quality of life of workers. With continued effort, organized labor has secured numerous important rights, including safe workplaces, decent wages, health and life insurance, worker's and unemployment compensation, and continuing education and training. This progress continues to this day, as the UAW recently completed a new round of contract negotiations with the big three automakers. The labor movement in the United States, led by Local #599, has been at the forefront of progress in the area of civil and human rights, representing one of the great social advances in history.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to pay tribute to the great contributions that the members of Local #599 have made to Michigan and the country, and I ask my colleagues to do the same. I would specifically like to acknowledge the leadership of Local President Arthur McGee, and recognize the recipients of the Walter P. Reuther Distinguished Service Award. This award is one of two sanctioned by the International Union UAW, and is given for exceptional meritorious service by UAW members and community leaders. The 19th Annual Walter P. Reuther Award Recipients are: Robert Aidif, David Aiken, Dennis Carl, Russell W. Cook, Harvey "Whitey" DeGroot, Patrick Dolan, Larry Farlin, Maurice "Mo" Felling, Ted Henderson, James Yaklin, Ken Mead, Don Wilson, Frank Molina, Shirley Prater, Gene Ridley, John D. Rogers, Dale Scanlon, G. Jean Garza-Smith, Nick Vuckovich, Jerry J. Ward, Greg Wheeler, Tom Worden, and Dale Bingley. I again congratulate these members for their service to the UAW, their communities and their country. It is an honor to represent the members of UAW Local #599 in the United States Congress.

FEMA AND CIVIL DEFENSE
MONUMENT ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1999

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, as we have seen in vivid detail in just the last month, Mother Nature can and does visit calamity upon us violently and with brief notice. Hurricane Floyd, with all its might and fury, is proof once again how powerless we are against the forces of nature.

The danger comes not just from hurricanes. In the West and South, the constant threat of wildfires from summer's heat often turns the countryside into a tinderbox. In the South and Midwest, steamy afternoons bring forth devastating tornadoes as this Spring's events in Oklahoma and Kansas have shown us.

When these disasters befall us, we must thank God there are dedicated men and women who answer the call, our nation's emergency management professionals. These dedicated individuals respond day or night in any conditions to protect the lives of their fellow citizens at a moment's notice, many of whom are volunteers. In addition to acts of nature, these brave men and women help pro-

tect us against manmade threats of terrorism for which we have become all too aware in recent years.

To honor these brave people Mr. BARTLETT and I introduced H.R. 348. This legislation authorizes the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to place a monument honoring this nation's emergency management and civil defense workers on the grounds of the National Emergency Training Center (NETC) in Emmitsburg, Maryland. The monument has been offered as a gift by the privately-funded, non-profit National Civil Defense Monument Commission to honor their comrades who have devoted their lives and careers to Emergency Management and Civil Defense.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. John Bex, a former Regional Director of the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, of Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Monument Commission, Alexander Atzert of Gaithersburg, Maryland and all members of National Civil Defense Monument Commission for their work and dedication on behalf of this legislation and I am pleased to support its passage.

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLIE WALLER

HON. PAUL RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my constituents, Charlie Waller. As we near Veterans Day, I feel it is appropriate to point out the achievements of one of our fine servicemen—achievements made while dealing with a unique disability.

You see, Charlie may be the most highly decorated man to serve in the U.S. Armed Forces with the sight of only one eye.

Charlie entered the U.S. Army (Air Corps) as a desk clerk. He was subsequently sent overseas first to Algeria and then to several locations in Europe. He served in the Communications Section of the 725th Squadron, 451st Bomber Group.

While there, it was noted by several of the soldiers in his unit that he was an excellent soldier. He also received several awards, including 10 battle stars, 2 presidential unit citation awards, an Army good Conduct medal, An American Campaign Medal, The European-African Middle Eastern Campaign Medal, 2 Oak Leaf Clusters, & the WWII victory Medal. This information has been verified by the National Personnel Records Center. Eventually, his commanding officers realized that he was not eligible to serve in a combat unit and he was promptly sent back to the states.

In 1997-98, Representative Mark Neumann assisted Charlie in having his records officially changed to reflect that he only had his limited vision of one eye prior to entering the service.

Again, Charlie overcame his disability and served his country with courage and honor. It is for his dedication and achievements that I honor him today.

TRIBUTE TO HITCHINER
MANUFACTURING COMPANY, INC.

HON. CHARLES F. BASS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to recognize Hitchiner Manufacturing Company, Inc., of Milford, New Hampshire. Hitchiner Manufacturing tomorrow will receive the Employer Support Freedom Award. This award is granted annually to those select companies that distinguish themselves in support of the National Guard and Reserve. Hitchiner Manufacturing will be one of only five companies to be so recognized this year, and will represent the Northeast Region's twelve states including Washington, DC.

Earlier this year, the New Hampshire Committee for the Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve Committee submitted Hitchiner Manufacturing as the state's nominee for this award. Hitchiner Manufacturing is a major New Hampshire-based manufacturing firm. It has more than 1200 employees at three New Hampshire plants and employs 22 members of the National Guard and Reserve. It has always encouraged its employees to volunteer their time to support local and civic organizations, and was the 1998 New Hampshire ESGR Pro Patria Award winner.

For almost 50 years, Hitchiner Manufacturing has had employee policies that far exceed the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act. It has extended salary and benefit packages during times of national crisis as well as world conflicts, such as Desert Storm, Somalia, Deny Flight and Bosnia. In fact, it has a specific policy to compensate employees for the difference between an employee's civilian and military pay while performing his or her military training. They have also provided professional counseling to soldiers who are going through difficult times.

But the company's good work goes beyond its own employees. At the Annual New Hampshire ESGR Awards luncheon held in January of this year, the Company President and CEO, Mr. John Morison, III, agreed to video tape his comments so that the New Hampshire ESGR Committee could share his thoughts and perspectives with other employers across the state. His presentation is now part of a major statewide Chamber of Commerce initiative. New Hampshire Adjutant General Major General John Blair, along with several key military leaders, are currently reaching out to Chambers of Commerce and other civic organizations across the state through a speakers program. "The Value of Employing Citizen Soldiers in the Workplace". It is clear that Hitchiner Manufacturing has set the pace for other New Hampshire-based companies to follow.

In closing, I wish again to commend Hitchiner Manufacturing President and CEO John Morison and all the company's employees on this proud day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably delayed during rollcall vote 504 on October 14, 1999. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

In addition, I was unavoidably delayed on November 1, 1999 during rollcall votes 550, 551, and 552. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall votes 550 and 551 and "no" on rollcall vote 552.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE WALTER
PAYTON

HON. EARL F. HILLIARD

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with great sadness to recognize the loss of one of this country's greatest athletes—Mr. Walter Payton. As a former football player, I knew from the moment that he touched the field that he would dominate the game and become one of the great heroes of the league. There was a "sweetness," as his nickname suggests, about him that let you know that he was in total control, and would have you wrestling to overpower him until the bitter end. His life is a testament to the American Dream, and embodies the struggles of a soldier at war against himself and his fellow man. Upon entering the league he was told he wouldn't be successful because of his small build, but through a rigorous workout and perseverance he became the best running back ever in the NFL. No other football player since him has brought such style and grace to a game defined by muscles and egos. In a society that is constantly coronating heroes and idols for our youth, I lift up Walter Payton as the epitome of valor, the symbol of truth, and the embodiment of what it means to be an American.

Martin Luther King once challenged us to do our jobs so well that all the hosts of heaven and earth will pause to say, here lived a great man who did his job well. This week, as we continue to reflect upon his career and look to the future, I ask that those of us on earth pause in tribute to a man who not only played football well, but served his people, his family and his country well. May we keep his family in our prayers and his legacy in our hearts.

RECOGNIZING DUVAL COUNTY
VETERANS SERVICE OFFICER J.
O. BARRERA FOR OUTSTANDING
SERVICE

HON. CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Duval County Veterans Service Officer Jose Oscar Barrera. It is with great appreciation that I recognize Mr. Barrera for his many years of dedicated service to the citizens of Duval County.

J.O. Barrera was born and raised in San Diego, TX. After graduating from high school, on November 18, 1942, Mr. Barrera was called to military service in the United States. Mr. Barrera returned to live in San Diego in December 1945. He accepted a job with Duval County in 1946 in the Tax Collector's Office. On February 1, 1955, he was appointed Duval County Veterans Service Officer, a position he continues to hold to this day.

During his tenure as Duval County Veterans Service Officer, Mr. Barrera received recognition for his outstanding service several times. In 1973, he was offered the position of Service Officer for the State Veterans Affairs Commission of Texas in San Antonio. Upon serious consideration of the offer, he declined, preferring to remain in his home town where he could continue to provide needed assistance to the veterans he knew best.

At the 32d annual meeting of the Texas County Service Officers Association held in Dallas in 1979, the membership honored Mr. Barrera with one of the highest awards for veterans service. He was named Outstanding Veterans County Service Officer for the 60-county San Antonio Region. On February 26, 1999, he was presented with AMVETS National Commander's Appreciation Certificate from the AMVETS/American Veterans Organization Office in Houston for his sincere dedication in assisting veterans and their dependents.

At the 52d annual Statewide Conference for Veterans Service Officers held September 28 through October 1, 1999, in Dallas, Mr. Barrera was awarded two certificates for his years of service. State Representative Ignacio Salinas, Jr. awarded Mr. Barrera a certificate recognizing his 44 years of service as Veterans Service Officer for Duval County. He was also awarded a certificate of excellence in service to the veterans of Duval County by State Senator Judith Zaferini.

Mr. Barrera exemplifies what every county should have, a competent Veterans Service Officer who dedicates his life to the veterans of his county. Mr. J.O. Barrera continues to proudly serve the veterans and their dependents in Duval County, TX. It is most appropriate to honor his work, dedication, and commitment to public service.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE FLETCHER
HENDERSON, JR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 3, 1999

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, Fletcher Henderson, Jr. is remembered as one of the great figures in jazz history.

Born in 1898, in the southwest Georgia community of Cuthbert, he pioneered as an arranger, composer and leader of an acclaimed band featuring the likes of Louis Armstrong, Coleman Hawkins and Lester Young.

He has been gone since 1952, but his memory is kept alive by the people of Cuthbert and Randolph County who are restoring the street and home where he was born and raised and who annually stage a jazz festival in his name, which was held for a full week in late October featuring the Fort Benning U.S. Army and Andrew College jazz

bands, gospel music, and a variety of activities. Visionary citizenship made all this possible, led by the planning committee of Chairman Mary Kearney, Mayor Willie Martin,

Henry Cook, Minnie Lewis, Wesley Shorter, and Thelma Walker.

This is just a start. They are planning even bigger things as a part of this community's

tribute to a great American and the art form he helped shape.

Congratulations, Cuthbert.

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 Thursday, November 4, 1999 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

NOVEMBER 5

10 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings on the nomination of Gregory A. Baer, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; and the nomination of Susan M. Wachter, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-538

11 a.m.
Foreign Relations
International Economic Policy, Export and Trade Promotion Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine issues relating to the International Monetary Fund, focusing on lessons learned from the Asian financial crisis.

SD-419

NOVEMBER 8

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on mergers in the telecommunications industry.

SR-253

2 p.m.

Aging

To hold hearings to examine challenges facing an aging baby boom generation.
SH-216

NOVEMBER 9

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs
Investigations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the vulnerabilities of United States private banks to money laundering.

SD-628

NOVEMBER 10

10 a.m.

Governmental Affairs
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold joint hearings on federal contracting and labor policy, focusing on the Administration's change in procurement regulations.

SD-628

1 p.m.

Governmental Affairs
Investigations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the vulnerabilities of United States private banks to money laundering.

SD-628

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S13729–S13869

Measures Introduced: Five bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1846–1850, S. Res. 218–219, and S. Con. Res. 68. **Page S13798**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 1477, to withhold voluntary proportional assistance for programs and projects of the International Atomic Energy Agency relating to the development and completion of the Bushehr nuclear power plant in Iran.

H.R. 1794, concerning the participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization (WHO).

S. Res. 208, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States policy toward the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union, in light of the Alliance's April 1999 Washington Summit and the European Union's June 1999 Cologne Summit.

S. Res. 209, expressing concern over interference with freedom of the press and the independence of judicial and electoral institutions in Peru.

S. 923, to promote full equality at the United Nations for Israel.

S. Con. Res. 30, recognizing the sacrifice and dedication of members of America's non-governmental organizations and private volunteer organizations throughout their history and specifically in answer to their courageous response to recent disasters in Central America and Kosovo.

S. Con. Res. 68, expressing the sense of Congress on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of historic events in Central and Eastern Europe, particularly the Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, and reaffirming the bonds of friendship and cooperation between the United States and the Czech and Slovak Republics. **Page S13795**

Measures Passed:

African Growth and Opportunity Act: By 76 yeas to 19 nays (Vote No. 353), Senate passed H.R. 434, to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Sahara Africa, expand trade benefits to the countries in the Caribbean Basin, renew the generalized system of preferences, and reauthorize the trade adjustment assistance programs, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S13729–82

Adopted:

Roth Amendment No. 2505 (to Amendment No. 2325), to authorize the extension of permanent normal trade relations to Albania and Kyrgyzstan.

Pages S13759–62, S13776

Subsequently, the amendment was modified.

Page S13776

Conrad/Grassley Modified Amendment No. 2360 (to Amendment No. 2325), to establish trade negotiating objectives for the United States for the next round of World Trade Organization negotiations that enhance the competitiveness of United States agriculture, spur economic growth, increase farm income, and produce full employment in the United States agricultural sector. **Pages S13729–33, S13770–71**

By a unanimous vote of 96 yeas (Vote No. 351), Harkin Amendment No. 2495 (to Amendment No. 2325), to deny benefits under the legislation to any country that does not comply with the Convention for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor.

Pages S13764–65

Thurmond Amendment No. 2410 (to Amendment No. 2325), to provide expedited trade adjustment assistance for certain textile and apparel workers. **Page S13775**

Nickles Amendment No. 2480 (to Amendment No. 2325), to provide a waiver of a section 901(j) denial of foreign tax credit in the national interest of the United States, and to expand trade and investment opportunities for United States companies and workers. **Page S13776**

Dorgan Amendment No. 2402 (to Amendment No. 2325), to clarify the acts, policies, and practices that are considered unreasonable for purposes of section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Pages S13753–54, S13776

Lott (for Roth/Moynihan) Amendment No. 2325, in the nature of a substitute.

Pages S13729–76

Rejected:

Wellstone Amendment No. 2487 (to Amendment No. 2325), to condition trade benefits for Caribbean countries on compliance with internationally recognized labor rights. (By 66 yeas to 31 nays (Vote No. 349), Senate tabled the amendment.)

Pages S13734–42, S13752–53, S13755–59, S13762–63

Specter Modified Amendment No. 2347 (to Amendment No. 2325), to provide for a private right of action in the case of injury from the importation of certain dumped and subsidized merchandise. (By 54 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 350), Senate tabled the amendment.)

Pages S13743–52, S13763

Feingold Modified Amendment No. 2427 (to Amendment No. 2325), to provide expanded trade benefits to countries in sub-Saharan Africa. (By 66 yeas to 29 nays (Vote No. 352), Senate tabled the amendment.)

Pages S13771–74, S13776

Withdrawn:

Landrieu Amendment No. 2430 (to Amendment No. 2325), to limit preferential tariff treatment to countries with a gross national product that does not extend 5 times the average gross national product of all eligible sub-Saharan African countries.

Pages S13754–55, S13763–64

During consideration of the bill today, Senate also took the following action:

Feingold Amendment No. 2409 (to Amendment No. 2325), to establish priorities for providing development assistance, was ruled out of order by the Chair on a point of order, and the amendment thus fell.

Pages S13742–43

Conrad/Grassley Amendment No. 2359 (to Amendment No. 2325), to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to provide trade adjustment assistance to farmers and fishermen, adopted on November 2, 1999, was subsequently modified.

Pages S13765–70

Pending motion to close further debate on the bill was vitiated.

Page S13776

Senate insisted on its amendment, requested a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair was authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate: Senators Roth, Grassley, Lott, Helms, Moynihan, Baucus, and Biden.

Page S13781

Healthcare Research and Quality Act: Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of S. 580, to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the Agency for Healthcare Pol-

icy and Research, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:

Pages S13843–45

Gramm (for Frist/Jeffords/Kennedy) Amendment No. 2506, in the nature of a substitute.

Pages S13843–45

Youth Drug and Mental Services Act: Senate passed S. 976, to amend title V of the Public Health Service Act to focus the authority of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration on community-based services children and adolescents, to enhance flexibility and accountability, to establish programs for youth treatment, and to respond to crises, especially those related to children and violence, after agreeing to a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the following amendment proposed thereto:

Pages S13845–61

Gramm (for Frist) Amendment No. 2507, to provide a grant program for strengthening families and to modify other provisions, and to make various technical corrections.

Pages S13855–61

Geneva Conventions 50th Anniversary: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of 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 the resolution was then agreed to.

Page S13861

Federal Erroneous Retirement Coverage Corrections Act: Senate passed S. 1232, to provide for the correction of retirement coverage errors under chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:

Pages S13861–67

Gramm (for Cochran/Akaka) Amendment No. 2508, in the nature of a substitute.

Page S13861

Position of Chief Agricultural Negotiator: Committee on Finance was discharged from further consideration of S. 185, to establish a Chief Agricultural Negotiator in the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and the bill was then passed.

Page S13867

Export Apple Act: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 609, to amend the Export Apple and Pear Act to limit the applicability of the Act to apples, and the bill was then passed, clearing the measure for the President.

Page S13867

OPIC Authorization: Senate passed S. 688, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to reauthorize the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

Page S13867

Honoring Walter Jerry Payton: Senate agreed to S. Res. 219, recognizing and honoring Walter Jerry

Payton and expressing the condolences of the Senate to his family on his death. **Pages S13867-68**

District of Columbia Appropriations: Senate passed H.R. 3194, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S13868**

Gramm (for Hutchison) Amendment No. 2509, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S13868**

Senate insisted on its amendment, requested a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair was authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate: Senators Hutchison, Domenici, Stevens, Durbin, and Byrd. **Page S13868**

Financial Services Modernization Conference Report: Senate began consideration of the conference report on S. 900, to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, and other financial service providers. **Pages S13783-91**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the conference report on Thursday, November 4, 1999. **Page S13868**

Executive Reports of Committees: Senate received the following executive reports of a committee:

Report to accompany the Tax Convention with Estonia (Treaty Doc. 105-55) (Exec. Rept. No. 106-3) **Page S13795**

Report to accompany the Tax Convention with Lithuania (Treaty Doc. 105-56) (Exec. Rept. No. 106-4) **Pages S13795-96**

Report to accompany the Tax Convention with Latvia (Treaty Doc. 105-57) (Exec. Rept. No. 106-5) **Page S13796**

Report to accompany the Tax Convention with Venezuela (Treaty Doc. 106-3) (Exec. Rept. No. 106-6) **Page S13796**

Report to accompany the Tax Convention with Slovenia (Treaty Doc. 106-9) (Exec. Rept. No. 106-7) **Page S13796**

Report to accompany the Tax Convention with Italy (Treaty Doc. 106-11) (Exec. Rept. No. 106-8) **Pages S13796-97**

Report to accompany the Tax Convention with Denmark (Treaty Doc. 106-12) (Exec. Rept. No. 106-9) **Page S13797**

Report to accompany the Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with Germany (Treaty Doc. 106-13) (Exec. Rept. No. 106-10) **Page S13797**

Report to accompany the Amending Convention with Ireland (Treaty Doc. 106-15) (Exec. Rept. No. 106-11) **Page S13797**

Report to accompany the Convention (No. 182) for Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor (Treaty Doc. 106-5) (Exec. Rept. No. 106-12) **Page S13797**

Report to accompany the Extradition Treaty with the Republic of Korea (Treaty Doc. 106-2) (Exec. Rept. No. 106-13) **Pages S13797-98**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting a report entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Between the United States of America and Australia Concerning Technology for the Separation of Isotopes of Uranium by Laser Excitation"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (PM-70). **Pages S13793-94**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Irwin Belk, of North Carolina, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Fifty-fourth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Carol Moseley-Braun, of Illinois, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to Samoa.

Earl Anthony Wayne, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Economic and Business Affairs).

Revius O. Ortique, Jr., of Louisiana, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Fifty-fourth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Bobby L. Roberts, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for a term expiring July 19, 2003.

Michael G. Rossmann, of Indiana, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation for a term expiring May 10, 2006.

Daniel Simberloff, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation for a term expiring May 10, 2006.

Routine lists in the Army, Foreign Service, Marine Corps, Navy. **Pages S13868-69**

Messages From the President: **Pages S13793-94**

Messages From the House: **Pages S13794-95**

Measures Placed on Calendar: **Page S13795**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S13795-98**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S13798-S13802**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S13802-04**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S13805-31**

Authority for Committees: **Pages S13831-32**

Additional Statements:

Pages S13832–37

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—353)

Pages S13763, S13765, S13776, S13781

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 8:11 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, November 4, 1999. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S13868.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

OPERATION ALLIED FORCE

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded hearings on the lessons learned from the military operations conducted as part of Operation Allied Force, and associated relief operations, with respect to Kosovo, after receiving testimony from Gen. Klaus Naumann (Ret.), Bundeswehr (German Army), former Chairman of the NATO Military Committee.

HABITAT CONSERVATION PLANS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Drinking Water concluded hearing to examine solutions to the policy concerns with respect to Habitat Conservation Plans, after receiving testimony from Jamie Rappaport Clark, Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Don Knowles, Director, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; Jimmy S. Christenson, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Madison; David Donnelly, Southern Nevada Water Authority, Las Vegas; Maureen S. Frisch, Simpson Investment Company, Seattle, Washington, on behalf of the Foundation for Habitat Conservation and Coalition for Habitat Conservation; Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League, Los Angeles, California; James Riley, Intermountain Forest Association, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; and Michael J. Bean, Environmental Defense Fund, Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 923, to promote full equality at the United Nations for Israel;

S. 1453, to facilitate relief efforts and a comprehensive solution to the war in Sudan, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. Res. 208, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States policy toward the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union,

in light of the Alliance's April 1999 Washington Summit and the European Union's June 1999 Cologne Summit;

S. Res. 209, expressing concern over interference with freedom of the press and the independence of judicial and electoral institutions in Peru;

S. Res. 217, relating to the freedom of belief, expression, and association in the People's Republic of China, with an amendment;

An original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68), expressing the sense of the Congress on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the historic events in Central and Eastern Europe, particularly in the Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, and reaffirming the bonds of friendship and cooperation between the United States and the Czech and Slovak Republics;

S. Con. Res. 30, recognizing the sacrifice and dedication of members of America's non-governmental organizations and private volunteer organizations throughout their history and specifically in answer to their courageous response to recent disasters in Central America and Kosovo;

H.R. 1477, to withhold voluntary proportional assistance for programs and projects of the International Atomic Energy Agency relating to the development and completion of the Bushehr nuclear power plant in Iran;

H.R. 1794, concerning the participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization (WHO);

Convention Between the United States of America and the Republic of Estonia for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on January 15, 1998 (Treaty Doc. 105–55), with 1 declaration and 1 proviso;

Convention Between the United States of America and the Republic of Lithuania for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on January 15, 1998 (Treaty Doc. 105–56), with 1 declaration and 1 proviso;

Convention Between the United States of America and the Republic of Latvia for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on January 15, 1998 (Treaty Doc. 105–57), with 1 declaration and 1 proviso;

Convention Between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Ljubljana on June 21, 1999 (Treaty Doc. 106–9), with 1 reservation, 1 understanding, 1 declaration and 1 proviso;

Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the

Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, together with a Protocol, signed at Caracas on January 25, 1999 (Treaty Doc. 106-3), with 2 understandings, 2 declarations and 1 proviso;

Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Italian Republic for the Avoidance of Double Taxation with Respect to Taxes on Income and the Prevention of Fraud or Fiscal Evasion, signed at Washington on August 25, 1999, together with a Protocol (Treaty Doc. 106-11), with 1 reservation, 1 understanding, 1 declaration and 1 proviso;

Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on August 19, 1999, together with a Protocol (Treaty Doc. 106-12), with 1 declaration and 1 proviso;

Protocol Amending the Convention Between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany for the Avoidance of Double Taxation with Respect to Taxes on Estates, Inheritances, and Gifts signed at Bonn on December 3, 1980, signed at Washington, December 14, 1998 (Treaty Doc. 106-13), with 1 declaration and 1 proviso;

Convention Amending the Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Ireland for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital Gains signed at Dublin on July 28, 1997 (Treaty Doc. 106-15), with 1 declaration and 1 proviso;

The Extradition Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea, signed at Washington on June 9, 1998 (Treaty Doc. 106-2), with 2 understandings, 1 declaration and 1 proviso;

Convention (No. 182) Concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor, adopted by the International Labor Conference at the 87th Session in Geneva on June 17, 1999 (Treaty Doc. 106-5), with 2 understandings, 1 declaration and 1 proviso; and

The nominations of Gary L. Ackerman, of New York, to be a Representative of the United States of America to Fifty-fourth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, William B. Bader, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, James D. Bindenagel, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during tenure of service as Special Envoy and Representative of the Secretary of State for Holocaust Issues, Avis Thayer Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State for Arms Control, Joseph

R. Crapa, of Virginia, to be Assistant Administrator for Legislative and Public Affairs of the United States Agency for International Development, James B. Cunningham, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador, and to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during his tenure of service as Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, Craig Gordon Dunkerley, of Massachusetts, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of Service as Special Envoy for Conventional Forces in Europe, Robert J. Einhorn, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Non-proliferation, Harriet L. Elam, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Senegal, Anthony Stephen Harrington, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Federative Republic of Brazil, Donald Stuart Hays, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, with the rank of Ambassador, and to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for UN Management and Reform, Martin S. Indyk, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to Israel, Gregory Lee Johnson, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Swaziland, Willene A. Johnson, of New York, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank, David H. Kaeuper, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Congo, Peter T. King, of New York, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Fifty-fourth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Jimmy J. Kolker, of Missouri, to be Ambassador to Burkina Faso, John E. Lange, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Botswana, Alan Phillip Larson, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary of State for Economic, Business and Agricultural Affairs, Delano Eugene Lewis, Sr., of New Mexico, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa, Charles Taylor Manatt, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, Joseph W. Prueher, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of China, Michael Edward Ranneberger, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mali, J. Stapleton Roy, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research, Samuel A. Rubino, of New Hampshire, for appointment as Foreign Service Officer of Class One, Consular Officer and Secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America, Christopher

L. Stillman, of Connecticut, for appointment as Foreign Service Officer of Class Two, Consular Officer and Secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America, Lawrence H. Summers, of Maryland, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund, United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, United States Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank, United States Governor of the African Development Bank, United States Governor of the Asian Development Bank, United States Governor of the African Development Fund, and United States Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Edward S. Walker, Jr., of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, Norman A. Wulf, of Virginia, to be a Special Representative of the President, with the rank of Ambassador, Mary Carlin Yates, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Burundi, and certain Foreign Service Officer Promotion lists.

Also, committee began markup of S. 1463, to establish a program to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries, but did not complete action thereon, and recessed subject to call.

PROMOTING U.S. INTERESTS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on International Operations held hearings on issues relating to promoting United States national interests at the United Nations, receiving testimony from Richard C. Holbrooke, United States Representative to the United Nations.

Hearings recessed subject to call.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1198, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for a report by the General Accounting Office to Congress on agency regulatory actions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1707, to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) to provide that certain designated Federal entities shall be establishments under such Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1516, to amend title III of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11331 et seq.) to reauthorize the Federal Emergency Management Food and Shelter Program;

An original bill, to amend the Federal Report Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-66; 109 Stat. 734);

S. 1503, to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Office of Government Ethics through fiscal year 2003;

H.R. 915, to authorize a cost of living adjustment in the pay of administrative law judges;

S. 1295, to designate the United States Post Office located at 3813 Main Street in East Chicago, Indiana, as the "Lance Corporal Harold Gomez Post Office";

H.R. 100, to establish designations for three United States Postal Service buildings in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the "Roxanne H. Jones Post Office Building", the "Freeman Hankins Post Office Building", and the "Max Weiner Post Office Building";

H.R. 197, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 410 North 6th Street in Garden City, Kansas, as the "Clifford R. Hope Post Office";

H.R. 1191, to designate four facilities of the United States Postal Service in Chicago, Illinois, the "Cardiss Collins Post Office Building", the "Otis Grant Collins Post Office Building", the "Mary Alice (Ma) Henry Post Office Building" and the "Robert LeFlore, Jr. Post Office Building";

H.R. 1251, to designate the United States Postal Service building located at 8850 South 700 East, Sandy, Utah, as the "Noal Cushing Bateman Post Office Building";

H.R. 1327, to designate the United States Postal Service building located at 34480 Highway 101 South in Cloverdale, Oregon, as the "Maurine B. Neuberger United States Post Office";

H.R. 1377, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 13234 South Baltimore Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, as the "John J. Buchanan Post Office Building", with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of LeGree Sylvia Daniels, of Pennsylvania, and John F. Walsh, of Connecticut, each to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, and Sally Katzen, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director for Management, and Joshua Gotbaum, of New York, to be Controller, Office of Federal Financial Management, both of the Office of Management and Budget.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1114, to amend the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 to establish a more cooperative and effective method for rulemaking that takes into

account the special needs and concerns of smaller miners;

S. 1809, to improve service systems for individuals with developmental disabilities, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Amy Achor, of Texas, to be a Member of the Board of Corporation for National and Community Service, Charles Richard Barnes, of Georgia, to be Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation, Michael Cohen, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of Education for Elementary and Secondary Education, A. Lee Fritschler, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary of Education for Postsecondary Education, Irasema Garza, of Maryland, to be Director, Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, Stephen Hadley, of the District of Columbia, and

Zalmay Khalilzad, of Maryland, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace, T. Michael Kerr, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, Paul Steven Miller, of California, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Anthony Musick, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, and Linda Aaker, of Texas, Edward Ayers, of Virginia, Ira Berlin, of the District of Columbia, Pedro Castillo, of California, Evelyn Edson, of Virginia, Peggy Prenshaw, of Louisiana, and Theodore Striggles, of New York, each to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 11 public bills, H.R. 3206–3216; and 2 resolutions, H.J. Res. 75 and H. Res. 357, were introduced.

Pages H11480–81

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2634, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to registration requirements for practitioners who dispense narcotic drugs in schedule IV or V for maintenance treatment or detoxification treatment, amended (H. Rept. 106–441, Pt. 1);

H. Res. 356, waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (H. Rept. 106–442);

H. Res. 358, providing for consideration of making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000 (H. Rept. 106–443);

H. Res. 359, providing for consideration of H.R. 3196, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000 (H. Rept. 106–444); and

H. Res. 360, providing that the House disagrees to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3194, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and agrees to a conference (H. Rept. 106–445).

Page H11480

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative LaTourette to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H11375

Journal Vote: Agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of Tuesday, November 2, by a ye and nay vote of 336 yeas to 59 nays with 2 voting "present", Roll No. 557.

Pages H11375, H11379–80

Motion to Instruct—Quality Care for the Uninsured Act: The House agreed to the Dingell motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2990, Quality Care for the Uninsured Act of 1999, to insist on the provisions of the bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act of 1999 and to insist that such provisions be paid for by a ye and nay vote of 257 yeas to 167 nays, Roll No. 558.

Pages H11380–90

The Speaker appointed conferees from the Committee on Commerce: Chairman Bliley and Representatives Bilirakis, Shadegg, Dingell, and Pallone. From the Committee on Ways and Means: Chairman Archer and Representatives, Thomas, Johnson of Connecticut, Rangel, and Stark provided, that Representative McCrery is appointed in lieu of Representative Johnson of Connecticut for consideration of title XIV of the House bill and sections 102, 111(b) and 304 and title II of the Senate amendment. From the Committee on Education and the Workforce: Representatives Boehner, Talent, Fletcher, Clay, and Andrews. From the Committee on Government Reform for consideration of section 503 of the Senate amendment: Chairman Burton and

Representatives Scarborough, and Waxman. Appointed as additional conferees: Representatives Goss and Berry.

Page H11395

Questions of Privilege: Pursuant to Rule IX, Representatives Doyle and Klink announced their intentions to present questions of the privileges of the House in the form of resolutions that call on the President to abstain from renegotiating international agreements governing antidumping and countervailing measures. The forms of these resolutions appear on pages H11390–91.

County Schools Funding Revitalization Act: The House passed H.R. 2389, to restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to States and counties containing National Forest System lands and public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management for use by the counties for the benefit of public schools and roads by a recorded vote of 274 ayes to 153 noes, Roll No. 560.

Pages H11395–H11420

Agreed to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order by the rule.

Page H11419

Agreed to the George Miller of California amendment that clarifies that the approved projects shall be in compliance with the Davis-Bacon Act.

Page H11409

Rejected the Udall of Colorado amendment that sought to give each eligible county the option of using 20 percent of its distribution for community based projects rather than to require it by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 559.

Pages H11409–19

The Clerk was authorized in the engrossment of the bill to correct section numbers, punctuation, cross references, and to make other necessary technical and conforming changes to reflect the actions of the House.

Page H11420

H. Res. 352, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill was agreed to by voice vote. Pursuant to the rule, amendments in H. Rept. 106–437 were considered as adopted.

Pages H11391–95

Providing for Suspensions: The House agreed to H. Res. 353, providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules by a yeas and nays vote of 222 yeas to 200 nays with 1 voting “present”, Roll No. 561.

Pages H11420–21

Consideration of Suspensions: Pursuant to H. Res. 353, the majority Leader announced that the following suspensions will be considered on Thursday, Nov. 4: H. Con. Res. 214 and H.R. 1693.

Page H11440

District of Columbia Appropriations: The House passed H.R. 3194, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other

activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000 by a yeas and nays vote of 216 yeas to 210 nays, Roll No. 562.

Pages H11423–40

H. Res. 354, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill was agreed to by voice vote. Earlier, agreed to the Linder amendment in the nature of a substitute that considers an amendment to H.R. 3194 to strike section 175 as adopted.

Pages H11422–23

Presidential Messages: Read the following messages from the President:

Separation of isotopes of uranium: Message wherein he transmitted his proposed agreement for cooperation between the United States and Australia concerning technology for the separation of isotopes of uranium by laser excitation—referred to the Committee on International Relations; and

Pages H11440–41

Veto Message on District of Columbia Appropriations Act: Message wherein he announced his veto of H.R. 3064, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000 and explains his reasons therefor—referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed H. Doc. 106–154.

Pages H11441–43

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate appear on pages H11375 and H11478.

Referrals: S. 440 was referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce; S. 1844 was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means; and S. Con. Res. 67 and S. Con. Res. 66 were referred to the Committee on House Administration.

Page H11478

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yeas and nays votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H11380, H11389–90, H11418–19, H11419–20, H11421, and H11439–40. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 11:51 p.m.

Committee Meetings

DEBT RELIEF FOR POVERTY REDUCTION ACT

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 1095, Debt Relief for Poverty Reduction Act of 1999.

SPAMMING

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection held a hearing on Spamming: The E-Mail You Want

To Can, focusing on the following bills: H.R. 3113, Unsolicited Electronic Mail Act of 1999; H.R. 2162, Can Spam Act; and H.R. 1910, E-Mail User Protection Act. Testimony was heard from Representatives Wilson, Green of Texas; and Gary Miller of California; Eileen Harrington, Associate Director, Marketing Practices, Bureau of Consumer Protection, FTC; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 1693, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to clarify the overtime exemption for employees engaged in fire protection activities; H.R. 2434, Worker Paycheck Fairness Act of 1999; and H.R. 3172, amended, to amend the welfare-to-work program and modify the welfare-to-work performance bonus.

PROVIDING ADEQUATE HOUSING

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources held a hearing on Providing Adequate Housing: Is HUD Fulfilling Its Mission? Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Housing and Urban Development: Saul Ramirez, Jr., Deputy Secretary; William Apgar, Assistant Secretary, Housing; and Kathy Kuhl-Inclan, Assistant Inspector General, Audit; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 2533, Fairness in Telecommunications License Transfers Act of 1999; H.R. 2636, Taxpayer's Defense Act; and H.R. 2701, Justice for MAS Applicants of 1999. Testimony was heard from Representatives McIntosh and Hayworth; William Kennard, Chairman, FCC; and public witnesses.

PROHIBIT INTERNET GAMBLING

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime approved for full Committee action H.R. 3125, to prohibit Internet gambling.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE; OVERSIGHT—FOREST SERVICE ROADLESS AREAS

Committee on Resources: Ordered reported, as amended, S. 430, Kake Tribal Corporation Land Exchange Act.

The Committee also held an oversight hearing on a proposal by the Administration directing U.S. Forest Service to promulgate regulations regarding roadless areas within the National Forest System. Testimony was heard from George Frampton, Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality; Michael P. Dombeck, Chief, Forest Service, USDA; and a public witness.

EXPEDITED PROCEDURES

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule waiving clause 6(a) of rule XIII (requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee) against certain resolutions reported from the Rules Committee. The rule applies the waiver to a special rule reported on or before the legislative day of November 10, 1999, providing for consideration of a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, an amendment thereto, a conference report thereon, or an amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon. The rule applies the waiver to a special rule reported on or before the legislative day of November 10, 1999, providing for consideration of any bill or joint resolution making general appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS, FY 2000

Committee on Rules: Granted by voice vote, a structured rule H.R. 3196, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, providing one hour of debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The rule provides that the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for a division of the question, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 2000 MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE

Committee on Rules: Granted by voice vote a rule providing that the House disagrees to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3194, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000. The rule provides that the House agrees to the conference requested by the Senate thereon.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FY 2000

Committee on Rules: Granted by voice vote, a closed rule on H.J. Res. 75, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000 providing one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit.

HOME PAGE TAX REPEAL ACT

Committee on Science: Subcommittee on Basic Research approved for full Committee action, amended, H.R. 2797, Home Page Tax Repeal Act.

AGING OF AGRICULTURE

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Empowerment and the Subcommittee on Rural Enterprises, Business Opportunities and Special Small Business Problems held a joint hearing on The Aging of Agriculture: Empowering Young Farmers to Grow for the Future. Testimony was heard from Susan Offutt, Administrator, Economic Research Service, USDA; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—COAST GUARD'S SEARCH AND RESCUE MISSION

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held an oversight hearing on the Coast Guard's search and rescue mission. Testimony was heard from James E. Hall, Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board; Adm. James M. Loy, USCG, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation; and public witnesses.

HARBOR AND INLAND WATERWAY FINANCING

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing on Harbor and Inland Waterway Financing. Testimony was heard from John H. Anderson, Jr., Director, Transportation Issues, GAO; and public witnesses.

CLASSIFIED INFORMATION—UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURES

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to hold a hearing on Unauthorized Disclosures of Classified Information: Scope and Seriousness of the Problem. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

Joint Meetings

AUTHORIZATION—FAA

Conferees continued to resolve the differences between the Senate and House passed versions of H.R. 1000, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, but did not complete action thereon, and will meet again tomorrow.

CHECHEN/RUSSIAN CRISIS

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded hearings on the Chechen crisis and its implication for Russian democracy, after receiving testimony from Lyoma Usmanov, Representative of the Chechen Republic to the United States; John Dunlop, Stanford University Hoover Institution, Stanford, California; and Fiona Hill, Eurasia Foundation, and Yo'av Karny, both of Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1999

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings on certain initiatives to improve nursing home quality of care, 10 a.m., SD-562.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings on the nomination of Alphonso Maldon, Jr., of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense; and the nomination of John K. Veroneau, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SR-222.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings on local phone competition, examining how to increase consumer choice in local telephone markets, 10 a.m., SR-253.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine issues relating to Chechnya, 10:15 a.m., SD-419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the future United States policy with Nigeria, 2:30 p.m., SD-419.

Committee on 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, 9:30 a.m., SD-106.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Full Committee, to hold hearings on issues relating to the MCI Worldcom/Sprint merger, 11 a.m., SD-226.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on the report of the United States Commission on National Security/21st Century, 9:30 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Problems with EPA's Brownfields Cleanup Revolving Loan Fund Program, 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection, hearing on WTO 2000: The Next Round, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, hearing on Project Exile: A Case Study in Successful Enforcement, 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, to mark up H.R. 2376, to require 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, 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, hearing on The Cuban Program: Torture of American Prisoners by Cuban Agents, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, to mark up H.R. 2528, Immigration Reorganization and Improvement Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, oversight hearing on Limitations on Patenting Millsites under the Mining Law of 1872 and the Approval of Mining Plans of Operations Pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, 11 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, hearing on the following bills: S. 548, Fallen Timbers Battlefield and Fort Miamis National Historic Site Act of

1999; H.R. 1668, Loess Hills Preservation Study Act of 1999; and H.R. 2278, to require the National Park Service to conduct a feasibility study regarding options for the protection and expanded visitor enjoyment of nationally significant natural and cultural resources at Fort Hunter Liggett, California, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Technology, and the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology of the Committee on Government Reform, joint hearing on Y2K Myths and Realities: Responding to the Questions of the American Public with 50 Days Remaining Until January 1, 2000, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, hearing on Defense Contract Bundling Policy, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing on Straight Out Departures at Newark Airport, 9:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Emergency Management, hearing on EPA Grants Management, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, briefing on North Korean Strategic Thinking: One Analyst's View, 2 p.m., H-405 Capitol.

Joint Meetings

Conference: meeting of conferees on H.R. 1000, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, time to be announced, SC-5, Capitol.

Joint Meetings: Senate Committee on 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, 9:30 a.m., SD-106.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, November 4

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the conference report on S. 900, Financial Services Modernization Act, with a vote on adoption to occur thereon.

Next meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, November 4

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of Suspensions:

(1) H. Con. Res. 214, Endorsement of Systematic Phonics Instruction;

(2) H.R. 1693, Clarification of Overtime Exemption for Fire Protection Activity Employees;

Consideration of H.J. Res. 75, further continuing appropriations for FY 2000 (closed rule, one hour of general debate);

Consideration of H.R. 3196, Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, 2000 (Structured rule, one hour of general debate);

Consideration of the Conference report on S. 900, Financial Services Modernization Act (rule waives points of order);

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baldacci, John Elias, Maine, E2246
 Bass, Charles F., N.H., E2262
 Biggert, Judy, Ill., E2248
 Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E2262
 Brown, Corrine, Fla., E2251
 Davis, Danny K., Ill., E2246
 Dixon, Julian C., Calif., E2261
 Doolittle, John T., Calif., E2247
 Evans, Lane, Ill., E2248
 Gilman, Benjamin A., N.Y., E2260
 Goodling, William F., Pa., E2261
 Green, Gene, Tex., E2246
 Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E2253
 Hall, Tony P., Ohio, E2259
 Hilliard, Earl F., Ala., E2262

Hinojosa, Rubén, Tex., E2251
 Hunter, Duncan, Calif., E2245
 Hyde, Henry J., Ill., E2257
 Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E2245
 Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E2250
 Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E2254
 McInnis, Scott, Colo., E2253, E2254, E2257, E2258, E2260
 McIntosh, David M., Ind., E2253
 McIntyre, Mike, N.C., E2246
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E2249
 Pomeroy, Earl, N.D., E2254
 Portman, Rob, Ohio, E2249
 Radanovich, George, Calif., E2252, E2256
 Reyes, Silvestre, Tex., E2249
 Rodriguez, Ciro D., Tex., E2262
 Rush, Bobby L., Ill., E2248

Ryan, Paul, Wisc., E2261
 Sanders, Bernard, Vt., E2262
 Sandlin, Max, Tex., E2246
 Scarborough, Joe, Fla., E2245
 Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E2251
 Shows, Ronnie, Miss., E2247
 Shuster, Bud, Pa., E2252
 Skelton, Ike, Mo., E2258
 Spence, Floyd, S.C., E2246
 Stabenow, Debbie, Mich., E2261
 Stenholm, Charles W., Tex., E2250
 Thompson, Mike, Calif., E2258
 Watt, Melvin L., N.C., E2253
 Watts, J.C., Jr., Okla., E2259
 Wynn, Albert Russell, Md., E2246



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