United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2000 No. 135

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 25, 2000.

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

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

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Ronald F. Christian, Director, Lutheran Social Services, Fairfax, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we acknowledge that Your mercy is great and it covers a multitude of our shortcomings. Your steadfast love is for each one and is unconditionally available to all. Your faithfulness is from generation to generation and is no respecter of persons.

Therefore, O God, we seek Your guidance in our work and our words. We need Your wisdom for our debates and our decisions. And we humbly pray for peace in our time, for peace in our community, and for peace in our world. 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 Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

NOTICE—OCTOBER 23, 2000

A final issue of the Congressional Record for the 106th Congress, 2d Session, will be published on November 29, 2000, in order to permit Members to revise and extend their remarks.

All material for insertion must be signed by the Member and delivered to the respective offices of the Official Reporters of Debates (Room HT–60 or S–123 of the Capitol), Monday through Friday, between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. through November 28. The final issue will be dated November 29, 2000, and will be delivered on Friday, December 1, 2000.

None of the material printed in the final issue of the Congressional Record may contain subject matter, or relate to any event that occurred after the sine die date.

Senators' statements should also be submitted electronically, either on a disk to accompany the signed statement, or by e-mail to the Official Reporters of Debates at ''Records@Reporters''.

Members of the House of Representatives' statements may also be submitted electronically by e-mail, to accompany the signed statement, and formatted according to the instructions for the Extensions of Remarks template at http://clerkhouse.house.gov. The Official Reporters will transmit to GPO the template formatted electronic file only after receipt of, and authentication with, the hard copy, signed manuscript. Deliver statements to the Official Reporters in Room HT–60.

Members of Congress desiring to purchase reprints of material submitted for inclusion in the Congressional Record may do so by contacting the Congressional Printing Management Division, at the Government Printing Office, on 512–0224, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. daily.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

WILLIAM M. THOMAS, *Chairman.*

☐ 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. FOLEY 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 Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4315. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3695 Green Road in Beachwood, Ohio, as the ''Larry Small Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4450. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 900 East Fayette Street in Baltimore, Maryland, as the ''Judge Harry Augustus Cole Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4451. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1001 Frederick Road in Baltimore, Maryland, as the ''Frederick L. Dewberry, Jr. Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4625. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2108 East 38th Street in Erie, Pennsylvania, as the ''Gertrude A. Barber Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4786. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 110 Postal Way in Carrollton, Georgia, as the ''Samuel P. Roberts Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4831. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2339 North California Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''Roberto Clemente Post Office''.

H.R. 4853. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1568 South Green Road in South Euclid, Ohio, as the ''Arnold C. D'Amico Station''.

H.R. 5229. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 219 South Church Street in Odum, Georgia, as the ''Ruth Harris Coleman Post Office Building''.

H.R. 5273. An act to clarify the intention of the Congress with regard to the authority of the United States Mint to produce numismatic coins, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2462. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5314. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to facilitate the adoption of retired military working dogs by law enforcement agencies, former handlers of these dogs, and other persons capable of caring for these dogs.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4788) ''An Act to amend the United States Grain Standards Act to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to collect fees to cover the cost of services performed under that Act, extend the authorization of appropriations for that Act, and improve the administration of that Act, to reenact the United States Warehouse Act to require the licensing and inspection of warehouses used to store agricultural products and provide for the issuance of receipts, including electronic receipts, for agricultural products stored or handled in licensed warehouses, and for other purposes.''

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills, joint resolutions, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1762. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide cost share assistance for the rehabilitation of structural measures constructed as part of water resource projects previously funded by the Secretary under such Act or related laws.

S. 2811. An act to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to make communities with high levels of out-migration or population loss eligible for community facilities grants.

S. 3164. An act to protect seniors from fraud.

S. 3194. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 431 North George Street in Millersville, Pennsylvania, as the ''Robert S. Walker Post Office.''

S. 3230. An act to reauthorize the authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to pay costs associated with removal of commodities that pose a health or safety risk and to make adjustments to certain child nutrition programs.

S. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution recognizing the late Bernt Balchen for his many contributions to the United States and a lifetime of remarkable achievements on the centenary of his birth, October 23, 1999.

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to change the date for counting the electoral votes in 2001.

S. Con. Res. 150. Concurrent resolution relating to the reestablishment of representative government in Afghanistan.

S. Con. Res. 155. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Government of the United States should actively support the aspirations of the democratic political forces in Peru toward an immediate and full restoration of democracy in that country.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 964) ''An Act to provide for equitable compensation for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, and for other purposes.''

The message also announced that in accordance with sections 1928a–1928d of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) as a member of the Senate Delegation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Assembly during the Second Session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress, to be held in Berlin, Germany, November 17–22, 2000.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 15 one-minute requests per side.

THE ADMINISTRATION HAS DEMORALIZED OUR MILITARY

(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, yesterday the Washington Times detailed the story of Shane Walsh, a former first lieutenant in the United States Army. And I say former first lieutenant because Shane Walsh has left the Army. His reason for leaving? Well, the Army he thought it would be and the Army he found it to be were two completely different things.

Lieutenant Walsh detailed the demoralizing situation facing our military today. For example, he said how M1A1 tanks sit abandoned with broken starter motors or unused simply because there is not enough money left to fuel them. His story is not unique. Our military is severely burdened by low morale and it continues to lose large numbers of servicemen and women today and every day.

The refusal of the Clinton-Gore administration to recognize this and to provide the necessary resources for our military, while still deploying them far and wide, has caused this desperate and disturbing situation.

Thankfully, this Republican Congress is truly committed to ensuring our military readiness today and in the future, and we are putting our military back on track with the needed resources to keep it strong and to keep qualified people like Shane Walsh in the military.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN H. KRAMER, DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVANT

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

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a distinguished public servant from my Congressional District, former Berks County Sheriff John Kramer. John has been a legend in local politics in my district for many years and has become my close personal friend and mentor.

John served as Chief Deputy Sheriff in Berks County, Pennsylvania, until 1975, when he was elected to his first term as county Sheriff. John won the primary election by nearly 10,000 votes, and later that year defeated his opponent by 20,000 votes in the general election.

Following that first election in 1975, John was reelected Berks County Sheriff four times, and in three of those elections was top voter of any candidate for office in the county. In 1995,

after 20 years in office, he announced he wanted to retire and would not seek a sixth term.

John was also a sports figure. He bought the Rising Sun Hotel from his father in 1955 and founded the Rising Sun Athletic Association in 1965. The association sponsored bowling, basketball and softball teams. The Sunners softball team won the national softball championship in 1975, and in 1976 the team became co-world champion.

In office and in politics, John Kramer valued loyalty. He enjoyed bipartisan support and was well respected by Republicans and Democrats alike.

He is a fine supporter of the Reading Phillies and Philadelphia Phillies and counts among his friends Mike Schmidt, Pete Rose and Gregg Luzinski.

John and his lovely wife, Doris, have been married for 47 years and reside in Reading, Pennsylvania.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE TILLIE FOWLER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, due to a scheduling conflict last night, I was unable to join my colleagues in a salute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER), so today I join my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), in saluting this wonderful advocate for the people of the great State of Florida.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) came from Jacksonville to not only be an integral part of this august body but she came to represent what is the best in America: She took care to make certain our military was well equipped, she made certain her home of Jacksonville was looked after, and she rose to the top ranks of this Congress as a member of the leadership team.

So as we prepare to adjourn the 106th Congress, I salute the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER), I salute her husband and family for allowing her to serve this great institution and our great State, and I know while her career may end in this House as we adjourn, hopefully this week, her sacrifice and her help for this Nation will continue long after this Congress adjourns. We all join Floridians everywhere in saluting her.

BRING OUR CHILDREN HOME

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, Uchechi Anyanwu is a U.S. citizen born of Nigerian nationals who were here with U.S. green cards. She had a younger sister, Ogechi, also born in the U.S. Because of marital problems, the family went back to Nigeria. When they arrived there, the father informed the mother that the marriage was over, took possession of the mother's passport and the children. He wanted to get a divorce in Nigeria to avoid having to pay child support.

The mother was able to escape with her family's help. When she came back to the United States, the mother immediately got temporary custody. The father came back to the U.S. without the children. The mother and father appeared before a judge in August of 1997 and the judge ordered the return of the children. He refused, and has been in jail ever since.

The children were allegedly with a paternal aunt and uncle in Lagos, Nigeria. In November 1997, the mother got word that the younger daughter, Ogechi, died of malnutrition. The uncle was jailed for 2½ months for the murder of his niece, but then was released.

Interpol has verified the child's death, but the burial site is unknown. Interpol has checked at the aunt's and uncle's home for the surviving child, but has not found her there. Uchechi's mom has hired an attorney in Logos, who took all her money and disappeared.

Mr. Speaker, do we have to wait until children die before this Congress takes notice of children being taken across our borders? It is time to bring our children home.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT IS IMPORTANT TO FLORIDIANS

(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, I am pleased to be a strong supporter of the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act. The Older Americans Act has been responsible for allowing millions of seniors across our country to remain in their own homes and living independently, allowing our aged citizens to keep their dignity and self-respect.

Florida is home to the Nation's largest senior population, and they rely on the many provisions of the Older Americans Act for nutrition, transportation and counseling. Josefina Carbonell, of the Little Havana Activities and Nutrition Center, reminds me of this each and every day. Gracias, Josefina.

There is a new and important authorization of the National Family Caregivers Support Program that gives help to family members who provide in-home care to older seniors. I am pleased that the funding formula has been reformed in order to ensure that States with large senior populations, such as Florida, will receive their fair funding formula.

The biggest winners, of course, are our seniors, who deserve to enjoy their golden years.

COLORADO SUPREME COURT MAKES POOR DECISION

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado Supreme Court threw out the 5-year mandatory prison sentences for rapists and child molesters. Thus, over 100 rapists are now out on the street. Unbelievable. Naturally, many people are up in arms, and who can blame them.

If that is not enough to reward criminals, my colleagues, the victims of these creeps were not even notified. Not even notified. Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. The Supreme Court of Colorado needs their heads examined by a proctologist.

I yield back all the victims of the Colorado Supreme Court. Think about that.

VICE PRESIDENT'S ATTACK OF GOVERNOR BUSH'S SOCIAL SECURITY PLAN IS FALSE

(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, I heard again yesterday Mr. GORE's attack on Governor Bush; that he was spending over the next 10 years the same $1 trillion twice, once to start up an investment account so that retirees could end up with more money, and once on Social Security benefits. I just wanted to set the record straight.

Over the next 10 years, there will be $7.8 trillion coming in to the Social Security Trust Fund. Benefits, or the cost during the next 10 years, is going to be $5.4 trillion. That leaves a balance, a surplus, of $2.4 trillion, and $1 trillion out of that $2.4 trillion is what Governor Bush is suggesting to use during the transition to start setting up personal retirement savings accounts that will supplement Social Security and add to benefits. It will stay in Social Security.

I think our goal has got to be to deal honestly with this problem; to get a better return on investments than the 1.9 percent that the average retiree now gets from the money sent in from the employer and employee.

IMMIGRATION BILL DISCRIMINATES

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

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to appeal to the Republican side to look at the immigration law from 1996. The 1996 law on immigration took away all discretion. The 1996 law took away all due process. The 1996 law splits apart families. The 1996 law took away all compassion.

We need to repeal the most punitive aspects of the 1996 immigration law. We need to restore fairness and equity to the system of immigration and naturalization. We need to give parity to Central Americans who fled for their lives. We need to allow for families to reside together, where they will be able to apply for an application without having to leave this country. We need to make sure and make clear that this law will be changed. And we need to make sure that both Customs and the Commerce, Justice, State bills do not pass until we make sure this immigration law is taken care of.

I ask the Republican side that everything be done to make sure that equal treatment be taken into consideration in this particular piece of legislation. I ask for consideration in amending the 1996 piece of legislation.

REPUBLICAN ACCOMPLISHMENTS

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is the time of year when history gets rewritten in politics; when people like President Clinton take credit for welfare reform that he vetoed repeatedly. Who was actually responsible for getting the compass going in the right direction can be quite confusing. For that reason, I would like to set the record straight.

I think the American people can be proud of the progress the Republican Congress has shown. Just a few years before we got here, this administration forecast budget deficits of $200 billion or more as far as the eye could see, and they said that the deficit is not a problem; that it is not an issue for us.

Well, Republicans reversed that. In 1998, we balanced the budget for the first time in decades. The next year we stopped a 40-year raid on Social Security, where our Social Security surplus was being diverted to other programs instead of being saved for retirement. And this year, because of that fiscal responsibility, we have a budget surplus. That only means we have to work harder to be fiscally responsible and not allow the White House to go on another spending spree.

We think the best responsibility is paying down the debt.

□ 1015

DEMOCRATS ARE FIGHTING FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND MODERNIZATION

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, Republicans in Washington, D.C., are always talking about what small business wants and it always comes down to what Washington Republicans want. But when I talk to small business men and women in Maine, the two most important issues to them are the education and training of their workforce and the cost of their health care.

The strong economy has meant that it is harder to find and keep qualified employees. But remember, the Republicans in this Congress tried and failed to eliminate the Federal Department of Education and the assistance that goes to local school boards.

It is Democrats who are fighting for school construction and modernization, which will improve education, hold down property taxes, and give our businesses, large and small, a better trained workforce.

On health care, too many small business men and women in Maine can now only afford to buy catastrophic health insurance with an annual $5,000 deductible. They are seeing 10 percent to 40 percent increases in their premiums. They will not get help from the Republicans in Congress because the majority here will not even support providing a guaranteed Medicare prescription drug benefit for our seniors.

For small business, Democrats stand for continued economic growth, support for education and health care, and fiscally responsible tax cuts.

REPUBLICANS STAND FOR LOCAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we should rejoice in our constitutional republic when there are differences of opinion. And I welcome the comments from my friend the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN). Although I think that harsh political attacks, even taking a look at where we are on the calendar, may be somewhat out of place here.

Attacking prosperity is curious. Attacking local control of public education is even more curious. Mr. Speaker, ''curiouser and curiouser'' said Alice through the looking glass.

The fact is we stand for local control, putting parents in charge of education. And, yes, we invite our friends to put people in front of politics and join with us in a bipartisan way to make sure there is full health care deductibility, to make sure that there are solutions not decreed by Washington bureaucrats but by the people at home and the business owners and parents in the home and teachers in the classroom.

That is where our strength remains, not in the bureaucracies of Washington, D.C.

WE HAVE NOT DONE OUR WORK

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have not done our work. The Republican controlled Congress has not finished its work.

Where is the Patients' Bill of Rights? Where is a prescription drug benefit? Where is the minimum wage legislation? Where are the 100,000 new teachers? Where is the new school construction? Where is the juvenile justice bill?

The majority party has not done its work. We have not been fair to the American people. They deserve better. They should get better. They need our help, and Congress has done nothing.

We are nearing the end of another ''do nothing'' Congress that has not done anything, not anything, not one thing for the American people. We should be ashamed to leave this place, be ashamed to close this Congress and not to be finished with the American people's agenda.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members and staff are reminded that the use of personal electronic communication devices on the floor of the House is a violation of the rules of the House and Members are to disable wireless telephones when entering the chamber.

PEOPLE OF SUDAN DESERVE TO LIVE IN PEACE

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, as conflict rages in the Middle East and the world's attention is drawn to the crisis, it is vital that we do not forget other peoples around the world who suffer extreme violence.

One Sudanese man recently said, ''We feel in Sudan that the world condemns us to die. Why? Our situation the world sees for 18 years, but no one seems to see help. We need mercy.''

A number of Members of Congress have stood on the House floor to describe the horrors occurring in Sudan. Yet, for some reason, this administration believes that the issue of Sudan ''is not marketable to the American people.''

Why in the world are we ignoring the plight of millions of Muslims, Christians, and those of tribal religions whose homes, places of worship, and schools are being bombed? What kind of civilized government bombs a clearly marked hospital or church?

Mr. Speaker, the people of Sudan deserve to live in peace. Our administration must ensure that food aid is not used as a weapon by the Khartoum government against the people of the South and we must support the IGAD peace process.

EDUCATION FUNDING HOLDING CONGRESS UP

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the coach from Georgia for sending me in.

Mr. Speaker, it is great to be here today. Except the problem I have is that we were supposed to be finished on October 3. This Congress has provided billions and billions of dollars for projects all over the country. And yet, what is holding us up? Education funding.

I want to congratulate my Republican colleagues for saying, we will do something for school construction around the country. But what about smaller class sizes?

Five years ago, when the Republicans took control, they wanted to eliminate the Department of Education. In fact, they have candidates all over the country saying that is what they want to do.

They are willing to now, instead of abolishing it up here, they just want to transfer funds to private schools. Over 90 percent of our children get their education through public schools. Let us do not take the funds away from them.

My children went to public schools. They graduated. They went to college. They had a great public education. My wife teaches math in a public high school in Houston, Texas. We have great public schools. But we do not do it by taking money away from them and sending dollars to private schools like my Republican colleagues want to do.

We need smaller class sizes. We need help with buildings. We need to work with our local school boards and our State legislators to say, okay, what works in Texas, we can help and we will send them funds to do it.

EDUCATION IS FIRST, LAST AND ALWAYS ABOUT CHILDREN

(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, education is first, last and always about children. The education debate is not about money. It is about Federal versus local control of schools and our children's future.

Republicans emphasize local education flexibility, not a Federal straitjacket so parents and teachers can decide if they need to hire more teachers or upgrade skills of their existing teachers. We promote basic academics and encourage parental involvement, not replace the role of children's parents in their lives. We support locally designed accountability standards, not mandated Federal testing.

We have tried to drive at least 95 cents of every Federal dollar directly to the classroom, not bureaucracies bloated by expanding the Federal role in neighborhood schools.

Mr. Speaker, the liberals have made it clear that in a Democrat Congress the education focus would once again shift back to the vision of big government, Washington-knows-best approach to dealing with local education issues.

Americans know better. They care about education and they are concerned about whether students are learning, whether they can read at grade level, and whether they are learning to add and subtract.

Under Republican leadership, we have placed the focus and quality on results with parents and teachers in control.

EDUCATION IS AN AMERICAN PROBLEM

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, to all of my colleagues, it is interesting when I hear and all of us in this debate about Federal versus local. Let us just deal with the facts for one moment.

Ninety-four cents of every dollar raised and spent for public education is raised and spent at the local level. Virtually all the policy setting authority for all of our schools across the country, in my district in Memphis and in districts all across this country, is done at the State and local level.

If we want to point fingers or blame people, we have to blame locals for our problem. But I am not in the business of blaming. What my local school districts suggest they want, Democrats, Republicans, conservatives and liberals, big government people and little government people, are actual solutions. They want help.

They have problems because kids are learning in trailer homes in my colleagues' districts and in our districts all across the country. They have problems because they have kids learning in closets and bathrooms in schools all across this country.

Now, we can sit here and pretend that this debate is meaningful and useful about Federal or local, liberal or conservative, Democrat or Republican. Reality is that there are kids that are not learning, there are kids that are caught in bathrooms and closets and trailer homes all across this country, because we would rather debate whether it is a local or Federal problem.

This is an American problem. I hope all of my colleagues will do the right thing and pass the education bill.

SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, Republicans will honor and strengthen Social Security. We will protect all benefits for today's seniors and ensure that Social Security is available for their grandchildren.

The administration has done nothing to save Social Security in the last 8 years even though the massive baby boom generation will begin drawing benefits 8 years from now.

When Social Security first started, there were 42 workers to support each retiree. In a few decades, there will be only two workers per retiree. As a result, Social Security benefits will exceed contributions beginning in the year 2015 and the system will go bankrupt in the year 2037.

The Vice President touts his plan for Social Security, but his plan would do nothing to improve the program's long-term solvency and will lead to higher taxes or cuts in benefits. In fact, the Vice President's plan would leave the basic structure of Social Security untouched, essentially gambling that future generations would be able to pay the bills when the baby boom generation begins to retire in full force. This is not good. Help is on the way with a Republican White House and a Republican Congress.

GOVERNOR BUSH'S TAX PROPOSAL

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in a great fiscal debate, a debate that is clouded by fuzzy fiscal figures. We are told by the Governor of Texas that he will provide tax relief to every American who pays taxes. This is simply not true.

Fifteen million Americans pay FICA tax that is pulled out of their wages, and these 15 million Americans who pay FICA tax but do not pay income tax will not get a single penny of relief from the Governor's proposal.

Second, he tells us that he will provide only $223 billion of tax relief to the richest one percent of Americans. He does this by ignoring his own estate tax repeal, which will cost $50 billion a year, $500 billion over 10 years, meaning that his plan will actually provide well over $700 billion to the wealthiest one percent of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is important. We need to look through the fuzzy fiscal facts and see it clearly.

BALANCED BUDGET SURPLUS

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, for 30 years when Democrats controlled the House of Representatives they talked about a balanced budget. But it was only talk. The debt continued to rise and we did not have a balanced budget.

For many years they talked about welfare reform. But it never happened. For years Democrats talked about middle class tax relief. But they raised taxes on everybody in America, not just the middle class, but everybody.

Then, 6 years ago, Republicans took over the House and we finally saw a balanced budget, we finally saw welfare reform, even though the President vetoed it twice before finally signing it

into law and taking credit for it. And we have seen welfare rolls come down across country.

Now that we have a balanced budget, we have a surplus. Republicans want to use that surplus to save Social Security and Medicare and give prescription drugs to seniors, to pay down the debt, and to cut taxes on everybody, especially the middle class.

That is the right thing to do for America.

CALLING ON PUBLIC RADIO TO DISCONTINUE POLITICAL ADS

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, Americans were shocked this morning to realize that today public radio is beginning to air political advertisements. It seems that public radio has interpreted their mandate to include reasonable access to Federal candidates to allow the placement of Democratic political advertisements on public radio.

Now, I think they have interpreted the law wrong. But I am calling upon public radio to immediately take those political ads down. The law requires, in effect, that they cannot charge for political advertising.

The Democrat candidates are apparently taking advantage of tax-free paid support to public radio by placing their ads free of charge on public radio. That ought to end today. If it does not end today, I will call upon every candidate in political elections to bring their ads to public radio and next year we will think about taking away their mandate entirely.

SOCIAL SECURITY PENSION AND VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CHECKS

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

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, last week we passed a continuing resolution for 1 week. The purpose of that continuing resolution was to keep the Government going for another week while we negotiated some thorny issues over how much we are going to spend and what tax relief was going to be for the American people. But that resolution had a very important provision because it authorized the Clinton administration to prepare the November 1 Social Security pension checks and the Veterans' Administration checks.

□ 1030

It is very important for those seniors and those people who are reliant on those checks to know that they are going to be there on November 1. What is important is that the majority of the Democrats, and virtually all of the Democrat leadership, came to this floor and voted against the resolution to keep those checks going. What that means is that the Democrats want to make Social Security a political issue, and it is the Republicans who are saying we are going to make sure that the people who are dependent on those checks have the security they are intended to provide.

Mr. Speaker, today we will vote again on a continuing resolution. It will be interesting to see whether the Democrats really care about security, or they are after a political issue. I ask my colleagues to support this continuing resolution.

BIPARTISAN SPIRIT CAN MAKE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFITS A REALITY

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

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are committed to achieving results, not setting up roadblocks. Already we have passed a plan to provide prescription drug coverage that is voluntary, affordable, and available to all. When we tried to work with Democrats on this issue, they got up and walked out of the Chamber.

It is time to put partisan politics aside and work to get a prescription drug plan signed into law. Vice President GORE campaigns for a plan to force seniors into a one-size-fits-all, government-run HMO. Recently, Mr. GORE told seniors a phony story about his own mother-in-law to win their support for this flawed drug plan. Now he and his friends in this Chamber are inventing stories about Medicare to frighten seniors.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Congress has put the Nation's financial house in order, we stopped the raid on Social Security, and we are paying down the national debt. Now a prescription drug benefit is possible. If the President and our friends on the other side of the aisle would adopt a bipartisan spirit, we would be able to offer these benefits next year.

SENIORS DEMAND GUARANTEED MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is a difference, and I am glad my colleague just called for a bipartisan approach to solving the problems for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I would just ask my colleague to pose the question to senior citizens throughout this country: Do they want the opportunity to dial up their HMO or pharmaceutical company and beg for an opportunity to buy low-cost prescription drugs, or do they want a guaranteed benefit by Medicare? I venture to say that my seniors who have seen HMOs close their doors in their community, who are crying out for health care, would argue: ''Give me a guaranteed Medicare prescription drug benefit. One that allows me to get the same cost and prices that are given to our hospitals and other large institutions.''

Mr. Speaker, it is very simple. Give them an opportunity to pay their rent and buy their food and still have good health care. I hope my colleagues see the light and are willing to pass a real prescription drug benefit, a real Patients' Bill of Rights that allows the patient-physician relationship to be restored and for HMOs to find their place.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, it is a shame, too, that we cannot pass a hate crimes bill.

LISTEN TO OUR SENIORS

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

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I say to the President, ''Listen to our seniors.'' My seniors are being hurt by their Medicare+Choice plans leaving the market. They are hurt because through these plans they get better benefits than Medicare offers, and millions of seniors in these plans are sicker and poorer than most of our senior citizens and can't afford Medigap prices.

You are closing down their plans, by having increased their reimbursements 2 percent a year for 3 years, and now offering 3 percent when costs are trending up at 8 to 10 percent, as well as giving every single Medicare provider a bigger increase. Your policy is simply forcing them out of the market.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the President that the plans have already left the less densely populated areas and in the next round are going to leave areas like New York City and its boroughs, leaving millions of seniors stranded. And, cruelly, these seniors cannot buy Medigap insurance either, because they cannot afford it or they would be excluded because of preexisting conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I again say to the President, ''Mr. President, help our seniors by giving the managed care plus choice plans a decent increase this year. And next year, let us reform Medicare so that the benefits are better for all seniors and the reimbursements fairer and simpler.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Member is reminded that remarks in debate are to be addressed to the Chair.

SECURING OUR CHILDRENS' FUTURE

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

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, imagine an America where all children receive a world class education and an opportunity to achieve their dreams in a safe school in every community. Imagine an America where the best and brightest teach America's children and every child can read by the third grade. Imagine an America where 95 percent of students graduate from high school and every high school graduate has access to a college education.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are committed to this vision for our children and making these dreams a reality.

Children are America's top priority. Republicans are open to innovation and new solutions to old problems. Republicans have made a solid commitment to education, but the Clinton-Gore administration and Democrats in Congress want the Federal Government to decide what local schools can and cannot do. This is what separates the two parties on education policy.

Wake up America. Every child, regardless of family income, deserves a quality education. We need to increase the role of parents in the day-to-day education of their children and decrease the role of Washington. Republicans are committed to securing America's future for our children and grandchildren.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 proceedings.

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 332, nays 51, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

YEAS—332

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—51

Aderholt
Becerra
Bilbray
Borski
Brady (PA)
Capuano
Clay
Clyburn
Costello
Crane
DeFazio
English
Etheridge
Fattah
Filner
Green (TX)
Gutknecht
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hooley
Hulshof
Kucinich
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
McDermott
McNulty
Miller, George
Moran (KS)
Oberstar
Pallone
Pickett
Ramstad
Riley
Sabo
Sanchez
Sawyer
Schaffer
Slaughter
Stark
Sweeney
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Weller
Wicker
Wu

NOT VOTING—49

Brown (OH)
Burton
Campbell
Cannon
Chenoweth-Hage
Coburn
Crowley
Danner
Delahunt
DeLay
Dickey
Dixon
Duncan
Engel
Forbes
Franks (NJ)
Goode
Goodling
Greenwood
Hastings (FL)
Hilleary
John
Kasich
Klink
Largent
Lazio
McCollum
McGovern
McIntosh
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Morella
Murtha
Ney
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Porter
Price (NC)
Shadegg
Shaw
Stabenow
Stupak
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Watts (OK)
Wise
Young (AK)

☐ 1056

Mr. HILLIARD changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4811, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 647 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 647

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

☐ 1100

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to 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.

House Resolution 647 provides for the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 4811, the Foreign Operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, for their hard work. I share the view expressed by the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman CALLAHAN) that this is a good bill; and as he stated last night in the Committee on Rules, the funding is too high for some, too low for others. It strikes an appropriate balance.

The bill contains $14.897 billion in funding, slightly below the President's request of $15.13 and includes an appropriation of $5 billion to reduce the public debt.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the bill appropriates $1.9 billion for military financing for Israel, as well as $840 million for economic assistance to Israel.

I also believe it is very important that we are increasing the child survival and disease program fund and providing $435 million for heavily indebted poor countries.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased that we are increasing funding for the agency for international development by $300 million over the prior fiscal year, bringing next year's funding to $3.08 billion.

I support this rule. The underlying legislation is very important. Obviously, much work has gone into this legislation. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the full committee, and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman of the subcommittee, as well as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, for their hard work on this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to adopt both the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me the time. As the gentleman just explained to my colleagues, this rule waives all points of order against the conference report on the foreign operations bill.

I consider these programs funded by this bill to be our first line of national defense. I believe the goodwill and friendship created by these programs helps prevent international tensions that, if left unresolved, might lead to more serious conflict. I think that we have many, many examples like this.

I think the greatest example before us today is North Korea. Mr. Speaker, I was saying a little bit about North Korea that it is a great example of what this bill is all about, because we, over the past 4 years through the world food program, have donated somewhere between 70 percent and 75 percent of all food aid, and humanitarian aid has brought us a tremendous amount of goodwill in North Korea.

It has really eased tensions, and I think it has, it has brought peace to a peninsula that has not had peace in a long time. That is an example of goodwill. That is an example of foreign aid that goes to save lives, that has really caught the attention of North Korea, South Korea, and so many countries of the world.

Mr. Speaker, moreover, this bill represents the spirit of American generosity and our commitment to the welfare of our fellow world citizens. This bill empowers individuals. It reduces hunger. It fights disease. It saves lives the world over.

I regret that many Americans do not see it that way. For that reason, the bill is very difficult to write. I applaud the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking Democratic member, for the work on this bill.

It has been difficult, but the result is a compromise that has support on both sides of the aisle. I am particularly pleased that many programs, as well as the overall total in the conference report, are increased over the levels in the original, inadequate House-passed bill.

One of the most important improvements in the funding is for debt relief. The conference report fully funds the President's request for $435 million, including $210 million in emergency supplemental funding. This is well over the original House bill. This money will help developing nations that are struggling to overcome crushing debts. This funding is critically important to allow these countries to get a fresh, debt-free start.

The bill increases the Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund to $248 million, more than last year's level, and this is $77 million more than the original House bill. Included in this figure is $110 million for UNICEF, the same as last year's level.

These programs give hope to the most vulnerable of the world's population, the children. These programs are aimed at improving the health of the children, enabling them to become healthy and productive adults.

I am also pleased that the bill prohibits foreign aid to any government which is aiding the rebels in Sierra Leone by providing military support or by assisting the illicit diamond trade in that country.

Overall, the bill provides $14.9 million for foreign operations, and that is $1.8 billion more than the bill we originally passed on the House floor in July. It is a 14 percent increase, and I am grateful for that. Still, it represents a 2 percent cut below the President's request. Also, it is less than the total appropriated last year, including supplemental and emergency funding.

Our Nation is the wealthiest in the world. We have the resources to help others and save lives, and I regret that getting the amount we finally achieved in this bill is such a struggle.

I do believe that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) have done the best they can in today's political environment. They have crafted this bill with compassion and understanding of the world's poor and needy people.

My regret over the low funding of the bill in no way diminishes my esteem for them and their work. In addition, I believe it is inappropriate to include in this bill the language that raises the overall spending cap for appropriations bills. This important provision should be considered separately.

Therefore, I will ask, or somebody on this side will ask, to defeat the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will ask to consider a concurrent resolution introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

This resolution would have the effect of amending the conference report to drop the language dealing with the spending caps. Furthermore, the resolution prohibits the House from adjourning until the spending caps are raised.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, but I want to commend my colleagues on the subcommittee for their help with regard to the provisions related to Armenia and specifically the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) for the work that they did on these provisions.

We are very happy with the fact that the level of assistance to Armenia at a minimum will be $90 million, which is more than what the administration had requested.

We also have the provisions in the bill that the House language provides funding for confidence-building measures and other activities in furtherance of the peaceful resolution of regional conflicts, particularly with regard to Nagorno-Karabagh. As many of my colleagues know, this is a conflict that has been going on for some time, and we certainly want to do everything we can to provide for confidence-building measures in that region.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, which prohibits direct U.S. assistance to Azerbaijan because of the continued blockade of Armenia, the language from the previous year is maintained in that regard. I think that is very important, because we need to continue

to send the message that this should not be direct assistance as long as the blockade of Armenia continues.

Lastly, I wanted to say that there is language in the report, language that says that in the event that Armenia is selected as the host site for the SESAME project, which is essentially a physics project, the Synchrotron Light Source Particle Accelerator Project, there is report language that says that $15 million of the funds made available for Armenia should support this or a comparable project.

I mention this, not only because the project itself is very important for the economic development of Armenia and I think the whole Caucasus's region, but also because it is an example of the type of development project that we would like to see more of. We would like to see more of U.S. assistance in the future, not as much the emphasis on humanitarian aid, more on development aid, and this is a good example.

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

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear at the onset that my objection to this rule or to this bill has nothing to do with the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) have done their work.

The problem that I have was already mentioned and that is raising the caps on this particular bill. It makes no sense whatsoever. This is something that we should have done 6 months ago and would have avoided the problems that we now have.

What are the problems we now have? Eight of the nine appropriations bills that Congress has passed and sent to the President would spend more than the President requested. The nine bills that have been sent to the President would result in $11.4 billion in outlays above the President's request.

The discretionary spending caps proposed by this rule would allow Congress to increase discretionary spending above the amount requested by the President, by $13 billion in budget authority and $8 billion in outlays. Now, the blame game has been going on and the finger pointing has been going on for weeks and will continue. But let us be real clear, and anyone that chooses to challenge me on these numbers, I will yield to them. This is the fourth year in a row that the Republican-controlled Congress has passed appropriations bills with higher discretionary spending outlays than the President has requested.

Mr. Speaker, although the Republican Congress cut discretionary spending with bipartisan help substantially in 1996, the first year after gaining the majority, total discretionary spending outlays in the 5 years that Republicans have controlled the Congress have exceeded the President's request by $4 billion in outlays.

By contrast, the Democratically controlled Congress appropriated less than Presidents Reagan and Bush requested during 7 years of the 12 years in office. Over the 12 years of the Reagan-Bush administrations, Congress appropriated $42 billion less than the President requested.

The 106th Congress is on pace to increase discretionary spending by at least 5.2 percent above the rate of inflation. This is the largest increase in discretionary spending. Hear me, the largest increase in discretionary spending since the Budget Act of 1974 was passed.

According to the Bipartisan Concord Coalition, if discretionary spending continues to increase at the same rate that it has over the last 3 years under Republican Congress, nearly two-thirds of the projected $2.3 billion surplus will be wiped out. By approving this rule, Congress will be voting to increase the discretionary spending caps for fiscal year 2001 by $96 billion in budget authority and $67 billion in outlays.

The Blue Dogs have proposed that in exchange for increasing discretionary spending caps for the next year to a more realistic level, Congress should set new caps to impose meaningful discipline on discretionary spending for the next 5 years and avoid this problem. This is not the Committee on Appropriations' problem. This was a leadership decision.

□ 1115

This is not an appropriations problem, this is a leadership problem. By the leadership putting a budget on the floor that everyone knew could not be sustained, we find ourselves in this position here on October 25. The same will occur next year if we do not choose to put some fiscal discipline into how we deal with budgets in this place. The discretionary caps for fiscal year 2001 provided no discipline in the appropriation process, none; and that is why we are here.

Now, after fiscal year 2002, the discretionary caps expire. By the way, the caps next year that Congress will be looking at will be $551 billion in BA, almost $100 billion below what we are talking about passing for this year.

Now, let me remind everybody again: the President proposed to spend $624 billion this year in BA and $637 billion in outlays. The Republicans suggested $600 billion, which was a ridiculous amount; and they could not find votes on their own side. The Blue Dogs suggested 617 and 733. Now, today, with this vote, everyone that votes for this rule is voting to increase the caps over and above what the President requested and over and above what we would have had bipartisan cooperation for in holding the fiscal discipline in this body.

The Blue Dogs suggested a number. The leadership in this House said under no circumstances will we do anything other than what we are wanting. Now this is what they are going to get. They will vote for increasing these caps, and so stop going out in campaigns all over the country and blaming Democrats for being the high spenders. It does not wash. It will not wash. I would be glad to yield to anyone that suggests that anything that I am saying is not 100 percent the truth. Quit talking about big-spending Democrats. Let us start talking about a big-spending Congress. Let us start talking about someone that had a grand strategy that would bring us almost to the election year in keeping us here by trying to come up with a false impression of what the budget will be.

Vote against this rule because of the caps, and then let us do our job.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I thank him for his work. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) of the Committee on Rules on the Republican side for bringing this bill to the floor. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and certainly the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his work.

I wish that we were discussing this weeks ago when we were piling up a lot of pork all over these bills, particularly roads and bridges which all of us need, and various other entities, because I consider this bill a bill that spells relief. And I hope that there will be a way that we handle our fiscal responsibilities in a proper manner, but we also realize the importance of this initiative.

First of all, this bill protects and allows us to be the responsible world leader and promoter of democracy that is so very important. It also says that we value the needs of women around this world as it relates to legitimately based family planning. The agreement also applauds the fact that there is now a sense of freedom in the former Yugoslavia, Serbia. It authorizes up to $100 million for assistance to Serbia; and having been in Kosovo and Albania and having seen Milosevic up close and knowing what he did to those people and that region, this is good news that we have an opportunity to stabilize that area.

I support the $2.3 billion for development aid, including $963 million for child survival and disease fund. The worst thing that we can find in developing nations are the number of children that are dying, the lack of opportunity, the poor health. This will be remedied in a large degree.

Let me also thank the leaders as well who I worked with of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS); the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK); the gentleman from Iowa (Mr.

LEACH); and I know there are many others, including the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on the Marshall Plan. There is money in here to begin talking about fighting worldwide AIDS, but there is $435 million in debt relief. This is a jubilee day for all of the religious denominations from the Jewish community to the Catholic community, the Muslim community, the Protestant community, if I might cite the general conference of Seventh-day Adventists who have been missionaries in the fields in these developing nations for many, many years. This is a fine day if this bill is passed, because we begin to start telling countries that we can build schools, we can build hospitals, we can build housing, we can tend to those who are devastatingly ill, we can begin nutrition plans, begin agricultural plans, we can do this because we do not have to pay the enormous amount of debt.

I would say that there is a 20-month delay on this for us to determine whether this can be implemented. I hope we move this along rather quickly. I hope we do not put a high bar for these developing nations so that they can, in fact, do what they need to do. I have worked very closely; in fact, as a freshman member, I added $1 million to the African Development Fund Bank. I am delighted that it is now funded at $100 million.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why there is the old adage, teach them to fish and they will be able to eat for days and days and years and years as opposed to giving them a fish. This is what the African Development Fund Bank does. It, in fact, gives them the ability to build small enterprises. It is an excellent program, and I support it.

I was a strong supporter of peacekeeping missions and I am gratified that we are engaged in peace, but I am also gratified on this point, Mr. Speaker.

The Congo, unfortunately, gets no money. I am hoping that we can find peace in the Congo in that region based upon African nations coming together and realizing that this country, the former Zaire, has to be in the midst of creating its own peace and not war. Then I am delighted that there is language dealing with prohibiting any country that provides support to Sierra Leone's Revolutionary United Front for any other country from helping, to prohibiting any money going to those countries that would destabilize those regions.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill; and I hope that it passes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH).

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his hard work on this bill. I know they have tried to forge an effective compromise.

I do want to touch on a few things that I think are important as we go through this debate. The gentlewoman from Texas just said that this was a ''jubilee day'' for people of all religious faiths because of debt forgiveness, because now we can build schools across the world, and because children can now get vaccines. But I think it is important for us to recognize today that this money is not going to build schools. This money is going to bankers for debt relief.

So let us not sing that jubilee song too loudly.

Secondly, she implored that we not set the bar so high. Let me tell my colleagues something. Part of the problem is, and part of the reason that I oppose this bill, is that most of these countries are in debt today because their economic systems are in chaos and the IMF has not held them accountable. In fact, when a provision was attempted to be inserted on the Senate side that would have required these countries receiving debt forgiveness to open up their markets to world trade, it was rejected.

I would ask everybody to look at the countries whose debts are being forgiven today, and compare it to a Heritage Foundation and Wall Street Journal report on the Index of Economic Freedom. Heritage and the Wall Street Journal compile this list by judging economic freedom in 161 countries on factors like trade policy, fiscal burden of government, government intervention in the economy, monetary policy, capital flow in foreign investment, banking, wages and prices, property rights, regulation, and the black market.

And, surprise of surprises: the 30 countries whose debts are being forgiven are the least free economically, restrict trade and have more centralized, socialistic-type governments that control the economies of the debtor nations.

Under some circumstances, I might not have a problem forgiving these debts. But today we are forgiving debt without requiring the type of reforms that would prevent these countries from coming back to us to ask for debt forgiveness again in 4 or 5 years. We know they are going to come back, because we are not requiring economic reform in these countries. It is a lesson we should have learned over and over again.

I know this bill is going to pass. But after everybody votes for this debt forgiveness plan, I ask that they go back and look at the Wall Street Journal's and Heritage's Index of Economic Freedoms.

Again, it is no coincidence that these 30 countries that are going to be bailed out by American tax dollars today, through their banks, are the same ones that are the most restrictive economically. Before this happens again, I hope we demand reforms in the way that the IMF loans money and the way these countries have the debt forgiven by American taxpayers.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations and the former chairman. He has also been a great proponent of humanitarian aid for many years, and he has played a major part in helping a lot of people all over the world.

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

Let me say that I think the bill that has been developed, the underlying bill, the foreign operations appropriations bill is a quite responsible bill; and I congratulate everyone who is involved, especially the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

I want to talk, however, about something which has been attached to this bill in the form of the Stevens amendment, because I think that amendment brings us face-to-face with what has essentially been the institutional dishonesty which has plagued this Congress going back to 1981.

What happened in 1981 and in many years since is that after the passage of the Budget Act, which imposed a new budget organization plan on the Congress, the Congress, beginning with 1981, began to pass a series of fictional budget resolutions. They are outlines which the Congress has to pass of expected budget activities; and after those outlines are passed, then we can proceed to pass the actual appropriation bills.

What has happened since 1981 is that the Congress has adopted fixed targets for spending based on assumptions that are totally false or at variance with what we really expected to happen down the line. Because those assumptions about what will happen next in the Congress are so at variance with the truth, those assumptions have allowed the Congress to then pretend that it had room in the budget to pass very large tax cuts, which we did in 1981; to pass very large spending increases, which we did in 1981. We essentially doubled the military budget on borrowed money.

The Congress pretended, at the time, that it was not doing it on borrowed money; it pretended it was paying for it. So for 18 years, we have been digging out from the deficits caused by the failure of those initial budget assumptions to really tell Congress ahead of time what would happen to the deficit if certain actions were taken.

Now we face the same situation again. We had a budget deal in 1997, and both the administration and the Congress agreed they were going to jump off the cliff and assume certain things were going to happen over the next few years; and they did. And as a result, this Congress proceeded under a budget resolution which, in the end, had to be hugely amended in order to fit our actions into those budget fixes.

Now we have this situation. The permanent budget ceiling under which we have been operating for appropriated money is $541 billion.

□ 1130

The budget resolution, which sort of bent that original number, the budget resolution that we have been operating under is about $600 billion. Now the Stevens amendment is an attempt to bring that number into some relationship to reality. The Stevens amendment requires that we change that number to $637 billion in discretionary spending for the next year.

Then guess what happens next year? Next year, the number reverts, and it goes back down to $551 billion. Is there one person on this floor who believes that, having raised that cap from $541 billion to $600 billion to $637 billion this year, that the Congress next year is going to cut enough money to get down to $551 billion in discretionary spending? Anybody who believes that the Congress is going to do that needs three straightjackets and a visit to the funny farm. It just is not going to happen that way.

So my objection to the Stevens amendment is not in what it attempts to do. It attempts to bring this institution closer to the truth. My problem is that it contains an implied lie for the next fiscal year. This is not the fault of the author of the amendment. He is just trying to get through the day 1 year at a time.

But the problem is that, by keeping that number in place in the out years, this institution, in effect, continues to lie to the American people about what we expect to be spent in future years.

So under these circumstances, there is not a Member of this body who has a right to question the veracity of either candidate for President so long as we continue to follow these fictions.

So that is why I am going to vote no on the rule. That is why I am going to vote no on the previous question, so that we can separate out this question and have an honest discussion of what our expectations are, not just for this year, but for the years to come.

I also have another concern. This Congress has added billions of dollars in appropriation bills which have passed above the President's request in several instances. Some of that spending I voted for and some of it I voted against. Now this ceiling is being adjusted to take into account all of that spending and also supposedly to make room for the other bills which have yet to be passed.

The major bill which has yet to be passed is the Labor, Health and Education bill. That is the bill that sums up our concern about people in the shadows of life: the weak, the young, the old, the sick. I am not at all certain that the assumptions that will be made about this number will enable us to meet our responsibilities on that bill.

I do not want to be seen as endorsing this number which would, in essence, bless all of the additional spending that has been approved by this Congress so far this year, but then put us in a position where when Education comes before us, we then say, ''Oh, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, there is not enough room under the budget ceiling.''

Oh, yes, we made enough room for the Energy and Water bill. We made enough room for the Defense bill. We made enough room for the Agriculture bill and the Transportation bill. But, oh, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no room in the inn to meet our responsibilities on class size, on teacher training, on after-school centers, on Pell Grants, on educations for disabled children. That is my concern with this process.

So I want to vote for the foreign aid bill. If there is a responsible coalition, a majority of people in both caucuses for that bill, I intend to do so. But I would ask people to vote no on the previous question on the rule so that we can have a more honest, for once, discussion with our constituents about what this Congress is really spending this year and does really intend to spend in the coming years.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say that I intend to vote for the previous question, and I intend to vote for the rule. This rule is basically the same rule that we have adopted for every appropriations bill. There is nothing unusual in the rule.

So we should do what we have done in all other instances. We ought to pass the rule so that we can get about the consideration of the bill on Foreign Operations.

On the previous question, the issue that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has indicated he will oppose the previous question so that he can offer an amendment to the rule which would provide a vehicle for us to eliminate the language in the bill relative to the budget caps.

Now, I do not have a strong disagreement with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) on the budget caps, because I think he and I both agreed earlier in the year that the budget resolution was not realistic, that it did not really provide for the priorities of the Congress and for the priorities of the President of the United States.

But, nevertheless, the Congress adopted a budget resolution at a specific number. Well, obviously, as we took up the bills and as we passed it through the House, which we have passed all of them through the House, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot say that often enough, we have passed all those bills through the House, but then we have to negotiate with our colleagues in the other body because their priorities very often are different than our priorities. Once we resolve that, then we have priorities from the President of the United States whose priorities are different.

So we have one overall number, but three sets of priorities; and they do not all fit into that over-all number.

So the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I do not disagree on that. We have made that fairly clear throughout the year. So now we come to the point of getting real. It has been suggested on several occasions in the debates before that these budget numbers are not real.

Well, now we are at the point where we are getting real because the appropriations bills have all passed the House. We bring today the next, after the Foreign Operations bill today, there are only two other appropriations vehicles out there for us to take up and consider, pass and send to the President. So we are at crunch time.

A lot of those issues were real thorny and controversial, most of which have nothing at all to do with appropriations, most of which are something not related at all to appropriations, but appropriations bills are being used as vehicle just to deal with these philosophical or these political or these authorizing-type issues.

As the House passed the bills, we knew that we would be exceeding the caps. So in the House on the appropriation bills, we waived the caps. But this provision from this bill that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) objects to, it is a provision that would apply to the Senate.

The other body needs this language because they have advised us that, without increasing the budget number, the caps, that they would not be able to consider any further appropriations bills.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to clear up one thing. It is not that I am objecting to the Stevens amendment. What I am trying to do is raise concerns about how it is going to be applied, whether it will be applied evenly to all bills, including Labor-HHS.

Secondly, what I object to is the fiction that, after this cap gets raised to $637 billion, that somehow this Congress expects next year to drop back down to $551 billion. I think that the Committee on the Budget's procedures are forcing this Congress to live under a ludicrous fiction which, in essence, is a public lie which none of us should be participating in.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have agreed with each other many times that the budget process is far from perfect. We attempted to make some changes earlier this year, but we were not successful with legislation that would have made some changes. But he and I do not disagree on that.

But the point is, in order for the Senate to continue to proceed with consideration of further appropriations bills,

they need this budget cap raised. Because under their rules, they have to do this. In the House, we do not have to. This does not affect the House. We have already taken care of that problem in our House. But in the other body, they need to do this and they need a 60-Member vote in order to accomplish it.

So if we do not do it on this bill, we are going to have to do it on the next bill, which hopefully we will have on the floor tomorrow if a couple of unsettled issues are settled, and that is the Commerce Justice bill, that would be applied to another bill. The Commerce Justice bill the Senate has not passed. So it has got to be connected to another bill, which we expect to be the District of Columbia appropriations bill, which both Houses have passed.

So we really need to do this. It is not a matter of whether one likes it or whether one does not like it. But if we are going to conclude our work, not in the House, but if we are going to conclude our work in the other body, we have to do this. So we might as well do it now, get it over with, and get on about our business. Hopefully, before the week is over, we will conclude the consideration of the District of Columbia and Commerce State Justice bill and then the Health and Education bill hopefully before the week is over.

But we need to move this bill out of the way so we can make room on our schedule for the next two vehicles. Then, Mr. Speaker, the appropriations process will have been completed. It has been delayed this year for a number of reasons. I will not take the time to express my opinion as to why the delays took place, but there have been delays, many of which were not under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. But, nevertheless, there have been delays.

We need to move this rule today. We need to move this bill today. Then we have two other vehicles. Then our colleagues will be able to return to their districts and spend a few days on the campaign trail.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this rule today to let the American people know of the subterfuge that is going on in these waning days of the Congress.

If this rule passes, we will have a bill which amends the budget law to raise the spending limits that now enforce our discretionary budget to reflect the leadership's wanderlust for spending over the past 2 months. This is the day of reckoning for Republicans to wake up and admit the budget resolution they set forth earlier this year was based on a false premise.

But in typical fashion, the leadership has decided to determine unilaterally the fiscal priorities of this Congress without a bipartisan agreement on education funding. No money for new teachers, no money for school repairs or expansion, no money for after-school.

I ask Members to support the Democratic effort to defeat the previous question so we can appropriately decide the scope of our education investment and then set the new spending levels accordingly.

I deeply regret that we have reached this point in the larger budget process. This is no way to run a budget process, a Congress, or a country. This body does not meet. We do not negotiate. We do not discuss. Republican leaders take off 5 days at a time; and as a result, our basic work is undone because we are not here doing our work. The result is one of the biggest budget disasters that anybody can remember.

My colleagues on the other side have been so busy throwing money at projects just to get out of town that we have already spent $11.4 billion over the President's request, $11.4 billion over what the President asked for, and they still have not spent a dime to hire a new teacher or build a new school.

They have not spent a dime on quality teaching or after-school programs because they have refused to make education the priority of this Congress.

□ 1145

We now pass a new CR every day because we are so far into the fiscal year and so far behind in our work. We should be focused on legislation to lift up every public school. This should be the true focus and passion of this Congress.

Instead, just yesterday Republican leaders rejected the bipartisan Johnson-Rangel bill supported by 228 Members, Democrats and Republicans, to help districts with school construction, and they came up with their own plan that is a day late and a dollar short. Their plan creates incentives that delay school construction, and half the benefit does not even go to school districts but to bond holders. Private investors. Not children, not principals, not teachers, but bond holders.

We are calling on the leadership to pass the bipartisan school construction measure to help modernize our schools. This bill reduces the burden on local taxpayers struggling to finance new construction for their communities. We urge Republican leaders to set aside their opposition and provide enough funding for teachers, emergency school repairs, after-school programs and teacher training, and to put all these measures into the education bill so the President can sign a bill that improves our schools this year.

Let us not block progress on education. Let us impose order on this irresponsible budget process. Let us do the work of the American people on education. Stop the delays, stop the foot dragging, stop the electioneering and accomplish something meaningful for our children. We can still salvage something important from this budget process. Let us get it done, and let us get it done this week.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that has produced this legislation; and again I want to commend him for his hard work on it.

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

I am very surprised to hear the minority leader come before this body, a man who knows the inner workings of this body probably more than anyone else, and try to confuse this body with unrelated facts to what we are talking about.

Let us step back from all this rhetoric that we just heard and look at where we are. The minority leader ought to be here praising what we have accomplished by bringing this bill to the floor today. The minority and the majority worked together. We did not sit in some back room, like we did last year, and negotiate this with the White House or the President's representative and to come forth with something in the middle of the night. We have negotiated this bill for the last 6 months and without outside interference, which is something that the minority leader ought to be encouraging. We bring before our colleagues today an agreed-upon foreign operations bill for the fiscal year 2001.

My colleague can confuse all he wants with his lack of addressing issues in this bill on educational matters. I am surprised that the minority leader did not say we do not fix the notch-baby problem either. There are a lot of things that we do not do, but there are a lot of things we ought not be doing. What we are doing is bringing before the Members a bill, a consensus bill of both the minority and the majority that is a responsible bill to provide for the needs of the State Department and our foreign affairs for the next fiscal year.

It is not everything I wanted. It is not everything the minority ranking member wanted. But it is a good bill, and it has been manufactured in this institution without the involvement of the White House.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman misheard the distinguished minority leader. I did not hear a single word of criticism about the gentleman's work product.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I think we heard a message, though, that is going out to all our Members over C-SPAN television confusing the fact about education and all these other issues which have nothing to do with where we are here today.

This simply says, as the chairman of our committee brought to the attention of the membership, that it facilitates the Senate by passing some rider to our bill that facilitates this bill to come up in the United States Senate. So I would respectfully not want to argue with the ranking member of our full committee, but I would say that none of the things that the minority leader mentioned has anything to do with this bill.

So I am urging the Members of this House, Republicans and Democrats, to vote for the previous question and to vote for the rule and let us get on with the business of the day, doing it like we are supposed to do it, between and amongst ourselves, without the tremendous pressure and input in a backroom deal with the President of the United States.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats have been chastised by their own leadership if they cosponsor bills, especially on Medicare. The whole partisanship in the direction instead of working together, while the President and our leadership and our appropriators are setting down with the President trying to negotiate these bills; and the President is sitting down trying to work with us, our colleagues on this side, their leadership, is so far extreme and so intent on taking back the majority that gridlock is the answer for them.

I would say when the gentleman from Missouri talks about increased costs going into this bill, I would remind people that the U.S.S. *Cole* that just went through a terrorist attack, that incident is going to cost $150 million to repair the *Cole*. It is going to take $4.5 million for a company out of Norway to come and transport the *Cole* so we can repair that ship.

The Chief of Naval Operations has put in a report, I have it and I will submit it for the RECORD, that says that because of all of the deployments that this administration has had us go on, $260 billion worth, which has come out of Defense, we have tired out our equipment and we have tired out our people. What they have had to do with equipment is take ship repair money and transfer it over for our submarine and our carrier refueling, nuclear refueling.

We have 22 ships tied up at the ports both in the Atlantic and Pacific fleets. They cannot go anywhere because they have had two and three times deferred maintenance. They cannot go anywhere. Before, they put them out to sea, hoping that they would not be in a war. Some did not have Ra-domes, some did not have radars, some did not have crash control or damage control, but yet they have put them out just to complete the mission. Well, they are gone.

Right now the CNO, and I am certain that my colleagues on the Democrat side have some ship repair industry in their districts, is $283 million short in ship repair because they have had to shift it over to nuclear refueling for subs and carriers because of all these deployments. I think that is wrong.

The gentleman from Missouri talked about construction for schools. If the gentleman from Missouri would waive Davis-Bacon, which costs 35 percent more to build our schools because they have to pay the union wage, most of us would support it. The gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), in San Diego, has had $5 million by the unions before his opponent ever put in a nickel. Five million dollars. And they talk about campaign finance reform. What a joke.

I went to 18 districts over the last month. I went to 18 districts, and the minimum amount spent by these union bosses was $1 million against our vulnerable candidates. Would my colleagues waive Davis-Bacon for their union bosses? Do they care about school construction, or do they care about the schools?

Alan Bersin, San Diego superintendent, a Clinton appointee, asked me if I would support a local school bond. I said absolutely. It is the most Republican thing I could be asked to do, because we do not end up with only 48 cents out of a dollar going to the classroom. We end up with a 100 percent or at least 90 percent because we do not have to go through the bureaucracy of here in Washington, D.C. The leadership on that side wants to put the money here in Washington and have the bureaucracy eat up over half of it. We are saying no. Let us waive Davis-Bacon, let us build school construction, let us put it in school bonds, and let us get 90 cents out of a dollar and not pay off the union bosses and make it competitive.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply say that I think many of us support the foreign aid bill, the substance of it. There is no question about it. We do have a problem with one aspect of the rule itself, and that is what I would like to address before I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I will urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer a substitute rule. The rule will adopt a concurrent resolution striking the spending caps sections from the conference report. It will make in order the foreign affairs conference report after the Senate also adopts the concurrent resolution. It will require the issue of caps be addressed before we adjourn sine die.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the text of the amendment that I would offer along with extraneous material, as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION AMENDMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 2001

Strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert the following:

''That upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall be considered to have adopted a concurrent resolution introduced by Representative Obey on October 25, 2000, directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make corrections in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Sec. 2. Only upon receipt of a message from the Senate informing the House of the adoption of the concurrent resolution, it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are hereby waived. The conference report shall be considered as having been read when called up for consideration.''

Sec. 3. For the remainder of the 106th Congress, it shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a sine die adjournment resolution until the House disposes of a bill or joint resolution to be introduced by Representative Obey adjusting the discretionary spending caps for fiscal year 2001.

H. CON. RES. 436

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 4811, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

(1) In section 101(a), insert before ''are hereby enacted into law'' the following: ''and as modified in accordance with subsection (c),''.

(2) In section 101(b), insert before the period at the end the following: '', modified in accordance with subsection (c)''.

(3) At the end of section 101, add the following new subsection:

''(c) The modification referred to in subsections (a) and (b) to the text of the bill referred to in subsection (a) is as follows: title VII is modified by striking section 701.''.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry,

asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

The vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his courtesy. I think we have had a very interesting debate. I want to reiterate that the underlying legislation is extremely important; the foreign aid legislation. The rule is fair, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I thought it was interesting that we heard, during the debate, criticism of the budget process by our friends on the other side of the aisle, a budget process that was created when they were in the majority. Now they criticize it. We heard that we spend too much money, and yet they say that a number of their priorities are not met; that they need more money. They have said that we have taken too long, and yet then we hear that they would be comfortable if they had more time. So, obviously, that is the essence of debate: Honest disagreement.

I again want to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), for what I consider a very good work product and to reiterate what we heard from the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). It is time to pass this legislation and move on to the other two appropriations conference reports that we need to pass as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution as well as the conference report, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. 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.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 197, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 545]

YEAS—210

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Martinez
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Metcalf
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—197

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez

Visclosky	Weiner	Wu
Waters	Wexler	Wynn
Watt (NC)	Weygand	
Waxman	Woolsey	

NOT VOTING—25

Brown (OH)	Hastings (FL)	Mica
Campbell	John	Peterson (PA)
Chenoweth-Hage	Klink	Shadegg
Danner	Largent	Stupak
Delahunt	Lazio	Talent
Dickey	McCollum	Watts (OK)
Edwards	McGovern	Wise
Engel	McIntosh	
Franks (NJ)	Meeks (NY)	

□ 1217

Mr. FORBES changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 647, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 647, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 24, 2000, at page H10759.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 4811, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

(Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the House the fiscal year 2001 conference report for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs.

It includes no new taxes. It protects the national security, and it does nothing to threaten the solvency of the Social Security system.

This is my sixth and final year, under the rules, as chairman of this subcommittee; and I want to take this opportunity to thank the subcommittee, the entire subcommittee, including the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our ranking member, and all of the staff who have worked so well with me during this last 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially proud that we reached our compromise agreement within the Congress as required by the Constitution and without participation at the White House. As some may recall at this very moment last year, we were negotiating with the White House on the year 2000 appropriation bill for foreign operations. In the middle of the night, a document was brought to me that I totally disagreed with that was negotiated by Jack Lew, the President's representative to the Congress on these issues. So incensed was I, Mr. Speaker, that I refused to handle the bill and voted against my own bill.

This year we did it right. Even though there are some things in this bill that I do not totally agree with, there are some things and most things I do agree with.

What I am especially proud of is that we were able to work with the minority and that we worked out, as the Constitution says, an agreement between the House and the Senate minority and the majority; and we bring before this House today a bill that was handled by the House of Representatives and the United States Senate and not consummated in some back room negotiating with some bureaucrat from the White House. I am especially pleased with that.

Mr. Speaker, this bill totals $14.9 billion in discretionary budget authority. It includes $14.4 billion in regular funding and just under $500 million in supplemental funding. These supplements were originally requested for the fiscal year 2000, but have been included in this conference report to meet urgent needs in Southern Africa and Eastern Europe and to provide part of the debt relief package for heavily indebted poor countries.

If we include the President's regular budget request for fiscal year 2001, plus the request for the fiscal year 2000 supplementals that are included in the conference agreement, the President's total request was $15.8 billion. This conference report is almost $900 million below the President's request. We are also at $1.5 billion below the fiscal 2000 enacted level.

While we did cut funding significantly below the President's request, we were able to provide full funding for debt relief and provide $42 million more than he requested for overseas refugees. This bill contains $435 million for debt relief, as well as important reforms affecting the International Monetary Fund. I remain skeptical but hopeful that the HIPC program will actually help poor people as intended. I ask all of the religious leaders who supported HIPC to work with the committee to make sure that it lives up to the promises that were made.

The conference agreement also includes $315 million in funding to combat HIV/AIDS and $60 million to limit tuberculosis, both of which are very important priorities for Members on both sides of the aisle.

I am especially proud of the $295 million provided for the child survival and maternal health, the program that has helped Rotary International help eliminate polio. It is the best thing this Congress has done in the last 5 years since I have been chairman.

The conference report continues to phase out economic assistance to Israel, while providing an increase of $60 million to meet Israel's current military needs. Of the total funding in this bill, over $5.2 billion, or 35 percent of it, is dedicated to the Middle East. As usual, we prohibit funding for the PLO and the Palestinian Authority. While funds are available for the West Bank/Gaza program of AID, they are subject to the overall Middle East spending cap. Based on a freeze on Middle East spending, with the exception of the increase in military assistance for Israel, the administration's request for this program is cut by approximately 25 percent.

The conference report also restores funding for foreign military financing grants for our allies and friends around the world. The Waters and Lee amendments that were adopted on the House floor would have resulted in the elimination of our military assistance to the countries of Eastern Europe and to the Baltic States. Those amendments also cut funding for Israel. Given what is going on in the Middle East, we could not accept cuts in Israel's military assistance that were approved by the House and have to have provided full funding.

□ 1230

We have provided up to $100 million in assistance for Serbia. While that aid is conditioned upon Serbian cooperation with the prosecution of war criminals and other matters, we suspend the application of these provisions until March 31, 2001, in order to give the new democratic government in Serbia time to consolidate its gains. Until that time, we expect the Department of State will use existing authority under the appropriations accounts for Eastern Europe to weigh provisions of law that could unduly complicate the provision of assistance to Serbia, such as section 564 of the conference report.

We also provide $89 million in assistance for Montenegro and $65 million in assistance for Croatia and urge support for Macedonia based on its cooperation during the Kosovo air campaign.

The conference agreement also provides $25 million for the International Fund for Ireland in support of the Good Friday peace agreement. This is a $5.4 million appropriation above the President's request, but I believe it is important that we continue to provide as much support as possible to bring peace to Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members support the passage of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4811)

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE						
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES						
Subsidy appropriation	759,000	963,000	742,500	768,000	865,000	+106,000
(Direct loan authorization)	(1,350,000)	(960,000)	(960,000)	(960,000)	(865,000)	(-485,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(10,400,000)	(15,040,000)	(15,040,000)	(15,040,000)	(13,535,000)	(+3,135,000)
Administrative expenses	55,000	63,000	55,000	58,000	62,000	+7,000
Negative subsidy	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	.....
Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States	799,000	1,011,000	782,500	811,000	912,000	+113,000
OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION						
Noncredit account:						
Administrative expenses	35,000	39,000	37,000	38,000	38,000	+3,000
Insurance fees and other offsetting collections	-303,000	-283,000	-283,000	-283,000	-283,000	+20,000
Subsidy appropriation	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	.....
(Direct loan authorization)	(130,000)	(127,000)	(127,000)	(127,000)	(127,000)	(-3,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	.....
Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation	-244,000	-220,000	-222,000	-221,000	-221,000	+23,000
TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY						
Trade and development agency	44,000	54,000	46,000	46,000	50,000	+6,000
Total, title I, Export and investment assistance	599,000	845,000	606,500	636,000	741,000	+142,000
(Loan authorizations)	(12,880,000)	(17,127,000)	(17,127,000)	(17,127,000)	(15,527,000)	(+2,647,000)
TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
Agency for International Development						
Child survival and disease programs fund	715,000	659,250	886,000	.....	963,000	+248,000
UNICEF	(110,000)	.....	(110,000)	.....	(110,000)	.....
Global health	.....	.....	.....	651,000	.....	.....
Development assistance	1,228,000	948,822	1,258,000	1,368,250	1,305,000	+77,000
Development Fund for Africa	.....	532,928	.....	.....	.....	.....
International disaster assistance	202,880	220,000	165,000	220,000	165,000	-37,880
Emergency funding	25,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-25,000
Transition Initiatives	.....	.....	40,000	.....	50,000	+50,000
(By transfer)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(5,000)	(+5,000)
Micro & Small Enterprise Development program account:						
Subsidy appropriation	1,500	.....	1,500	.....	1,500	.....
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(30,000)	.....	(30,000)	.....	(30,000)	.....
Administrative expenses	500	.....	500	.....	500	.....
Urban and environmental credit program account:						
Subsidy appropriation	1,500	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,500
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(14,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-14,000)
Administrative expenses	5,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-5,000
Development credit programs account:						
Subsidy appropriation	.....	.....	1,500	.....	1,500	+1,500
(By transfer)	(3,000)	(15,000)	(2,000)	.....	(5,000)	(+2,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(40,000)	(213,000)	(49,700)	.....	(49,700)	(+9,700)
Administrative expenses	.....	8,000	6,495	4,000	4,000	+4,000
Subtotal, development assistance	2,179,380	2,369,000	2,358,995	2,243,250	2,490,500	+311,120
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund	43,837	44,489	44,489	44,489	44,489	+652
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development	520,000	520,000	509,000	510,000	520,000	.....
(By transfer)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(1,000)	(+1,000)
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General	25,000	27,000	27,000	25,000	27,000	+2,000
Total, Agency for International Development	2,768,217	2,960,489	2,939,484	2,822,739	3,081,989	+313,772
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance						
Economic support fund:						
Camp David countries	1,695,000	1,535,000	1,535,000	1,535,000	1,535,000	-160,000
Other	650,500	778,000	673,900	685,000	760,000	+109,500
Subtotal, Economic support fund	2,345,500	2,313,000	2,208,900	2,220,000	2,295,000	-50,500
Emergency funding	450,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-450,000
International Fund for Ireland	19,600	.....	25,000	.....	25,000	+5,400
Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States	535,000	610,000	535,000	635,000	600,000	+65,000
Emergency funding	50,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-50,000
Assistance for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union	839,000	830,000	740,000	775,000	810,000	-29,000
Total, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance	4,239,100	3,753,000	3,508,900	3,630,000	3,730,000	-509,100

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4811) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Inter-American Foundation						
Appropriation	.....	20,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
(By transfer)	(5,000)	.....	(10,000)	.....	(12,000)	(+7,000)
Total	(5,000)	(20,000)	(10,000)	.....	(12,000)	(+7,000)
African Development Foundation						
Appropriation	.....	16,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
(By transfer)	(14,400)	.....	(16,000)	(14,400)	(16,000)	(+1,600)
Total	(14,400)	(16,000)	(16,000)	(14,400)	(16,000)	(+1,600)
Peace Corps						
Appropriation	245,000	275,000	258,000	244,000	265,000	+20,000
Department of State						
International narcotics control and law enforcement	305,000	312,000	305,000	220,000	325,000	+20,000
Assistance for counternarcotics activities (emergency funding)	1,018,500	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,018,500
Assistance to Plan Colombia	.....	256,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Migration and refugee assistance	625,000	658,212	645,000	615,000	700,000	+75,000
United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund	12,500	20,000	12,500	15,000	15,000	+2,500
Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs	216,600	346,740	241,600	215,000	311,600	+95,000
Total, Department of State	2,177,600	1,592,952	1,204,100	1,065,000	1,351,600	-826,000
Department of the Treasury						
International affairs technical assistance	1,500	7,000	2,000	5,000	6,000	+4,500
Debt restructuring	123,000	262,000	238,000	75,000	238,000	+115,000
United States community adjustment and investment program	10,000	10,000	.....	.....	.....	-10,000
Subtotal, Department of the Treasury	134,500	279,000	240,000	80,000	244,000	+109,500
Total, title II, Bilateral economic assistance	9,564,417	8,896,441	8,150,484	7,841,739	8,672,589	-891,828
Appropriations	(8,020,917)	(8,896,441)	(8,150,484)	(7,841,739)	(8,672,589)	(+651,672)
Emergency funding	(1,543,500)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-1,543,500)
(By transfer)	(22,400)	(15,000)	(28,000)	(14,400)	(39,000)	(+16,600)
(Loan authorizations)	(84,000)	(213,000)	(79,700)	.....	(79,700)	(-4,300)
TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
International Military Education and Training	50,000	55,000	47,250	55,000	55,000	+5,000
Foreign Military Financing Program:						
Grants:						
Camp David countries	3,220,000	3,280,000	3,237,505	3,280,000	3,280,000	+60,000
Other	200,000	258,200	30,495	239,000	265,000	+65,000
Subtotal, grants	3,420,000	3,538,200	3,268,000	3,519,000	3,545,000	+125,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(30,495)	(33,000)	(30,495)	(33,000)	(33,000)	(+2,505)
FMF program level	(3,420,000)	(3,538,200)	(3,268,000)	(3,519,000)	(3,545,000)	(+125,000)
Total, Foreign Military Financing	3,420,000	3,538,200	3,268,000	3,519,000	3,545,000	+125,000
Emergency Funding	1,375,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,375,000
Special Defense Acquisition Fund:						
Offsetting collections	-6,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+6,000
Peacekeeping operations	153,000	134,000	117,900	85,000	127,000	-26,000
Total, title III, Military assistance	4,992,000	3,727,200	3,433,150	3,659,000	3,727,000	-1,265,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(30,495)	(33,000)	(30,495)	(33,000)	(33,000)	(+2,505)
TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
International Financial Institutions						
World Bank Group						
Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:						
Global Environment Facility	35,800	175,567	35,800	50,000	108,000	+72,200
Contribution to the International Development Association	775,000	835,570	566,600	750,000	775,000	.....
Contribution to Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency	4,000	16,000	4,900	4,000	10,000	+6,000
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(20,000)	(80,000)	(24,500)	(80,000)	(50,000)	(+30,000)
Total, World Bank Group	814,800	1,027,137	607,300	804,000	893,000	+78,200

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4811) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital	25,611	.....	.....	.....	.....	-25,611
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(1,503,719)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-1,503,719)
Contribution to the Inter-American Investment Corporation	16,000	34,000	8,000	10,000	25,000	+9,000
Contribution to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund	.....	25,900	10,000	.....	10,000	+10,000
Total, contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank	41,611	59,900	18,000	10,000	35,000	-6,611
Contribution to the Asian Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital	13,728	.....	.....	.....	.....	-13,728
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(672,745)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-672,745)
Contribution to the Asian Development Fund	77,000	125,000	72,000	100,000	72,000	-5,000
Total, contribution to the Asian Development Bank	90,728	125,000	72,000	100,000	72,000	-18,728
Contribution to the African Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital	4,100	6,100	3,100	6,100	6,100	+2,000
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(64,000)	(95,983)	(49,574)	(95,983)	(97,549)	(+33,549)
Contribution to the African Development Fund	128,000	100,000	72,000	72,000	100,000	-28,000
Total	132,100	106,100	75,100	78,100	106,100	-26,000
Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:						
Paid-in capital	35,779	35,779	35,779	35,779	35,779	.....
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(123,238)	(123,238)	(123,238)	(123,238)	(123,238)	.....
Contribution to the International Fund for Agricultural Development	.....	.....	5,000	.....	5,000	+5,000
Total, International Financial Institutions	1,115,018	1,353,916	813,179	1,027,879	1,146,879	+31,861
(Limitation on callable capital subscript)	(2,383,702)	(299,221)	(197,312)	(299,221)	(270,787)	(-2,112,915)
International Organizations and Programs						
Appropriation	183,000	354,000	183,000	288,000	186,000	+3,000
(By transfer)	(2,500)	(2,500)	.....	(2,500)	.....	(-2,500)
Total, title IV, Multilateral economic assistance	1,298,018	1,707,916	996,179	1,315,879	1,332,879	+34,861
(By transfer)	(2,500)	(2,500)	.....	(2,500)	.....	(-2,500)
(Limitation on callable capital subscript)	(2,383,702)	(299,221)	(197,312)	(299,221)	(270,787)	(-2,112,915)
TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Economic development administration (contingent emergency appropriations) for FY 2000	.....	.....	.....	250,000	.....	.....
International Health Emergencies (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	40,000	.....	.....
Total, title V	.....	.....	.....	290,000	.....	.....
TITLE VI						
SOUTHERN AFRICA REHABILITATION AND RECONSTRUCTION						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
Agency for International Development						
Economic support fund (FY 2000, emergency appropriations)	.....	183,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
International disaster assistance:						
FY 2000 emergency appropriations	.....	10,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
FY 2000 Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	160,000	35,000	.....	.....
FY 2001 Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	.....	135,000	+135,000
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development (FY 2000, emergency appropriations)	.....	21,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
FY 2001 Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	.....	13,000	+13,000
Total, AID	.....	214,000	160,000	35,000	148,000	+148,000
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance						
Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States:						
FY 2000 emergency appropriations	.....	195,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
FY 2001 Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	.....	75,825	+75,825
Military Assistance						
International Military Education and Training:						
FY 2000 emergency appropriations	.....	2,875	.....	.....	.....	.....
FY 2001 Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,875	+2,875
Foreign Military Financing Program:						
FY 2000 emergency appropriations	.....	31,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
FY 2001 Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	.....	31,000	+31,000

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4811) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Department of the Treasury						
Debt restructuring:						
FY 2000 appropriations	.....	210,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
FY 2001 Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	.....	210,000	+210,000
PLAN COLOMBIA						
BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
Department of State						
Assistance for Plan Colombia and for Andean regional counternarcotics (emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	934,100	.....	.....
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
Drug Enforcement Administration						
Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	.....	17,850	.....	.....
Methamphetamine initiative (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	40,000	.....	.....
Total, Drug Enforcement Administration	.....	.....	.....	57,850	.....	.....
Office of Justice Programs						
State and Local Law Enforcement assistance (rescisssion)	.....	.....	.....	-7,850	.....	.....
Total, Department of Justice	.....	.....	.....	50,000	.....	.....
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE						
Military construction, Defense-wide (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	8,500	.....	.....
Department of Defense	.....	.....	.....	37,600	.....	.....
Total, title VI	.....	652,875	160,000	1,065,200	467,700	+467,700
FY 2001 contingent emergency	.....	.....	.....	.....	(467,700)	(+467,700)
FY 2000 funding	.....	(652,875)	(160,000)	(1,065,200)	.....	.....
Grand total	16,453,435	15,829,432	13,346,313	14,807,818	14,941,168	-1,512,267
FY 2001 appropriations	(16,453,435)	(15,176,557)	(13,186,313)	(13,492,618)	(14,941,168)	(-1,512,267)
Appropriations	(13,534,935)	(15,176,557)	(13,186,313)	(13,452,618)	(14,473,468)	(+938,533)
Emergency appropriations	(2,918,500)	.....	.....	(40,000)	(467,700)	(-2,450,800)
FY 2000 appropriations	.....	(652,875)	(160,000)	(1,315,200)	.....	.....
(By transfer)	(24,900)	(17,500)	(28,000)	(16,900)	(39,000)	(+14,100)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(30,495)	(33,000)	(30,495)	(33,000)	(33,000)	(+2,505)
(Limitation on callable capital subscript)	(2,383,702)	(299,221)	(197,312)	(299,221)	(270,787)	(-2,112,915)
(Loan authorizations)	(12,964,000)	(17,340,000)	(17,206,700)	(17,127,000)	(15,606,700)	(+2,642,700)

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to join in presenting our Foreign Operations conference report. I do not use this word often around here about legislation that is being brought to the floor, but I really am genuinely proud of the priorities that are in this bill. Would I like to see more money in some of the areas, for example, in the AIDS account? Yes. As I said last night to the Committee on Rules, this is not a bill I would have written; but it is a bill I can support, because, while I would have liked more, the priorities are definitely in order.

Before I begin my remarks about the bill, Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge that our distinguished chairman will be managing this bill as chairman for the last time. I want to thank him for his leadership. I also want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), who will be leaving the Congress, who are two distinguished members of the committee.

I want to also point out to our colleagues that since the bill came to the floor in its original form and today, we have lost our former colleague, Congressman Sid Yates. I bring up Sid because Sid served on the Foreign Operations Committee since the day it was formed. It was the Marshall Plan committee, imagine in those days, and, except for a brief hiatus when he left to run for Senate and came back, Sid served on the committee from then, the late 1940s, until he left Congress nearly 2 years ago. So I want to acknowledge all of the work that he did to promote democratic values and the compassion of the American people, and also as a tough budgeter on the committee. We will acknowledge the staff as we go on, but I did want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for their fine work.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman pointed out some of the aspects of the bill to our colleagues so they know what they are voting on; and I want to revisit some of those issues. In doing so, I want to recall to our colleagues' minds a quote from President Kennedy that I am fond of bringing up when we do this bill. Every person in America, practically, or certainly of a certain age, is familiar with President Kennedy's inaugural address when he said to the citizens of America, ''Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.'' But not many people know that the very next line in that speech is, President Kennedy said to the citizens of the world, ''ask not what America can do for you, but what we can do working together for the freedom of mankind.''

It is in that spirit that I ask my colleagues to support this important legislation that is here today, because in demonstrating the compassion of the American people, in recognizing that it is in our national interest to promote the global environmental health and stop the spread of AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, and helping countries develop so we develop markets for our products, this is all in our interest, but it is all in furtherance of the freedom of mankind as well.

The total funding bill, as has been mentioned, is $14.9 billion and is just almost near the President's request, a couple hundred million dollars short of that. The bill fully funds the President's request for $435 million for international debt relief. This is a very important accomplishment of this Congress, and it could not have happened without bipartisan cooperation. I think it never would have happened without the outside mobilization of the religious community throughout our country in this Jubilee Year to ask for forgiveness, including debt forgiveness.

This means the United States will be finally able to live up to the pledges made 2 years ago to the international community to engage in meaningful debt relief for the world's poorest countries. That language has been included to require the U.S. to oppose any loan from the international banks or IMF when it imposes user fees for a condition. More on that later.

The bill also contains on the subject of AIDS, which is a very high priority here.

Before I leave debt relief, I want to recognize the work of the authorizers, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE); the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS); the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS); the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK); and also the great work of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio, on this. This has really been a bipartisan cooperative effort.

On the subject of AIDS, we are all familiar with the dramatic increase that this body voted on, the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), on the day she came back from the AIDS conference in Africa, and the bill includes $315 million for HIV–AIDS and which includes $20 million for the World Bank HIV–AIDS trust fund, which was the good work of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the chairman of the Committee on Banking.

I hoped for more funding, as I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, for HIV–AIDS and the trust fund, but the increases provided in this bill, along with the increased funding anticipated in the Labor-HHS bill, will bring about real advances in the fight against HIV–AIDS.

I want to talk for a moment about the international family funding, which has gone from 372 to 425 million dollars. No funding can be obligated until February 15. However, no Mexico City language has been included. I want to commend the President of the United States for his steadfastness on this, excluding this language from the bill; and I want to also commend Democrats and Republicans for working together on this, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. Maloney) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), in terms of the Mexico City language, and, of course, the very distinguished members of our subcommittee on the Democratic side, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who all helped to make this bill a success.

The bill contains a total of $693 million for the Child Survival Account, part of which we are going to call the Callahan Child Survival Maternal Health Account, in tribute to the fine work he has done on this. This account funds the HIV programs, as well as providing $50 million for global alliance for vaccines and immunizations and $60 million for tuberculosis.

The overall funding includes funding for the African Development Bank, for increased funding for the Inter-American Development Bank.

I just want to say on Serbia, because that is a question that has been asked, the language in the bill, the agreement allows up to $100 million in assistance for what I would characterize as an appropriate degree of flexibility. It is a compromise. More on that as the debate continues.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman might find this somewhat of a surprise when I rise in support of his bill, because the gentleman has known for years that I was one of the leading opponents of our foreign aid programs. I did so because I did not think they worked. I did not think that the claims of helping poor people were actually authentic. I would be here on the floor, and I had the privilege of being the ranking member on this subcommittee some years ago, and I remember being berated by others who would say this money is for the poorest of the poor.

Well, I am willing to help the poorest of the poor, but in those days the money was not going to help the poor, it was going to help the people who ran the countries where the poorest of the poor lived. Under the dynamic leadership of the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), things have changed. Reforms have been put into

effect by his leadership that make it possible for me to stand here and support this bill.

The gentleman has done a good job in facing up to the tough issues in the foreign workplace. He has dealt with foreign leaders in a very professional and dignified, but tough, way.

I also want to compliment the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). She has been very aggressive in making her own viewpoint known, but she has cooperated completely with the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN). They have been a good team.

I would say as an aside, Mr. Speaker, that I really wish that we did not have the rule that the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) could not continue to be chairman of this subcommittee, but under the term limits that we imposed on ourselves for committee chairmen and subcommittee chairmen, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has to give up the leadership of this subcommittee. I think that is a mistake. I think the Congress will be worse off because of that, because of the ability that he has to deal with these international issues and to deal with international leaders, and also because of his ability in a nononsense way to bring together many divergent viewpoints that are held by many of our Members.

So the gentleman has done a really good job, and I just want to commend the gentleman as strongly as I possibly can for the good job that he has done, and tell him that I will continue to seek a way to keep him as chairman of the subcommittee when the time comes.

This is a good bill, Mr. Speaker. He and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) have done a really good job in identifying real needs and putting in safeguards that, in fact, will guarantee for the most part that the poorest of the poor that need the help are going to get the help.

Is it a perfect bill? Is it one that I read every word of it and read every section and say, gee, I agree with everything? No. To the contrary, there are still some things in this bill that I would prefer not be here. But, for the most part, I do agree with what is in the bill.

Again, I commend the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the good job they have done. I hope we can proceed to complete that action on this bill today, because we have two other conference reports that we need to get to quickly so the House and the Congress can complete its appropriations mission for this year.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a member of the committee.

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report, and I want to thank our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who have worked so hard to craft this fair, bipartisan foreign operations bill. Of course, also our staff on both sides, who have done superb work on this bill. It goes a long way toward adequately funding United States foreign policy priorities, and it really has been a pleasure to work with the chairman and our ranking member. I thank them for their efforts and their superb work.

There are a lot of good things in this bill, and I would like to highlight just a few. First and foremost, this conference report removes the anti-democratic global gag rule restrictions that have threatened our international family planning programs throughout the past year. The language jeopardizes the lives of women around the world and undermines a key objective of United States foreign policy, the promotion of democracy around the world.

I am also pleased that this bill fully funds our yearly aid package for Israel. As recent events have shown, helping Israel, our ally in the Middle East, maintain its qualitative military edge in the region, remains an urgent United States national security objective.

The measure also provides $435 million for international debt relief, a hard-fought victory for our efforts to help the poorest of the poor throughout the world. One of the guiding principles of United States foreign policy is that, whenever possible, we should use our assistance to enable developing countries to stand on their own two feet. Because of this historic funding, many of the countries benefiting from these funds will, for the first time, be able to spend the necessary resources on health care and education for their citizens, rather than spending large percentages of their budget servicing debt. I am proud that the United States will be a partner in this international initiative.

The conference report also demonstrates a strong commitment to combatting HIV–AIDS, and it also supports a high United States contribution to the global alliance for vaccines and immunizations and supports the international AIDS vaccine initiative, two multilateral efforts to combat the infectious diseases that cause widespread human devastation and cripple developing economies.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, I stood up here many times before to share with my colleagues why I think our investment in foreign aid is so important. In my judgment, the single most important argument for this investment is that in times of great prosperity and burgeoning budget surpluses, we have a responsibility to help those who have been left behind.

As a fortunate Nation, we have the moral obligation to alleviate some of the terrible, heartbreaking suffering in the world. But there is also another reason why our foreign assistance is so important. And that is because in the long run, we in the United States will reap the benefits from the stability shown by our aid.

Countries that are now top candidates for foreign assistance can use our aid to strengthen their democracies, stabilize their economies, and improve the health and well-being of their citizens. I strongly support the bill and again thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a member of our Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for this conference report, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this effective and responsible bill.

The gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) deserves extraordinary praise, I think, for his accessibility, his leadership, his thoughtfulness, his patience, his effectiveness, last of all, but most importantly.

I would also like to extend congratulations to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

I think the two of them, although it was difficult on some of the issues, work together very well. I do not want to forget the staff, and I am not going to start naming them, but the work that they have done is something that we should all be cheering about and saluting.

There are many things in this bill that deserve to be highlighted. First, this bill provides important funding for countries in the Middle East to help support peace in that region. Now, at this most difficult time, this funding is as important as it has ever been.

The United States has reiterated its support for Israel, Egypt and Jordan, countries which have successfully negotiated peace agreements, by providing significant economic and security assistance.

I am pleased also that we have provided $35 million to help the people of Lebanon. I must point out that this money will not be sent to the Lebanese government; rather, this money will be used to expand the USAID program in Southern Lebanon, so that American NGOs, nongovernment organizations, will be able to directly provide services to the Lebanese people while monitoring the results of our efforts.

The bill also provides important funding for countries of the former Soviet Union, including $90 million for our ally, Armenia. In addition, we are financing confidence-building measures for the countries of the Southern Caucasus to help build a foundation for peace among Armenia, Nagorno-Karabagh and Azerbaijan.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased that the cuts made to foreign military financing during consideration on the House floor have been restored. This funding is essential for our allies, such as the Baltic countries, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons to support this bill, and the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, should again be commended for accommodating the Members of this body while crafting a very effective and responsible piece of legislation. I urge all Members to vote in favor of this bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a very valued member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I will take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) for his leadership over these last several years that I have had a chance to work with the gentleman. I want to thank the gentleman for allowing me to participate and also including some of the projects. I thank the gentleman very much for his leadership.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our ranking member, for her undying efforts to work to get the job done. I want to thank the two of them. They certainly have brought a great deal to the floor. We would all hope for more money, at least on our side; but it certainly is a good bill. And I would urge my colleagues to support it.

I want to say special thanks to the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) for being persistent, to see that Mozambique, one of the most stable countries on the African continent, is able to continue in their prosperity.

I know without their leadership, we would not have seen the early release of the dollars and then the final effort here in this bill. I want to thank both the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN).

We live in a global economy. When America deals well as the leading country in the world, it is our obligation to be a partner in the rest of the world, and this bill begins that effort. And I certainly want to add my voice to those who say that when we live in a global economy, and as the richest country in the world that God has blessed us to be born and raised in, that responsibility is beginning to be met with this foreign operations bill in front of us.

With the international family planning language set, with the $420 million appropriation there to help family planning for women all over the world, it is a major effort. I commend the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, for working closely and hard on that.

Debt relief for some of the poorest countries in the world, understanding that this country only has a small fraction of that debt relief, that much of it is from other countries, by us being the leaders in the world, our effort in this bill will certainly help those poor countries and send a signal to those other countries where much of that debt is held; Africa, the continent, the largest in the world, from funding the African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, helping in reaching out.

This is a bill that we can support. Thanks again to the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our ranking member, for their support of our projects.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the gentleman who supported the previous question just a few minutes ago.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, there are probably a lot of our staff that are watching this bill, and they come to Washington fundamentally to hope that they can be involved in changing the world.

I think in a lot of ways this bill is a breakthrough, a historic precedent, an effort to really bring about great change in the world. I am referring to the section of this bill that provides debt relief for the poorest countries.

America has unprecedented economic and political and military power. And I do not think countries are much different than people. When people are successful, very successful, there is a tendency in human beings for resentment to build, and the person who is successful has it incumbent on them to try to work to share some of their bounty and to exercise humility as they carry on with their success.

The same is true with nations. When nations experience unprecedented economic success and political success and military success, great resentment begins to build, in fact some anger and hatred; some of which we have seen exhibited across this world in the last few weeks.

But in this bill is an effort to share our bounty, the wonderful American bounty, not only to share that bounty with the poorest of the poor, but then as a Nation to become a model and a leader among all the other free nations of the world to pitch in and do their share to share with the poorest of the poor. The Congress of the United States deserves great credit for the aid and the forgiveness of debt to the poorest countries in the world.

The President of the United States has shown great leadership in a meeting that was just held several weeks ago, and his staff deserves to be commended for their effort to carry through on this project. Religious leaders all over this country of all faiths, Jews and Christians, who got together to assert that this is the jubilee year, the year to give a fresh start to the poorest of the poor, have pitched in and have been relentless in their efforts to try to make sure that we share our bounty in a responsible way.

My good friend, my good friend Bono from the rock band U2, who set aside musical scores and concerts and albums and CDs in an effort to try to give something back to humanity. This has gone as high as the Pope, to the President of the United States, to religious leaders across this country to political leaders.

This program in forgiving debt is not to give relief to dictators and thieves and other countries. In fact, the reform language in this bill was written by Senator JESSE HELMS, one of the greatest reformers of the international institutions. I, myself, have chased the World Bank and the IMF to bring about needed reforms.

The debt relief in this bill is designed to make sure that these countries act responsibly; that, in fact, that the money that is forgiven by these countries will be used to deal with the health problems and the economic development problems of the poorest of the poor.

The jubilee year is special. The jubilee year is special because it is recognized in our great Old Testament, and it means that those who have bounty will forgive the debts of those who have little.

This is not just forgiveness. This is a down payment to give these countries a new start, to move towards free markets, to move to clean up the corrupt systems all over this world, but particularly the corrupt systems in Africa.

What the Congress engages in today is what can only be called a historic act of grace, and a historic act of grace is proper in the jubilee year. The United States provides the leadership, but so many of our other allies and friends around the world must join in. This is a time when we have provided that leadership, and we should be encouraged that we are all part of changing this world in which we live.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. BARRETT of Nebreska. Although remarks in debate may identify Senate sponsorship of particular propositions, debate may not characterize Senators.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our distinguished ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations, the long-time chair of the Foreign Operations Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think there are many good things in this bill, and I especially

want to say that I think that the debt relief provisions in this bill are long overdue. They will not cost the American taxpayers, because this is debt on the part of destitute countries that would never be repaid anyway. This is simply fessing up to the fact.

I would simply like to take one moment to make a comment on one region of the world that is funded heavily in this bill.

I do not believe that any Member of this House has been more supportive of the peace process or more insistent that the legitimate concerns of the Palestinians or the Arab world be brought into account in dealing with our problems in the Middle East, but I cannot begin to describe how dismayed I am at the way Mr. Arafat, and I believe even more so, a number of Arab governments have refused to recognize the opportunity presented to them by the extended hand of Mr. Barak, the leader of the State of Israel.

This was the greatest opportunity for peace that that region has seen in the over 30 years that I have been following events in that region.

I do not excuse the actions of Mr. Sharon in clumsily provoking antagonism in that region, and I recognize the concerns about the level of violence that has been inflicted by both sides in that region. But I believe that the Arab refusal to take Mr. Barak's hand is profoundly and tragically short-sighted, and I would hope that both sides, regardless of injustices perceived to be created by the other, I would hope that both sides recognize that it is not just they, but all of us who are at a precipice, and that is a precipice that we do not want to leap from.

It is going to be virtually impossible to put together a civilized policy in that part of the world, unless both sides recognize that the overall imperative that they both have is to bring peace to the people that they are supposed to represent. With that, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for doing their usual, fine work.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida, (Ms. LEHTINEN-ROS).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Callahan), the chairman, on an important project addressed in both the House and the Senate committee reports, which originally accompanied this bill for the purpose of securing a clear understanding of the conferees' intent. I am speaking about the Cuban transition project.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, I would be most pleased to enter into a colloquy with the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, allow me to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Callahan) for a fine bill.

The Senate committee report states clearly that it supports the $3.5 million be provided through USAID for the important initiative to provide policymakers, analysts and others with accurate information and practical policy recommendations that will be needed over a multiyear basis to assist this country in preparing for the next stage of our interaction with the Cuban community and nation.

□ 1300

The gentleman's House committee report similarly supported this project, and it is my understanding that the gentleman does support this project, and indeed, that it receive support from USAID.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, the gentlewoman's understanding is indeed correct. Inasmuch as support for this project was clearly stated in both the House and Senate reports, we did not restate it in this statement of managers. However, the legislative history is clear. It is the committee's intention that the Cuban Transition Project be supported by USAID in fiscal year 2001 as indicated.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for reiterating his support and clarifying the intent of this subcommittee. It is true that this project has the strong support of the chairman of the House Committee on International Relations, and I know that this committee will also be expressing its support to the agency.

I would like to ask if the gentleman would be willing to further advise the agency formally of his position on this matter. I would be most appreciative of his assistance in this regard. Indeed, it would be very invaluable.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would again yield, I assure the gentlewoman that the subcommittee will continue to work with her to ensure that USAID funds on these important programs are spent.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), a very distinguished member of our subcommittee.

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this conference report. This conference report is not a perfect product, but I think it is a good compromise and one that we can all live with. Passing this conference report is important to demonstrate America's leadership abroad. The aid provided in this bill can significantly improve the lives of hundreds of millions of people around the world. Too much is at stake in this conference report; and despite some of its shortcomings, I urge Members' support for this conference report.

I want to start my remarks by commending the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, and the other members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and the subcommittee staff for the work that they have done to get us here today. I want to especially thank the chairman and the ranking member for working with me in the subcommittee to improve some sections of this conference report with respect to Africa and those countries that are not as fortunate as the United States.

If the United States is to maintain its position as a global leader, we must act like one and assist those countries most in need. This conference report goes a long way in doing just that. There may be some Members of this body who disagree, but it is in our national interests to create opportunities and spread stability throughout the world by combating infectious diseases, poverty, working for conflict resolution, enhancing democratization, and fostering the conditions for economic growth. This conference report, Mr. Speaker, moves us in that direction.

The budget authority for the Foreign Operations Conference Report was $14.8 billion. Even though this amount is just shy of the President's request, I think it does tremendous good. Consider this: this conference report fully funds the President's request for $435 million in international debt relief, it contains $315 million to combat HIV/AIDS worldwide. In July of this year, this conference report was insufficient regarding the African Development Bank and the African Development Fund. I worked with the subcommittee markup, the full committee markup and floor consideration to ensure that these accounts were increased. I am pleased to say that this conference report includes $6.1 million for the African Development Bank and $100 million for the African Development Fund.

This conference report includes $425 million for international family planning, and under the chairman's leadership, the conference report contains large increases for the child survival and disease account, more than $248 million over fiscal year 2000. Within this account, $60 million is included for tuberculosis, $45 million for malaria, $50 million for the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunizations.

Many nations on the continent of Africa are making unprecedented progress towards democratic rule and open markets. This is why I had hoped and continue to hope that the development fund for Africa would be included as a separate account. As a separate account, DFA funding would be assured to remain focused on the long-term problems and development priorities of our African partners.

In July, when this bill was first being considered on the House Floor, I said, ''In turning our attention to some important regions of the world, we should not turn our back on others.'' This conference report demonstrates that the

U.S. has not turned its back on the world.

Again, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the ranking member, and their staffs for all of the work that they have done and for listening to and addressing my concerns. Again, I want to reiterate my support for this conference report.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on International Relations, I am convinced that foreign assistance is a good investment for America in two cases, where it strengthens our national security and where it exports our values of freedom, democracy, free enterprise, freedom of speech and religion, all of our exports.

Foreign assistance, when it hits the mark, can make a real difference for America; and I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the ranking member on this issue when we have hit that mark.

One area of the bill, though, I am terribly disappointed in and it deals with heavily indebted poor countries but probably not an area that we are thinking of. I think in addition to providing them a fresh start, I had hoped that we would also get in return a measure of justice for America and for American families of violent crime. Here is the problem. It used to be in past days that criminals would flee justice by running to the county line or to the State line. Today, criminals run to another country or to another continent. As a result, Americans are victims of violent crime, child abduction, terrorism, money laundering, drug trafficking; and we have very little hope of returning these criminals to face American justice.

That is because many of our treaties with other countries are outdated, but most importantly because 40 percent of the world is a safe haven for these criminals. They have no agreement with America to return them for justice here. Mr. Speaker, 35 of those countries happen to be heavily indebted poor countries; and I was hopeful that in this bill, we would have a provision that said in return for this fresh start, work with us to begin negotiations on extradition treaties. Not that they have to have one in place, because those take time, they have to be negotiated, they have to be thoughtful; but only that they responsibly sit down with America to discuss, to start negotiations so we can close safe havens.

I do not think it is fair that we subsidize any country anywhere that would harbor the terrorists that attacked the U.S.S. *Cole* recently. This issue will not be going away, and I am hopeful that we can work in a bipartisan manner to address this in the future.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), the very distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and recognize him for the extraordinary work he did in the international debt relief provision.

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

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, 40,000 people died of starvation and inadequate medical care. Today, 40,000 people will die. Tomorrow, I believe we will significantly reduce those numbers because of the debt relief provisions within this bill.

About 2 weeks ago, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI); the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS); the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH); and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS); and myself met with President Clinton and a representative of the National Catholic Bishops Conference, the president of Bread for The World, the Reverend Andy Young, and the Reverend Pat Robertson, and the White House; and we said that the most important foreign policy initiative for the new millennium would be the full funding of debt relief for the highly impoverished countries of the world.

Mr. Speaker, everyone should support this, the most important foreign policy initiative for the new millennium.

Nothing that Congress has done this year has the potential to do so much good so quickly as passage of debt relief funding. This week, Congress and the President reached an agreement to provide $435 million in funding for a multi-country initiative that will relieve the world's poorest countries of their international debt burdens. The agreement will also authorize the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to conduct a revaluation of its gold holdings in order to make even more resources available for debt relief. Our success in this area is in large part due to the consistent and effective efforts of the NGOs and the multi-faith coalition involved in the Jubilee 2000 effort, who have seen this as a highly appropriate way to celebrate Jubilee 2000. I fully concur. This week's victory for debt relief is a fitting victory for them and a tribute to the Jubilee year.

In 1999, the House Banking Committee approved H.R. 1095, which I co-sponsored with Chairman JIM LEACH. This bipartisan effort laid the groundwork for this week's agreement. H.R. 1095 authorized a multi-year initiative that will substantially reduce the debt owed by the poorest countries, provided they agree to use the resources to invest in their own citizens in the form of better education, health services, and serving other critical needs.

Forty-thousand people, half of them children, die each day as a result of starvation or inadequate medical care in poor countries. Debt relief will have a direct impact on this tragic situation. By freeing these countries of the burden of financing their debt, much of it incurred many years ago by corrupt regimes and dictatorships, we will help them make new funds available for anti-poverty programs. Debt burdens effectively hold hostage the public budgets of poor countries, with debt payments often accounting for 20 percent or more of the budget. With little room in their discretionary budgets to make basic social and economic investments or even to maintain a minimal level of services, these countries are forced to rely on outside sources of support in the form of grants and concessional loans, which are themselves too often in short supply. Only substantial debt relief will help to break this cycle of dependency.

Debt relief granted by the U.S. and other creditors in recent years is already bearing fruit. In Mozambique, the government has committed debt savings to an expansion of basic medicines in government clinics. In Bolivia, spending on health care, education, and other social programs increased by $119 million last year, a direct result of savings for debt relief. Not only do the poverty reduction strategies address critical short-term needs such as medicine and provision of food, these countries are also using their debt relief savings to make important long-term investments in their people and their economies. Uganda, for example, has used debt relief savings to eliminate the fees charged to grade school students. As a result, enrollment rates have nearly doubled since the introduction of the debt relief initiative, and Uganda is fast approaching universal enrollment in primary education with 94 percent of the primary school age population now in school.

These reforms are working because the debt relief initiative approved by Congress requires accountability, transparency in decision-making, and a responsible use of resources targeted on poverty alleviation. For example, Uganda's Poverty Action Fund has a transparent and accountable structure of management, with reports on financial allocations released quarterly at meetings of donors and NGO's. Working with officials at the World Bank and IMF, and with oversight from our own Treasury Department, all countries approved for debt relief will have comparable systems of accountability.

But let's be clear about the magnitude of the challenge before us, which goes far beyond sound fiscal management. Nearly half of the world's population lives on less than $2 a day. And of the 2 billion people that will be added to the world's population over the next 25 years, 97 percent will be in developing countries where poverty is most prevalent. We are facing a poverty time bomb. Our $435 million commitment is an important step toward improving this situation, but it will not single-handedly turn it around. I hope that this year's funding demonstrates a resolve to remain fully engaged in efforts to address the crises of poverty around the world.

Unfortunately, the tremendous political struggle associated with securing the $435 million this year, as well as a steadily declining development assistance budget, should give us pause in this respect. From Washington's perspective, these are too often seen as the problems of remote countries lacking strategic geopolitical significance for the United States. The U.S. spends less in real terms on development aid today than we did during the 1980's, and we spend less as a share of our economy than any of the other 20 OECD countries.

My greatest hope for the debt relief initiative does not rest in the dollars we've made available this year. It is in the bipartisan, multi-faith coalition that has formed around the issue and

around the broader goal of sustained development in the world's poor countries. This coalition has given voice to a problem that has no political consistency within the United States. We must work hard on both sides of the aisle in the coming months and years to strengthen the coalition and strengthen the U.S. resolve to make a lasting commitment to alleviating global poverty.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the very distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee that oversees international debt relief, and a real leader and fighter who was successful on this floor in increasing the funding for debt relief.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the conference report for H.R. 4811, the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. This conference report has broad bipartisan support and is a substantial improvement over the bill that passed the House on July 13, 2000.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) who has been the real driving force behind this legislation to craft a bill that we could all support. But I would also like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the CBC and particularly the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her work, particularly as it relates to AIDS.

There are many substantial items in this bill, but I would like to make special mention of debt relief and AIDS. I am especially pleased that the conference report provides a total of $435 million to forgive the debts of the world's poorest countries. This appropriation fully funds the President's request and when leveraged with contributions from other creditor countries, will forgive $27 billion in debt owed by these impoverished countries. The conference report also includes language to permit the International Monetary Fund to use the earnings from the reevaluation of its gold reserves to fund its share of the international debt relief program.

Throughout this Congress, I have been working on this issue, and I have been inspired by the breadth and depth of the commitment to the forgiveness of poor country debts. I have worked with debt relief supporters from both sides of the aisle, as well as officials representing the administration and the Treasury Department, to ensure that the debt relief program will benefit the world's poorest people. I have also met with church leaders, development advocates, civil society leaders from poor countries, and many other members of the worldwide Jubilee 2000 movement which has been working to make debt relief a reality. The success of our efforts proves that we can overcome our differences.

Again, the money that is afforded for AIDS in this bill will help to deal with the problem of the epidemic that could not be dealt with because of the burden of the debt.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), a leader in the fight for protecting reproductive rights throughout the world.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and for her great leadership on this bill.

We are 25 days late and $11 billion over the President's request. The bill does many good things, funding for Israel and other countries in the Middle East. It has funding for debt relief, relief for the AIDS epidemic. But I object to the fact that the bill also raises the cap on the total amount of discretionary spending on this and other fiscal year 2001 appropriations bills by $37 billion.

The conference report is the first step toward restoring the U.S.'s commitment to saving women's lives through international family planning without the onerous gag rule. The antidemocratic gag rule would have silenced women around the world by barring them from using their own funds to lobby for or against abortions or perform abortions. This is a short-term solution as it removes the gag rule until February 15, 2001, when the next President would have the ability to support or gag women's voices around the world. This is another reason why the choice for President on November 7 is so important.

Last year, President Clinton pledged to women Members of Congress that he would not sign any legislation that included the gag rule again. We thank him for standing firm and removing the gag rule that would be unconstitutional in our own country and it is unconscionable to force it on some of the world's poorest women.

□ 1315

This conference report is the first time in 5 years that this body has increased funding for international family planning. Just 5 years ago, we spent $200 million more a year to save women's lives.

With the increase in this bill today, raising USAID funding to $425 million from $385 million last year, we are taking the first step to restoring our commitment to the life-saving resources international family planning provides to some of the world's poorest women.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who, as I said before, coming back from Durban, South Africa, was successful on the floor increasing funds for HIV/AIDS, and with this bill taking a very major first step for the World Bank Trust Fund.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Foreign Operations conference report. I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), ranking member, for their tireless and dedicated work really on behalf of our human family.

The funding in this bill signifies our Nation's commitment to peace and stability and to progress around the world. I am also pleased that the conference report includes funding for the flood victims of Mozambique and Madagascar and appeals the global gag rule so important to women in developing countries. It also includes debt relief funding, which is long overdue.

I want to express a special thanks to Jubilee 2000, our faith-based organization, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman LEACH) for their successful efforts.

Debt relief is so important to poverty alleviation and to fighting the HIV/AIDS pandemic. As we all know this pandemic is wreaking havoc in Africa like no other disease in the history of humankind. But Africa is only the epicenter of this pandemic. It is a ticking time bomb in India, Asia and the Caribbean. So that is why the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman LEACH) and myself offered the World Bank AIDS Trust Fund.

I want to just thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), and all of those Members on the conference committee for reporting out $20 million for the trust fund, an excellent first start.

But we must do more. We must continue to fight until we make sure that we eradicate AIDS from the face of the globe. Six thousand people are dying in Africa every day now of AIDS. There are 12 million children who are orphans in Africa.

We must enlist our international partners in the private sector in a global international effort led by the United States, and we also must enhance the United States contribution to our joint U.N. program on AIDS.

In closing, I would just like to once again thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), ranking member, for her support, her commitment and her hard work. I want to encourage her to keep up the good fight.

I want to also once again thank the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman LEACH), the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), ranking member, and former Congressman Ron Dellums for all of their hard work and their leadership.

I remind this Congress that fighting international AIDS is not a Democratic or Republican issue. It is a moral issue that demands a moral response.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), and in recognizing him, acknowledge the work that he did along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH) in helping to shape the flexible compromise that we have in here, enabling us to go forward with assistance to Serbia while respecting the work of the War Crimes Tribunal.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I really want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the work she has done on this bill. This is a conference report very much worth supporting. I congratulate her and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman of the subcommittee.

I have had the honor of representing this body on the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe with some of our other colleagues, the Helsinki Commission. I just really want to compliment the language we have in aid to Serbia, because I believe it is consistent with the position that we have taken on the Helsinki Commission.

We welcome Serbia's change of leadership of Mr. Milosevic being removed from power. It is appropriate that we now participate with Serbia on foreign assistance. I support the provisions in the bill that does that.

I also think it is important that we make it clear, and we do, that, for ongoing assistance, Serbia must cooperate with the international Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia, that it must take steps to comply with the Dayton Accords, and it must take steps to implement the rule of law and protection for minority rights.

My colleagues spelled that out in their conference report, and I applaud them for it. It is a good compromise. I support it. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), a very valued member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, who from day one has been very involved in helping us shape this debt relief package.

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, first let me commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), ranking member of the subcommittee, on the compromise.

I support this bill. In particular, on the debt relief, I would like to make two points. One is, even though the United States is the smallest creditor among the industrialized nations in this, the debt relief package would not go forward without the participation and the leadership of the United States. So it is critical that we take a role in this.

I would say to the critics of the IMF, the World Bank, the last thing one wants is for the U.S. not to be involved in this because they will then take a leadership role. I think it is very important Members understand that.

Second of all, I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his language providing for the moratorium, the 2-year moratorium, on new debt to HPIC countries. This is something I proposed in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services when we were working on the authorization.

I think it makes a great deal of sense, even countries going to the soft loan window, that when we relieve their debt, that we do not get them back into the red again. We ought to let them build out of it. I commend my colleagues for that. I think it makes a great deal of sense.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), who has been a very important part of our challenge to shape language on family planning. He has been doing that ongoing. He is a very valued member of this effort.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the fiscal year 2001 Foreign Operations appropriations bill.

I sincerely thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), ranking member, for their tireless efforts on behalf of this bill.

From the explosion of violence in the Middle East to the historic democratic transition in Yugoslavia, the funding included in this package will have a tremendous impact throughout our world.

The scope of this bill is not limited to bilateral aid and debt relief. It takes into account important health issues as well.

It gives me great pleasure to vote for a Foreign Operations bill that does not contain the global gag rule.

The $425 million for international family planning will allow agencies around the world to do their job, to protect the lives of women and children.

I want to thank the President for his dedication to eliminating this harmful provision in this Foreign Operations bill.

This bill provides $435 million in debt relief to regional banks in Africa and Latin America.

I would like to mention two projects of particular importance to me, and the strengthening of the peace process in Northern Ireland.

I would be remiss if I did not thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) in seeing that this money is provided in this bill.

The bill provides for $25 million for the International Fund for Ireland and $250,000 for Project Children. Both projects promote tolerance, understanding and cooperation in the north of Ireland.

The International Fund for Ireland is a wonderful program which bridges sectarian and political divides by bringing people in both the North and the Republic of Ireland together to build stronger communities. With contributions from the United States, the European Union, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, IFI has established the objectives of promoting economic and social advancement, and encourages contact, dialogue, and reconciliation between Unionists and Nationalists throughout Ireland.

Project Children was created in 1995 to bring outstanding students from Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland to the United States for the summer.

This provides students with the opportunity to develop leadership skills, gain valuable work experience at the highest levels in the U.S. political system, and offers a new perspective on the politics and culture of Northern Ireland, Ireland and the United States. Most importantly, this program allows the future leaders of Ireland to work in an environment of mutual respect, to demonstrate the progress that can be made by implementing a strategy, of tolerance and cooperation.

Tolerance and Cooperation. These are two things that seem to be quite elusive these days.

The latest eruption of violence in the Middle East has been cause for concern by many nations around the world.

The United States has been a firm and active supporter of the Middle East peace process for many years. We have sought to negotiate a peace that would be acceptable to all parties involved. Unfortunately, negotiating a lasting peace is impossible when all parties are not acting in good faith. Mr. Arafat has chosen the path of violence over the path of peace. The United States cannot condone such a decision. The provisions and funding included in this bill appropriately reflect the position of the United States on this matter. I encourage Mr. Barak and Mr. Arafat to return to the bargaining table as soon as possible. Nothing is gained when life is lost.

Clearly, this bill covers a wide spectrum of issues that are crucial to U.S. interests throughout the world. With that in mind, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), a great advocate for peace in the Middle East.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I wish that this bill literally had tens of billions of dollars of more aid for peace in the Middle East, because I think all of us know that, had there been a closure at the Camp David meeting, that we would have been asked to do that. I for one would have been ready to step up to the plate and vote and support that type of concept.

But I stand in front of my colleagues today as someone who has been supporting legislation to actually cut back and eliminate all aid, both direct and

indirect aid, to the Palestinian Authority. The reason that I have done that is, unfortunately, what we have seen over the last several weeks is either one of two situations.

Either, one, Chairman Arafat has purposely, consciously chosen not to stop the violence, or the second is that he cannot stop the violence. Either one of those outcomes, either one of those explanations is reason enough to stop literally hundreds of millions of American taxpayer dollars funneling to the Palestinian Authority.

I urge my colleagues, even in the short time that we have left, to support this legislation and add it as one of our final acts before the end of this Congress.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), another champion for peace in the Middle East.

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal to commend this bill, and I commend the authors and sponsors of it: $435 million for debt relief, funds for peace in Northern Ireland, $2.9 billion for Israel, but not a penny for the Palestinian Authority.

I, like the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), believe that this is an opportunity to use this bill as an opportunity to pass along a message.

For virtually the entire existence of Israel, Chairman Arafat has had at his desk two buttons, one button that read ''peace'' and one button that read ''war.'' At every major crossroads in our history, we have seen Mr. Arafat press the war button.

When it was time to consider the partition plan at the very beginning of the creation of the State of Israel, a plan that, frankly, hurt Israel, did not allow her to control Jerusalem, it was the Palestinians that said no. Ever since then, Yasser Arafat and the Palestinians have chosen war over peace. Today he is waging war.

Let us not be romantic about what goes on there. Let us not allow the image of people throwing stones change the fact that Israel is surrounded by nations that are at war with her.

We have to make the message clear from this House that enough is enough. Until Arafat is prepared to press the button that stands for peace, we will stand four square with our ally, Israel, in the Middle East.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 8½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) be agreeable to yielding 1 minute of his time?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in responding to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), this is my swan song. In order to yield her time, I am going to have to leave out an entire verse.

Ms. PELOSI. Is that the part about me, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of cooperation such as has existed for the last year, I yield 1½ minutes of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Alabama be more agreeable to a unanimous consent to add 2 minutes on each side?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would rather not do that, but I yield 1½ minutes of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful for the time. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) is, as always, a gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, this debate today I think points to the quality of the bill that the committee has brought before the full House. I think it is clear from the participation of so many Members that they have been participating every step of the way.

We are blessed in this House by a very active Congressional Black Caucus, Hispanic Caucus, Congressional Women's Caucus, all of whom have taken a very particular interest in this bill and different provisions in it. Their involvement has helped us produce a better bill.

The involvement of the outside community, particularly the Jubilee 2000 initiative of the ecumenical movement for debt forgiveness in this jubilee year has helped us produce good policy that will help people throughout the world, helped us produce a better bill.

We have commended each other variously and severally and individually as to our participation in various parts of the bill. I want to also recognize the Clinton administration. We are very proud of the debt relief provisions in this bill. The President has been a leader on this issue, has made it a very high priority as has Secretary Summers, Gene Sperling, his advisor, and others in the administration. They have helped us get where we are today on that score.

I also want to again commend the President for his commitment to reproductive freedom by staying with us with the promise of not signing a bill that would have the restrictive language that was contained in the bill last year.

Very important to all of this, though, Mr. Speaker, are our staff: Charlie Flickner, John Shank, Chris Walker, Gloria Maes, Nancy Tippins on the Republican side; Mark Murray and Jon Stivers on the Democratic side. I want to commend them for all of their hard work in bringing us to where we are today.

Then I would like to once again say good-bye to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), two valued members of the committee, and commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), our distinguished chairman. It is a pleasure to work with him, Mr. Speaker. We do have our differences.

As I said last night, this is not a bill I would have written. It is a compromise. It has good priorities in it. We still have a long way to go. On HIV/AIDS, a disease that challenges the conscience of this world and certainly of our country with all of our tremendous resources, we have increased the funding; and with the World Bank Trust Fund, we have taken a major first step. But we must recognize that much more needs to be done.

□ 1330

We must all recognize that all of this is in our national interest, in our national interest to help the poorest of the poor in the world, to spread Democratic values, to make the world a more peaceful and safe place, to expand our own economy by promoting our exports. All of this is contained in this bill. This is a better bill because of the active involvement of our colleagues, the outside groups and the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and commend our distinguished chairman once again for his extraordinary service.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I echo the sentiments of my colleague from California with respect to our staff people who have helped us, assisted us, during these last 6 years: Mr. Flickner, Mr. Shank, Mr. Walker, Ms. Maes, along with Nancy Tippins, my legislative director, have been invaluable to me. When I came to foreign operations, I will assure my colleagues that I thought foreign was spelled F-O-R-N operations. They have educated me, they have worked with me, they have schooled me with respect to this great world that we live in. It has been tremendous that we have been able to achieve the successes that we have, which could not have been done without them.

Also Mark Murray on the Democratic side has been extremely cooperative, as has the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). Jim Dyer, Mr. Parkinson, Mr. Mikel in our full committee office, as well as the chairman of our full committee, Mr. Young, have been extremely cooperative during these past 6 years. What a glorious past 6 years it has been and how fast it has gone by. How rapidly we have been able to learn about the world.

Mr. Speaker, we have had the opportunity to visit in bipartisan delegations countries that some of us did not know existed before we became involved in this committee. We have traversed the jungles of South America

and Central America. We have visited countries that used to be the Soviet nation that are now independent states and listened to the leaders of those new nations strive for democracy and plead with us to send them additional technical assistance. Not cash, assistance in establishing a democracy and market economy.

What an interesting trip it has been. And I certainly would never, never regret for a moment that this opportunity to chair this subcommittee was given to me. With respect to the distinguished offer of our chairman of our full committee to consider the possibility of making me the chairman of this committee again next year, before he does that, I think I should advise him that I have had about all the fun I can stand. So I will want to talk to him before that decision is made. Yes, I want to be chairman. Yes, I have enjoyed foreign operations. Yes, I think we have accomplished a great deal. But before this final decision is made, let us sit down and have a cup of coffee and decide what might be best for me for the next 6 years.

With respect to foreign operations, when I first became chairman of this committee, I read a report about the attitude of the American people, a poll that was taken about their attitude toward foreign policy and foreign aid. The American people thought that 20 percent of the money that we appropriate went to foreign aid. In reality, this bill that we pass today represents 2 percent of the total appropriations that we will make this year. So our contribution is not anywhere near what the American people think.

In explaining foreign operations and foreign aid to the people of south Alabama, and indeed the people of the entire country, not one person that I have met during this entire 6 years has given any indication that they do not support direct aid to people who need it, to starving children, to sick people, to uneducated people.

No one objects to that. They object to years past when all of this money was given to the leaders of corrupt nations. No longer, because of the cooperation I have received from the minority and this House and the Senate, do we provide much of this direct aid outside of the Middle East. All of our efforts are concentrated in a manner that will ensure that the monies that we appropriate today go for the intended purposes, and that is to provide for the needy throughout the world, the less fortunate than those here in the United States.

Many comments have been made today about debt forgiveness. Not one individual on the Republican or Democratic side of this body disagrees with the intended purpose of debt forgiveness. There are some of us who question whether or not this entire $435 million will actually get to its intended purpose because the United States of America has already forgiven its bilateral debt to all these nations, and a lot of this money will go to these nations and just be channeled through to a bank that has made a bad loan. But no one disagrees with the Jubilee Year intentions of providing for those of us that are not so fortunate. So, yes, the $435 million is there, and I challenge those supporters of debt forgiveness to make absolutely certain that this money goes for its intended purpose.

It has been a great year. I will admit that we have had some trying times. The chairman of this committee has given me the opportunity to sit with some of my colleagues at the White House and to discuss the possibilities of the occupation that we went into in Kosovo. I sat with some of my colleagues, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), and worried about our troops going into Bosnia. And even though, for instance, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and I both disagreed about the involvement of our troops in Bosnia, nevertheless the Commander in Chief said that that was what he was going to do, and so we both came back and supported it.

So it has given me the opportunity to be involved in a process even though I disagreed at times with the President. I have disagreed with the Secretary of State. I have disagreed with the minority side of this House. But it has been a tremendous experience for me to have played a part in these historical events that have taken place during the last 6 years.

So I suppose my swan song on this particular bill, I say to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), would be patterned after one of her former residents of California, although ultimately he wised up and moved to the south, to Florida, but Frank Sinatra had that song that he sang, his theme song, ''I Did It My Way.''

This year, we did it our way. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and I and our committee members and our chairman of our full committee sat down together and negotiated a bill that is not exactly what I would like in its entirety, nor is it exactly what the gentlewoman would like in its entirety, but it is a bill that originated in this House, that was compromised within the body of the legislative branch of government and which did not involve negotiations at some late-night hour with the President of the United States.

This is a bill, Mr. Speaker, that was formulated by this body. It is a bill that deserves the support of this entire body, and I urge a ''yes'' vote on passage of this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama for bringing this conference report to the floor. While this subcommittee works with one of the smaller allocations, this bill is usually one of the most contentious. The Chairman and his staff have done an outstanding job of trying to address numerous concerns while working within the constraints of, what I consider, too small a budget for the important programs that this bill supports.

I am pleased that the conference committee continues to recognize the needs of areas of conflict, such as Armenia, and Cyprus, and I hope that a peaceful settlement will soon be reached in both of these regions. I am also pleased that the committee recognizes areas of the world where unfortunately people have to flight for democracy and the rule of law such as Burma and Tibet.

Further, I strongly support the committee's continued suspension of military aid to and engagement with Indonesia until the East Timorese refugees are safely returned home and until there is accountability for the perpetrators of the violence which is occurring throughout Indonesia not only on Timor island, but also in the Moluccas, Aceh and West Papua.

I am pleased that the Migration and Refugee Assistance account is funded above the President's request. This is money which is critically needed in areas throughout the world to aid the most desperate peoples, the refugees who have been forced out of their homes. The increase is especially needed today in light of the increasing danger faced by refugees assistance workers as seen in the recent murders of UNHCR workers in West Timor and Guinea.

Also, I support the final funding level of the Global Environment Facility and the funding provided for biodiversity programs implemented through USAID. As indicated in the House Report and the Statement of Managers, the Congress supports increased funding for important biodiversity programs as protection of natural resources around the world becomes more critical as populations increase and economies expand.

Finally, I am pleased that agreements were reached on the two most contentious issues—debt relief for the world's poorest countries and international family planning. I support full funding for the U.S. contribution to the global initiative to alleviate the debt of the most impoverished countries and I am pleased that the Mexico City language was not included in this year's bill. The small increase in funding for international voluntary family planning program is at least a step in the right direction and will help to improve the health of countless women and children around the world, but a great deal more is needed.

While I support most aspects of this bill, I raise one concern regarding the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative (IAVI). As an early, strong and constant supporter of efforts to combat the global AIDS epidemic, I support the overall goal of this initiative. However, I raise concerns with the process. In the appropriations bill funding the National Institutes of Health (NIH), we do not earmark by disease or provide any funds for specific private research organizations. We believe that this should be determined by the scientists and researchers who know what is ripe for funding. Echoing concerns raised by Dr. Harold Varmus, Nobel Prize recipient for research and former Director of NIH, I believe that explicit support for IAVI sets a dangerous precedent for funding of medical research.

Finally, I remain concerned with the continued under funding in U.S. foreign assistance. As I have said before, the U.S. is now the sole superpower and world leader. Yet, we are not leading. As our role in the world becomes

more important, our budget for foreign operations continues to lag behind our level of responsibility, thereby, limiting the impact we can have on global development.

Again, I would like to congratulate my colleague from Alabama and his staff for their hard work and ultimate success in bringing a free-standing Foreign Operations Conference Report to the floor.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 4811, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act for FY 2001. I'd like to thank Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Member PELOSI for once again including $13 million in funding for the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998.

The Tropical Forest Conservation Act expands President Bush's Enterprise for the Americas Initiative and provides a creative market-oriented approach to protect the world's most threatened tropical forests on a sustained basis. It is a cost-effective way to respond to the global crisis in tropical forests—since 1950, half of the world's tropical forests have been lost. The groups that have the most experience preserving tropical forests—including the Nature Conservancy, World Wildlife Fund, Conservation International and others—agree with this approach, and the Administration strongly supports it as well. It is an excellent example of the kind of bipartisan approach we should have on environmental issues.

The Tropical Forest Conservation Act gives the President authority to reduce or cancel U.S. AID and/or P.L. 480 debt owed by an eligible country to the United States. In return, the country creates a fund in its local currency to preserve, maintain, and restore its tropical forests.

I am delighted that on September 12, 2000 the United States and Bangladesh signed the first Tropical Forest Conservation Act agreement. This agreement will allow Bangladesh to save $10 million in debt payments to the U.S. over 18 years. In return, Bangladesh is setting aside $8.5 million in its local currency to endow a Tropical Forest Conservation Fund.

Bangladesh's tropical forests cover more than three million acres, including an area that is home to 400 endangered Bengal tigers, the world's largest single population. The area also contains one of the largest mangrove forests in the world, and it has wetlands of internationally-recognized importance. Bangladesh is home to more than 5,000 species of plants, compared to 18,000 in the United States, which is 67 times its size. Clearly, the debt-for-forest arrangement with Bangladesh will play an important role in preserving endangered species and protecting biodiversity, as well as help that struggling nation's economy.

On another front, our government is actively involved in debt treatment discussions with the government of Belize, including a possible debt swap option with non-government organizations. This is an excellent example of a public-private partnership to protect tropical forests.

Several other countries have expressed interest in participating in Tropical Forest Conservation agreements including El Salvador, Peru, Thailand, Paraguay, Ecuador, Indonesia, Costa Rica, and the Philippines.

The Tropical Forest Conservation Act preserves and protects important tropical forests worldwide in a fiscally responsible fashion, and I call upon my colleagues to support the conference report which provides the funds necessary to implement this important program.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4811, the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. Although this legislation contains some important and worthwhile provisions, it unfortunately contains more provisions that I oppose.

I applaud the appropriators and the administration for including Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) debt relief funding. For decades many poor countries have been forced to spend large portions of their income to pay down debts incurred in an attempt to restructure their economies. In some cases this money was lost to fraud and abuse by leaders in these countries. For other countries this money failed to reform the economy. In other cases the money successfully transformed the economy, but they have been unable to provide health services and education because of the burdens of this debt. This initiative of debt relief is a good first step in helping the poorest in our world begin to receive the education and public health services they need by reducing their country's debt burden.

This bill also includes no restrictions on international family planning activities for non-profit organizations. I'm not sure why my anti-abortion colleagues have allowed this bill to proceed, but I'm thankful that this body has begun to realize that we cannot force our own personal morality on other people. I hope that in the future this body will continue on this path and support a woman's right to choose.

The funding for international HIV/AIDS programs and tuberculosis control programs will also provide much needed relief to those countries who are experiencing unprecedented outbreaks in these diseases. Most of this suffering is occurring in Africa, where these diseases threaten not only to kill millions of people, but also threaten the very stability of these countries. By providing this funding we will help alleviate the suffering of families around the world.

Unfortunately, I have several objections to this bill. Primarily, the continued American taxpayer subsidy of foreign militaries and U.S. defense contractors. This bill contains over $3 billion in aid to a handful of countries to purchase missiles, tanks, guns, attack helicopters, and fighter planes. In a time of increased tension and conflict this body should be working to reduce the number of guns in this world rather than wasting taxpayer money increasing the killing potential of foreign militaries.

Through this appropriation bill we also fail to protect human rights by continuing to provide anti-narcotics funding to countries with well-documented violations of human rights. It also does not include requirements that the School of Americas include human rights training in its course work. These failures will encourage human rights violators to continue their actions.

Finally this bill includes an increase in the spending caps for this year's budget. While Members on the other side of the aisle, claim to be fiscally conservative, their actions continue to spend billions of dollars that fail to protect future programs. If we approve this increase my Republican colleagues will push to spend more money on irresponsible tax cuts to benefit the wealthy and push through their BBRA give-back bill which will provide billions of dollars to HMO's which continue to drop seniors from their Medicare programs. This spending will not benefit the majority of Americans while at the same time kowtowing to the wealthy and special interests.

It is with these considerations that I vote against this appropriations bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and the nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the conference report on H.R. 4811 will be followed by 5-minute votes on each of the following motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays were ordered yesterday: H.R. 782, H.R. 5375, H. Con. Res. 426, and S. 2547.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 307, nays 101, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 546]

YEAS—307

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hastings (WA)
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Maloney (CT)

Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Strickland
Sununu
Sweeney
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—101

Aderholt
Archer
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Berry
Blunt
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cox
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
DeMint
Doolittle
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
Everett
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kind (WI)
Kucinich
Lewis (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Manzullo
McDermott
McInnis
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Norwood
Oberstar
Paul
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Rahall
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sandlin
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Shows
Smith (MI)
Spence
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Vitter
Walden
Watkins
Weldon (FL)
Whitfield

NOT VOTING—24

Brown (OH)
Campbell
Chenoweth-Hage
Conyers
Danner
Delahunt
Engel
Franks (NJ)
Gephardt
Hastings (FL)
John
Klink
Largent
Lazio
McCollum
McGovern
McIntosh
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Peterson (PA)
Shadegg
Stupak
Talent
Wise

□ 1358

Messrs. HERGER, MCINNIS, CANADY, GOODLATTE and WHITFIELD changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I mistakenly voted in favor of the Conference Report to H.R. 4811, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes. My vote should have been recorded as a vote in opposition to the passage of the Conference Report.

□ 1400

OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 782, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 782, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 2, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
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
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Paul
Sanford

NOT VOTING—25

Brown (OH)
Campbell
Chenoweth-Hage
Danner
Delahunt
Engel
Franks (NJ)
Gephardt
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
John
Klink

Largent	Meeks (NY)	Talent
Lazio	Mica	Waxman
McCollum	Peterson (PA)	Wise
McGovern	Shadegg	
McIntosh	Stupak	

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, because of urgent business in my congressional district, I was unable to be present earlier today, October 25, 2000, and I missed votes as a result. Had I been here, I would have voted in support of the Conference Report on the FY 2001 Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill (H.R. 4811) and in support of H.R. 782, the Older American Act Amendments, which would have been recorded as ''yea'' on rollcall votes 546 and 547.

I applaud Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Member PELOSI for negotiating a conference agreement that provides important funding for multilateral debt relief, HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention programs and child survival programs. While I would support greater funding for development assistance for USAID bilateral programs that promote sustainable development, poverty alleviation, universal education and refugee and disaster assistance, I recognize that this bill is a significant improvement over the original House-approved bill. I am very glad to see that the so-called ''Mexico City'' restrictions on international family planning programs have been removed from the bill. I also commend the conferees for including strong conditions on our military aid and relations with Indonesia because of the continuing refugee crisis in West and East Timor and for maintaining the Section 907 conditions on U.S. assistance to Azerbaijan.

I am especially pleased that statutory language remains in this bill requiring the President to direct all federal agencies to declassify and release all relevant documents about the 1980 murders in El Salvador of four American churchwomen. This is a matter on which I have long labored, and I hope our government will make all documents and other materials available to the families of these women before December 2, 2000, which will observe the 20th Anniversary of their deaths.

□ 1409

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

''A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend authorizations of appropriations for programs under the Act, to modernize programs and services for older individuals, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERIE CANALWAY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5375, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5375, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 183, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Goodling	Petri
Archer	Gordon	Pickering
Armey	Goss	Pickett
Bachus	Graham	Pitts
Baker	Granger	Porter
Ballenger	Green (WI)	Portman
Barcia	Greenwood	Pryce (OH)
Barr	Gutknecht	Quinn
Barrett (NE)	Hall (OH)	Radanovich
Bartlett	Hansen	Ramstad
Barton	Hastings (WA)	Rangel
Bass	Hayes	Regula
Bereuter	Hayworth	Reynolds
Biggert	Hefley	Riley
Bilbray	Herger	Roemer
Bilirakis	Hill (MT)	Rogan
Bliley	Hilleary	Rogers
Blumenauer	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Blunt	Hoekstra	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehlert	Horn	Roukema
Boehner	Hostettler	Ryan (WI)
Bonilla	Houghton	Ryun (KS)
Bono	Hulshof	Saxton
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Scarborough
Bryant	Hutchinson	Serrano
Burr	Hyde	Sessions
Burton	Isakson	Shaw
Buyer	Istook	Shays
Callahan	Jenkins	Sherwood
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Shimkus
Camp	Jones (NC)	Shows
Canady	Kasich	Shuster
Cannon	Kelly	Simpson
Castle	King (NY)	Sisisky
Chabot	Kingston	Skeen
Chambliss	Knollenberg	Slaughter
Clement	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Collins	Kuykendall	Smith (NJ)
Combest	LaFalce	Smith (TX)
Cook	LaHood	Souder
Cooksey	Latham	Spence
Cox	LaTourette	Stabenow
Cramer	Leach	Stearns
Crane	Lewis (KY)	Stump
Cubin	Linder	Sununu
Davis (VA)	LoBiondo	Sweeney
Deal	Lucas (KY)	Tancredo
DeLay	Lucas (OK)	Tauzin
DeMint	Maloney (CT)	Taylor (MS)
Diaz-Balart	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Dickey	Martinez	Terry
Doolittle	McCarthy (NY)	Thomas
Dreier	McCrery	Thornberry
Duncan	McHugh	Thune
Dunn	McInnis	Tiahrt
Ehlers	McIntyre	Toomey
Ehrlich	McKeon	Traficant
Emerson	Menendez	Upton
English	Metcalf	Vitter
Everett	Miller (FL)	Walden
Ewing	Miller, Gary	Walsh
Fletcher	Mollohan	Wamp
Foley	Moran (KS)	Watkins
Fossella	Morella	Watts (OK)
Fowler	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)
Gallegly	Ney	Weller
Ganske	Northup	Whitfield
Gekas	Norwood	Wicker
Gibbons	Nussle	Wilson
Gilchrest	Ose	Wolf
Gillmor	Oxley	Young (AK)
Gilman	Packard	Young (FL)
Goode	Pease	
Goodlatte	Pelosi	

NAYS—183

Abercrombie	Bentsen	Boyd
Ackerman	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Allen	Berman	Brown (FL)
Andrews	Berry	Capps
Baca	Bishop	Capuano
Baird	Blagojevich	Cardin
Baldacci	Bonior	Carson
Baldwin	Borski	Clay
Barrett (WI)	Boswell	Clayton
Becerra	Boucher	Clyburn
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (MN)
Coburn	Jones (OH)	Phelps
Condit	Kanjorski	Pombo
Conyers	Kaptur	Pomeroy
Costello	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Coyne	Kildee	Rahall
Crowley	Kilpatrick	Reyes
Cummings	Kind (WI)	Rivers
Cunningham	Kleczka	Rodriguez
Davis (FL)	Kucinich	Rothman
Davis (IL)	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Lantos	Rush
DeGette	Larson	Sabo
DeLauro	Lee	Salmon
Deutsch	Levin	Sanchez
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Dingell	Lipinski	Sandlin
Dixon	Lofgren	Sanford
Doggett	Lowey	Sawyer
Dooley	Luther	Schaffer
Doyle	Maloney (NY)	Schakowsky
Edwards	Markey	Scott
Eshoo	Mascara	Sensenbrenner
Etheridge	Matsui	Sherman
Evans	McCarthy (MO)	Skelton
Farr	McDermott	Smith (WA)
Fattah	McKinney	Snyder
Filner	McNulty	Spratt
Forbes	Meehan	Stark
Ford	Meek (FL)	Stenholm
Frank (MA)	Millender-McDonald	Strickland
Frost	Miller, George	Tanner
Gejdenson	Minge	Tauscher
Gonzalez	Mink	Thompson (CA)
Green (TX)	Moakley	Thompson (MS)
Gutierrez	Moore	Thurman
Hall (TX)	Moran (VA)	Tierney
Hill (IN)	Murtha	Towns
Hilliard	Nadler	Turner
Hinchey	Napolitano	Udall (CO)
Hinojosa	Neal	Udall (NM)
Hoeffel	Oberstar	Velazquez
Holden	Obey	Visclosky
Holt	Olver	Waters
Hooley	Ortiz	Watt (NC)
Hoyer	Owens	Weiner
Inslee	Pallone	Wexler
Jackson (IL)	Pascrell	Weygand
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pastor	Woolsey
Jefferson	Paul	Wu
Johnson, E. B.	Payne	Wynn

NOT VOTING—26

Brown (OH)	John	Mica
Campbell	Klink	Peterson (PA)
Chenoweth-Hage	Largent	Royce
Danner	Lazio	Shadegg
Delahunt	Lewis (CA)	Stupak
Engel	McCollum	Talent
Franks (NJ)	McGovern	Waxman
Gephardt	McIntosh	Wise
Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	

□ 1416

Mr. ROTHMAN changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONCERNING VIOLENCE IN MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 426.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 426, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 365, nays 30,

answered ''present'' 11, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

YEAS—365

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
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
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—30

Bonior
Boucher
Clay
Clayton
Coburn
Conyers
Dingell
Edwards
Ford
Gilchrest
Goodling
Hilliard
Hostettler
Jackson (IL)
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Lee
Martinez
McKinney
Metcalf
Moran (VA)
Paul
Payne
Rahall
Rohrabacher
Sanford
Serrano
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Waters

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—11

DeFazio
Jones (OH)
LaHood
Lofgren
Rivers
Sanders
Sawyer
Snyder
Sununu
Thurman
Watt (NC)

NOT VOTING—26

Brown (OH)
Campbell
Chenoweth-Hage
Danner
Delahunt
Engel
Franks (NJ)
Gephardt
Hastings (FL)
John
Klink
Largent
Lazio
McCollum
McGovern
McIntosh
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Peterson (PA)
Pickett
Royce
Shadegg
Stupak
Talent
Waxman
Wise

☐ 1426

Mr. FORD changed his vote from ''present'' to ''nay.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table

GREAT SAND DUNES NATIONAL PARK AND PRESERVE ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 2547.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2547, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 366, nays 34, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 550]

YEAS—366

Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon

Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—34

Abercrombie
Berry
Boyd
Burton
Chabot
Coble
Coburn
Conyers
Cook
Cubin
DeMint
Duncan
Hansen
Hefley
Herger
Hostettler
Jones (NC)
Metcalf
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Paul
Pombo
Riley
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sabo
Sanford
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Simpson
Stearns
Stenholm
Tiahrt
Toomey

NOT VOTING—32

Brown (OH)
Buyer
Campbell
Chenoweth-Hage
Collins
Danner
Delahunt
Engel
Franks (NJ)
Gephardt
Hastings (FL)
Horn
John
Klink
Largent
Lazio
McCollum
McGovern
McIntosh
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Minge
Peterson (PA)
Pickett
Royce
Shadegg
Stupak
Talent
Thompson (MS)
Waxman
Wise

□ 1433

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4846. An act to establish the National Recording Registry in the Library of Congress to maintain and preserve sound recordings that are culturally, historically, or aesthetically significant, and for other purposes.

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

S. 2772. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to enhance dairy markets through dairy product mandatory reporting, and for other purposes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, AND 120, EACH MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 646 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 646

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 joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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.

Sec. 2. upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 116) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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.

Sec. 3. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 117) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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.

Sec. 4. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 118) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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.

Sec. 5. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 119) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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.

Sec. 6. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 120) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), 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 646 is a closed rule providing for consideration of House Joint Resolutions 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, and 120. Each of these joint resolutions makes further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for a period of 1 day.

H. Res. 646 provides for 1 hour of debate on each joint resolution 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 these joint resolutions. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit on each joint resolution as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, the current continuing resolution expires at the end of the day today and further continuing resolutions are necessary to keep the government operating while Congress completes consideration of the remaining appropriations bills. Because the President refuses to sign any longer duration, the joint resolutions covered by this rule each simply extend the provisions included in H.J. Res. 109 by one additional day.

Mr. Speaker, after weeks of hard work, the House now just has three appropriations conference reports left to pass. However, as we work to reach agreement over the remaining appropriations bills, we will have to take valuable time away from our negotiations each day to pass 1-day continuing resolutions. President Clinton has threatened to veto any continuing resolution of more than one day's duration, so each day we must take the appropriators away from negotiations and bring them to the floor to vote on these 1-day measures.

Mr. Speaker, if that is what the President wants, it is fine with me. I will come to the floor every day to vote for a continuing resolution to keep the government running. Like my Republican colleagues, I am determined to

pass fair and fiscally responsible appropriations bills. We will stay here as long as it takes to do the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is responsible for only two-thirds of the appropriations process. The executive branch must also do its job to move the appropriations process along. We would all like to complete our business and go home, but our principles keep us here, and the Republican majority is committed to putting people before politics and passing appropriations bills that reflect the priorities of the American people.

I hope that the President will join us in our good-faith efforts to negotiate a fair, bipartisan solution to the disagreements still before us. I am confident that the fair, clean, continuing resolutions covered by this rule will give us the time we need to complete the appropriations process in a thoughtful and judicious manner.

This rule was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules yesterday evening, and I urge my colleagues to support it so we may proceed with general debate and consideration of this bill.

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 the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), my colleague and my friend, for yielding me the customary half hour.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of not 1, not 2, not 3, not 4, not 5, but 6 continuing resolutions. Each one ends on a different day beginning tomorrow and going through Halloween. That way my Republican colleagues can finish now or they can finish later. With this rule, they have the continuing resolution they need to, no matter when they finish, without having to get more rules on the continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the 13 appropriation bills were supposed to have been passed and signed into law by October 1. Today only four appropriations bills have been signed into law, Defense, Military Construction, Interior and Transportation. There are 5 bills waiting at the White House: VA–HUD, Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, Treasury-Postal and Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, so in order to keep the Federal Government open, despite the unfinished business, we must keep passing these continuing resolutions until the appropriation bills are finally signed into law.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the appropriations bills that are still outstanding, Labor, Health and Human Services, Commerce Justice State, Foreign Operations and the District of Columbia, are some of the most controversial. So these bills are not going to be finished without a fight, and that might take some time.

But my Republican colleagues continue to move slowly, and in the last month, the Congress has been in session only a few days a week, and for many of those days, we have been voting on very noncontroversial suspension bills.

Instead of renaming post offices, my Republican colleagues should have been passing real managed care reform. They should have passed the prescription drug program within Medicare. They should have passed campaign finance reform, gun safety legislation; but, Mr. Speaker, they did not. And even Republican Senator MCCAIN said, we are gridlocked by the special interests.

Democrats, on the other hand, want to help working families. We want to hire 100,000 new teachers. We want to build new schools and repair the old ones.

We wanted to help school districts with school construction bonds. We want to create after-school programs. But my Republican colleagues just will not let us.

Mr. Speaker, even though my Republican colleagues balk at spending money on education, they are increasing spending on other items faster than ever before, even nondefense spending.

□ 1445

And that increase in spending, Mr. Speaker, is very significant, even if we account for inflation.

So I think it is time Congress enacted some bills for everyday Americans. I think it is time we put education first. I think it is time we finished the appropriation bills instead of stalling for another week. So I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule providing for the six continuing resolutions.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members it is not in order in debate to refer to statements of Senators occurring outside the Senate Chamber.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, only to offer myself first in line to nominate my friend from Massachusetts as chairman of the national school board.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the Democratic whip.

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

Mr. Speaker, those of us who are from the Midwest are familiar with an insect called the cicada. Now, the cicada is a very fierce bug that lays dormant for years, but at any given time, they seem to wake up from their slumber, they make an incredible racket for a very brief period of time, and then they are gone, they have vanished. Now, how very much like this Republican Congress are the cicada. It is a Congress that for 2 long years has been laying flat on its back and only now is it rising to its feet to give its self-serving speeches.

Now, in the words of Washington Post's editorial, this is an un-Congress. We have heard of the ''uncola.'' They have called this the un-Congress. Quote: ''The un-Congress continues neither to work nor adjourn. For 2 years, it has mainly pretended to deal with the issues that it has systematically avoided,'' The Washington Post.

Now, is this because, Mr. Speaker, there is no work left to be done? Granted, our country is in much better shape today than it was under the last Republican President, but that does not mean that all of America's problems have been solved.

Just consider education. We know that one of the toughest obstacles to learning is the fact that too many kids are stuck in overcrowded, undisciplined schools and classrooms, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has just made clear. Overcrowding has gotten so bad that in some schools it is at the point that classes have been held in converted boiler rooms. We have even heard of roofs caving in on our students. We should be doing something about that. We have a bill to do something about that. In fact, there are Republicans that have sponsored our bill to do something about that. We can pass the Rangel-Johnson bill. We can have safer and modern schools and, by the way, at the same time help cut the property taxes at the local level.

But, it seems the Republican leadership would rather complain about public schools than join with us in helping to fix them. If their leadership put as much time into crafting solutions as they do in passing stopgap measures, we could have addressed this issue. We could have passed the patients' bill of rights. We could have approved a Medicare prescription drug plan under Medicare. We could have had hate crimes legislation. We could have raised the minimum wage. All of these major pieces lie dormant like the cicada after it raises a racket.

So maybe if we could have done these things we could have earned the right to take some of those extra long weekends we have been enjoying. But, Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for my colleagues on this side of the aisle when I say that none of us ran for Congress because we came here to complain about problems. We came here to help solve them.

If my Republican friends are not willing to roll up their sleeves to stay here to face those four or five issues, to make sure we have the education agenda in modern schools, in lower class sizes, in after-school programs, if they are not willing to do that and they are not willing to do raising the minimum wage and doing the prescription drug benefit under Medicare and making HMOs accountable and passing campaign finance reform, I suggest that they step aside in favor of those who will.

So I urge my colleagues to vote no on this rule so that we can raise these issues in a way that will allow us to have them before us so we can have something to take back to the American people before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon reluctantly in support of the continuing resolutions that we will be passing, but in opposition to the rule. I would like to speak just briefly about the importance of understanding the current state of our fiscal affairs.

It is important to understand that these measures that we will be voting on are very small infinitesimal steps in a significantly larger process. That larger process is one that has not been very well explained to the American people. The American people understand or expect that we are going to have a budget surplus and that we will be paying down on the debt and that over the next 10 years, that payment may be as much as $4 trillion. Well, the facts do not really square up with that, and the action here today really gives us reason to pause.

I would like to start by just pointing out with respect to this chart that we have had not a surplus, but indeed we have had an increase in the debt over the last year. The dates here just are from June 30, 1999 to June 30, 2000. We can look and see that the debt went up by $40 billion. Now, compared to what it has been in some other years, this is really cause to rejoice, but compared to where we think we are, it is cause for pause, and it is cause to be much more sensible about where we are going.

In this regard, I would like to emphasize that if we look at the spending that has been occurring under the current leadership here in Congress over the last several years, discretionary spending has been going up at a rate of about 5.5 percent a year. And when we look at the Social Security system which we should not even consider in calculating our surplus, and we back out that amount, then we back out this increase that has occurred and projected into the future, we will have approximately $350 billion of surplus over the next 10 years.

Now, the point of this brief discussion is that we simply cannot afford all of the things that our colleagues and the leadership have been telling us we must do. For example, a $292 billion marriage tax bill which was misguided, it was not in the budget, it came up before we even passed a budget. This type of irresponsible legislation is what is going to put us back into deficit spending, back into the Social Security trust fund, and I urge my colleagues, as we consider these continuing resolutions this afternoon, let us be realistic about where we are going long term and let us make sure that we keep our eye on the ball and the ball is to pay down on the national debt.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, rightfully so, the Chair admonished me for using the name of a Senator. I meant to refer to our former House colleague, JOHN MCCAIN, the former Presidential candidate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up where our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) has left off and actually rise in opposition to the rule which will give us a series of six 24-hour continuing resolutions.

According to information, Mr. Speaker, compiled by the House Committee on the Budget, the Republican leadership is in the process of busting the spending cap of $600.3 billion that they set earlier this year. Keep in mind that the Congress has not sent all 13 appropriations bills to the President yet, but if the present trend continues, the Republicans are on track to spend $620.5 billion, which means they will have busted the spending caps that they set by over $20 billion. In fact, on the nine bills that Congress has agreed upon, the Republican leadership has agreed to spend over $11 billion more than the President requested in his budget. Considering the House and Senate have not even worked out the differences on three of the 13 appropriations bills, including the huge Labor-HHS-Education bill, this number will only get significantly larger.

The really sad thing is that, Mr. Speaker, all of this could have been avoided. The Blue Dog Coalition worked very hard last spring to develop a viable budget plan and reached out and offered to work with the Republican leadership to reach a bipartisan agreement that would receive widespread support on both sides of the aisle.

First, our plan would have locked up 100 percent of the Social Security surplus for future retirees. It would have set aside 5 percent of the non-Social Security surplus for debt reduction over the next 10 years; set aside 20 percent of the non-Social Security surplus for tax cuts, and allowed Federal spending to grow at a rate of 2.5 percent over last year. However, like last year, Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership was not interested in reaching a compromise. They enacted a completely unrealistic budget that set spending caps on the 13 annual appropriations bills at levels which assured those caps would be ignored this fall.

The fact that Congress is now in the 4th week of a new fiscal year with three of the 13 appropriations bills still not ready for the President's signature, including one that the Senate has not even considered, shows how unrealistic their budget was in March. Because they do not have a sound budget plan, this Republican Congress is on track to spend more money than any other Congress in history, with an increase in non-Defense spending of 5.2 percent over last year. I repeat, an increase in non-Defense spending of 5.2 percent over last year. This is over twice the rate of spending growth proposed in the Blue Dog budget.

This orgy of spending is a result of the poor budget decisions made by the Republican leadership in March of this year. Instead of working to develop a bipartisan budget plan with responsible tax and spending priorities, instead of working to develop a bipartisan plan with responsible priorities, we have passed a budget that made a nice political statement to a faction within the party with virtually no chance of being successfully implemented.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that we use back home: you reap what you sow. When we sowed the seeds that grew into a budget back in March, the Republican leadership rejected every offer of compromise from the Blue Dog Coalition. Now it is fall and the crop has failed. We are 24 days past the end of the fiscal year with the spending caps destroyed, three appropriations bills left to pass, and no idea how much more will be spent.

Mr. Speaker, this is fiscally irresponsible, and it is a direct result of the failure of the Republican leadership to develop a sound budget plan back in March.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

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

Here we are 25 days after the end of the fiscal year, and we still do not have all of the appropriations bills passed to keep the government running. Frankly, that is no way to run a railroad. One would not run one's business that way, one would not run one's household budget that way, but here we are.

Some may say, what is wrong with it? Well, what happens when we get in this predicament is exactly what we see playing out. The back room deals end up being made out of the light of day and we end up spending more money than this Congress should spend.

□ 1500

My friends in the other party always talk about the Democrats as the big spenders. I want to tell my colleagues those old fables just do not work anymore.

The truth is this is the fourth year in a row that the Republican-controlled Congress has passed appropriations bills with higher discretionary spending outlays than the President requested. By contrast, the Democratic-controlled Congresses of the Reagan and Bush years more often than not appropriated less than the President requested.

We all talk about this big budget surplus. The presidential candidates are talking about it, how they want to spend it. The truth of the matter is this Congress is frittering away that budget surplus. It may not even be here if we continue along this path.

We talk about a $2.2 trillion on-budget surplus, but it is based on a whole lot of iffy assumptions. If we continue increased spending at an annual rate of 5.5 percent as this Congress has done since 1998, we will wipe out two-thirds of that projected surplus.

Now, to put this in context, just a year ago, the Republicans in Congress proposed cutting taxes a trillion dollars. Now, I am for cutting taxes. But the truth of the matter is, if we had passed that legislation, we would have wiped out the surplus, considering the increase in spending that this Congress seems intent to do. The problem that we face today is to pass a budget that preserves our surplus and ensures our future prosperity.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to continue to talk a few minutes here about the Nation's financial picture. But before I do, we are now 25 days into the new fiscal year. Do my colleagues know how many days Congress has met of those 25? We have sat for 12, only 12 of those days.

At the beginning of the fiscal year this year, on October 1, only two of 13 appropriation bills had been completed and signed by the President. Today only four, there are five more waiting, but we are still three or four away from even having something to negotiate to send to the President.

Now, if one ran one's business in that manner or if a physician practiced medicine in that manner, I would suggest that a suit for malpractice, legislative malpractice would apply. This is not the way to conduct the Nation's business. It was done and the seeds were sown, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) said earlier, back in March when a political statement was enacted called a budget that was unrealistic and was never intended to be followed.

We are now in a situation where the Republicans say, well, we have to stay in session here to keep President Clinton from demanding all of this money to be spent. If we look at history, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) just alluded to it, and the Blue Dogs went back and looked at this when we compiled our budget, over the 12 years Reagan-Bush, Bush-Quayle, the Democratic-controlled House at that time, part of that time, of course the Republicans had the Senate, spent less than those Presidents asked the Congress to spend.

For the last 4 years, the Republican Congress has spent more on nondefense items than President Clinton has asked for. We now are in a never-never land 25 days into a new fiscal year with no idea in sight of how we wind up the business of the country for the previous fiscal year. We are in a position where the surplus is a projection and the spending is a fact.

Now, we are going to support a CR to keep the government open. But this rule is a sham to get by for another 6 days, trying to keep this ball in the air before the November 7 election day so that no one can definitively and affirmatively state what this Congress did or did not do. I have been here 12 years. This is as poor a way to run the Nation's business as I have witnessed in those 12 years.

Yesterday or 2 days ago, we were not only not consulted, we are told 2 days ago there is a tax package out there, and the leadership is going to brief the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman of the Finance Committee in the Senate about what is in it.

We are supposed to be a legislative body. I tell my colleagues, the country needs to know that whatever may happen November 7, this situation is not the way to conduct their business in a responsible manner.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying at home, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Well, take a good look at what we are talking about today. We continue to hear a lot of rhetoric from the other side of the aisle about Republicans standing up to big spending demands of the President and Democrats in Congress.

Before my colleagues point fingers about big spenders, they should take a good look in the mirror or better yet at the record. Eight of the nine appropriation bills that Congress has passed so far this year and sent to the President would spend more than the President has requested.

The nine bills Congress has sent to the President would result in $11.4 billion in outlays above the President's request. This is the chart. According to estimates of the Congressional Budget Office, the nine appropriation bills that this Congress, under Republican majority, has sent to the President would spend $498.6 billion, $11.4 billion more than the $487.1 billion requested by the President on those bills.

I do not know how my Republican colleagues can continue to honestly explain that Democrats are big spenders for asking for $5 billion in additional spending for education when they have already voted for appropriation bills spending $11 billion more than the President has requested.

According to one rather prominent Republican who has been a leader in fighting against pork barrel spending, the nine appropriation bills that Congress has sent to the President contain $21 billion in programs and projects which he identified as low priority, unnecessary or wasteful spending for programs and projects that have not been appropriately reviewed in the normal merit-based prioritization process of the Congress.

I do not understand how voting to increase spending by $21 billion on programs that some have identified as pork is acceptable, but asking for $5 billion more for education makes someone a big wasteful spender.

Everyone who voted for the rule on the Foreign Operations conference report earlier today voted to increase total spending by $13.3 billion in budget authority and $8.3 billion in outlays above the President. Let me repeat that. If my colleagues voted for the rule on the Foreign Operations bill, they voted to increase spending substantially above the amount requested by the President. No Member who voted for that rule can honestly continue to claim that the President is responsible for increased spending.

According to the bipartisan Concord Coalition, if discretionary spending continues to increase at the same rate it has over the last 3 years under Republican Congress for the next 10 years, nearly two-thirds of the projected $2.3 billion on-budget surplus everybody has been talking about will be wiped out.

I will again say to any of my colleagues on this side, if they wish to challenge me on anything I am saying as to the accuracy and authenticity of what I am saying, I will yield to them.

By contrast, discretionary spending increased by just 1.2 percent, the rate of inflation, under Democratic Congresses after the budget was created.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman's chart of the President's request include the additional demands he is making upon closing this process or only his original requests?

Mr. STENHOLM. The original requests, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LINDER. Which does not include the coverage for fires in the West, for example.

Mr. STENHOLM. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LINDER. And did not include the coverage, the additional programs and spending he asked for right now at the end of the process.

Mr. STENHOLM. The numbers in our chart represent the original Republican requests, the original President's request, and the Blue Dog request that we have begged and pleaded with those of you on the other side to agree with us on numbers that we could stand together.

If we are so concerned about the President's request for spending, why

did my colleagues never at one time, their leadership, ever come to the Blue Dogs and say we accept your numbers which is between the President and you.

So the point of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is well taken except I think my point still stands. We are spending more because my colleagues have voted for it. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's point he is making because it is a valid point and is one which more people need to understand. But the finger pointing needs to stop. It needs to stop.

The problem is not today with the Budget Act, as some would say. The problem is with a leadership in this House that has made the budget process irrelevant by proposing unrealistic budgets, refusing to work in a bipartisan manner on a realistic budget that would have held down spending to less than what the President has requested. That is the problem.

As I said this morning, I have no quarrel with the Committee on Appropriations, and I see the chairman here and the ranking member. I have no problem here. Mine is with the process and the finger pointing that has gotten into the political process, which it is ridiculous.

The problem is with the leadership of this House. We now absolutely can show big spending originates in the House. Presidents do not spend money. Congress spends money. We are in the minority. I am in the minority. I am a part of the minority party. We cannot be responsible. The majority has to assume that responsibility.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair be kind enough to inform the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) and me how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 27½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for the time.

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) just said is exactly on point. My friend Archie the cockroach said once that what happens to men or to mankind is not determined by the system that they have. He says, what happens to mankind is determined by what they do with whatever system they happen to have in hand. I think that is the case with the budget resolution.

As the gentleman from Texas has said, the problem we are facing now is not due to defects in the budget resolution, per se, although it certainly has some giant ones. The problem is that the budget resolutions have been used to deceive the American people about the true intention of this Congress for over 10 months. They have been used to deceive the American people about what is intended, what is affordable, and what is doable under that resolution.

Because those resolutions have been so deceptive, that is what has enabled the majority to pretend that there was enough room within their spending caps to provide the tax package that they tried to pass over the last 10 months. Most of the benefits in that tax package went to those in this society who were already the most comfortable and the most blessed.

Now we have the chickens coming home to roost time. We have just seen the passage of a provision in the previous bill which admits that the fiction that this Congress is going to spend only $600 billion this year on discretionary spending was a giant public fib.

So now we have proceeded to pass a number of bills, and we are down to two of them. The main issue that divides us on those two remaining appropriation bills is education. As the gentleman from Texas says, we are now being told that, after this Congress has exceeded the President's request on a number of those appropriation bills, after we have seen large amounts of money, $19 billion above last year put into the military budget, and, again, I find that amusing because the majority party said that there was not enough in that budget for readiness. Then they cut the readiness portion of the defense budget by $1.4 billion, either 1.4 or 1.6, I have forgotten which, in order to make room for congressional projects.

Now we are told, after we have done all of that, that there is not room in the inn to meet the President's budget request on reduced class size so that teachers are teaching classes rather than zoos.

□ 1515

We are told there is not enough room in the inn to train teachers, even though we are going to need well more than a million new teachers because so many are close to retirement nationally.

We are told there is no room in the inn to have a significant school modernization construction program. We have a $125 billion backlog in the need for school reconstruction in this country. The President is asking us to support a proposal that pays for less than 20 percent, and we are being told by the majority there is no room in the inn.

Well, I have to tell my colleagues something. There is no room in the schools, and we are going to have more than a million additional children attending our public schools and we are not ready for that challenge. We are not ready in terms of buildings, we are not ready in terms of technology, we are not ready in terms of teacher training. One out of every 10 teachers in this country is not qualified to teach the subject that they are teaching. We are certainly not meeting our responsibilities with respect to either Pell Grants so that we measure up to our pretense that we are providing equal opportunity for people to attend college, and we are certainly not meeting our obligations with respect to special education. I believe we are only spending about 17 percent, or at the 17 percent level in terms of the requirements in order to meet the mandates sent down by the Federal Government.

So now we are here having to pass these day-after-day CRs because the majority refuses to meet our national needs in education, after we have seen so much money poured into other bills. That is our problem. That is what needs to change if we want to go home.

Mr. LINDER. 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 (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. 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 205, nays 191, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 551]

YEAS—205

Aderholt	Deal	Hoekstra
Archer	DeLay	Horn
Armey	DeMint	Hostettler
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Houghton
Baker	Dickey	Hulshof
Ballenger	Doolittle	Hunter
Barr	Dreier	Hutchinson
Barrett (NE)	Duncan	Hyde
Bartlett	Dunn	Isakson
Barton	Ehlers	Jenkins
Bass	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Bereuter	English	Jones (NC)
Biggert	Everett	Kasich
Bilbray	Ewing	Kelly
Bilirakis	Fletcher	King (NY)
Bliley	Foley	Kingston
Blunt	Fossella	Knollenberg
Boehlert	Fowler	Kolbe
Boehner	Frelinghuysen	Kuykendall
Bono	Gallegly	LaHood
Brady (TX)	Ganske	Latham
Bryant	Gekas	LaTourette
Burr	Gibbons	Leach
Burton	Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)
Buyer	Gillmor	Lewis (KY)
Callahan	Gilman	Linder
Calvert	Goode	LoBiondo
Camp	Goodlatte	Lucas (OK)
Canady	Goodling	Manzullo
Cannon	Goss	Martinez
Castle	Graham	McCrery
Chabot	Granger	McHugh
Chambliss	Green (WI)	McInnis
Coble	Gutknecht	McKeon
Coburn	Hansen	Metcalf
Combest	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Cook	Hayes	Miller, Gary
Cooksey	Hayworth	Moran (KS)
Cox	Hefley	Morella
Crane	Herger	Myrick
Cubin	Hill (MT)	Nethercutt
Cunningham	Hilleary	Ney
Davis (VA)	Hobson	Northup

Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—36

Bonilla
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Chenoweth-Hage
Collins
Danner
Delahunt
Ehrlich
Engel
Franks (NJ)
Gephardt
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Klink
Largent
Lazio
Maloney (CT)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntosh
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Mollohan
Peterson (PA)
Radanovich
Shadegg
Slaughter
Stabenow
Stupak
Talent
Waxman
Wise

□ 1537

Messrs. MURTHA, FARR of California, and EDWARDS 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 for:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was absent and unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Res. 646 (rollcall No. 551).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 115 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Pursuant to the rule just adopted, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 115

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 106–275, is further amended by striking the date specified in section 106(c) and inserting ''October 26, 2000''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 646, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 115 is a continuing resolution, and it continues the funding of our Government for one day until midnight tomorrow night.

I am not sure that is the smartest way to go. I think that, with the progress that we are making now, that we could probably be finished by Friday or Saturday. I would have preferred to have introduced a resolution to go to at least Saturday. However, the President of the United States has told us that he would only sign CR's for one day at a time. And, of course, that is his prerogative. He is the President and he has the veto pen; and unless we have a two-thirds vote to override him, he prevails. And so, he prevails in this case, and we have a 1-day CR. If we do not finish our business tomorrow, we will have another 1-day CR.

Where we are on the progress of our bills is, after having passed the Foreign Operations appropriations conference report today, there are only two outstanding conference reports, one of which we intend to file tonight, that is the District of Columbia appropriations bill along with the Commerce, State, Justice bill. And then the one remaining bill is the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education bill, which we hope to be able to file by tomorrow night and move to consideration of it Friday or Saturday.

Then we will have completed our appropriations process. All this CR does is extend the continuation of the Government from midnight tonight to midnight tomorrow night.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my ranking member for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say I want to thank the President of the United States for insisting that this continuing resolution be for only 24 hours and that we operate with these 24-hour resolutions from now on.

And the reason is simple. Most of the discussion right now is over the fact that the Republican leadership refuses to move on the Democratic education initiatives that include funding for school modernization and also for more teachers and more money that goes back to the local towns and school districts to hire more teachers. I just want to say how important those initiatives are.

In the State of New Jersey, we rely mostly for our school funding on local property taxes; and increasingly we find that the towns are unable to afford more money for educational purposes. And so, what we have is that the class sizes continue to rise; the school buildings, in many cases, do not receive the necessary repairs; we have overcrowding where we cannot even in a lot of the school districts build a new school because we do not have the money.

So when the Democrats talk about an initiative that allows these towns to have more money to hire teachers, to reduce class size, or to pay for school modernization or for new schools, these are real problems, these are real issues that affect people every day and affect

children in New Jersey and throughout the country every day.

□ 1545

The bottom line is the Republican leadership talks about the need for discipline in the classroom. How are we going to have discipline in the classroom if we have a class that has 25, 30, or even 40 students? If we give money back to the school districts to hire more teachers, they can reduce the class size. I think the President's suggestion is down to 18 students at the elementary level. That means better discipline in the classroom, better learning opportunities for these kids in the public schools.

And the same thing goes for the school modernization initiative. How can they learn if they are in a building that is falling apart? I have been to school districts in my district where the roof was collapsing. Or in other situations where they have to have two shifts and kids go to school starting at 7:00 in the morning to noon and then 12:00 noon to 5 o'clock, or something like that.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats are talking about something that is real here. This is not pie in the sky. All we are saying is that we have the money now, let us make it available for these towns, because it helps with their property taxes. But most importantly, it helps with these kids and their lives.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Am I correct that if we passed the initiative that we have been hoping to pass on making sure that we have more classrooms and more teachers to bring class sizes down and have safe and clean, healthy schools to teach in, am I correct that if a local subdivision did not want to have more teachers, or did not want to do any school construction, that this legislation would not force them to do anything? Am I correct?

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, so it would be the local school board's choice, the local citizens' choice whether or not to utilize these resources.

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, if I could say to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the money for both classroom size reduction and for school construction has been included in the conference report since July 27. It is fully available under title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Under this title the school district, if it decides it does not need the money for school construction, can use the money for other purposes like teacher training or equipping classrooms with technology and computers.

So there should be no dispute about the money being available. The dispute is about whether money is to be mandated by Washington to be spent for a particular purpose, or whether the local school district and the parents in that school district will decide the use for that money. The money is there; there has never been a dispute about the money. There is a dispute about Washington control or about local decision-making. We favor local decision-making.

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

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman, as he knows, and for all that he has done in his capacity as chairman of the subcommittee. But I think there is a serious issue here about whether the money really is available in the sense that what has been proposed, from what I understand from the Republican leadership, is that this is more in the nature of a block grant and it is not necessarily the case the way the language is now that this money would be available for these purposes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman that the way it is structured, not only $1.3 billion would be available for school construction, $2.7 billion would be available for that purpose. Or the $2.7 billion would be available for classroom size reduction. In other words, we are not straitjacketing the process; we are giving flexibility so that the schools can decide their needs themselves. That is the way it should be done, in my judgment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would again yield, I think there is a serious question about that and whether or not the money would actually flow to the school districts. I understand the gentleman disagrees.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), chairman of the subcommittee, my friend; but I would nonetheless like to set the record straight, because I view this issue quite differently than does he.

He says that the argument is not about availability of money. He says the argument is simply about whether or not we are going to have Federal dictation to local school districts or whether they are going to have some flexibility.

I would point out one simple fact: 93 percent of all of the money that is spent by every school district in the country, on average, is raised and spent in accordance with State and local wishes. That hardly sounds to me like Federal dictation. It is true that what we are trying to do on this side of the aisle is to assure that the other 7 percent is focused on what we regard to be critical national priorities. One of those priorities is school construction. Another is teacher training. A third is class size.

We happen to believe that the research shows that children do a better job of learning if the classes are small enough so that teachers can have, from time to time, control of the classroom in which they are teaching and have some close personal relationship with those students.

We also happen to believe that children do better if they are not in schools that are falling down. There is a $125 billion backlog on school construction in this country. The President is trying to fashion a program which meets at least 20 percent of that need, and we make no apology in trying to focus that 7 percent of Federal funds that we provide on those items.

The third point I would make is simply this. With respect to class size, lest anyone in this Chamber believe that there is not a large degree of flexibility for local school districts, let me point out the following: school districts now have flexibility to spend up to 25 percent of the funds on training, existing teachers, testing new teachers, and providing high-quality professional development to ensure that all teachers have the knowledge and schools to teach effectively.

So if school districts have already reached the class size target at 18, they are free to move a significant portion of their funds to teacher training, as the majority demanded last year.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says that we here in Washington know that reduced class sizes are better for kids to learn, and we here in Washington know that kids should not have to go to school in dilapidated classrooms. What makes the gentleman think that the local school board does not know those same things? What makes him think that we have to tell them how to spend their money?

It seems to me that the argument that since 93 percent of the money is raised locally, we ought to be able to dictate how our 7 percent is used simply goes against the genius of public education in our country. The secret is not Washington control, it is local control. That is what we have done for 200 years in America, and it seems to me that we can trust them to make these decisions. They have made a lot of good decisions.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, taking back my time, I would simply say the gentleman has asked why is it that local school districts do not recognize these same priorities. The fact is that they do, and that is why they are asking us to pass these programs. Take a look and see which educational organizations have supported these programs: the PTA, right on down.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would prefer that the gentleman get some time from the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). I would be happy to continue this exchange, but I prefer that some of it be on his time.

But let me simply complete my thought. Directing that 7 percent of the education money that is spent in this country be spent on national priorities is not what I call running roughshod over local control. What we are saying is they control 93 percent of the funds. Spend it any way they want. But if they want us to use taxpayers' dollars at the Federal level, we want them used for areas that we know by research work, and in areas that have an extra problem.

We know that the average school in this country is 43 years old. Some of them are so old we cannot even wire them anymore for modern technology. We ought to be helping to change that, instead of obstructing the efforts of the President to do something about it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER).

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has just clearly defined our differences. We believe that education decisions can be made at the local level, and we are willing to give not the President's level of $1.3 billion, but $2.7 billion. If local school districts want to use it for school construction, they can. We believe that they can make these decisions without Washington direction.

The flexibility that we believe in and the control that they believe in clearly defines the differences between our two parties in this area. That is the way it is. We understand it. We accept it. We think that they are wrong; and obviously, they think that we are wrong.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have had this argument in our committee before, and I ask the gentleman why then does he not believe that all the education money that we appropriate in his bill should not be simply block granted? Let me give a specific example.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, what makes the gentleman think that I do not believe that?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if he does, that is fine. Why does he not propose that?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, again reclaiming my time, I will say to the gentleman that we have made every effort, for example, to put money into special education for disabled children. Now, that is an account that is a Federal mandate. We know that that money has to be spent. The more money that we put into that account, while it obviously helps that situation and that need, it also frees up other money that has had to be spent in that account for other purposes and allows the local school district to decide where those funds can best be used.

So, yes. Are we for more flexibility? Absolutely. That is what we believe in.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I understand his premise. We have, for instance, billions of dollars in our bill for Head Start. Is it the gentleman's position that we ought to make that flexible so that if a community locally decides that they do not need a Head Start program in that community, they can use those dollars for something else?

Mr. PORTER. That is not an education program. That is an HHS program. It is a Federal program. It is not administered by the schools.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), my distinguished friend and chairman of the subcommittee, that in some instances he is correct. In Prince George's County, the Head Start program is administered by the school system and they can use Head Start money only for Head Start. They do not have the flexibility, I tell my friend, to put that money in other places.

Now, why is that? Why is that? Because 435 of us have been elected by the people of the United States to make policy, to make judgments, to establish priorities. I have full respect for State legislators. I was in the State legislature for 12 years, president of the Senate for my last 4. I respect the members of the State Senate. I respect my county council and my county executive.

But, Mr. Speaker, they were not elected to decide how we spend Federal tax revenues. As a matter of fact, we had a revenue-sharing program that most on that side of the aisle voted to repeal, as I recall. This is in effect what the gentleman from Illinois is talking about, a revenue-sharing program.

I believe, as the gentleman from New Jersey believes, that there is a critical problem in America: A, there is a shortage of teachers; B, there is a shortage of classrooms and we have crowded classrooms. Now, it may not exist in every school system. So what I believe, and what the President believes, is because we have identified a problem, the gentleman is correct, it may not exist in every school system. We are providing a program to respond to that problem.

Now, those who represent school districts that think that the teacher-pupil ratio is perfect, that the school buildings do not need rehabilitation, they do not need help with school bonding, then fine. They do not have to take the money. But we have identified as Federal legislators a need, and we are prepared to take the responsibility for appropriating funds to solve that problem.

□ 1600

That is where the gentleman and I disagree. He places it in a context that I think is not the premise that I adopted. I am not for controlling the local system. What I am for doing is establishing a Federal policy which says that we need to have small classrooms so that we can educate our children to be competitive in a world-class economy. I think that is essentially what we are trying to do.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, we are doing exactly the same thing. The money is there. In fact, more money is there for construction, for classroom size reduction. We simply provide flexibility as to how that money will be used.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is not correct. Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, why you are not correct. What you do is you take a sum of money and you distribute that by formula pursuant to title VI to every school system in America that may or may not have this particular problem that I think I have identified, my constituents have identified; and what you have turned it into is a revenue-sharing program to be disseminated. Some jurisdictions, frankly, are going to get a paltry sum.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is the administration asked for $1.3 billion in renovation funds. They asked for $1.75 billion for class size. You merged that into a block grant. They asked for $3 billion. You gave them $2.7 and block granted it.

We have seen from the way you use the community service block grants and other programs that the first step on your side of the aisle is always to block grant funds. Then, after you block granted it so you do not have to take the heat for individual program cuts, then you cut the guts out of them in the second and third years. That is what has happened time and time again in social service programs, and we are not going to fall for it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), who is one of the leading experts in this Congress on the issue of education and funding for education.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say to my colleague from Wisconsin that there was already $365 million in the education block grant. The total for all activities including class size reduction and school renovations is $3.1 billion. I would also say to my friend from Maryland that his example of Head Start is an example of a federal

program that does not exist under the Department of Education. It may be that school districts apply to the Department of Health and Human Services or the State of Maryland. But clearly that is not an example of what we are trying to do in providing greater flexibility in these accounts.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I tell my friend from Illinois, my point was, A, that the money in Head Start is in our bill. I said in our bill. I understand it is not in the education title because it is administered under HHS. It happens to be run by the education department in my county, and about one-quarter of the Head Start programs, as the gentleman knows, in America are under the education departments. Three-quarters are not.

My point was that the Head Start money is money that is identified for a particular program. I tell my friend from Illinois that we made a determination that children from at-risk homes needed a special start, a head start. It is a program Ronald Reagan said worked.

We, therefore, at the Federal level made a determination that we were going to, in our case, make billions of dollars available, but for this purpose, because we have made, as a Federal legislative body, a determination of a need.

My point to you, sir, is that I believe that we have made on our side of the aisle a similar determination that there is a classroom shortage in America, that there are crowded classrooms in America, and that we have a teacher shortage in America as a result of having more students in our schools than any time in our history.

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

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

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

I understand the gentleman from Maryland's discussion about a specific Federal purpose like the Head Start Program or a specific Federal purpose like school construction or a specific Federal purpose like reducing the size of classrooms for teachers. But in this particular instance, there are specific needs that this money can fill.

For example, in the school district in Somerset County, where Crisfield students go to high school, there is no new construction that is needed. There are no new teachers needed, because classroom sizes are already small and getting smaller because the community is reducing in size. What is desperately needed in that poor, lower shore community, where salaries are very low, is some technology. So this particular program as distributed across the country can help in school class size, school construction, but in that community specifically these dollars spent by the local school district can help in the arena of enhancing those teachers, in training, technology, and computers.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the Un-Congress, as ''The Washington Post'' now calls us, will approve now its fifth continuing resolution, and with it the Federal Government will stay open for an additional 24 hours.

Mr. Speaker, I will support, of course, this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. It finally focuses on doing work. For as every one of us knew when we approved the fourth continuing resolution just 6 days ago, not much was going to be done in the 5 days that we lost. We knew it would take a measure such as this.

As ''The Washington Post'' again stated, ''The un-Congress continues neither to work nor to adjourn. For 2 years, it has mainly pretended to deal with issues that it has systematically avoided.''

This Congress has avoided a real patients' bill of rights, it has avoided a meaningful Medicare prescription drug benefit, it has avoided campaign finance reform, and now, of course, it seeks to avoid, I tell my friend from Maryland, the Democratic initiatives on class size reduction and school modernization.

It seeks instead to simply parcel out very small sums of money to everybody in America, and perhaps solve no problem, because the monies that everybody will receive will be too small to accomplish any one objective.

The mother of all budget train wrecks, those irresponsible and decisive government shutdowns in 1995, Mr. Speaker, has morphed this year into the eerily quiet derailment. After 6 years of Republican leadership, our budget process is in a shambles. It is unnecessarily contentious, it is often disingenuous. And I want to make it clear, as I have made it clear on each one of the four previous continuing resolutions, this is not the fault of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), a distinguished, able, effective and very honest chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who does this institution credit in his leadership.

I believe it has contributed to the growing cynicism in our country towards the legislative process. While our budget debate need not degenerate into intransigence, the GOP's approach, in my opinion, over the last 6 years has made such an outcome inevitable.

The majority has adopted unrealistic budget resolutions in each of the last 3 years. That is why we are here today, because the budget resolution was unreasonable. And guess what we did just a few hours ago? We changed the budget caps. Why? Because they were not working.

In some years, including this one, House and Senate Republicans have been unable to reach agreement even among themselves, Mr. Speaker, as you know, and, although I do not want to put words in your mouth, I am sure you lament as well.

Just 2 years ago, Congress failed to enact a budget for the first time in 24 years, since the adoption of the 1974 Budget Act. And I will say to my friends on the majority side of the aisle, that budget could have been adopted without a single Democratic vote. It was not. Both Houses are controlled by the majority party, and they did not adopt a budget.

Republicans have loaded up spending bills with legislative riders that, frankly, have no place on appropriation bills. As Chairman YOUNG said recently, ''the thing that is holding us up are the non-appropriation issues that should have been taken care of in authorizing committees.''

Finally, Republicans have proposed spending cuts that even ardent conservatives could not long have lived with. My good friend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of our Committee on the Budget, how quickly they forget, released a report on Monday that debunks the myth of big spending Democrats. I want to have my majority party friends hear this. In fact, domestic appropriations have risen faster when the House is controlled by Republicans.

I will just let that sink in a while, because it is contrary, of course, to what you argue out on the hustings.

So while I urge my colleagues to vote for this continuing resolution, Mr. Speaker, and to complete this year's budget, I lament the fact that again we are hung up at the end of a session because of our unwillingness in the majority to confront the educational needs of America's children and America's families.

We have been discussing the difference, and the difference is the identification of a critical need in America, that of more classrooms. Why? Because we have more children in school than at any time in our history. And we know that we have a teacher shortage, a quality teacher shortage; and what we seek to do is expand upon the availability of classrooms and of teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the majority party to take a hard look at our process. No reasonable person, in my view, can conclude that this is the way this great institution ought to be run. Even Senator PHIL GRAMM commented in the morning's Post, ''I think the budget process has been destroyed; and I think, unfortunately, Republicans have been heavily numbered among the assassins.'' So said PHIL GRAMM.

Mr. Speaker, we can and should do better. Let us come to agreement on providing more classrooms and more teachers for our children.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would remind

Members that it is not in order in debate to refer to statements of Senators occurring outside the Senate Chamber.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, as good a friendship as I have with my friend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), I would strongly disagree with the statement that he made that the Republican majority has not done well for education. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) pointed out very effectively that we have actually provided more funding this year alone than the President asked for. The only difference is the great debate over who is going to control the funds, who is going to make the decision on what the needs are, back in my congressional district or in his congressional district, a bureaucrat in Washington, or the locally elected school board back home in our districts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats controlled this House for 40 years, and what have we ended up with? This Nation, with all its resources, last in math and science of all the industrialized nations; last in literacy. Our schools are crumbling, and they need help. But what have they done? They have catered to the trial lawyers and the unions to rip off our school system. And I want to be specific.

They talk about school construction. Waive Davis-Bacon. It costs between 15 to 35 percent, depending on what State, to build schools, because Federal dollars have to fall under the prevailing wage. They say, well, we want a living wage. Ninety percent of all the construction in this country are nonunion, and they earn a living wage. And, guess what? Minority contractors have a good chance at the jobs, where they do not with the unions.

We can build schools. Let us not take that money away from the schools. Let us let the schools keep it. Do they want more construction, do they want teacher training, or whatever? But my colleagues on the other side, because they get most of their campaign money out of the unions, will not cross the unions.

Secondly, my colleague from Wisconsin says that 93 percent of the money is controlled by State and local, and 7 percent Federal.

□ 1615

That is the way it is supposed to work. Just look at IDEA and special education. Look at the requirements in the D.C. bill; we capped the amount that liberal trial lawyers could take out of special education, Alan Bernstein's number one problem in San Diego, the superintendent of schools.

But yet my colleagues wanted to pay off for the liberal trial lawyers and oppose it. Luckily, the Senate saw through in the conference. Guess what? The city was able to hire 123 special-needs teachers. Democrats wanted to control it. We said no, let the local district do it.

When I was chairman of the authorization committee, 16 programs came forward from different areas. Every one of them had the absolute best program in the world. And after the hearing, I said, which one of you have any one of the other 15 in your district? None of them. That is the whole point.

We want to give it directly to the schools so that the teachers, the parents, and the local administrators can make those decisions. My colleagues want Federal control of everything.

Another good example was Goals 2000. There are 14 ''wills'' in that bill, which means you will do it. They say it is voluntary. Well, it is only voluntary if you want the money. One of those wills you had to establish another board to see if you comply with Goals 2000. It then went to your school board. It then went to the principal; it then went to the superintendent.

Think about it, all the schools in California sending all of that paperwork to Sacramento and the bureaucracy it takes. Then where did it go? It came back here to the Department of Education.

Think of all the schools in the United States sending all of that paperwork and bureaucracy and, of course, there was paperwork going back. That is why we only get 48 cents out of a dollar to the classroom.

That is what my colleagues on the other side want to continue to do is have government control of education. Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference, in the two parties.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, let me first commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for his sacrifices in trying to work through the difficult details of the bill.

If my colleagues listened to the last several speakers who came before us, claiming this is a do-nothing Congress, as if all of this slow-down of bill passage is our fault, well, if my colleagues listened to the other side of the aisle, this Chamber and this government would be financially insolvent if they had their way.

No rhyme or reason, no restrictions on spending. Our projects, our way or the highway. I voted for Patients' Bill of Rights. I have voted for hate crimes. I voted for a number of issues that are not considered traditional Republican issues, but I have yet to see my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle want to come to conclusion on any of those bills.

Minimum wage, let us not pass it, let us just use it for campaign issue; and then they come down to the floor here today, and assume some way, we, as the Republican majority, are holding up the will of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I personally believe we are exemplifying the will of the people by trying to bring some restraint and establish priorities and focus Federal resources.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) said, despite the stump speeches, domestic spending has risen at the behest of the Republican leadership. Amen to that. We are finally putting our money in domestic accounts for the people of the United States who are the taxpayers. No longer are we willing to waste away money on international expeditions, finding ways to send money to every nation that never votes with us at the U.N. treaties or any other instances.

Again, I hope that the Members of this Congress will applaud and appreciate the hard work of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and I hope they will come together and end the rhetoric.

Yes, it is almost election day; and we know we are all tense and ready to leave, but our government is better for the debate and the negotiations that have occurred. If the President is willing to negotiate with us on some of these final outstanding issues, we will be gone. Do not look to us and blame us for all of this slow-down.

I think a lot of it is occurring on the other side of the aisle, and they should take equal credit.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think to understand our concern about today people need to understand what the record was yesterday. And if my colleagues take a look at what our Republican friends in the majority have tried to do on education since the day that they took over control of this Chamber 6 years ago, my colleagues will see the following:

Over that 6-year period, they tried to cut the President's budget request for education by a total of over $13 billion.

They shut down the government twice to try to force the President to buy their priorities which included the elimination of the Department of Education.

They will claim, well, you are just talking about cuts in the increase, you are not talking about cuts in actual spending levels.

I have two responses to that. First of all, we will have a million more children in our schools, and so any budget that does not provide increases for education each year, in fact, results in less dollars being spent on every child each year, and that is not a way to promote educational quality.

My second point is that even if you only measure the cuts, which our Republican friends tried to make in preexisting spending levels, you will find that they, on four occasions in the last 6 years, they tried to cut education spending below the amount that was being spent at the time to the tune of more than $5.5 billion.

After we went through all of the arguments, we wound up, because of pressure from the White House and pressure from the Democratic side of the aisle, we wound up restoring some $15.5 billion to those education budgets. That is the track record.

I was amused when I saw the Republican leadership yesterday in a media event brag about the fact that they should be trusted on education, because they had increased spending on education by over 50 percent since they had taken control of the House. That is true, but only after you shut down the government twice to try to avoid doing that, only after you tried to cut $5.5 billion below existing spending levels.

The only reason that spending for education has risen by 50 percent over the last 6 years is because we made you do it. I find it ironic that you are now taking credit for the fact that you were beaten in previous years. That is an interesting trick, but the numbers that I am giving you happen to be true.

Mr. Speaker, the record will bear them out.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following three charts demonstrating what I have just said:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—GOP EDUCATION CUTS BELOW PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Request	House level	House cut	Percent cut
1996 Labor-HHS—Education	25,804	20,797	−5,007	−19
1997 Labor-HHS—Education	25,561	22,756	−2,805	−11
1998 Labor-HHS—Education	29,522	29,331	−191	−1
1999 Labor-HHS—Education	31,185	30,523	−662	−2
2000 Labor-HHS—Education	34,712	33,321	−1,391	−4
2001 Labor-HHS—Education	40,095	37,142	−2,953	−7
Total FY 96 to FY 01	186,879	173,870	−13,009	−7

Note.—Discretionary Funding—Minority Staff, House Appropriations Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—GOP EDUCATION APPROPRIATION CUTS COMPARED TO PREVIOUS YEAR

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Prior year	House level	House cut
1995 Rescission	25,074	23,440	−1,635
1996 Labor-HHS—Education	25,074	20,797	−4,277
1997 Labor-HHS—Education	22,810	22,756	−54
2000 Labor-HHS—Education	33,520	33,321	−199

Note.—Discretionary Funding—Minority Staff, House Appropriations Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—EDUCATION FUNDING RESTORED BY DEMOCRATS

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	House level	Conf agreement	Restoration	Percent increase
1995 Rescission	23,440	24,497	1,057	5
1996 Labor-HHS—Education	20,797	22,810	2,013	10
1997 Labor-HHS—Education	22,756	26,324	3,568	16
1998 Labor-HHS—Education	29,331	29,741	410	1
1999 Labor-HHS—Education	30,523	33,149	2,626	9
2000 Labor-HHS—Education	33,321	35,703	2,382	7
2001 Labor-HHS—Education	37,142	40,751	3,609	10
Total FY 95 to FY 01	197,310	212,975	15,665	8

Note.—Discretionary Funding—Minority Staff, House Appropriations Committee.

Now, we are down to the last days of this Congress, I hope, and we have essentially two issues remaining, one involves what are we going to do with the issues of class size and teacher training and Pell grants and special education. Are we going to meet our responsibilities there?

We have seen billions of dollars go into other appropriations bills. Now we are told, oh, you have to be tight on this one. So that is one education issue remaining.

The other issue is whether or not we are going to sufficiently respond to the President's request on school construction.

What has been missing from this debate so far on that side of the aisle is the recognition that there are two construction pieces which the administration is trying to achieve. The first is the small $1.3 billion renovation package which we are trying to get in the Labor, Health Education appropriation bill, and the second is the bonding assistance that the administration is trying to get, either by running it through this bill or by running it through the Committee on Ways and Means, the bonding authority which they are trying to get so that they can help by the expenditure of $2.5 billion of Federal money over a multiyear period so that they can leverage the construction of $25 billion in additional new school facilities, modern school facilities.

As I said before, to put that in context, the demonstrated need for the country is $125 billion. So that basically is what we find at issue on education as we try to reach agreement.

We are here because we have seen the succession of week-long continuing resolutions, and as a result of that, the Congress has moved along in a leisurely fashion, most Members being able to go home 5 days a week; the negotiators on the Committee on Appropriations being stuck here most of the time around the clock, 7 days a week.

Mr. Speaker, I have been home to my district exactly 2 days since Labor Day, and that is why I have told people I feel like a fugitive on a chain gang.

I would hope that we will be able to reach closure on these issues. Until we do, we have no choice but to approve the continuing resolution before us, but I would urge in the meantime that we have additional flexibility on the majority side when it comes to the school construction issue, because that, in my view, is the issue that has to be resolved before we are going to be able to put together the rest of the pieces on education and get out of here in time to at least say hello to the constituents that we all thought we would be greeting and meeting with and talking with for the last 3 weeks.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I had been prepared to just yield back my time early on during this debate, because the issue before us is simply a 1-day extension of the continuing resolution, but so many things have been developed during this debate that I feel tempted to respond to each and every one of them, but I am not going to do that. But I feel tempted.

I understand the position of the minority. I served in the minority for a lot of years, as did many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. We were not all here for 40 years, but for those who have been here nearly that long, we served in the minority almost the whole time we have been here, so we understand the frustrations.

But when we became the majority party and I became chairman of one of our subcommittees on appropriations, I was determined that the minority would have access to every bit of information, would have the opportunity to have input on every subject coming before that subcommittee, and I think any member of that subcommittee on either side would concede that and confirm the fact that that is how we function.

When I became chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, one of the first instructions I laid down to the Members and the staff that the minority would be included in all of our deliberations, and I believe they would admit to that at the staff level and the Member level.

We have met with each other off and on most of the year, and then as we got toward the end of the process, we began meeting with the President's representatives, and both parties were involved in all of those meetings. Even at that we understand the frustration of the minority.

We tried to be as responsible as we could and as generous as we could in trying to reach consensus and trying to reach bipartisan agreements.

□ 1630

And we have reached a lot of bipartisan agreements. But there is a lot of political rhetoric occurring now, because we are rapidly approaching Election Day.

One of the things that got my attention was the gentleman from Wisconsin's statement that the Republicans shut down the government. Well, that conclusion is the result of masterful and effective spin-mastering. The Republicans did not shut down the government; the Republicans passed the appropriations bills, they sent them to the Clinton-Gore administration, they vetoed them, and when they vetoed them, the government shut down for a couple of days. The Republicans sent the appropriations bills to the President. We did our job. He vetoed them. Until we were able to come back and rewrite the bills, the government was closed for a short period of time.

Now, there are two major issues that have been developed here today. There are those who spoke and complained that the budget really was not high enough, that we were not doing enough spending. I say to those people who believe that, they are true to their conviction. They really believe that there should be more government spending,

that there should be more government involvement. And while I might disagree with them, I do not question their sincerity, and I do not question their motivation for standing for what they believe.

But there are others who say, well, we are spending too much. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will remember, as I remember, that all through this appropriations process we spent hour after hour, day after day, week after week on appropriations bills dealing with amendments from the minority side to increase spending, to increase the amount of money in those appropriations bills. Yet some of the people, not all, but some of the Members on that side who voted for all of those amendments now complain that we are spending too much money. We really cannot have it both ways. We cannot vote for every amendment to increase and vote against any amendment that would reduce and still stand up and say, with a clear conscience, we spent too much money.

There is another reason that it has taken some time to conclude this process. This is because we have included all sides, Republicans and Democrats in the House and in the Senate, and the White House. There is also another reason. We had a few years ago a real disaster, in my opinion. Under our watch, we had an omnibus bill that included about eight appropriations bills. We put all of those eight bills together, and the leadership sat down with the White House and we negotiated them. We came out with an omnibus appropriations bill. I do not think many people today still know what was in that bill.

We have not done that this year. We have resisted that. We have gone one bill at a time. The House has had an ample opportunity to deal with every bill specifically and independently, and we passed all 13 of our bills through the House early in the process. Now, we slowed down a little when the other body did not get around to taking up some of their bills; but nevertheless, we found a way to deal with that, and we attached one of the bills they had not passed to one of the bills that we had passed. And probably tomorrow, we will do the same thing again.

Mr. Speaker, there is no omnibus appropriations bill being developed this year. We in the House have dealt with each and every one of the bills. That takes a little time, because instead of having one large negotiation taking place, we had 13 small negotiations that, by the way, all developed into pretty big ones. So it took a little more time.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we are not here to campaign. The political rhetoric that we hear from time to time on the floor, especially on appropriations bills, is not what we are here for. We are here to do the people's business. The campaigning should be on the campaign trail. I listened to the minority leader last week make what I thought was an excellent speech where he appealed to us and said, let us work together, let us be bipartisan, let us do the best we can to get our job done for what is best for the American people. I liked that speech and I complimented him right after he made the speech on the floor, in public. But then so much campaign rhetoric followed. I know that he was sincere, but I just believe that some of the people on his side were not listening to his appeal.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to deal with a 1-day continuing resolution. I just ask that the Members vote for this CR so we can get about the rest of our business today and the rest of the week.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 646, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution 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 joint resolution.

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

Mr. OBEY. 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 395, nays 9, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 552]

YEAS—395

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson

Wolf	Wu	Young (AK)
Woolsey	Wynn	Young (FL)

NAYS—9

Baird	Costello	Kaptur
Barton	DeFazio	Miller, George
Capuano	Ford	Visclosky

NOT VOTING—28

Bonilla	Greenwood	Owens
Campbell	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (PA)
Chenoweth-Hage	Klink	Shadegg
Collins	Largent	Slaughter
Combest	Lazio	Stupak
Danner	Maloney (CT)	Talent
Delahunt	McCollum	Waxman
Engel	McIntosh	Wise
Fossella	Meeks (NY)	
Franks (NJ)	Mica	

□ 1656

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and could not vote on rollcalls Nos. 544 through 552. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' for each of these measures.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 835, ESTUARIES AND CLEAN WATERS ACT OF 2000

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 648 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 648

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 835) to encourage the restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient project financing and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), my friend, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules; pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 1700

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 648 provides for consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 835, the Estuaries and Clean Waters Act of 2000. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The rule also provides that the conference report shall be considered as read. This is a standard rule for this type of conference report. And I believe it is totally without controversy. I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Before we get a chance to vote, Mr. Speaker, S. 835 is an excellent piece of environmental legislation and yet another addition to the fine environmental legacy of the 106th Congress. S. 835 encourages partnerships between Federal, State, and local interests for estuary habitat restoration. Of even greater importance is that the bill supports the development and implementation of comprehensive management plans for the National Estuary Program. This is of particular importance to me because of the Charlotte Harbor NEP, which is located in my district in southwest Florida. I worked hard with our local community to secure the NEP designation for Charlotte Harbor, and I am pleased this legislation will ensure a comprehensive management plan goes forward from the process.

Another key issue for my home State of Florida is title VI of the bill, which authorizes a pilot program to allow States to explore alternate water supply solutions to meet critical needs. We have always had water wars in Florida, but given the increase in population and the attendant demand for water, we will surely reach a crisis point unless we take immediate action now. The alternate water source provisions in this bill will help in that effort, and I want to thank my colleague and good friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER), for her hard work in particular on this issue.

S. 835 also includes other critical restoration efforts for areas such as Lake Pontchartrain and the Tijuana River Valley. I am extremely disappointed to note the Senate refused to accept a provision passed by the House that would have established an EPA grant program to improve water quality in the Florida Keys. I am not aware of any substantive problem on this issue, and I remain hopeful we can adopt this program perhaps through another legislative vehicle.

Even so, this bill is a remarkable piece of legislation, and I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and his Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their hard work in the area and the successful result. In short, Mr. Speaker, this is a good rule, it is a good bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support both.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, my dear friend from Florida (Mr. GOSS), for yielding me the customary time; and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for the bipartisan conference report. America's estuaries are in trouble. According to the national water quality inventory, 44 percent of our estuaries are not meeting their designated uses, whether they are fishing, swimming, or supporting aquatic life. This bill attempts to do something about that by authorizing $275 million over the next 5 years to help the Corps of Engineers restore estuary habitats.

These funds will be available, Mr. Speaker, for projects to improve degraded estuaries and estuary habitats and get them to the point that they are self-sufficient ecosystems.

Mr. Speaker, estuaries are areas where the current of a river meets the tide of the sea; and because such a wide variety of life thrives there, they are the beginning of the food chain. Estuaries provide the nursing grounds for fisheries, support numerous endangered and threatened species, and host almost half of the migratory birds in the United States.

But, Mr. Speaker, estuaries are very fragile and are suffering from increasing human and environmental pressures. In response to those pressures, this bill includes a number of individual bills that passed the House overwhelmingly. The conference report passed the Senate by unanimous consent and is supported by State and local governments and the business community and the entire environmental community. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time, the honorable dean of the Massachusetts delegation; and I wish to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their support of this rule that makes in order this very important piece of legislation, the Estuary Habitat Restoration Improvement Act.

For those of my colleagues who are familiar with my State of Rhode Island, we are practically one big estuary. The Narragansett Bay runs right through my State. It is a very important part of our whole economy; and so, therefore, this bill represents an important step forward for our State and also for our Nation in preserving these fragile estuaries.

My State, as my colleagues know, has had a long history of trying to work to preserve its Narragansett Bay. It goes to the importance of fishing in our State, sailing, swimming, and our number one industry, the tourism economy. Of course this has a major impact on our tourism economy. So for all of these reasons, this Habitat and Estuary Restoration Act is very important for our State's economy.

It is not only the case in Rhode Island but it is also the case nationally that our waters have not always been treated with the respect and care that they deserve. Estuaries are very valuable ecosystems in our overall environment. They nourish a wide variety of animal and plant life, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) pointed out. They also serve to help filtrate pollution that comes in in the

form of so much runoff from farms, to oil spills, to wastewater overflow. Estuaries help in that very important part of preserving this environment by acting as a buffer.

Recently, I read an article in our own newspaper, the Providence Journal, where Curt Spalding, our executive director of Save the Bay in Rhode Island, said that we in Rhode Island have lost over half of our salt marshes in our State. Over 1,000 acres of eelgrass, for example, in our State, that we once possessed, only about 1/100th of that still remains, depriving countless marine life from its ability to find a source of primary food. And he writes that the damming of these rivers and streams has had a totally detrimental impact on countless fish habitat as well as other marine life.

So without immediate action on legislation such as this, we might pass the point of no return, and that is why acting on this legislation right away is so very important. That is why I urge my colleagues to pass this Estuary Habitat Restoration Act, making the provision of $275 million funding for local projects that will incent the saving of our estuaries. I urge all of my colleagues to support this very valuable and important piece of legislation to all of our coastal ways, and especially to our coastal ways in the Northeast, like my State of Rhode Island.

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

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill, especially because it contains some very strong protection and preservation measures for the Long Island Sound.

I also wish good luck to the New York Mets, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 835, the Estuary Habitat Restoration and Improvement Act Conference Report. This measure authorizes $1.6 billion over five years for various estuary conservation and restoration activities, including the Long Island Sound.

Preservation of the Long Island Sound is not a parochial issue, but a national one. By its inclusion as a charter member in the National Estuaries Program, the Sound has been designated as one of only 28 estuaries of national significance. Congress recognized the national importance of the Sound by creating the Long Island Sound Study (LISS), which involved Federal, state, and local entities as well as private groups. The result of this study was the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP). This report has detailed the many challenges which Long Island Sound faces including floating garbage, biological contamination, and industrial waste—in short, all the things which plague our modern society.

The time to act is now. The $200 million over 5 years which is authorized under this agreement, will be used to provide grants to implement remedial efforts to clean up the Long Island Sound as part of the CCMP.

I am proud to represent an area that borders the Long Island Sound. The Sound is one of our nation's natural treasures with important environmental, recreational, and commercial benefits. Its value as an essential habitat for one of the most diverse ecosystems of the Northeast cannot be understated. Residents and vacationers alike enjoy the Sound for swimming and boating. And the approximately $5 billion in revenue generated by commerce relating to the Sound is vital to the region and to individuals who base their livelihood on the benefits of the Sound.

Unfortunately, the effects of millions of people on the shore and in the Sound are evidenced in the deteriorated water quality. Over the last several years, Long Island Sound has suffered from numerous forms of pollution. This pollution is now threatening the Sound's multibillion dollar a year fishing industry. The most recent and devastating example is the unexplained and widespread lobster die-off. We must supply adequate resources to address this lobster die-off and to examine possible problems in the water that could have caused this crisis. I am confident that this legislation will have a significant impact on the ongoing efforts to improve the quality of the Sound.

For the past seven years I have sponsored legislation to provide funding for clean up and pollution control programs for the Long Island Sound. I am very pleased that today we see legislation that will protect our beautiful Long Island Sound, along with other important bodies of water in our nation. I would like to thank Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. OBERSTAR for their leadership on this legislation and their commitment to preserving our national estuaries. I would also like to acknowledge the hard work and dedication of my colleagues who represent areas along Long Island Sound. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join with me today in supporting this conference report.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from New York also endorsed the rule, at least I hope he did. I did not hear any controversy on the rule.

I think this is yet another accomplishment of the do-something 106th Congress. I see nothing except a good debate ahead and a strong approval.

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

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague on the rule as well as the bill.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished friend, 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.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 648, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 835) to encourage the restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient project financing and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 648, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 24, 2000, at page H10537.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, this conference report, includes several bills which have already passed the House. It includes the Estuaries Restoration Act authored by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST); it includes the Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act, which was guided through the House by our late colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN); it includes the bill of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) to reauthorize the National Estuary Program; the bill of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO), the Long Island Sound Restoration Act; it includes the bill of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Act; the Alternate Water Sources Act authored by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER); the bill of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) to reauthorize the Clean Lakes Program; and the Tijuana River Valley Estuary and Beach Sewage Cleanup Act of 2000, authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

This legislation meets environmental restoration needs by encouraging cooperative efforts at the local, state and Federal levels and fostering public-private partnerships to identify and address water quality problems. I would like to assure my colleagues that this legislation does not create any new regulatory authorities and requires full public participation. In particular, the estuary habitat restoration strategy to be developed under section 106 of the act must be developed following public notice and a meaningful opportunity for comment. I expect the Estuary Habitat Restoration Council established under section 105 to provide a period of at least 90 days to allow the public to comment on the proposed strategy, or any subsequent revisions. This legislation is supported by state and local government, the business community and the environmental community. Every Member of Congress should be proud to support it.

I would like to thank the sponsors of the bills included in this conference report, the

House conferees, and all the members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I would particularly like to thank Ranking Member OBERSTAR, Subcommittee Chairman BOEHLERT and Subcommittee Ranking Member BORSKI, for their hard work on bringing this legislation to the floor. Let me also congratulate and thank the Senate conferees, in particular Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member BAUCUS of the Environment and Public Works Committee, for their cooperation.

This conference report is also the result of a lot of hard work by House and Senate staff. Special thanks go to Susan Bodine, Carrie Jelsma, Donna Campbell, Ben Grumbles, Ken Kopocis, Ryan Seiger, Pam Keller, John Rayfield, and David Jansen of the House staff and Ann Klee, John Pemberton, Suzanne Matwyshen, Ann Loomis, Jo-Ellen Darcy and Peter Washburn of the Senate staff. I urge all Members to support this comprehensive package of critically needed environmental bills.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my thanks to the chairman for this great work. This is, in fact, a major step forward for environmental protection and estuary enhancement. So I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the other conferees on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their great work on this bill.

The section of the bill that, of course, I authored, H.R. 1237, allows the authorized funding of $35 million annually through 2005. These Federal funds can be used for implementation, in addition to the development of comprehensive management plans in estuarine areas.

Congress recognized the importance of preserving and enhancing coastal environments with the establishment of the National Estuary Program, NEP, in 1987. The NEP's purpose is to facilitate State and local governments' preparation of comprehensive management plans for threatened and impaired estuaries.

In support of this effort, the EPA is authorized to make grants to States to develop CCMPs for 30 designated estuaries across the country. My own State of New Jersey has three approved sites in the NEP, one of which is Barnegat Bay, which lies mostly in my district. The bay is a watershed which drains land for approximately 550 square miles. Over 450,000 people live in the Barnegat Bay watershed and the population doubles there in the summer.

Nonpoint source pollution, while diffuse, is cumulatively the most important issue in addressing adverse impacts on water quality and the health of living resources in the bay. The final CCMP for Barnegat Bay is complete, but without the additional funding of this program, as well as explicitly permitting NEP to use Federal funds for the implementation of the program, the Federal Government would have absolved itself of the responsibility as a partner with the States in protecting and enhancing the Nation's most endangered habitats.

Therefore, I would like to thank my colleagues, in particular the chairman, for expeditiously moving this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for doing such a fine job in bringing us this conference report. I would like to speak on one part of this conference report, a part that is a win-win-win solution for the people in San Diego, California, and all those areas which border the country of Mexico.

We have been dealing with the problem of Mexican sewage flowing into our area for many decades.

□ 1715

The gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) and I introduced the legislation that has the provisions in this conference report. What we intended to do, Mr. Speaker, is to provide a comprehensive solution to the problem of Mexican sewage flowing into the United States in our waters.

We have a unique problem, the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) and I. I want to thank him for working so closely with me and for our staffs that worked so closely together. I do not think any other two Members of Congress can say that we have raw sewage flowing through our districts from another country onto our beaches and onto our riverbeds. And we, I know, jointly thank the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER); the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR); and their staffs, especially Ken Kopocis, Ryan Sieger, and David Heinsfeld because they worked very hard through some problems that we had between us and with the Senate. But once everyone realized the magnitude of the problem and, if I may say so, the historic opportunity to provide a comprehensive solution to it, these fine staff members and our leadership fought diligently to craft legislation on which all parties could agree. And the people of southern San Diego owe a great deal to the chairman and the ranking member, and I want to thank them so much on their behalf for their support.

We will advance, through this legislation, a common sense solution to the problem of international sewage, the treatment of Mexican sewage in Mexico. Before the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) and I introduced our legislation, plans called for treating less than half of the sewage that fouls our beaches and estuaries.

It has taken bureaucracies 10 years to prepare a secondary treatment farm of the International Wastewater Treatment Plant. In that time, the sewage flows have more than doubled. Yet, the plans have persisted for a so-called solution that will really not solve the problem but will only take us back 10 years ago. This legislation seizes the momentum for solving the problem and fixes the problem now and comprehensively.

My colleague from San Diego and I have been working, are working on this problem combined for probably 35 to 40 years. When we started this, 25 million gallons a day of sewage from Mexico needed to be treated to protect our water and land. Now it has reached 55 to 75 million gallons of sewage. Our residents and particularly our children need to be protected from this public health nightmare.

Private investors have come forward with an innovative public-private partnership to treat all of the sewage and treat it in Mexico. Mexico has generated the sewage and under a treaty has the right to the treated water. So it makes the most sense not only to treat the sewage that we have now but to treat it where it is generated and can be reused by that country's agricultural and industrial interest.

This is a win for the U.S. environment. It is a win for our children's health. It is a win for international relations and a win for recycling a precious resource.

So I urge support for this comprehensive solution. It is an innovative way to approach the issue. It is a longstanding health and environmental problem. And it most certainly has its own very needed place in the Estuaries and Clean Water Act of 2000.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a supporter of the conference report on S. 835, the Estuaries and Clean Water Act of 2000.

As my colleagues before me have stated very eloquently, the chairman and the gentleman from California (Mr. Filner) and others who will be addressing some specifics of this bill, it is good legislation; and it deserves to be passed.

I am particularly pleased with the final package because it includes a reauthorization and an expansion of the Long Island Sound Program. I want to give particular praise to my colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON). They and their colleagues have worked tenaciously on this legislation.

Let me tell my colleagues, in my capacity as chairman of the subcommittee, I was summoned to the office of the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) several months ago; and thus began a partnership with the gentleman and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON). We worked literally hundreds of hours to put together this package.

I want to praise Governor Rowland of Connecticut and Governor Pataki of my home State of New York. They

have been real leaders. This just does not happen overnight. This required a lot of hard work on the part of a lot of people with vision. Let me say that the vision of the Lazio-Johnson team has been something very special.

There is a lot more in this bill that is very good, and I will let my colleagues address that. But let me say that this is probably the last major bill of the Shuster chairmanship of the Committee on Transportation. And let me say, as someone who has been in this institution for many years as a staff member and as a Member of Congress in my own right, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) has proven by performance that he has been the most effective chairman this Congress has seen in many, many years.

He has assembled a very able, very capable, very professional team; and he has provided leadership for that team. And he has worked on a bipartisan basis. Every member of this committee, which is the largest committee in the history of the Congress, feels that they are part of the historic legislation, TEA–21, AIR–21; and we have laid the foundation for Water-21.

This does not just happen by accident. We have to have a leader. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) has provided that leadership. We have to have a very capable staff, and he has exercised the sound judgment to assemble a team second to none.

So as we look back on these 6 years, and incidentally, I think the idea of term limiting chairmen is crazy. I think the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) had it right when he said it is a dumbing down of Congress. If we have good people in positions of major responsibility, we ought to keep them there. I might add, I am going to be a big beneficiary of term limits. But that is another story for another day.

But let me say in conclusion, this is a good bill. It came from a very productive committee that has had very able leadership. And I, for one, want to salute our very distinguished chairman as he brings this conference report to the floor for our consideration.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and many other Members in this body. He has spent hours and hours learning about the issues in other parts of the country and my part of the world. In San Diego, California, I know how much time he has spent. He has asked his staff to make sure they understand the problem. He had legitimate questions and concerns, but he ended up fighting with us and for us to achieve this goal. And I thank him from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the distinguished ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I appreciate the kind words of the gentleman.

But, Mr. Speaker, no one has been more persistent or vigorous in pursuit of a goal than has the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER). He has doggedly pursued with the determination and with copious documentation the goal that we achieve today on this floor, and I compliment the gentleman on his extremely able representation of the people of his district. And I appreciate the partnership that has resulted also with the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) in equally pursuing. Practically the first issue that he discussed with me after his swearing into the Congress a few years ago was this very issue, and I have not forgotten.

I concur in the remarks of the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources. Our distinguished full committee chairman, on many occasions I have referred to his extraordinary leadership and record of accomplishment. But I am just a little puzzled. This should not be the last bill that the chairman brings to the House floor. We are hopeful that there will be another that will be a fitting cap to the chairman's distinguished career in the House and we finally act on the Water Resources Development Act.

I also want to pay deserved tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) who has devoted an enormous amount of time to this legislation, of course to the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) for his pursuit of environmental protection on our committee. I appreciate the partnership that we have had and the leadership that he has given, Mr. Speaker.

The primary focus of this legislation is restoration of estuaries. In the Nation's ocean coastal regions, the estuary is the great meeting place of salt and fresh water, the great meeting place where new forms of life are created.

All through the world, there are about a handful of truly extraordinary great resources, estuaries. The Chesapeake Bay is one of those. There are others that we address today in this legislation. And the reason that we focus our attention on this legislation is that whatever drains into the estuary from the land, wherever the ocean meets that fresh water, either we are doing good for the generation of new species or the maintenance of existing species or we are doing irreparable harm.

The legislation that we act on today moves us in the direction of doing right by the fish and the wildlife in these vital transition areas between fresh and salt water.

In the most recent national water quality inventory, States reported that 44 percent of the Nation's assessed estuaries do not meet their designated use, fishing, swimming, supporting aquatic life.

In the Great Lakes, it is even more troubling; a matter that I spent a great deal of time on over my service in the Congress as a Member and previously as a member of the staff. The data on the Great Lakes are troubling. Ninety-six percent of the assessed shoreline miles of the Great Lakes do not meet one or more designated uses.

As expressed in one of the most important indicators of quality of water, fish consumption advisors, if we live anywhere in America, we have five parts per billion PCBs in our body. If we live within 25 miles of one of the Great Lakes and eat fish once a week, we have up to 440 parts per billion PCBs in our body.

We need to clean those estuaries. We need to remove the sediment on the bottom. We need to take those permanent toxins out of the bottom where they have been deposited over decades and remove them so that we can restore the health of the fishery and the health of the people who depend upon that beneficiary.

This bill does not address that issue, nor do I raise an issue about that. I just make the point that there is much more work for us to be done.

The $275 million over the next 5 years authorized under this bill will enable the Secretary of the Army and the Corps of Engineers to restore estuarine habitat. The cost will be shared with local sponsors to improve degraded estuaries and estuarine habitat, the goal of building a self-sustaining system integrated into the landscape surrounding the estuaries.

One important aspect of this program is the participation of nonprofit entities as local sponsors. The conference report allows nongovernmental organizations to act as local sponsors of estuary restoration projects after consultation and coordination with the appropriate State and local officials. Unlike the House-passed version of the bill, the conference report does not require the approval of the governor of a State before a nongovernmental organization can act as the non-Federal cosponsor.

I want to express to the chairman my great appreciation for his cooperation in working this matter out. It was very important to me and to the regions that I represent of Minnesota and those throughout the Great Lakes to have come to this accommodation, and I appreciate the chairman's assistance.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, as previous speakers have said, I would like to also add my comments and praise and respect to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

It has been my experience in dealing with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) that we have had for a number of years an honorable, professional relationship. The chairman has helped with this package of restoration bills to restore a number of problems throughout this Nation, and I want to thank him for that.

□ 1730

We are here to pass the conference report that will do a great deal as far as restoring America's estuaries and other problems throughout our coastal regions and the Great Lakes of the United States. We are here because our approach to these problems has not been the best in the past. Our approach to deal with the Nation's estuaries and the Great Lakes have been the responsibility of, for example, the Corps of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife, Department of Agriculture, EPA, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Geological Survey, and the list goes on and on and on; and each of those Federal entities has been responsible for a certain piece of the whole.

Now, they have also been responsible for things like dredging, which degrade estuaries; bulldozing; the building of dams; draining; paving; sewage discharge. The list goes on there as well.

Each of those areas, draining, bulldozing, sewage discharge, dredging, damming, air pollution, all of those things has a degrading, fragmenting effect on our estuaries. And each of the Federal agencies has approached each of those entities as something distinct and separate.

What this legislation does is it brings all of those Federal agencies and their appropriate counterparts on the State level, the local level, and the private sector and it sees the estuaries as a whole. The entire ecosystem not only will be researched and studied, but will be restored. The grasses will be replanted. The oysters, instead of oyster bars, will have oyster reefs. The migrating songbirds will have a place to rest on the way to South America. The migrating Canada geese or the snowgeese or the shad or any other fish species that we can think of will come back because the ecosystem, instead of being fragmented, will begin to become whole.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''aye'' on the conference report. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), chairman of the committee, once again for his help with this legislation.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), my good friend.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, the love fest that is going on around here obviously makes us all feel very good about what this committee has accomplished over the last couple of years in transportation and in water issues, and so I give my congratulations to all of my colleagues for the work that they have done. I do not serve on the committee, so I am expressing great gratitude to all members who have worked over the last several years with me.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. THURMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, she may not serve on this committee, but she has been so persistent in pursuit of the issues that she and the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) have both coordinated on, that this is a better bill because of the gentlewoman's persistence.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for those kind words.

I have to say that I am very excited about the Alternative Water Sources Act being put into this conference report. For 20 years in various capacities, whether on the city council or in the State Senate, I have worked on alternative water sources because of some particular problems in the State of Florida. Those problems sometimes are issues where in counties that I live and represent, we have an abundance of water and to the south of me, there is not as much water. So there is always this opportunity or problem going on of trying to come in and pipe water down to other areas.

So what we have tried to really do in this piece of legislation is to work with the technology that is available across this country for providing alternative water sources, because we are finding that States and other places are actually having to hunt for this water for drinking and agriculture and industrial and commercial uses.

What the bill represents is the beginning of a long-term, sustained effort to meet our future water needs. Over the years, Congress has adopted many water programs; some deal with quality and others deal with quantity. But the Alternative Water Sources Act will help States meet ever-expanding demands for water. This bill establishes a 3-year, $75 million program to fund water projects that conserve, reclaim, and reuse precious water resources in an environmentally sustainable manner.

As a result of innovative technology, such as deep-well infusion, new methods of reusing and enhancing area water supplies can be applied today. And if we use or improve this technology in one part of the country, it will help other parts of the country because it will reduce pressure to move water from one region to another.

A quote from the Christian Science Monitor on April 14 said, ''Whether it is desalinization, capturing rainwater, water-saving farming methods, or water pricing structures that impel greater conservation, humanity should use every tool available to safeguard this most basic natural resource.''

Alternative water projects provide an important tool to safeguard this to safeguard these resources. And I realize that water reuse alone will not solve coming water problems. But I do believe that a real national water policy, that actually the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and I talked about on this floor, must include improved conservation programs. I think this is a great first step.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to the road that we travel next year in the 107th Congress. The only thing that I will miss is the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER), who has been steadfast, as always with tenacity, in helping us move this legislation along and her friendship, and her confidence in this piece of legislation is deeply appreciated. I will miss the gentlewoman, and I know she will be with us working right alongside of us anyway.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER).

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in strong support of the conference report on S. 835, the Estuaries and Clean Waters Act of 2000. This bill is a combination of eight important water-related pieces of legislation, and it does represent the true bipartisanship of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I do also want to add my commendations to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) to those of my colleagues for his tireless efforts on this important legislation and his effectiveness as chairman, because it has been a real pleasure and an honor for me to serve on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and as a subcommittee chairman under his leadership for the past 6 years.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) for their work on this important piece of legislation and all of their assistance that they provided in getting us to this point.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked on title VI of this bill, the Alternative Water Sources Act, with my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), and she has worked tirelessly on this, and she is a true friend. This measure will create a pilot program providing Federal matching funds under the Clean Water Act to assist eligible States with the development of alternative water sources projects to meet the projected water supply demand for urban development, industrial, agricultural, and environmental needs.

Many will say our existing water supply is sufficient, but our children could have an uncertain future when they turn on the faucet. There are many States, including Florida and New York, where the increase in population growth has put a significant strain on their water supply. That is why we need to encourage States to be forward

thinking when it comes to water supply and alternative sources. A new Federal partnership is needed to avoid a crisis, a partnership that will ensure our water supply will keep pace with population growth and protect this natural resource.

So, I again want to thank the leadership of this committee for all of their hard work on this, and I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by commending the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), chairman and the ranking member of the committee. I have to say, while I have not always agreed with the chairman and the ranking member, I have the greatest respect for them and I think they have been the most effective team in the time that I have spent in the House. And quite frankly, they have been a model for how this House ought to operate, and so I commend both of them, particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), as well as the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee.

I have had the opportunity to work with them on a number of pieces of legislation, even though I do not sit on the committee; and both the full and subcommittee chair and ranking members have always been helpful. If a Member has a good idea, they are willing to listen and work with them.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on S. 835, the Estuaries and Clean Water Act. I want to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), for his work on this, and in particular on the National Estuary Act of which he is an original sponsor and I am one of the cosponsors. This bill is tremendously important to restore all of our national estuaries, including Galveston Bay, which borders my district in Texas.

Galveston Bay produces two-thirds of Texas' oyster harvest, one-third of Texas' bay shrimp catch, and one-quarter of Texas' blue crab catch. Galveston Bay's watershed is heavily industrialized and densely populated. Since the 1950s, 30,000 acres of wetlands have been lost in this estuary. Wastewater discharges into Galveston Bay account for half of Texas' total wastewater discharges every year. Like many of America's beloved bays and estuaries, the productivity of Galveston Bay has declined. Local community response, however, which is necessary, is facilitated by this act.

The report authorizes $275 million over 5 years in a matching grant for locally developed estuary habitat restoration projects. The goal of this money is the restoration of a million acres of estuary over the next 10 years. Only with our help will estuaries continue producing food, water quality, employment, and recreation benefits along America's coastlines.

I am also pleased that the conference report authorizes an additional $175 million for the National Estuary Program. These funds will be used to develop and implement comprehensive programs in estuaries of national significance, including Galveston Bay.

As proof of the ability of local communities and organizations to take on estuary restoration, I would like to share this about Galveston Bay. The Galveston Bay Foundation was created under the National Estuary Program, and they have undertaken the ambitious program of restoring 24,000 of the 30,000 estuary acres lost, habitat acres lost in Galveston Bay. Assisted by the National Estuary Program, the foundation also monitors water quality by training volunteers in distributing monitoring equipment.

In addition, I would add that the Galveston Bay Foundation has been the catalyst for developing an environmentally sensitive approach to the deepening and widening of the Houston ship channel, which was authorized under WRDA 1996 bill. So I think from Galveston Bay, and this is true with the other bays around the Nation, the Galveston Bay Foundation has proved that the National Estuary Program works and that the National Estuary Act can work as well.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman, ranking member, and the subcommittee chairman and ranking member for having the foresight to move this bill; the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) for authoring it; and I hope the other body will pass it and the President will sign it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Orleans, Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in strong support of this conference report on the Estuaries and Clean Water Act of 2000. I speak with personal knowledge of the importance of this effort, because of Lake Pontchartrain, a lake that lies largely within my congressional district. It is vital to the health of the entire region. It is vital to the quality of life, to the economic health of the region, and so too with the other estuaries we address in this bill.

It is not a case of people versus the environment somehow. It is people and the environment, hand in hand. Lake Pontchartrain is a good example; 5,000 square miles in the Pontchartrain Basin that encompasses 16 parishes in Louisiana as well as four counties in Mississippi, one of the largest estuaries in the United States. In the middle of it, Lake Pontchartrain, 630 square miles, the second largest lake in the United States after the Great Lakes. The population center, of course, for Louisiana, being surrounded by 1.5 million residents.

But we have had problems in that estuary system over the last 60 years. Wetlands loss, human activities, natural forces have all had adverse impact on the basin. Wetlands around the basin have been drained, dredged, and filled and channeled for oil and gas development. Storm water discharges, inadequate wastewater treatment, agricultural activities, all of these activities have significantly degraded water quality.

Loss of wetlands due to subsidence, salt water intrusion, and hurricanes have also harmed the basin wildlife population so that 13 species are actually on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's threatened or endangered list. And today, swimming is still not allowed on the south shore due to high levels of pollution.

□ 1745

As a result of this, I introduced last September the Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Act, and that is included in this conference report. It will create a coordinated, technically sound program that will truly bring restoration of the basin to the next level.

I want to thank everyone who was so helpful in passing this legislation in the conference report, certainly including the chairman, the ranking member of the full committee and the subcommittee and the subcommittee staff.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), a great member of our committee and a great advocate for the people of Florida.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to express my strong support for the conference report. This bill is important to the citizens of the State of Florida and it contains provisions that would improve quality of life and contribute to the cleanup of Lake Apopka, Florida's second largest but most polluted lake.

For months I have worked with Senator BOB GRAHAM and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), along with Members of the local community, such as Commissioner Bob Freeman of Orlando and Friends of Lake Apopka seeking to get Federal help in tackling this problem of Lake Apopka.

Before the Second World War, Lake Apopka was a nationally known bass fishing and vacation spot. This 31,000 acre water body supported over two dozen fish camps as well as numerous hotels, restaurants and other businesses. This authorization is a well-deserved effort that includes Lake Apopka in a priority demonstration program under Clean Lakes administration by the EPA.

Regarding alternate water, I would like to congratulate also the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) and the conferees for their determination in getting a new grant program

within EPA for alternate water sources.

I was proud to cosponsor this bill when it was introduced in the House, and I am very delighted it is included in this conference report. We must address the critical water resource needs of our expanding communities, especially in my home State, which so happens to be the fourth largest State and growing rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, the Water Infrastructure Network released a comprehensive report at the Conference of Mayors' press conference recently here at the Capitol on the crisis facing the Nation's waste water and drinking water systems. The report concluded that there is an ''increasing gap between the Nation's water infrastructure needs and the Federal Government's financial commitment to safe and clean water.''

This bill is a good start, and I want to commend the parties involved.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time, and I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) for his outstanding leadership of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in these 6 years of his chairmanship and thank him and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for their thorough and careful negotiating of this bill with the Senate and my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), who was so instrumental in writing this estuary bill which will restore 1 million acres of estuary habitat over the next 10 years through a voluntary incentive-based program. I believe it is going to serve the Nation admirably and enable us to do something we have long needed to do, which is better protect our estuaries.

In this bill is the Long Island Sound bill that the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO), with Republican and Democrat backing from New York, and I, with the same broad backing from Connecticut, spearheaded. It will provide Connecticut and New York with the help they need to restore the Long Island Sound to full health so that all of our constituents can enjoy its beaches, its seafood and the products that come through its ports.

As important, this bill's provisions in regard to the Long Island Sound provide Connecticut and New York with the flexibility that they need to develop innovative approaches to cleaning the Sound, while reducing costs for small communities and impoverished cities.

Indeed, we cannot do things in the future in exactly the same way we have done them in the past. We must achieve the same goals, but we must do it in a way that does not destroy the taxpaying base of our small rural communities with their rather set tax capability or harm our impoverished cities.

So this bill provides flexibility to allow States like Connecticut and New York to develop the kind of innovative and cost-effective approaches using the most modern technologies to address the problems of Long Island Sound and restore it to its health.

I thank the chairman for his leadership and his support.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

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

Mr. Speaker, the Estuary Restoration Act is good for the Nation and thus good for California. I commend the leadership of the House and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their hard work to bring this conference report before us.

This act demonstrates congressional commitment to restoring one million acres of estuaries over the next decade, while promoting a constructive partnership among all levels of government and the private sector.

This conference report directs the Secretary of the Army to give priority consideration to the Los Cerritos wetlands, located in the district that I represent. Restoration of these wetlands will help retain natural habitat in Los Angeles County and improve the quality of life for residents throughout the area. Los Angeles County has lost more than 93 percent of its coastal wetlands. Los Cerritos represents one of only three sizable areas remaining that could be restored and could include nearly 400 acres when completed.

The Estuary Restoration Act provides critical help to our Nation's environment, and I strongly urge support for this vital legislation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY)

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for not only this bill, for including my bill into this package, but also all of the work that he has done to help us with the Tijuana sewage problem in San Diego Imperial Beach area. I want to thank the ranking member for his sensitivity to it. I know we have been discussing this a long time.

This bill that the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and I have been working on that has been included in this package is actually one that goes back to a recognition that 20 years ago the Federal Government of the United States decided that the Tijuana estuarine area was so important environmentally that 50 percent of the City of Imperial Beach, my hometown, had to be taken by condemnation to be able to preserve it for future generations.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that from the month that that designation of estuarine preserve was given by the Federal Government, the estuary has been polluted by foreign sources of sewage. I want to commend the chairman and the ranking member, because in this bill, it is the first comprehensive, long-term strategy to address that pollution problem that has existed for all too long.

I think it recognizes the fact that if the Federal Government thinks that the Tijuana estuary is so important to preserve by taking it in possession, it is also important enough to make sure it is not polluted and destroyed by a foreign government's adverse activity through the introduction of sewage. This bill will finally have that comprehensive approach and do it in a way that is not only not piecemeal, but actually binational as we work into it.

I think again, as we have said before, the fact is that this bill will include a prototype that I would ask my colleagues to look at, that will not only work in Imperial Beach and San Diego and the Tijuana estuary, but I think will be the vanguard of environmental strategies around the world, and that is paying for a service done, rather than a project built; paying for the environment to be cleaned up, not for a plan or a project that hopefully will clean up the problem.

This is not the end, but it is definitely the beginning of the end of addressing a problem that some of us have worked on for over 20 years and spent many years working on.

I want to thank everyone involved, and the estuary and the people that live around the estuary will thank you for this for years to come.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege and the pleasure of serving on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for the past 2 years. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), have disproven an old thought or an old perception that you cannot have it both ways, you cannot rebuild America's infrastructure and at the same time improve the environmental conditions here, and this is one of the best examples of that. I want to thank them for all of their hard work.

Earlier this year, this House passed the Clean Lakes Act by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 420 to 5. I introduced the Clean Lakes bill because I have a strong belief that we can make a difference in preserving the environment for future generations. I am pleased to see the Clean Lakes bill included as amendment to S. 835, and I am proud of the hard work that went into the conference report, and strongly support its passage today.

This single bill encompasses eight excellent programs that will advance clean water initiatives across the country and will benefit the generations to

come by cleaning up and restoring many of our estuaries, sounds, beaches, bays, basins, keys and lakes.

I just want to take a moment to focus specifically on the Clean Lakes Program. Where I am from, which includes the Catskill and Adirondack mountain ranges in upstate New York, the very lives of our lakes are threatened. This bill forwards a number of initiatives that will allow us and give us the resources to fight the fight that we need to, to ensure that their pristine nature and the way of life that many of my constituents know today can be preserved.

Again I want to thank both the chairman and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for their terrific work.

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

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, again I want to thank the chairman and his staff, particularly Carrie Jelsma, was very helpful to us and worked so hard; the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and his staff, they worked overtime to help the people I know in my area; and I am sure throughout the Nation. I want to thank the staff of the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), Dave Schroeder, and my own staff member, Mary Niez, who worked tirelessly on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, thanks from many parts of the Nation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, while we are hopeful that we might have legislation to bring to this floor in the waning days of the Congress, that may well not be the case, so this could well be the last legislation that we will have before the body during my stewardship over the past 6 years as chairman of Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the largest committee of the Congress, 75 members, as well as the most productive.

I want to thank all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their tremendous support in working to pass as much legislation as we have indeed passed to build America. The extraordinary bipartisanship of our committee is the reason why we were able to be so productive.

My dear friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and I have worked shoulder to shoulder with all the members on both sides of the aisle. Over these past 6 years, this committee has passed through this House 265 bills, of which 109 pieces of legislation have been signed into law, an unparalleled record. Indeed, not only have there been a large number of bills come through our committee, but, as a result of the bipartisan effort in the committee and in this House, historic legislation as well.

We have put finally, after many years of battle, trust back into the transportation trust funds, in TEA–21, a $218 billion transportation to rebuild America, the largest transportation bill in the history not only of the United States but of the world, and yet no tax increase, because we simply unlocked the trust fund so the money the American people pay into that trust fund for transportation could be used.

Likewise, with AIR–21, a $40 billion bill to not only invest in building our aviation system, but to reform it as well. And, goodness knows, we need that investment and that reform in our aviation system. AIR–21 takes effect October 1, so it has just been in effect for a few weeks now. But in the months and years ahead, I am sure the American people will see the positive impact of that legislation.

We passed major environmental legislation to clean up our lakes and our waters, our water and sewer systems. We passed economic development legislation to create jobs and stimulate the economy. The committee indeed is the building committee of the Congress, and that is what that committee has been about for the past 6 years, on a totally bipartisan basis.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD a report entitled ''Building a Transportation and Infrastructure Legacy, Accomplishments of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the 104th, 105th, and 106th Congresses.''

BUILDING A TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE LEGACY, ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, 104TH, 105TH, 106TH CONGRESSES

INTRODUCTION

The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has been a Committee of accomplishment. During the past six years, under the bipartisan leadership of Chairman Bud Shuster (R–PA) and Ranking Members Norm Mineta (D-CA) and James Oberstar (D-MN), the Committee has been a driving force in renewing America's commitment to building assets and promoting safety in all modes of transportation and key aspects of environmental protection. The T&I Committee succeeded in restoring integrity to the Highway and Aviation Trust Funds after nearly three decades of fiscal abuse, enabling us to make much-needed improvements to our roads, bridges, transit systems, airports, and air traffic control system in a fiscally responsible manner and without increasing taxes. In the spirit of Teddy Roosevelt's leadership on the Panama Canal and Dwight Eisenhower's on the Interstate Highway System, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has renewed the country's commitment to our national transportation network as the cornerstone of a strong economy. It is a legacy that will last well into the 21st Century.

Whether it be a renewed investment in highways and transit systems contained in the ''Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century'' (''TEA 21''), a commitment to modernization and expanding our aviation system found in the ''Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century'' (''AIR 21''), a reform package to help the financially troubled national passenger railroad Amtrak achieve solvency, changes to our international ocean shipping regulations to encourage competition and increase U.S. exports, or assistance for water and wastewater infrastructure and hazardous waste cleanup, the T&I Committee has worked in a bipartisan fashion to address the needs of America's communities.

In addition, the Committee has worked hard to make sure that—both through proper investment and appropriate federal oversight—the public safety is protected in all modes of transportation. Through its six subcommittees—Aviation; Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation; Economic Development, Public Buildings, Hazardous Materials, and Pipeline Safety; Ground Transportation; Water Resources and Environment; and Oversight, Investigations and Emergency Management—significant time was devoted to safety oversight of aviation, railroads, motor carrier and truck safety, pipelines, commercial vessel and recreational boating safety, and public buildings, including increased federal security in the wake of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City.

An equally important Committee responsibility is that of protecting our environment. The Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment has led the effort to increase assistance for community water infrastructure systems and to protect and restore degraded or threatened waters and watersheds. The results have been landmark laws, such as Water Resource Development Acts, other bipartisan, broadly supported bills as well as probing oversight hearings that have ushered in significant administrative reforms for controversial Superfund and Clean Water programs. The Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee also developed legislation to help the Coast Guard improve the enforcement of Federal laws protecting the marine environment, including the reduction of solid waste pollution and oil spills from vessels. The Subcommittee also conducted extensive oversight hearings on marine environmental protection.

During the six years that the T&I Committee was led by Chairman Shuster, it grew from a 61-Member panel to a 75-Member panel—the largest in the history of Congress. To carry out its broad responsibilities, the Committee held 314 hearings, passed 265 bills through the House, of which 109 have been enacted into law to date.

RESTORING TRUST TO THE TRANSPORTATION TRUST FUNDS

When the Highway Trust Fund was established in 1956, the principle was simple: motorists would pay a tax that would be put into a Trust Fund dedicated to improving the nation's roadways. In 1970, the same framework was applied to the establishment of the Aviation Trust Fund. Unfortunately, the principle was compromised. For three decades, more money was collected than was actually spent on road improvements. Each year, the unified budget ''borrowed'' money from the trust fund to offset other federal spending. In 1995, the Highway, Aviation and two smaller water infrastructure trust funds had a combined balance of about $30 billion that, under the Administration's proposal, was expected to balloon to $77 billion by 2002.

Under Chairman Shuster's leadership, the T&I Committee launched a successful campaign that released billions of dollars in highway, transit and aviation funds and established permanent budget reforms that restored integrity to the Highway and Aviation Trust Funds and provided a precedent for unlocking the water trust funds.

Beginning with the introduction of H.R. 842, the ''Truth in Budgeting Act'' in the 104th Congress, which had 224 cosponsors and passed the House by an overwhelming vote of 284–143, and a subsequent amendment to the

FY 1998 Budget Resolution that again demonstrated the strong support for unlocking the trust funds, the foundation was paved for passage of critical budget reforms in the 105th Congress with the enactment of TEA 21 (Public Law 105–178). This landmark legislation reauthorized the nation's highway and transit programs and changed the budget treatment of the Highway Trust Fund, thereby permanently protecting it from budgetary abuse.

In the 106th Congress, the Committee focused its effort on unlocking the Aviation Trust Fund. Again, budget reforms were instituted as part of the AIR 21 (Public Law 106–181), that are just now resulting in significant increases in funding for much-needed airport expansion and air traffic control system modernization.

INVESTING IN AMERICA AND OUR COMMUNITIES

One of the oldest responsibilities of the federal government is the establishment and maintenance of our transportation and infrastructure system. Beginning with ocean ports and waterways, then later roads, railways, and airports, the government made the necessary investments and the nation prospered. In today's increasingly global marketplace, the need for an efficient transportation network is more important than ever before. Moreover, assuring modern environmental and water infrastructure is both a quality of life issue and, for many communities, an economic necessity.

The T&I Committee's flagship achievement was the 1998 enactment of TEA 21, which reauthorized the nation's highway, transit, motor carrier, and highway safety programs for fiscal years 1998–2003. This historic legislation created, for the first time, a statutory link between highway and transit investment and the fuel excise taxes paid by motorists and deposited into the Highway Trust Fund.

TEA 21 puts the financial resources of the Highway Trust Fund to work rebuilding and improving the nation's infrastructure, which had suffered from anemic under-funding during the past several decades. The overall authorized levels of $218 billion represents a 43 percent increase in funding for roads, bridges, and transit systems nationwide. These increases were accomplished without increasing taxes by simply unlocking the money already being collected from system users. Moreover, the budget reforms mean that, if Trust Fund receipts increase in the future, the amount available to maintain and improve our roads and transit systems will increase. It also included a greatly expanded, $3.5 billion rail infrastructure revolving loan program to help communities address serious transportation choke points at major port, transloading facilities, passenger terminals and other intermodal facilities.

TEA 21 directly addressed equity concerns of ''donor'' states by ensuring a fair return on each state's Highway Trust Fund contributions. On an average annual basis, each state will receive more in real dollars than it did in ISTEA, TEA 21's predecessor, and each state will receive a ''Minimum Guarantee'' of 90.5 percent return on what its motorists contributed. The minimum guarantee replaces the myriad equity programs that existed under ISTEA. TEA 21 also eliminated the donor state ''penalty'' that counted allocations of discretionary grants against the state's return.

In response to a growing concern over our aviation system's ability to handle the increased demand for air travel since deregulation of the airline industry, the Aviation Subcommittee sponsored and the House passed H.R. 2276, ''The Aviation Revitalization Act,'' to help the Federal Aviation Administration address some of the barriers to system improvements. These include changes to cumbersome personnel rules so the agency can move its most experienced air traffic controllers to areas of greatest needs and a simplification of procurement requirements in order to more quickly acquire advanced technology. The most significant of these reforms were ultimately enacted in the DOT appropriations bill.

In H.R. 3539, the ''Federal Aviation Authorization Act'' (Public Law 104–264), the Committee went further, increasing funding to enable FAA to hire and train additional maintenance and flight inspectors to achieve a higher level of safety for the flying public. It was in this legislation that Congress established the National Civil Aviation Review Commission to make recommendations on long-term actions to address increased demand.

In 1997, the National Civil Aviation Review Commission's report said that, ''Without prompt action, the United States' aviation system is headed toward gridlock shortly after the turn of the century. If this gridlock is allowed to happen, it will result in a deterioration of aviation safety, harm the efficiency and growth of our domestic economy, and hurt our position in the global marketplace. Lives may be endangered; the profitability and strength of the aviation sector could disappear; and jobs and business opportunities far beyond aviation could be foregone.''

In response to these findings and ever-growing frustration on the part of passengers across the country, the Committee successfully passed the AIR 21. Significant increases in funding for air traffic control modernization and airport expansion are just now being realized as a result of this landmark legislation. While the effects will not be immediate. FAA will now have the resources to modernize the air traffic control system and expand airport capacity, thereby reducing chronic delays, which have crippled the aviation system and frustrated passengers.

The T&I Committee continued to champion the Economic Development Administration (EDA) and the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC), both founded in 1965 to address the chronic poverty in economically distressed regions of the country. Through highway and safe drinking water investments, as well as investments in technical and vocational schools and health care facilities, the Appalachian region has seen its poverty rates cut in half and its employment rate and number of high school graduates double. It is a dramatic example of how investment in roads and other public infrastructure can spur economic growth and reduce poverty. The 105th Congress reauthorized these programs (Public Law 105–393), providing $1.8 billion over 5 years to EDA and $207 million for three years to ARC. In the case of EDA, it was the first time in seventeen years that the agency's mission was formally reauthorized, so agency reforms were also instituted to better direct its activities to the most distressed communities.

The T&I Committee also maintains jurisdiction over the nation's water infrastructure, including ports, inland waterways, drinking and wastewater infrastructure, and dams and other water management infrastructure developed by the Army Corps of Engineers. The Committee has sought to provide significant increases in funding for this infrastructure to help communities meet their ever-growing needs.

The Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1996 (Public Law 104–303), authorizing $5.4 billion in various Corps of Engineers projects and programs, successfully returned Congress and the nation to the two-year cycle for enacting water projects and policy changes. On a bipartisan basis, the Committee authorized 44 major projects for navigation, flood control, shore protection, environmental restoration, hydropower production, water supply, and recreation, as well as scores of other projects and project modifications. WRDA of 1999 (Public Law 106–53), authorizing $6.1 billion in various Corps projects and programs, signified yet another bipartisan success in meeting the nation's water resource needs on a timely basis. Among the highlights: 45 major project authorizations, including a controversial flood control project for the American River in California, a new program for flood control and ecosystem restoration, and modified or additional authorities for critical projects and regional programs for environmental restoration and related infrastructure. WRDA 2000 authorized the Army Corps of Engineers to begin an historic 20-year project to restore the natural water flow in the Florida Everglades as well as authorizing $5.1 billion in flood control, navigation improvements, environmental protection and restoration, and other national water infrastructure projects. The House passed WRDA 2000 on October 19, 2000, by a vote of 394–14.

In addition, the Committee has also approved 200 survey resolutions since 1995, directing the Corps of Engineers to study potential solutions to water-related infrastructure problems throughout the country, as well as four ''small watershed program'' projects directing the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), formerly the Soil Conservation Service, to construct projects in rural areas for flood control, water supply, and environmental restoration.

The ''Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996'' (Public Law 104–182) included key provisions championed by the T&I Committee. It established a new $1 billion per year state revolving fund (SRF) for drinking water assistance, modeled on and integrated with the Clean Water Act's existing SRF, and included a new $350 million authorization for grants to States for drinking water infrastructure and watershed protection. It also included financial and technical assistance for the District of Columbia's drinking water treatment system and for sanitation needs in Alaska and along the U.S.-Mexico border.

Clean Water infrastructure also has been a major focus of the Committee over the last 6 years, including the development and passage of comprehensive legislation, over a dozen legislative and oversight hearings, and countless discussions with appropriators and members of the Executive Branch. The Committee has consistently sought to help communities and state and local water officials in their campaign to win more funding for core programs under the Clean Water Act, such as the SRF, and for grants to hardship communities, rural areas, and states for wastewater treatment, combined sewer and sanitary sewer overflows, and nonpoint source pollution. For example, the House-passed Clean Water Amendments of 1995 authorized over $11 billion for the SRF and $1 billion for nonpoint source grants.

In the 106th Congress, the Committee successfully moved important regional and national infrastructure and water quality bills through the House. For example, the ''Estuaries and Clean Waters Act of 2000'' authorized approximately $1.6 billion for various coastal and inland projects and infrastructure programs for the country. The House passed the conference report on this legislation (S. 835) on October 25, 2000, clearing the bill for the President.

PROMOTING TRANSPORTATION SAFETY

A key Committee responsibility is oversight of our Federal programs that protect the safety of the traveling public and our communities. The Committee took a number of steps to improve the public safety on board aircraft and marine vessels, and on our nation's roads, railroads, and pipeline transportation network.

Aviation safety played a prominent role during the past six years. In response to National Transportation Safety Board recommendations and at least seven accidents where pilot error was the cause and the pilot had a previous record of poor performance, Aviation Subcommittee Chairman Duncan sponsored the ''Airline Pilot Hiring and Safety Act.'' The legislation, enacted as part of the Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act of 1996, requires airlines to request and receive records of an individual's performance as a pilot before hiring that individual as a commercial pilot. In the 1995 reauthorization of the National Transportation Safety Board (Public Law 104–291), the Committee made changes to facilitate voluntary reporting of safety data. In this year's NTSB reauthorization, the Committee clarified the role of the Safety Board in accident investigations and strengthened the protection of information obtained from voice and flight data recorders.

The Aviation Subcommittee also responded to reports that more people die from heart attacks aboard aircraft than die as a result of aircraft accidents. The Committee enacted the ''Aviation Medical Assistance Act'' (Public Law 105–170) directing the Federal Aviation Administration to gather data and develop a rule to require that defibrillators be installed on aircraft. Since then, airlines have begun installing defibrillators and many lives have been saved.

Promoting safety of motor carrier operations on our Nation's highways has always been one of the Committee's top priorities. In 1999, in an effort to ensure that motor carrier safety issues were given their due attention and funding with the U.S. Department of Transportation, the Ground Transportation Subcommittee held a series of four hearings to examine the effectiveness of the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA's) oversight of this ever-expanding industry. The Committee found that motor carrier safety functions were hampered by competition for resources at FHWA.

The Motor Carrier Safety Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–159) transferred motor carrier safety functions and oversight of the motor carrier safety program (MCSAP) out of FHWA and created a new Administration to take over those responsibilities. The Act also equipped the new Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration with an increase in funding for the MCSAP program and tighter, more demanding commercial drivers' licensing requirements.

In April 1995, a home-made bomb exploded outside the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, killing 168 people, including several preschool children enrolled in the building's child care center, and causing $500 million in damages to 320 buildings in the vicinity. This tragedy illustrated the vulnerability of federal employees and facilities to random acts of violence. The Committee responded by calling on the General Services Administration to undertake an assessment of security at all federal buildings. In July 1995, the Administration submitted its security assessment and requested over $240 million for upgrades at the nation's federal buildings. For FY 1997, the Committee approved $40 million to ensure that all newly authorized federal buildings, courthouses, and border stations received these security enhancements. The Committee also sponsored the House-passed Baylee's Law, requiring GSA to notify parents enrolling children in child care centers in federal buildings of the current federal agencies occupying the building and the level of security of the building.

To address one of our nation's most dire public health problems, the nation's failure to reduce illegal drug use among America's youth, the Committee moved to tighten the noose around illegal narcotics smugglers. While the Administration has relied on programs to treat and retreat hard-core drug addicts, the T&I Committee has consistently supported Coast Guard drug interdiction efforts, which raise the street price of illegal drugs to deter casual drug users, especially teenagers. The ''Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act'' (Public Law 105–277), represented a bold move by Congress to address the increase in illicit drug use by teenagers over the last eight years. It provided the Coast Guard with an additional $151 million annually to expand its drug interdiction efforts. In addition, the House-passed ''Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1999'' provides $550 million in additional funding for Coast Guard drug interdiction above the level requested by the President for fiscal year 2001.

In order to strengthen and improve our nation's efforts to combat drunk driving, the T&I Committee adopted a number of broad programs in TEA 21 to reduce drunk driving and accidents and fatalities. These included: a $500 million incentive grant program for states which enact .08 Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) laws; increased funding of $219 million for the impaired driving grant program along with programmatic reforms to include performance-based factors and to target those drunk drivers who pose the highest risk on the roads; and provisions to encourage states to enact open container laws and minimum penalties for repeat offenders.

The T&I Committee has sought, through a number of vehicles, to improve maritime safety. The ''Sportfishing and Boating Safety Act of 1998,'' (enacted as part of Public Law 105–178) increased state funding for recreational boating safety programs. The Coast Guard Authorization Acts of 1996, 1998, and 2000 included provisions to improve maritime drug and alcohol testing programs, provide penalties for interfering with the safe operation of a vessel, and require a more prompt development of the Coast Guard's new National Distress and Response System. The Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee held numerous oversight hearings that highlighted the importance of safety in the maritime environment, including the Coast Guard's vessel traffic systems, commercial vessel safety mission, search and rescue mission, and icebreaking mission, as well as cruise ship safety, and recreational boating safety.

Lastly, the Committee has continued its oversight of the Pipeline Safety Program administered by the Department of Transportation. In the 104th Congress, the Committee reauthorized the pipeline safety program for a four-year term, introducing reform into the burdensome regulatory framework. In the 106th Congress,the Committee again sought to reauthorize the program, as well as address specific concerns raised by serious pipeline incident, which occurred in Bellingham, Washington, and Carlsbad, New Mexico. Towards this end, Chairman SHUSTER brought to the House for consideration S. 2438, a strong, bipartisan pipeline safety bill that passe the Senate 99–0. While the legislation received the support of a majority of House Members, it failed to gain the 2/3 vote required under ''suspension,'' with only 51 Democrats supporting the bill. Some of the major reforms sought by this comprehensive bill included: mandates for periodic testing of pipelines and for training and evaluating safety personnel; significantly increased penalties for safety violators; a lower reporting threshold to require reporting of smaller hazardous liquid spills; an increased state role in the oversight of interstate pipelines; and increased funding for safety efforts. The legislation also included a number of provisions on ''right to know'' to broaden public access to information on pipeline operations and hazards, whistle blower protection, and establishment of a formal research and development program to develop pipeline inspection and safety technology. It is hoped that Congress will revisit this issue early in the next Congress.

MAKING TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS WORK MORE EFFICIENTLY

The T&I Committee has jurisdiction over federal agencies that regulate transportation. In 1995, the Committee began looking at ways to make many of the federal regulatory functions perform better. Two early efforts were the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), which had economic oversight over the trucking and railroad industries, and the Federal Maritime Commission, which had oversight over ocean shipping. These two agencies, both envisioned as small entities charged with preventing monopolistic practices in their respective industries, had failed to evolve with the changing marketplace.

In the case of the ICC, established more than a century ago to oversee the railroad industry at the start of the industrial revolution, it had become archaic in the modern, global economy. The Interstate Commerce Commission Termination Act (Public Law 104–88) addressed these problems by eliminating the ICC and transferring nearly all of the remaining motor carrier regulatory oversight functions to the Federal Highway Administration. The remaining rail functions were transferred to a 3-member autonomous Surface Transportation Board within DOT. The legislation saved taxpayers money and established a regulatory framework that better ensures competition and smooth functioning of our $320 billion surface transportation industry.

The Federal Maritime Commission was subject to similar criticisms, where tariff filing requirements had saddled shippers and vessel operators with enormous administrative costs and strengthened foreign shipping cartels by providing them with access to the private shipping agreements of their U.S. competitors. In the 104th Congress, the T&I Committee put forward sweeping legislation to provide U.S. shippers and vessel operators with a level playing field in the global shipping industry. The legislation, H.R. 2149, received strong House support. Although the Senate failed to act on that legislation in the 104th Congress, it put forward compromise legislation in the 105th that incorporated many key elements of H.R. 2149. The House accepted the Senate's version and enacted the ''Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 1998 (OSRA)'' (Public Law 105–258). The most important provision of OSRA allows for ''confidential contracts'' for ocean transportation. At an oversight hearing a year after enactment, witnesses from the Federal Maritime Commission, international ocean carriers, U.S. shippers, and U.S. labor all reported that the new system was a success. The new system has increased competition in the international ocean shipping markets while allowing individual shippers and carriers to pursue private contracts that provide for the most efficient international ocean transportation arrangements.

The National Highway Designation Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–59) approved the designation of 160,000 miles of U.S. roadway as

the National Highway System, and provided $13 billion in Interstate Maintenance and NHS highway funds to the states in 1996–97. The legislation also eliminated a number of federal sanctions that had been imposed on the states in the past, including penalties for states that fail to enforce a national maximum speed limit or compulsory motorcycle helmet laws, and streamlined the delivery of highway and transit programs.

In TEA 21, the Committee remained committed to making Federal highway and transit programs more efficient, working to streamline program delivery and cut red tape. The bill contained a landmark provision to streamline environmental reviews for highway and transit projects, which was backed by the Administration, state and local government groups and environmental constituencies.

Following the ValuJet and TWA airplane crashes in 1996, families who lost loved ones complained about their ill treatment at the hands of both government and airline officials. The Aviation Subcommittee held hearings that resulted in the introduction of the Aviation Disaster Family Assistance Act, which was included in the Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–264). The law requires airlines to develop plans to handle these situations in the future and gives the National Transportation Safety Board responsibility for coordinating these efforts. As a result, more recent crashes have not given rise to the sort of complaints experienced in 1996. In 1999, the Committee sought to apply a similar framework to rail accidents in the Rail Passenger Disaster Family Assistance Act of 1999, which passed the House but was not enacted.

Under T&I Committee leadership, the 105th Congress enacted the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act (Public Law 105–134). The bipartisan reforms contained in the Act remove Amtrak from a crippling statutory straight jacket. At the time, Amtrak was headed toward bankruptcy. Similar to legislation the T&I Committee successfully passed through the House in the 104th Congress but which the Senate declined to consider, this Act gave Amtrak the opportunity to operate in a more business-like fashion. Significantly, the Act allowed Amtrak for the first time to contract work (other than food service) with third parties and to evaluate routes based upon profitability rather than a congressionally determined route structure. It also eliminated statutory labor protections that required Amtrak to pay displaced workers a year of severance for each year of service (maximum of six years). Finally, the Act established a new, seven-member Reform Board filled with qualified professionals to provide a much-needed fresh start for Amtrak.

While the reform law provided Amtrak with many new tools, in addition to authorizing vastly increased funding, it did not and could not guarantee a successful outcome. The T&I Committee continues to conduct oversight of Amtrak operations and Reform Board actions. Recent reports from the General Accounting Office and the DOT Inspector General are that Amtrak is not taking advantage of the new law. The decisions it makes in the coming months will determine whether the goals of the reform law are realized.

In the 106th Congress, the T&I Committee worked with railroad labor groups and management to craft a reform package for the financially ailing Railroad Retirement program. The ''Railroad Retirement and Survivors Improvement Act'' provided long-term solvency to the federally-managed railroad pension fund by allowing limited trust fund resources to be privately invested. It also improved employee benefits by lowering the retirement age to 60 (with 30 years of service), increasing benefits for widows, and reducing the vesting period from 10 to 5 years.

Finally, the T&I Committee introduced and passed as part of AIR 21, an amendment to the ''Death on the High Seas Act.'' The Act ensures that families will be treated the same regardless of whether an aircraft crashes on land or at sea. Prior to the enactment of this legislation, families were unable to recover damages for the death of a child as a result of an aircraft accident on the high seas.

ENSURING A CLEAN, SAFE ENVIRONMENT

Over the last five years, the Committee has led the debate on innovative and effective environmental protection for the 21st Century. Legislative achievements and oversight initiatives have translated into cleaner, safer communities, more deference to state and local decision making, and greater emphasis on cost-effective, science-based regulations.

The Committee's bipartisan ''Clean Water Act Amendments of 1995,'' strongly supported by state and local officials, offered a comprehensive, commonsense approach to reauthorization and reform of the Clean Water Act. The House-passed legislation has served as a catalyst for regulatory reform in many ways including: more flexibility for water quality standards to reflect regional and seasonal variations; greater flexibility in the pretreatment and stormwater programs; increased focus on watershed-based effluent trading; greater emphasis on federal-state funding partnerships; increased funding for voluntary approaches to managing agricultural runoff and pilot projects to allow companies and communities regulatory flexibility to achieve environmental goals in more cost-effective ways.

The ''Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act of 2000'' authorized $150 million for EPA assistance to states to establish monitoring programs to provide the public with information about the quality of coastal recreational waters. This act also strengthens the science behind and effectiveness of water quality standards for coastal recreational waters. Comparable legislation had been pending, and languishing, in Congress for almost a decade. The ''Estuaries and Clean Water Act of 2000,'' comprising 10 separate House-passed bills, authorized $1.6 billion in non-regulatory, federal assistance for Clean Water Act and related programs. Such efforts will help restore and protect estuaries, coastal waters and publicly owned lakes.

Efforts in the 104th and 105th Congresses to enact Superfund reform and address brownfields highlighted the glaring deficiencies of the Superfund toxic waste program: cleanups that are costly, delayed, and ineffective and a liability system that rewards litigation and rejects fairness. The ''Reform of Superfund Act,'' the ''Superfund Acceleration, Fairness, and Efficiency Act,'' and Committee hearings helped push the Administration towards modest reforms to make Superfund cleanups ''faster, fairer, and more effective.''

In 1996 and 1998, in the annual Department of Defense Authorization bills, the Committee participated in the development of language to encourage the redevelopment of closed bases. Also in the FY 1997 Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations bill, the Committee participated in the development of language to protect lenders from Superfund liability.

The push for administrative reform and legislative overhaul of Superfund continued in the 106th Congress. In an historic vote of 69 to 2, the Committee approved the ''Recycle America's Land Act of 1999,'' reforming key aspects of Superfund liability and revitalizing brownfields. The legislation, which included liability for small businesses and incentives for voluntary cleanups, helped to initiate another round of modest administrative reforms.

With the enactment of the ''National Invasive Species Act of 1996'' (Public Law 104–332), the Committee expanded and improved efforts to combat problems from invasive, non-indigenous aquatic species (such as zebra mussels), including ballast water exchange procedures and Federal research and demonstration projects. Resulting efforts have benefited municipal, industrial and agricultural water supplies, maritime transportation, and the environment.

Finally, the National Parks Air Tour Management Act, sponsored by Aviation Subcommittee Chairman Duncan, helps minimize aircraft noise over national parks. The legislation, enacted as part of AIR 21, requires the FAA Administrator to prescribe operating conditions and limitations for each commercial air tour operator and, in cooperation with the Director of the National Park Service (NPS), develop a plan before air tours can be conducted over national parks.

Mr. Speaker, indeed, in closing, I want to give my heartfelt thanks to all my colleagues for their tremendous support, because without that support we would not have any accomplishments to insert in the RECORD today or, more importantly, to provide to the American people in the years ahead.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, just briefly, although I have commented many times in committee and on the several bills that we have had, since the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) is sounding a note this may, indeed, may be our last major bill on the floor, I just want to emphasize for our colleagues that in an era of rancor and divisiveness publicly in the body politic and between the parties and between the two bodies of Congress, this Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has stood as a model of legislative achievement, as an example of how we can advance the commonweal of the Nation by working together in a relationship of trust and of understanding and of mutual respect.

Mr. Speaker, that is the bond that draws us together and the bond of respect that I hold for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), our chairman, and for his leadership, steadfast throughout these 6 years of holding an ideal and working to achieve it.

Together we have accomplished something of lasting value for America, and I compliment the chairman on his leadership, his distinguished contribution to America. That will stand for all time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), my dear friend, and the key word, I think, is together. We have stood together,

and so it is with heartfelt thanks that I thank the gentleman, the ranking member of the committee, as well as all of my colleagues for their tremendous support so that our stewardship of this committee could indeed be one in which we could be proud.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the decline of estuary habitats—especially in the San Francisco Bay estuary—has been well-documented in the scientific and resource management literature for over 30 years. Tragically, San Francisco Bay has lost over 95% of its tidal wetlands and continues to be besieged by invasive and aquatic nuisance species.

Fortunately, S. 835, the Estuaries and Clean Water Act, will provide a reasonable, balanced approach to both preserve remaining estuarine habitats and to facilitate effective, locally-driven estuary restoration in estuaries like San Pablo Bay and Suisun Bay in my district.

I am particularly pleased that non-governmental organizations (NGOs) will be eligible to participate in this new program. NGOs, such as Save the Bay and The Bay Institute in the Bay Area, embody the locally driven focus of this legislation and provide local expertise and support.

Amendments agreed to in conference also enhance the role of the Estuary Habitat Restoration Council in the selection of projects and the delegation of oversight responsibilities for project implementation. This will bring additional expertise and provide direct ties to other successful Federal-State partnership programs for protecting the estuaries, such as the National Estuary Program, the National Estuarine Research Reserve Program, and the National Marine Fisheries Service's Fishery Habitat Restoration program.

This conference report is good environmental legislation and I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support its passage.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the Conference Report on Estuaries and Clean Waters Act. This bill provides critical relief to the Long Island Sound and estuaries across the country.

Estuaries are an integral part of our environment, as well as our economy. They give live to and provide a habitat for many important species, they naturally cleanse our water, they provide protection against floods and storm damage, and serve as a playground for children and families during the summer months. The health of our nation's estuaries are critical to the protection of our natural heritage, and to those who make their lives off these waters.

The Long Island Sound, in particular, is one of the most complex estuaries in the country—10 percent of the U.S. population lives within 50 miles of the Sound and millions more flock to it for recreation every year. It brings in more than $5 billion annually to the regional economy from various activities—all of which require clean water.

However, these natural jewels are in danger of being lost forever, Estuaries are suffering from severe water quality problems, declining habitat quality, and, in some areas, total habitat loss. More than 50 percent of wetlands in coastal states have been destroyed—an amount equal in size to six Grand Canyons.

If you don't want to take my word on how important an estuary can be to our communities and our economy, I invite you to visit with the lobstermen in my district. Walk the docks with them, and listen to their stories. We are suffering a massive lobster die-off in the Long Island Sounds that has virtually wiped out an industry. While we are still searching for the specific cause of the die-off, we do know that a safer, cleaner Sound would mean that incidents like this would be less likely to occur in the future.

This bill provides a sensible approach to a problem that has plagued efforts to clean up our estuaries—the lack of a reliable, steady funding source for implementing conservation and management plans. Cleaning up estuaries cannot be piecemeal effort. This conference report takes a step in the right direction by authorizing the Long Island Sound Program at $200 million over five years—a significant increase over the $3 million a year it currently receives. It takes a comprehensive approach to fix such a complex problem.

That is why I have fought alongside Nita Lowey to pass the Water Pollution Control and Estuary Restoration Act, which we first introduced nearly eight years ago, and which we fought for again in the current Congress. I want to thank all of my colleagues that have supported this effort over the years, especially my colleagues from Connecticut and New York, who have worked together to bring relief to the Sound. Thank you for working together on a bipartisan approach to fixing a non-partisan problem.

We have an obligation to protect and preserve the Sound for future generations. It is the right thing to do for our children and for our economy, and for men and women—like the Long Island Sound's lobstermen that are still struggling to stay afloat. I urge the House to pass this important legislation.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 835, the Estuary Habitat and Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act.

I would like to thank Mr. GILCHREST for all his efforts in bringing this bill forward.

I am thrilled that we are recognizing the critical importance of estuaries—the diverse, thriving habitats where fresh and salt water mix—and that this legislation will strengthen the all-important partnerships between federal, state, and local interests for estuary habitat restoration.

As a co-chair with NITA LOWEY of the Long Island Sound Caucus, I am particularly pleased that this legislation includes a title on Long Island Sound Restoration.

All of us who live in the Long Island Sound region owe a debt of gratitude to NANCY JOHNSON, and RICK LAZIO for their sponsorship and stewardship of the Long Island Sound Restoration Act.

Repubicans and Democrats alike have worked for years on the ongoing local-state-federal effort to restore the Sound, and know just how important this important body of water is.

The Sound contributed over $5.5 billion to our regions economy in 1994—and obviously contributes even more today—through water-dependent activities such as commercial and recreational fishing, boating, and tourism.

The $40 million annual authorization for the Sound in this legislation will make it possible to continue the progress begun six years ago when New York and Connecticut first signed the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) for long Island Sound, which in itself was the culmination of 10 years of effort.

Since the implementation of the CCMP, our states have spent an extraordinary amount on Long Island Sound. The federal government has played a small, though vital role.

Today we have the opportunity to back up the promise of the CCMP with a commitment to fund Long Island Sound restoration in line with the Sound's place as the center of a watershed region encompassing 8 million people, with over 15 million living within 50 miles of the Sound's shores.

This is truly an estuary of national significance and one which deserves the support of this body. I urge my colleague to vote for this excellent bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on S. 835.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL COURTS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2915) to make improvements in the operation and administration of the Federal courts, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) to explain the procedure and what he is offering.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the request is to take S. 2915, which improves the Federal Court System by improving its administration and procedures, eliminating operational inefficiencies, and reducing operating expenses, and not to pass the whole bill but to offer an amendment which will make technical corrections, strike section 103, and make modifications to section 309.

Section 103, which I propose to strike, provides that retirement funds contributed by the judiciary be transferred back to the judiciary, which judges for whom the contributions were made elected to transfer to another retirement system.

The amendment also makes modifications in section 309 which deals with insurance programs relating to judges of the Court of Federal Claims.

This amendment is noncontroversial.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, with that explanation, I support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2915

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Federal Courts Improvement Act of 2000''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

TITLE I—JUDICIAL FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 101. Extension of Judiciary Information Technology Fund.
Sec. 102. Disposition of miscellaneous fees.
Sec. 103. Transfer of retirement funds.
Sec. 104. Increase in chapter 9 bankruptcy filing fee.
Sec. 105. Increase in fee for converting a chapter 7 or chapter 13 bankruptcy case to a chapter 11 bankruptcy case.
Sec. 106. Bankruptcy fees.

TITLE II—JUDICIAL PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS

Sec. 201. Extension of statutory authority for magistrate judge positions to be established in the district courts of Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands.
Sec. 202. Magistrate judge contempt authority.
Sec. 203. Consent to magistrate judge authority in petty offense cases and magistrate judge authority in misdemeanor cases involving juvenile defendants.
Sec. 204. Savings and loan data reporting requirements.
Sec. 205. Membership in circuit judicial councils.
Sec. 206. Sunset of civil justice expense and delay reduction plans.
Sec. 207. Repeal of Court of Federal Claims filing fee.
Sec. 208. Technical bankruptcy correction.
Sec. 209. Technical amendment relating to the treatment of certain bankruptcy fees collected.
Sec. 210. Maximum amounts of compensation for attorneys.
Sec. 211. Reimbursement of expenses in defense of certain malpractice actions.

TITLE III—JUDICIAL PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION, BENEFITS, AND PROTECTIONS

Sec. 301. Judicial administrative officials retirement matters.
Sec. 302. Applicability of leave provisions to employees of the Sentencing Commission.
Sec. 303. Payments to military survivors benefits plan.
Sec. 304. Creation of certifying officers in the judicial branch.
Sec. 305. Amendment to the jury selection process.
Sec. 306. Authorization of a circuit executive for the Federal circuit.
Sec. 307. Residence of retired judges.
Sec. 308. Recall of judges on disability status.
Sec. 309. Personnel application and insurance programs relating to judges of the Court of Federal Claims.
Sec. 310. Lump-sum payment for accumulated and accrued leave on separation.
Sec. 311. Employment of personal assistants for handicapped employees.
Sec. 312. Mandatory retirement age for Director of the Federal Judicial Center.
Sec. 313. Reauthorization of certain Supreme Court Police authority.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDERS

Sec. 401. Tort Claims Act amendment relating to liability of Federal public defenders.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Extensions relating to bankruptcy administrator program.
Sec. 502. Additional place of holding court in the district of Oregon.

TITLE I—JUDICIAL FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF JUDICIARY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FUND.

Section 612 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''equipment'' each place it appears and inserting ''resources'';

(2) by striking subsection (f) and redesignating subsections (g) through (k) as subsections (f) through (j), respectively;

(3) in subsection (g), as so redesignated, by striking paragraph (3); and

(4) in subsection (i), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking ''Judiciary'' each place it appears and inserting ''judiciary'';

(B) by striking ''subparagraph (c)(1)(B)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)(1)(B)''; and

(C) by striking ''under (c)(1)(B)'' and inserting ''under subsection (c)(1)(B)''.

SEC. 102. DISPOSITION OF MISCELLANEOUS FEES.

For fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter, any portion of miscellaneous fees collected as prescribed by the Judicial Conference of the United States under sections 1913, 1914(b), 1926(a), 1930(b), and 1932 of title 28, United States Code, exceeding the amount of such fees in effect on September 30, 2000, shall be deposited into the special fund of the Treasury established under section 1931 of title 28, United States Code.

SEC. 103. TRANSFER OF RETIREMENT FUNDS.

Section 377 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(p) TRANSFER OF RETIREMENT FUNDS.—Upon election by a bankruptcy judge or a magistrate judge under subsection (f) of this section, all of the accrued employer contributions and accrued interest on those contributions made on behalf of the bankruptcy judge or magistrate judge to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund under section 8348 of title 5 shall be transferred to the fund established under section 1931 of this title, except that if the bankruptcy judge or magistrate judge elects under section 2(c) of the Retirement and Survivor's Annuities for Bankruptcy Judges and Magistrates Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–659), to receive a retirement annuity under both this section and title 5, only the accrued employer contributions and accrued interest on such contributions, made on behalf of the bankruptcy judge or magistrate judge for service credited under this section, may be transferred.''.

SEC. 104. INCREASE IN CHAPTER 9 BANKRUPTCY FILING FEE.

Section 1930(a)(2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$300'' and inserting ''equal to the fee specified in paragraph (3) for filing a case under chapter 11 of title 11. The amount by which the fee payable under this paragraph exceeds $300 shall be deposited in the fund established under section 1931 of this title''.

SEC. 105. INCREASE IN FEE FOR CONVERTING A CHAPTER 7 OR CHAPTER 13 BANKRUPTCY CASE TO A CHAPTER 11 BANKRUPTCY CASE.

The flush paragraph at the end of section 1930(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$400'' and inserting ''the amount equal to the difference between the fee specified in paragraph (3) and the fee specified in paragraph (1)''.

SEC. 106. BANKRUPTCY FEES.

Section 1930(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) In districts that are not part of a United States trustee region as defined in section 581 of this title, the Judicial Conference of the United States may require the debtor in a case under chapter 11 of title 11 to pay fees equal to those imposed by paragraph (6) of this subsection. Such fees shall be deposited as offsetting receipts to the fund established under section 1931 of this title and shall remain available until expended.''.

TITLE II—JUDICIAL PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR MAGISTRATE JUDGE POSITIONS TO BE ESTABLISHED IN THE DISTRICT COURTS OF GUAM AND THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.

Section 631 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the first two sentences of subsection (a) and inserting the following: ''The judges of each United States district court and the district courts of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands shall appoint United States magistrate judges in such numbers and to serve at such locations within the judicial districts as the Judicial Conference may determine under this chapter. In the case of a magistrate judge appointed by the district court of the Virgin Islands, Guam, or the Northern Mariana Islands, this chapter shall apply as though the court appointing such a magistrate judge were a United States district court.''; and

(2) by inserting in the first sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) after ''Commonwealth of Puerto Rico,'' the following: ''the Territory of Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,''.

SEC. 202. MAGISTRATE JUDGE CONTEMPT AUTHORITY.

Section 636(e) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(e) CONTEMPT AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A United States magistrate judge serving under this chapter shall have within the territorial jurisdiction prescribed by the appointment of such magistrate judge the power to exercise contempt authority as set forth in this subsection.

''(2) SUMMARY CRIMINAL CONTEMPT AUTHORITY.—A magistrate judge shall have the

power to punish summarily by fine or imprisonment such contempt of the authority of such magistrate judge constituting misbehavior of any person in the magistrate judge's presence so as to obstruct the administration of justice. The order of contempt shall be issued under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

''(3) ADDITIONAL CRIMINAL CONTEMPT AUTHORITY IN CIVIL CONSENT AND MISDEMEANOR CASES.—In any case in which a United States magistrate judge presides with the consent of the parties under subsection (c) of this section, and in any misdemeanor case proceeding before a magistrate judge under section 3401 of title 18, the magistrate judge shall have the power to punish, by fine or imprisonment, criminal contempt constituting disobedience or resistance to the magistrate judge's lawful writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command. Disposition of such contempt shall be conducted upon notice and hearing under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

''(4) CIVIL CONTEMPT AUTHORITY IN CIVIL CONSENT AND MISDEMEANOR CASES.—In any case in which a United States magistrate judge presides with the consent of the parties under subsection (c) of this section, and in any misdemeanor case proceeding before a magistrate judge under section 3401 of title 18, the magistrate judge may exercise the civil contempt authority of the district court. This paragraph shall not be construed to limit the authority of a magistrate judge to order sanctions under any other statute, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

''(5) CRIMINAL CONTEMPT PENALTIES.—The sentence imposed by a magistrate judge for any criminal contempt provided for in paragraphs (2) and (3) shall not exceed the penalties for a Class C misdemeanor as set forth in sections 3581(b)(8) and 3571(b)(6) of title 18.

''(6) CERTIFICATION OF OTHER CONTEMPTS TO THE DISTRICT COURT.—Upon the commission of any such act—

''(A) in any case in which a United States magistrate judge presides with the consent of the parties under subsection (c) of this section, or in any misdemeanor case proceeding before a magistrate judge under section 3401 of title 18, that may, in the opinion of the magistrate judge, constitute a serious criminal contempt punishable by penalties exceeding those set forth in paragraph (5) of this subsection; or

''(B) in any other case or proceeding under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or any other statute, where—

''(i) the act committed in the magistrate judge's presence may, in the opinion of the magistrate judge, constitute a serious criminal contempt punishable by penalties exceeding those set forth in paragraph (5) of this subsection;

''(ii) the act that constitutes a criminal contempt occurs outside the presence of the magistrate judge; or

''(iii) the act constitutes a civil contempt, the magistrate judge shall forthwith certify the facts to a district judge and may serve or cause to be served, upon any person whose behavior is brought into question under this paragraph, an order requiring such person to appear before a district judge upon a day certain to show cause why that person should not be adjudged in contempt by reason of the facts so certified. The district judge shall thereupon hear the evidence as to the act or conduct complained of and, if it is such as to warrant punishment, punish such person in the same manner and to the same extent as for a contempt committed before a district judge.

''(7) APPEALS OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE CONTEMPT ORDERS.—The appeal of an order of contempt under this subsection shall be made to the court of appeals in cases proceeding under subsection (c) of this section. The appeal of any other order of contempt issued under this section shall be made to the district court.''.

SEC. 203. CONSENT TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE AUTHORITY IN PETTY OFFENSE CASES AND MAGISTRATE JUDGE AUTHORITY IN MISDEMEANOR CASES INVOLVING JUVENILE DEFENDANTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18.—

(1) PETTY OFFENSE CASES.—Section 3401(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''that is a class B misdemeanor charging a motor vehicle offense, a class C misdemeanor, or an infraction,'' after ''petty offense''.

(2) CASES INVOLVING JUVENILES.—Section 3401(g) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: ''The magistrate judge may, in a petty offense case involving a juvenile, exercise all powers granted to the district court under chapter 403 of this title.'';

(B) in the second sentence by striking ''any other class B or C misdemeanor case'' and inserting ''the case of any misdemeanor, other than a petty offense,''; and

(C) by striking the last sentence.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 28.—Section 636(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraphs (4) and (5) and inserting in the following:

''(4) the power to enter a sentence for a petty offense; and

''(5) the power to enter a sentence for a class A misdemeanor in a case in which the parties have consented.''.

SEC. 204. SAVINGS AND LOAN DATA REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 604 of title 28, United States Code, is amended in subsection (a) by striking the second paragraph designated (24).

SEC. 205. MEMBERSHIP IN CIRCUIT JUDICIAL COUNCILS.

Section 332(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) Except for the chief judge of the circuit, either judges in regular active service or judges retired from regular active service under section 371(b) of this title may serve as members of the council. Service as a member of a judicial council by a judge retired from regular active service under section 371(b) may not be considered for meeting the requirements of section 371(f)(1) (A), (B), or (C).''; and

(2) in paragraph (5) by striking ''retirement,'' and inserting ''retirement under section 371(a) or 372(a) of this title,''.

SEC. 206. SUNSET OF CIVIL JUSTICE EXPENSE AND DELAY REDUCTION PLANS.

Section 103(b)(2)(A) of the Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–650; 104 Stat. 5096; 28 U.S.C. 471 note), as amended by Public Law 105–53 (111 Stat. 1173), is amended by inserting ''471,'' after ''sections''.

SEC. 207. REPEAL OF COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FILING FEE.

Section 2520 of title 28, United States Code, and the item relating to such section in the table of contents for chapter 165 of such title, are repealed.

SEC. 208. TECHNICAL BANKRUPTCY CORRECTION.

Section 1228 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by striking ''1222(b)(10)'' each place it appears and inserting ''1222(b)(9)''.

SEC. 209. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO THE TREATMENT OF CERTAIN BANKRUPTCY FEES COLLECTED.

(a) AMENDMENT.—The first sentence of section 406(b) of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1990 (Public Law 101–162; 103 Stat. 1016; 28 U.S.C. 1931 note) is amended by striking ''service enumerated after item 18'' and inserting ''service not of a kind described in any of the items enumerated as items 1 through 7 and as items 9 through 18, as in effect on November 21, 1989,''.

(b) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENT.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to fees collected before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 210. MAXIMUM AMOUNTS OF COMPENSATION FOR ATTORNEYS.

Section 3006A(d)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by striking ''$3,500'' and inserting ''$5,200''; and

(B) by striking ''$1,000'' and inserting ''$1,500'';

(2) in the second sentence by striking ''$2,500'' and inserting ''$3,700'';

(3) in the third sentence—

(A) by striking ''$750'' and inserting ''$1,200''; and

(B) by striking ''$2,500'' and inserting ''$3,900'';

(4) by inserting after the second sentence the following: ''For representation of a petitioner in a non-capital habeas corpus proceeding, the compensation for each attorney shall not exceed the amount applicable to a felony in this paragraph for representation of a defendant before a judicial officer of the district court. For representation of such petitioner in an appellate court, the compensation for each attorney shall not exceed the amount applicable for representation of a defendant in an appellate court.''; and

(5) in the last sentence by striking ''$750'' and inserting ''$1,200''.

SEC. 211. REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES IN DEFENSE OF CERTAIN MALPRACTICE ACTIONS.

Section 3006A(d)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the last sentence and inserting ''Attorneys may be reimbursed for expenses reasonably incurred, including the costs of transcripts authorized by the United States magistrate or the court, and the costs of defending actions alleging malpractice of counsel in furnishing representational services under this section. No reimbursement for expenses in defending against malpractice claims shall be made if a judgment of malpractice is rendered against the counsel furnishing representational services under this section. The United States magistrate or the court shall make determinations relating to reimbursement of expenses under this paragraph.''.

TITLE III—JUDICIAL PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION, BENEFITS, AND PROTECTIONS

SEC. 301. JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIALS RETIREMENT MATTERS.

(a) DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE.—Section 611 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by inserting ''a congressional employee in the capacity of primary administrative assistant to a Member of Congress or in the capacity of staff director or chief counsel for the majority or the minority of a committee or subcommittee of the Senate or House of Representatives,'' after ''Congress,'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''who has served at least fifteen years and'' and inserting ''who has at least fifteen years of service and has''; and

(B) in the first undesignated paragraph, by striking ''who has served at least ten years,'' and inserting ''who has at least ten years of service,''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''served at least fifteen years,'' and inserting ''at least fifteen years of service,''; and

(B) by striking ''served less than fifteen years,'' and inserting ''less than fifteen years of service,''.

(b) DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER.—Section 627 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by inserting ''a congressional employee in the capacity of primary administrative assistant to a Member of Congress or in the capacity of staff director or chief counsel for the majority or the minority of a committee or subcommittee of the Senate or House of Representatives,'' after ''Congress,'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''who has served at least fifteen years and'' and inserting ''who has at least fifteen years of service and has''; and

(B) in the first undesignated paragraph, by striking ''who has served at least ten years,'' and inserting ''who has at least ten years of service,''; and

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking ''served at least fifteen years,'' and inserting ''at least fifteen years of service,''; and

(B) by striking ''served less than fifteen years,'' and inserting ''less than fifteen years of service,''.

SEC. 302. APPLICABILITY OF LEAVE PROVISIONS TO EMPLOYEES OF THE SENTENCING COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 996(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking all after ''title 5,'' and inserting ''except the following: chapters 45 (Incentive Awards), 63 (Leave), 81 (Compensation for Work Injuries), 83 (Retirement), 85 (Unemployment Compensation), 87 (Life Insurance), and 89 (Health Insurance), and subchapter VI of chapter 55 (Payment for accumulated and accrued leave).''.

(b) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Any leave that an individual accrued or accumulated (or that otherwise became available to such individual) under the leave system of the United States Sentencing Commission and that remains unused as of the date of the enactment of this Act shall, on and after such date, be treated as leave accrued or accumulated (or that otherwise became available to such individual) under chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 303. PAYMENTS TO MILITARY SURVIVORS BENEFITS PLAN.

Section 371(e) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''such retired or retainer pay'' the following: '', except such pay as is deductible from the retired or retainer pay as a result of participation in any survivor's benefits plan in connection with the retired pay,''.

SEC. 304. CREATION OF CERTIFYING OFFICERS IN THE JUDICIAL BRANCH.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF DISBURSING AND CERTIFYING OFFICERS.—Chapter 41 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 613. Disbursing and certifying officers

''(a) DISBURSING OFFICERS.—The Director may designate in writing officers and employees of the judicial branch of the Government, including the courts as defined in section 610 other than the Supreme Court, to be disbursing officers in such numbers and locations as the Director considers necessary. Such disbursing officers shall—

''(1) disburse moneys appropriated to the judicial branch and other funds only in strict accordance with payment requests certified by the Director or in accordance with subsection (b);

''(2) examine payment requests as necessary to ascertain whether they are in proper form, certified, and approved; and

''(3) be held accountable for their actions as provided by law, except that such a disbursing officer shall not be held accountable or responsible for any illegal, improper, or incorrect payment resulting from any false, inaccurate, or misleading certificate for which a certifying officer is responsible under subsection (b).

''(b) CERTIFYING OFFICERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director may designate in writing officers and employees of the judicial branch of the Government, including the courts as defined in section 610 other than the Supreme Court, to certify payment requests payable from appropriations and funds. Such certifying officers shall be responsible and accountable for—

''(A) the existence and correctness of the facts recited in the certificate or other request for payment or its supporting papers;

''(B) the legality of the proposed payment under the appropriation or fund involved; and

''(C) the correctness of the computations of certified payment requests.

''(2) LIABILITY.—The liability of a certifying officer shall be enforced in the same manner and to the same extent as provided by law with respect to the enforcement of the liability of disbursing and other accountable officers. A certifying officer shall be required to make restitution to the United States for the amount of any illegal, improper, or incorrect payment resulting from any false, inaccurate, or misleading certificates made by the certifying officer, as well as for any payment prohibited by law or which did not represent a legal obligation under the appropriation or fund involved.

''(c) RIGHTS.—A certifying or disbursing officer—

''(1) has the right to apply for and obtain a decision by the Comptroller General on any question of law involved in a payment request presented for certification; and

''(2) is entitled to relief from liability arising under this section in accordance with title 31.

''(d) OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this section affects the authority of the courts with respect to moneys deposited with the courts under chapter 129 of this title.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 41 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''613. Disbursing and certifying officers.''.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not be construed to authorize the hiring of any Federal officer or employee.

(d) DUTIES OF DIRECTOR.—Section 604(a)(8) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(8) Disburse appropriations and other funds for the maintenance and operation of the courts;''.

SEC. 305. AMENDMENT TO THE JURY SELECTION PROCESS.

Section 1865 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting ''or the clerk under supervision of the court if the court's jury selection plan so authorizes,'' after ''jury commission,''; and

(2) in subsection (b) by inserting ''or the clerk if the court's jury selection plan so provides,'' after ''may provide,''.

SEC. 306. AUTHORIZATION OF A CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT.

Section 332 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h)(1) The United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit may appoint a circuit executive, who shall serve at the pleasure of the court. In appointing a circuit executive, the court shall take into account experience in administrative and executive positions, familiarity with court procedures, and special training. The circuit executive shall exercise such administrative powers and perform such duties as may be delegated by the court. The duties delegated to the circuit executive may include the duties specified in subsection (e) of this section, insofar as such duties are applicable to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

''(2) The circuit executive shall be paid the salary for circuit executives established under subsection (f) of this section.

''(3) The circuit executive may appoint, with the approval of the court, necessary employees in such number as may be approved by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

''(4) The circuit executive and staff shall be deemed to be officers and employees of the United States within the meaning of the statutes specified in subsection (f)(4).

''(5) The court may appoint either a circuit executive under this subsection or a clerk under section 711 of this title, but not both, or may appoint a combined circuit executive/clerk who shall be paid the salary of a circuit executive.''.

SEC. 307. RESIDENCE OF RETIRED JUDGES.

Section 175 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) Retired judges of the Court of Federal Claims are not subject to restrictions as to residence. The place where a retired judge maintains the actual abode in which such judge customarily lives shall be deemed to be the judge's official duty station for the purposes of section 456 of this title.''.

SEC. 308. RECALL OF JUDGES ON DISABILITY STATUS.

Section 797(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(a)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) Any judge of the Court of Federal Claims receiving an annuity under section 178(c) of this title (pertaining to disability) who, in the estimation of the chief judge, has recovered sufficiently to render judicial service, shall be known and designated as a senior judge and may perform duties as a judge when recalled under subsection (b) of this section.''.

SEC. 309. PERSONNEL APPLICATION AND INSURANCE PROGRAMS RELATING TO JUDGES OF THE COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 178 the following:

''§ 179. Personnel application and insurance programs

''(a) For purposes of construing and applying title 5, a judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims shall be deemed to be an 'officer' under section 2104(a) of such title.

''(b) For purposes of construing and applying chapter 89 of title 5, a judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims who—

''(1) is retired under section 178 of this title; and

''(2) was enrolled in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5 at the time the judge became a retired judge,

shall be deemed to be an annuitant meeting the requirements of section 8905(b)(1) of title 5, notwithstanding the length of enrollment prior to the date of retirement.

''(c) For purposes of construing and applying chapter 87 of title 5, including any adjustment of insurance rates by regulation or otherwise, a judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims in regular active service or

who is retired under section 178 of this title shall be deemed to be a judge of the United States described under section 8701(a)(5) of title 5.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 7 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 179 and inserting the following:

''179. Personnel application and insurance programs.''.

SEC. 310. LUMP-SUM PAYMENT FOR ACCUMULATED AND ACCRUED LEAVE ON SEPARATION.

Section 5551(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended in the first sentence by striking ''or elects'' and inserting '', is transferred to a position described under section 6301(2)(xiii) of this title, or elects''.

SEC. 311. EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONAL ASSISTANTS FOR HANDICAPPED EMPLOYEES.

Section 3102(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''and'';

(2) in subparagraph (B) by adding ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) an office, agency, or other establishment in the judicial branch;''.

SEC. 312. MANDATORY RETIREMENT AGE FOR DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 627 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) through (f) as subsections (a) through (e), respectively.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 376 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(D) by striking ''subsection (b)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(D) by striking ''subsection (c) or (d)'' and inserting ''subsection (b) or (c)''.

SEC. 313. REAUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN SUPREME COURT POLICE AUTHORITY.

Section 9(c) of the Act entitled ''An Act relating to the policing of the building and grounds of the Supreme Court of the United States'', approved August 18, 1949 (40 U.S.C. 13n(c)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''2000'' and inserting ''2004''.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDERS

SEC. 401. TORT CLAIMS ACT AMENDMENT RELATING TO LIABILITY OF FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDERS.

Section 2671 of title 28, United States Code, is amended in the second undesignated paragraph—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''includes''; and

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '', and (2) any officer or employee of a Federal public defender organization, except when such officer or employee performs professional services in the course of providing representation under section 3006A of title 18.''.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. EXTENSIONS RELATING TO BANKRUPTCY ADMINISTRATOR PROGRAM.

Section 302(d)(3) of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Bankruptcy Act of 1986 (28 U.S.C. 581 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the matter following clause (ii), by striking ''or October 1, 2002, whichever occurs first''; and

(2) in subparagraph (F)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) in subclause (II), by striking ''or October 1, 2002, whichever occurs first''; and

(ii) in the matter following subclause (II), by striking ''October 1, 2003, or''; and

(B) in clause (ii), in the matter following subclause (II)—

(i) by striking ''before October 1, 2003, or''; and

(ii) by striking '', whichever occurs first''.

SEC. 502. ADDITIONAL PLACE OF HOLDING COURT IN THE DISTRICT OF OREGON.

Section 117 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Eugene'' and inserting ''Eugene or Springfield''.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. COBLE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. COBLE:

Strike section 103 and redesignate the remaining sections accordingly.

In section 636(e)(6) of title 28, United States Code, as inserted by section 202 of the bill, strike the semicolons in subparagraph (A) and in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (B) and insert commas.

In section 179 of title 28, United States Code, as inserted by section 309(a) of the bill, strike subsection (b) and insert the following:

''(b)(1)(A) For purposes of construing and applying chapter 89 of title 5, a judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims who—

''(i) is retired under subsection (b) of section 178 of this title, and

''(ii) at the time of becoming such a retired judge—

''(I) was enrolled in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, but

''(II) did not satisfy the requirements of section 8905(b)(1) of title 5 (relating to eligibility to continue enrollment as an annuitant),

shall be deemed to be an annuitant meeting the requirements of section 8905(b)(1) of title 5, in accordance with the succeeding provisions of this paragraph, if the judge gives timely written notification to the chief judge of the court that the judge is willing to be called upon to perform judicial duties under section 178(d) of this title during the period of continued eligibility for enrollment, as described in subparagraph (B)(ii) or (C)(ii) (whichever applies).

''(B) Except as provided in subparagraph (C)—

''(i) in order to be eligible for continued enrollment under this paragraph, notification under subparagraph (A) shall be made before the first day of the open enrollment period preceding the calendar year referred to in clause (ii)(II); and

''(ii) if such notification is timely made, the retired judge shall be eligible for continued enrollment under this paragraph for the period—

''(I) beginning on the date on which eligibility would otherwise cease, and

''(II) ending on the last day of the calendar year next beginning after the end of the open enrollment period referred to in clause (i).

''(C) For purposes of applying this paragraph for the first time in the case of any particular judge—

''(i) subparagraph (B)(i) shall be applied by substituting 'the expiration of the term of office of the judge' for the matter following 'before'; and

''(ii)(I) if the term of office of such judge expires before the first day of the open enrollment period referred to in subparagraph (B)(i), the period of continued eligibility for enrollment shall be as described in subparagraph (B)(ii); but

''(II) if the term of office of such judge expires on or after the first day of the open enrollment period referred to in subparagraph (B)(i), the period of continued eligibility shall not end until the last day of the calendar year next beginning after the end of the next full open enrollment period beginning after the date on which the term expires.

''(2) In the event that a retired judge remains enrolled under chapter 89 of title 5 for a period of 5 consecutive years by virtue of paragraph (1) (taking into account only periods of coverage as an active judge immediately before retirement and as a retired judge pursuant to paragraph (1)), then, effective as of the day following the last day of that 5-year period—

''(A) the provisions of chapter 89 of title 5 shall be applied as if such judge had satisfied the requirements of section 8905(b)(1) on the last day of such period; and

''(B) the provisions of paragraph (1) shall cease to apply.

''(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'open enrollment period' refers to a period described in section 8905(g)(1) of title 5.

In section 310, strike ''6301(2)(xiii)'' and insert ''6301(2)(B)(xiii)''.

In section 501, strike paragraphs (1) and (2) and insert the following:

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the matter following clause (ii), by striking ''or October 1, 2002, whichever occurs first,''; and

(2) in subparagraph (F)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) in subclause (II), by striking ''or October 1, 2002, whichever occurs first''; and

(ii) in the matter following subclause (II)—

(I) by striking ''October 1, 2003, or''; and

(II) by striking '', whichever occurs first''; and

(B) in clause (ii), in the matter following subclause (II)—

(i) by striking ''October 1, 2003, or''; and

(ii) by striking '', whichever occurs first''.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

Mr. COBLE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

The amendments were agreed to.

The Senate bill, as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT ACT OF 2000

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2413) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to clarify the procedures and conditions for the award of matching grants for the purchase of armor vests, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) to explain the purpose of his request.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, S. 2413, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000, is identical to its House counterpart H.R. 4033, which passed the House on January 26, 2000, by a margin of 413–3.

This legislation will reauthorize the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2004. It will increase the authorized funding to $50 million per year and guarantee that smaller jurisdictions receive full funding available under the program.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for making that inquiry.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, with that explanation, I support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2413

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the number of law enforcement officers who are killed in the line of duty would significantly decrease if every law enforcement officer in the United States had the protection of an armor vest;

(2) according to studies, between 1985 and 1994, 709 law enforcement officers in the United States were killed in the line of duty;

(3) the Federal Bureau of Investigation estimates that the risk of fatality to law enforcement officers while not wearing an armor vest is 14 times higher than for officers wearing an armor vest;

(4) according to studies, between 1985 and 1994, bullet-resistant materials helped save the lives of more than 2,000 law enforcement officers in the United States; and

(5) the Executive Committee for Indian Country Law Enforcement Improvements reports that violent crime in Indian country has risen sharply, despite a decrease in the national crime rate, and has concluded that there is a ''public safety crisis in Indian country''.

SEC. 3. MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ARMOR VESTS.

(a) MATCHING FUNDS.—Section 2501(f) of part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ll(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The portion'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The portion'';

(2) by striking ''subsection (a)'' and all that follows through the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting ''subsection (a)—

''(A) may not exceed 50 percent; and

''(B) shall equal 50 percent, if—

''(i) such grant is to a unit of local government with fewer than 100,000 residents;

''(ii) the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance determines that the quantity of vests to be purchased with such grant is reasonable; and

''(iii) such portion does not cause such grant to violate the requirements of subsection (e).''; and

(3) by striking ''Any funds'' and inserting the following:

''(2) INDIAN ASSISTANCE.—Any funds''.

(b) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Section 2501(g) of part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ll(g)) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Funds available under this part shall be awarded, without regard to subsection (c), to each qualifying unit of local government with fewer than 100,000 residents. Any remaining funds available under this part shall be awarded to other qualifying applicants.''.

(c) APPLICATIONS.—Section 2502 of part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ll–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) APPLICATIONS IN CONJUNCTION WITH PURCHASES.—If an application under this section is submitted in conjunction with a transaction for the purchase of armor vests, grant amounts under this section may not be used to fund any portion of that purchase unless, before the application is submitted, the applicant—

''(1) receives clear and conspicuous notice that receipt of the grant amounts requested in the application is uncertain; and

''(2) expressly assumes the obligation to carry out the transaction, regardless of whether such amounts are received.''.

(d) DEFINITION OF ARMOR VEST.—Section 2503(1) of part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ll–2(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''means body armor'' and inserting the following: ''means—

''(A) body armor'';

(2) by adding ''or'' at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) body armor that has been tested through the voluntary compliance testing program, and found to meet or exceed the requirements of NIJ Standard 0115.00, or any revision of such standard;''.

(e) INTERIM DEFINITION OF ARMOR VEST.—For purposes of part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended by this Act, the meaning of the term ''armor vest'' (as defined in section 2503 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3796ll–2)) shall, until the date on which a final NIJ Standard 0115.00 is first fully approved and implemented, also include body armor which has been found to meet or exceed the requirements for protection against stabbing established by the State in which the grantee is located.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(23) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(23)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2004''.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESIDENTIAL THREAT PROTECTION ACT OF 2000

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3048) to amend section 879 of title 18, United States Code, to provide clearer coverage over threats against former Presidents and members of their families, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments numbered 2 and 4, concur in Senate amendments numbered 1 and 3, and concur in Senate amendment numbered 5, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, and the House amendment to the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, strike out lines 19 through 24 and insert:

''(e)(1) When directed by the President, the United States Secret Service is authorized to participate, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, in the planning, coordination, and implementation of security operations at special events of national significance, as determined by the President.

''(2) At the end of each fiscal year, the President through such agency or office as the President may designate, shall report to the Congress—

''(A) what events, if any, were designated special events of national significance for security purposes under paragraph (1); and

''(B) the criteria and information used in making each designation.''.

Page 7, line 6, after ''offense'' insert: *or apprehension of a fugitive*

Page 8, strike out lines 17 through 19

Page 9, strike out line 14 and insert:

issuance.

''(11) With respect to subpoenas issued under paragraph (1)(A)(i)(III), the Attorney General shall issue guidelines governing the issuance of administrative subpoenas pursuant to that paragraph. The guidelines required by this paragraph shall mandate that administrative subpoenas may be issued only after review and approval of senior supervisory personnel within the respective investigative agency or component of the Department of Justice and of the United States Attorney for the judicial district in which the administrative subpoena shall be served.''.

Page 10, after line 8, insert:

SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPOENAS TO APPREHEND FUGITIVES.

(a) AUTHORITY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Section 3486(a)(1) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 5 of this Act is further amended in subparagraph (A)(i)—

(1) by striking ''offense or'' and inserting ''offense,''; and

(2) by inserting ''or (III) with respect to the apprehension of a fugitive,'' after ''children,''.

(b) ADDITIONAL BASIS FOR NONDISCLOSURE ORDER.—Section 3486(a)(6) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 5 of this Act, is further amended in subparagraph (B)—

(1) by striking ''or'' and the end of clause (iii);

(2) by striking the period at the end of clause (iv) and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(v) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or undue delay of a trial.''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3486 of title 18, as amended by section 5 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'fugitive' means a person who—

''(A) having been accused by complaint, information, or indictment under Federal law of a serious violent felony or serious drug offense, or having been convicted under Federal law of committing a serious violent felony or serious drug offense, flees or attempts to flee from, or evades or attempts to evade the jurisdiction of the court with jurisdiction over the felony;

''(B) having been accused by complaint, information, or indictment under State law of a serious violent felony or serious drug offense, or having been convicted under State law of committing a serious violent felony or serious drug offense, flees or attempts to flee from, or evades

or attempts to evade, the jurisdiction of the court with jurisdiction over the felony;

''(C) escapes from lawful Federal or State custody after having been accused by complaint, information, or indictment of a serious violent felony or serious drug offense or having been convicted of committing a serious violent felony or serious drug offense; or

''(D) is in violation of subparagraph (2) or (3) of the first undesignated paragraph of section 1073;

''(2) the terms 'serious violent felony' and 'serious drug offense' shall have the meanings given those terms in section 3559(c)(2) of this title; and

''(3) the term 'investigation' means, with respect to a State fugitive described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), an investigation in which there is reason to believe that the fugitive fled from or evaded, or attempted to flee from or evade, the jurisdiction of the court, or escaped from custody, in or affecting, or using any facility of, interstate or foreign commerce, or as to whom an appropriate law enforcement officer or official of a State or political subdivision has requested the Attorney General to assist in the investigation, and the Attorney General finds that the particular circumstances of the request give rise to a Federal interest sufficient for the exercise of Federal jurisdiction pursuant to section 1075.''.

SEC. 7. FUGITIVE APPREHENSION TASK FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall, upon consultation with appropriate Department of Justice and Department of the Treasury law enforcement components, establish permanent Fugitive Apprehension Task Forces consisting of Federal, State, and local law enforcement authorities in designated regions of the United States, to be directed and coordinated by the United States Marshals Service, for the purpose of locating and apprehending fugitives.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General for the United States Marshals Service to carry out the provisions of this section $30,000,000 for the fiscal year 2001, $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2003.

(c) OTHER EXISTING APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit any existing authority under any other provision of Federal or State law for law enforcement agencies to locate or apprehend fugitives through task forces or any other means.

SEC. 8. STUDY AND REPORTS ON ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPOENAS.

(a) STUDY ON USE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPOENAS.—Not later than December 31, 2001, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall complete a study on the use of administrative subpoena power by executive branch agencies or entities and shall report the findings to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Such report shall include—

(1) a description of the sources of administrative subpoena power and the scope of such subpoena power within executive branch agencies;

(2) a description of applicable subpoena enforcement mechanisms;

(3) a description of any notification provisions and any other provisions relating to safeguarding privacy interests;

(4) a description of the standards governing the issuance of administrative subpoenas; and

(5) recommendations from the Attorney General regarding necessary steps to ensure that administrative subpoena power is used and enforced consistently and fairly by executive branch agencies.

(b) REPORT ON FREQUENCY OF USE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPOENAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury shall report in January of each year to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the number of administrative subpoenas issued by them under this section, whether each matter involved a fugitive from Federal or State charges, and the identity of the agency or component of the Department of Justice or the Department of the Treasury issuing the subpoena and imposing the charges.

(2) EXPIRATION.—The reporting requirement of this subsection shall terminate in 3 years after the date of enactment of this section.

In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment numbered 5, insert the following:

SEC. 6. FUGITIVE APPREHENSION TASK FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall, upon consultation with appropriate Department of Justice and Department of the Treasury law enforcement components, establish permanent Fugitive Apprehension Task Forces consisting of Federal, State, and local law enforcement authorities in designated regions of the United States, to be directed and coordinated by the United States Marshals Service, for the purpose of locating and apprehending fugitives.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General for the United States Marshals Service to carry out the provisions of this section $30,000,000 for the fiscal year 2001, $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2003.

(c) OTHER EXISTING APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit any existing authority under any other provision of Federal or State law for law enforcement agencies to locate or apprehend fugitives through task forces or any other means.

SEC. 7. STUDY AND REPORTS ON ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPOENAS.

(a) STUDY ON USE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPOENAS.—Not later than December 31, 2001, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall complete a study on the use of administrative subpoena power by executive branch agencies or entities and shall report the findings to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Such report shall include—

(1) a description of the sources of administrative subpoena power and the scope of such subpoena power within executive branch agencies;

(2) a description of applicable subpoena enforcement mechanisms;

(3) a description of any notification provisions and any other provisions relating to safeguarding privacy interests;

(4) a description of the standards governing the issuance of administrative subpoenas; and

(5) recommendations from the Attorney General regarding necessary steps to ensure that administrative subpoena power is used and enforced consistently and fairly by executive branch agencies.

(b) REPORT ON FREQUENCY OF USE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPOENAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury shall report in January of each year to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the number of administrative subpoenas issued by them under this section and the identity of the agency or component of the Department of Justice or the Department of the Treasury issuing the subpoena and imposing the charges.

(2) EXPIRATION.—The reporting requirement of this subsection shall terminate in 3 years after the date of enactment of this section.

Mr. HUTCHINSON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman to explain the purpose of his request and the amendments that are being proposed.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3048, the Presidential Threat Protection Act of 2000 passed the House by voice vote on June 26 of this year.

The bill was introduced by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), to clarify the authority of the Secret Service to protect the President, former Presidents and their families, and candidates for the Office of President and Vice President and their families.

When this bill was considered in the other body, provisions were added that would have authorized the Attorney General to issue administrative subpoenas, principally through the U.S. Marshal Service in connection with investigations of fugitives from justice.

These provisions have caused considerable concern in the House, and in response to those concerns the unanimous consent request that I am making today will strike all of the provisions dealing with the administrative subpoenas in fugitive cases.

The unanimous request retains a provision from the Senate amendment to the underlying bill that requires the Attorney General to establish and fund fugitive apprehension task forces which are comprised of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies who work together to catch Federal and State fugitives.

Mr. Speaker, task forces such as these, led by the FBI with respect to violent crimes generally and led by the Marshals Service in fugitive cases, have proven effective over the years and should be continued.

The Attorney General retains the discretion as to where these task forces should be located; however, we believe that fugitive task forces created under this provision should not be located in places where they might overlap with existing FBI violent crime task forces.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the unanimous consent requests that I am making today retain two minor amendments to the underlying Secret Service bill requested by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, this bill first passed the House by voice vote. The provisions added by the Senate that have caused concern here in the House will be deleted by my request. It

is vitally important to the protective operation of the Secret Service that the remaining portions of this bill, the provisions that have passed without opposition, be enacted into law.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, based on the explanation, particularly in light of the disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 2 and 4, and the other amendments I do agree with, I support their concurrence.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAIRY MARKET ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2773) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to enhance dairy markets through dairy product mandatory reporting, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to share my strong support for S. 2773—the Dairy Marketing Enhancement Act of 2000. To our nation's dairy farmers this legislation is commonly referred to as the mandatory price reporting bill. This legislation was passed by the Senate earlier today. Identical legislation, H.R. 5495, was introduced by myself, Congressman SIMPSON and others. This legislation is urgently needed to restore producer confidence in the dairy market following recent cheese and butter price/inventory reporting fiascoes that sent markets plunging.

As my colleagues who represent dairy farmers know, recent reporting errors in cheese and butter stocks have highlighted the need to make reporting of storable dairy products mandatory, verifiable and enforceable. A Chicago Mercantile Exchange warehouse reporting error resulted in a sizable inventory adjustment and caused a 10 cent drop in the double a butter price.

This latest inventory reporting error came less than a year after a similar error with the U.S. Department of Agriculture cheese inventory. Following that reporting error cheese prices dropped within a week to their lowest levels in almost a decade. These events have caused a great deal of concern among our nation's dairy producers.

Under current law, manufacturers of dairy products voluntarily provide the USDA with the amount and price of dairy commodities (cheese and butter) that the manufacturer has sold during a given month.

This information is then used by the USDA to establish the minimum monthly prices under the federal milk marketing order system. This legislation will foster a more accurate price and inventory reporting system for dairy products and enable farmers to base business decisions on the most accurate information.

By requiring mandatory reporting, dairy producers will be given more accurate, complete and timely market information. This information will lead to a better price discovery for all dairy products and allow producers and other market participants to make fully informed business decisions with respect to the marketing of raw milk.

Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the calender year, dairy farmers have experienced excruciating low milk prices. These inhospitable market conditions have resulted in the loss of 3-to-4 family dairy farmers in my home state of Wisconsin each day. With the loss of these farmers, the economies of our rural communities are also placed under extreme financial pressure.

While this legislation is no panacea for ailing milk prices, it will go a long way in improving prevailing attitude and restore some much needed optimism.

It is for this reason that I ask all of my colleagues to join me in passing this simple but important piece of legislation.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2733. The bill represents a consensus among processor and producer groups. It will benefit the entire industry.

Mr. Speaker, under recently reformed Federal milk marketing orders, monthly minimum prices are determined based on market prices for manufactured dairy products, including nonfat dry milk, butter, cheddar cheese, and whey. USDA determines those product prices by surveying manufacturers. The responses are voluntary and USDA has limited authority to verify accuracy.

Mr. Speaker, because the determination of accurate market prices is key to establishing milk orders that are reflective of supply and demand, processors have agreed to subject themselves to the requirements that will result from the passage of this bill. The bill requires that USDA use the current survey format as a starting point for mandating reporting. For many processors, this will mean that little will change with the establishment of the mandatory program.

Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure accuracy, the bill allows the Secretary to require that reporting companies make their records available for Department audit. Any willful and intentional violation of requirements to make accurate and timely reports is punishable by a civil fine of up to $20,000 under the terms of the bill.

The bill also requires that USDA guard the confidentiality of information from each reporting company.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 2733.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2773

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Dairy Market Enhancement Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. DAIRY PRODUCT MANDATORY REPORTING.

The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Subtitle C—Dairy Product Mandatory Reporting

''SEC. 271. PURPOSE.

''The purpose of this subtitle is to establish a program of information regarding the marketing of dairy products that—

''(1) provides information that can be readily understood by producers and other market participants, including information with respect to prices, quantities sold, and inventories of dairy products;

''(2) improves the price and supply reporting services of the Department of Agriculture; and

''(3) encourages competition in the marketplace for dairy products.

''SEC. 272. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subtitle:

''(1) DAIRY PRODUCTS.—The term 'dairy products' means manufactured dairy products that are used by the Secretary to establish minimum prices for Class III and Class IV milk under a Federal milk marketing order issued under section 8c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608c), reenacted with amendments by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

''(2) MANUFACTURER.—The term 'manufacturer' means any person engaged in the business of buying milk in commerce for the purpose of manufacturing dairy products.

''(3) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

''SEC. 273. MANDATORY REPORTING FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a program of mandatory dairy product information reporting that will—

''(1) provide timely, accurate, and reliable market information;

''(2) facilitate more informed marketing decisions; and

''(3) promote competition in the dairy product manufacturing industry.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In establishing the program, the Secretary shall only—

''(A)(i) subject to the conditions described in paragraph (2), require each manufacturer to report to the Secretary information concerning the price, quantity, and moisture content of dairy products sold by the manufacturer; and

''(ii) modify the format used to provide the information on the day before the date of enactment of this subtitle to ensure that the information can be readily understood by market participants; and

''(B) require each manufacturer and other person storing dairy products to report to the Secretary, at a periodic interval determined by the Secretary, information on the quantity of dairy products stored.

''(2) CONDITIONS.—The conditions referred to in paragraph (1)(A)(i) are that—

''(A) the information referred to in paragraph (1)(A)(i) is required only with respect to those package sizes actually used to establish minimum prices for Class III or Class IV milk under a Federal milk marketing order;

''(B) the information referred to in paragraph (1)(A)(i) is required only to the extent that the information is actually used to establish minimum prices for Class III or Class IV milk under a Federal milk marketing order;

''(C) the frequency of the required reporting under paragraph (1)(A)(i) does not exceed the frequency used to establish minimum prices for Class III or Class IV milk under a Federal milk marketing order; and

''(D) the Secretary may exempt from all reporting requirements any manufacturer that processes and markets less than 1,000,000 pounds of dairy products per year.

''(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to ensure compliance with, and otherwise carry out, this subtitle.

''(2) CONFIDENTIALITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise directed by the Secretary or the Attorney General for enforcement purposes, no officer, employee, or agent of the United States shall make available to the public information, statistics, or documents obtained from or submitted by any person under this subtitle other than in a manner that ensures that confidentiality is preserved regarding the identity of persons, including parties to a contract, and proprietary business information.

''(B) RELATION TO OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no facts or information obtained under this subtitle shall be disclosed in accordance with section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

''(3) VERIFICATION.—The Secretary shall take such actions as the Secretary considers necessary to verify the accuracy of the information submitted or reported under this subtitle.

''(4) ENFORCEMENT.—

''(A) UNLAWFUL ACT.—It shall be unlawful and a violation of this subtitle for any person subject to this subtitle to willfully fail or refuse to provide, or delay the timely reporting of, accurate information to the Secretary in accordance with this subtitle.

''(B) ORDER.—After providing notice and an opportunity for a hearing to affected persons, the Secretary may issue an order against any person to cease and desist from continuing any violation of this subtitle.

''(C) APPEAL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The order of the Secretary under subparagraph (B) shall be final and conclusive unless an affected person files an appeal of the order of the Secretary in United States district court not later than 30 days after the date of the issuance of the order.

''(ii) FINDINGS.—A finding of the Secretary under this paragraph shall be set aside only if the finding is found to be unsupported by substantial evidence.

''(D) NONCOMPLIANCE WITH ORDER.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If a person subject to this subtitle fails to obey an order issued under this paragraph after the order has become final and unappealable, or after the appropriate United States district court has entered a final judgment in favor of the Secretary, the United States may apply to the appropriate United States district court for enforcement of the order.

''(ii) ENFORCEMENT.—If the court determines that the order was lawfully made and duly served and that the person violated the order, the court shall enforce the order.

''(iii) CIVIL PENALTY.—If the court finds that the person violated the order, the person shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $10,000 for each offense.

''(5) FEES.—The Secretary shall not charge or assess a user fee, transaction fee, service charge, assessment, reimbursement fee, or any other fee under this subtitle for—

''(A) the submission or reporting of information;

''(B) the receipt or availability of, or access to, published reports or information; or

''(C) any other activity required under this subtitle.

''(6) RECORDKEEPING.—Each person required to report information to the Secretary under this subtitle shall maintain, and make available to the Secretary, on request, original contracts, agreements, receipts, and other records associated with the sale or storage of any dairy products during the 2-year period beginning on the date of the creation of the records.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.''.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 2773.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1815

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). 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.

THANKING THE PEOPLE OF THE 12TH DISTRICT OF FLORIDA FOR THE HONOR TO SERVE IN THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, some time in the next few days, the last vote of the 106th Congress will be cast. For those of us who will not be returning next year, that vote will mark the end of our legislative career.

Mr. Speaker, 260 years ago, Samuel Johnson wrote of those ''points of time where one course of action ends and another begins,'' times when ''we are forced to say of something, 'this is the last.' ''

For those of us who will soon end our course as Members of Congress and begin some new endeavor, the sense of the honor it is to serve here is felt more keenly now than ever before. As I approach the point in time when I am forced to say with the vote I cast that this is the last, I wish to express my thanks to the people of the twelfth district of Florida for giving me the opportunity to serve as their representative over the last 8 years.

What a great privilege it is to serve in this House and to participate in the great American enterprise of government by reflection and choice. What an awesome privilege it is to be chosen to come from the communities we represent to this House and to take on the responsibilities imposed by our oath of office: the responsibility to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; the responsibility to bear true and faithful allegiance to that Constitution; and the responsibility to well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which we enter. I will always be humbled by the knowledge that the people of the district I represent had the confidence in me to entrust me with these important responsibilities.

God has blessed our Nation in many ways. It has been a single blessing for the people of the United States to have a Constitution, a Constitution which has indeed secured for us the blessings of liberty.

Among the chief objects of our Constitution was to establish justice. The work of this House involves many mundane issues of passing significance. Much that takes place here will not long be remembered, but when we act to further the constitutional goal of establishing justice, we deal with matters of enduring significance.

As Members of this House, we can come to stand and to speak in this Chamber. We can rise in this place to speak against injustice; and when truth stumbles in the public square, we can sound a warning that in our life as a people, as well as in our individual lives, nothing is more important than the truth. We can sound a warning that justice is in peril whenever the truth is not respected. As Members, on occasion we have the privilege to stand here in defense of the powerless and to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves. The value of the opportunity to do such things is inestimable.

To all those who have made it possible for me to serve as a Member of this House, I owe a great debt of gratitude, a debt of gratitude which I do not have the words to express as I would like. I can simply say, thank you for allowing me to be your Congressman.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk for just a few minutes about an issue that is critical not only to my district, but to communities and children all across this country. This issue is school construction. I am pleased that several of my Democratic colleagues have agreed to join me this evening to talk about school construction and other priorities in the Democrats' education agenda. I shall restrict my remarks mostly to school construction.

Today is October 25. The fiscal year started October 1; and yet, the Republican leadership of this House has failed to do its work and get the work done for the American people. To put it in school terms, they are tardy and they are incomplete. They have failed the test of leadership for the American people. Today, the House passed a stopgap spending measure to keep the government from shutting down for one

more day. This is the fifth time this year that we have had to pass one of these bills just because the leadership, the Republican leadership has failed to get the people's work done.

Specifically, they have failed to act on important educational priorities, like the bipartisan school construction bill that is desperately needed in communities all across this country. The bill would provide $25 billion in school construction bonds to build new schools, renovate them, and to relieve overcrowding, reduce class size, and enhance the opportunity for discipline in the classroom and improve education by making sure that all of our children get the kind of individual attention that they need to learn.

Mr. Speaker, I have been working with my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle to pass this bill since I first came to this people's house 4 years ago. We have gathered more than 228 members on H.R. 4094; and yet, the Republican leadership has refused to simply bring this bill to a vote.

As this Congress crawls to its conclusion, more than 3 weeks late, the educational funding bill is the very last priority of the Republican leadership. While education languishes under the threats of cuts and the current congressional leadership has loaded up the appropriations bill with special interest pork, we are still waiting.

Last week, I told this body about a Senator from Arizona's observation that the leadership's pork has swelled each of the spending bills that have been passed. For example, he pointed out that the transportation appropriation contains some $700 million in transportation earmarks for the Chicago Metropolitan Transit Authority in the home State of the Speaker of the House. The transportation appropriations bill also earmarked $102 million for a bridge across the Mississippi River in the home State of the majority leader of the other body. A senior Republican appropriations member got $1.5 million to refurbish something called the Vulcan Statue in Alabama.

Today, I was shocked to read in the paper that one of the Republican appropriation members describing the raid on the U.S. Treasury by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The House Republican described items like $1.25 million for repairs to a church, $176,000 for a Reindeer Herders Association for somewhere in southeastern Alaska. That Republican concluded by saying, ''You need a cargo plane to carry all of this money back.''

Mr. Speaker, each of these projects may very well merit Federal support. These projects may not be the big spending Federal pork that they appear to be. I am not an expert on these items. But as a former State superintendent of the State of North Carolina, I know that our local neighborhood schools need our help. Our schools are bursting at the seams, and our communities do not have the resources to build or repair and provide the quality schools that our children need. As a result, children are stuffed into overcrowded classrooms, substandard facilities and rickety trailers that they should not be in.

My Republican colleagues like to talk about block grants, but when it comes to their own special projects, they are not shy about adding earmarks, and all of us in this body know what earmarks are. They are directed projects to be spent specifically for that purpose. If they were not so important, why did they not just put them in the transportation bill and let them decide at the local level how to spend the money. When it comes to roads, airports, bridges and prisons, special interest pork is powerful when it comes to powerful politicians.

Mr. Speaker, we should be able to come up with common sense legislation to build a few schools for the children in this country, and I think H.R. 4094 is that common sense bill. Mr. Speaker, I call on the Members to pass it and pass it now. Prisons ought not to be nicer than our schools.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to remind my colleagues that the bills we passed here are much more important than the abstract arguments about outlays and budget authority. These bills reflect our values, and these bills demonstrate what our priorities are.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CELEBRATING 10 YEARS OF SERVICE IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, last evening, rather late into the night, a number of my colleagues came here to the floor to do a Special Order celebrating or recognizing my retirement, I am not sure which. But it was certainly something that I appreciated, and I am not going to try and discredit the fine things that were said. All of those were very much appreciated.

But I did want to recognize my colleague from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), who arranged for the group to come to the House Chamber; the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER); the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT); and on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM); the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO); and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI). I appreciate very much their comments and the recognition of the years that I have spent in this body.

I would like to say that serving in the United States Congress was the fulfillment of an ambition that I probably first thought about when I was in high school, and serving on the Committee on Agriculture and being a chairman there was part of that dream that I had for many years. So my almost 10 years in this body has been very fulfilling, very rewarding, and certainly a highlight in my life. The ability that I have had here to grow and to learn and to develop I think is something that one will take with them forever.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that I could say this to everyone in this country: The people in this House are some of the finest people that a person could meet anywhere, on both sides of the aisle. I cannot think of one person that I have served with in this House that I did not like, that I did not find had merit to what they said and believed in what they fought for here.

Unfortunately, the American people I do not think understand how we come here and how we fight and how we talk and stand for issues that are important to us, issues that we believe in. And even though we may disagree to a great extent, I never questioned somebody's motives or judgment, and that is, to me, a great honor. Everyone that I have served with here is a good person, and they are serving this country and our system.

I often say to many people, do not complain about the harsh rhetoric in the House. We never see tanks, we never see troops in the streets of this country because we fight our issues out right here on the floor of the House, and every society has to have a safety valve and it has to be a place for those issues to be vetted. This is that place. It is a great institution.

Mr. Speaker, I will always be proud to have been a part of this House, to have served in the Congress of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, thank you to you, thank you to every Member of this House.

□ 1830

INDONESIA

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to share my concern over the continued bloodshed in Indonesia. I continue to receive reports that, despite statements of the Indonesian government in Jakarta, the violence, destruction and murder continues in Ambon.

The people living in the Malukus are pleading for the international community to get involved and bring them relief, both in terms of humanitarian aid and physical protection.

Reports from Indonesian NGOs state that refugees are not only neglected, but are harassed.

Recently, at least 32 people were killed in a day-long attack by Muslims on an outlying village in Ambon, the capital of the Maluka Islands. Eyewitnesses stated that the Jihad attackers were aided by government soldiers during the attack on the village of Hatiwe Besar.

Many who were killed died violently. Most of them, including a 10-month-old infant, were shot and their bodies were tossed in the fires of houses burned by the attackers.

In a different account of recent violence, families in one village that refused to fight were killed and their bodies were found deposited in the wells in the village.

Yet another account tells of women and girls who, at the sound of gunfire, ''were desperately clawing at the small yellow buses, hammering on the side for the driver to stop and let them on. As we slowed down, they tried to board our vehicle. I had never seen such fear in people's faces, people who knew the sound of automatic guns meant that the army was in action and that death was not far away.''

More eyewitness accounts reveal that even 3 weeks ago Jihad warriors were still moving by boat into the Malukus from Java and surrounding islands.

One man said, ''We desperately need weapons to defend ourselves. Nobody cares about us. Nobody offers to help us. We cannot trust the army because they are often supporting the Jihad fighters. The politicians and authorities talk a lot, but their words and promises are not translated into action.''

Many people who witness the violent attacks confirmed that, although the Indonesian Army was present during the attacks, either nothing was done to protect the villagers or some of the soldiers actually joined the aggressors in shooting at the escaping villagers.

Unfortunately, even people such as the current leader of the People's Consultative Assembly, Dr. Armien Rais, openly supported calls for Jihad or an Islamic holy war against the Christians and other religious believers in Indonesia.

However, there are other Islamic leaders who clearly state that this jihad should not be happening. ''A.T. Zees, a Muslim leader in Minahasa, told a crowd of Protestant, Catholic, Hindu, and Buddhist leaders Sept. 14 that the jihad fighters should leave . . . In Islam, jihad is a holy war against all evils—not murdering Christians, destroying their houses and churches, robbing, and doing other contemptible deeds,'' he said. ''A number of peaceful Muslims have tried to protect Christians.''

Why does the world not pay attention to the continued violence in which reportedly over 4,000 people have been killed and over 350,000 are now refugees?

When the three U.N. workers were killed in East Timorese refugee camps, the whole world raised their voices and condemned the killings—rightly so. Yet, thousands have died in the Malukus, but instead of outrage, silence has reverberated.

Church leaders and other community leaders are pleading for the international community to send aid and protect the people against death from the Jihad fighters. Church leaders say that, if the U.N. will not send peacekeepers, the least we ask is that ships be kept ready to evacuate the surviving Christians. Otherwise they will be forced to choose between Islam and death.

Mr. Speaker, a whole population has been targeted and is slowly being wiped out or forced out of their homeland. Why will the Indonesian Government not act so that the killing stops? Where is the outrage in the international community? Something must be done, or we will see the destruction of an entire society.

Both Christians and Muslims from this area want peace. They have lived in peace for many years and in friendship with their neighbors.

We should ask that the IMF, the World Bank, U.N. officials take appropriate action to let the Indonesian Government know that they must take steps to stop the killing. It is not simply an internal Indonesian affair. The Indonesian people are crying out for help from the international community because they are not receiving it from their own government.

Delegations from the U.N. and other countries need to visit the Malukus to investigate and report on the bloodshed and destruction throughout the area.

In addition, our government needs to seriously consider the implications of resuming the close military ties with the Indonesian Government. The record of human rights abuses by the Indonesian military is well documented.

Further, our government needs to examine the religious nature of these killings. This is not simply a local economic conflict. Declarations of Jihad underscore the religious aspects to the violence, and this must be considered in terms of U.S. Government actions.

I enjoyed my visit to Indonesia earlier this year. Indonesia is a land of many resources in its people and its abundance of natural resources. We are friends of the Indonesian people. It is our hope that all the people in Indonesia will be able to live in peace.

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

(Mr. STENHOLM 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 Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LAHOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENTS OF CLINTON ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, there is much good news in higher education this year, and we should take a few moments in the House of Representatives to take notice of it.

Education Secretary Dick Riley appeared today before the last Committee on Education and the Workforce hearing of the 106th Congress. Although the stated purpose of the hearing was a sad commentary on presidential politics, it was an excellent opportunity to highlight the educational achievements of the past 8 years under Secretary Riley. He has been a true friend to all American children during his tenure, and especially to the Hispanic community, as no other Education Secretary before him.

On behalf of all American children, I want to commend Secretary Riley for his tireless dedication to improving both education programs and the Education Department. I know I for one have greatly enjoyed the opportunity to work with such a great and inspirational figure.

I am very glad to have worked with Secretary Riley personally, who visited my district twice over the past 4 years. It has afforded us both valuable experience because each time he has had the opportunity to witness the beneficial impact of Federal programs such as the E-Rate, bilingual education, or Gear-up in my south Texas congressional district.

For example, we have reaped a great benefit from the $75 million given to date to the Region One Education Service Center, which overseas 38 school districts in south Texas, serving 298,000 students, 95 percent of whom are Hispanic.

I know each time he visited he raised the morale of our students, strengthening the appreciation for education among Hispanic, low-income, and extremely motivated and bright students.

While many of the Department's achievements were noted in his testimony, there are others worthy of note here tonight. For example, $18 billion has been added to the annual Federal education spending since 1995. Math SAT scores are at an all-time high. NAEP, the National Assessment of Education Progress, reading achievement scores have significantly improved in all grades tested, and ACT scores increased from 1992 to 1999. Better still, the numbers of females and minorities taking the ACT test increased five-fold.

Secretary Riley is the undisputed champion of minority education. Under his tenure, the Department of Education has helped more than 200 colleges and universities, middle and high schools form Gear-up partnerships to help 480,000 students and their families to attend college. Many of the beneficiaries are minority students.

The Department of Education has also been an avid partner in implementing the Hispanic Education Action Plan, or HEAP, as we call it. It was started in 1994. These are among the exemplary programs that assist a great number of minority students and their families in districts such as mine in south Texas, the third poorest metropolitan statistical area in the Nation.

The Department's accomplishments included in the Secretary's testimony are sharply contrasted by a Rand report released yesterday on public education in my home State of Texas. The Rand report raises serious questions about the purported test score gains in our State standards test, the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills, commonly referred to as TAAS.

In particular, this report finds that results on TAAS, collected by Governor Bush's State Education Agency, and other standardized tests such as NAEP tell very different stories. Rand is by all accounts an unbiased, well-respected research organization. So when their reports state that alleged minority students' gains are illusory, we must take notice.

The report goes on to observe that ''evidence regarding the validity of score gains on the TAAS can be obtained by investigating the degree to which these gains are also present on other measures of these same general skills.'' So how did they measure up?

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude and say that it is vital to remember that the true education reform is slow and steady and based on empirical and unbiased data as Secretary Riley and the rest of the Department employees have done.

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

(Mr. CRANE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EDUCATION

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) in their interest in the subject of education.

We are fond of pointing out the absolute truth that education is a local function. It is a State responsibility. But from time to time in our Nation's history, it has become an overarching national concern. Such a time occurred a little over a hundred years ago as the United States emerged from what was largely an agrarian era in this Nation's history, a time when half of all of Americans lived and worked on farms because it took that many of us to feed and clothe all of us, to the entrance into the second industrial revolution.

It changed everything. Mechanized manufacturing and agriculture and transportation made it possible for cities to grow in ways that had never ever occurred before, and it changed the skill expectations of an entire country. It was a time when we really faced the challenge of elevating the skill level of an entire Nation from one end of the spectrum to another, all at the same time. That is an extraordinary undertaking in the life of any nation, and we have been through it. It was a time of overarching national concern.

The land grant colleges changed the way we educated people for nation-building here in the United States. Normal schools improved the education of teachers who, up to that point, the majority of whom had barely gotten beyond high school themselves when they were teaching high school. It was done through a partnership of local, State and Federal activity, and it really was a reinvention of America. It was the invention of the American century.

Today we find ourselves in a time of very similar change. Technology today is changing everything. We are seeing a time when the need has expanded in very much the same way as it did a hundred years ago.

Today we are finding an entire generation of baby boom teachers who began their careers in the late 1960s and early 1970s moving toward retirement, at the same time that the largest school age population in the Nation's history is moving through our classrooms, breaking enrollment records every year and likely to again for the next 12 to 15 years.

All of this is happening at a time when we are seeing the greatest shift in job skills expectation that we have seen in this country perhaps since that time 100 or 110 years ago when we became a new country.

We see at the same time that school buildings, some tired, many worn out, often obsolete, buildings that were at least in, close to a third of which were built prior to the Great Depression, coming into a time of extreme challenge and expectation. That is the circumstance that we face today. It is what the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) was talking about. It is what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) was talking about.

This is not a crisis, but it is a time when we need to understand those needs. We have been through that any number of times since 100 years ago when we put together the Land Grant Colleges Acts. We have seen it in the G.I. bill when millions of men came home from the Second World War, a war fought with some 23 percent high school graduates. It was not until 1951 that we saw half of all Americans graduating from high school. Today those numbers are up into the mid-80s, and the performance of minority populations are the highest they have ever been.

We saw that kind of cooperation in the National Defense Education Act in the wake of Sputnik and in title I for the educationally disadvantaged in the 1960s, the development of special education in the mid-1970s, the adult education programs that have grown in need and performance in the course of this decade alone.

□ 1845

And we have seen college aid, through financial loans and grants, change the face of higher education in the United States. It has not happened just because it is possible; it has happened because it has been necessary. It has been necessary as we seek to change the face of the Nation yet again.

We need to develop a whole new cohort of well-qualified teachers and to assist in the financing of a new school construction and renovation plan that will make it possible for this largest generation of school learners to take part in that education. This is not something we do simply because we think it would be nice. As we stand here trying to seek to extend the kind of prosperity that we enjoy today through paying down the national debt, through extending the solvency of Social Security, there is no better way we can do that than through ensuring the skill levels of a new Nation.

Our children will have to learn as if their entire world depended on it, because it does. Their world and our world.

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

(Mr. MANZULLO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HUNGER RELIEF ACT, H.R. 3192

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, we observed World Food Day last week, and we paused to recognize that hunger is still a way of life for far too many in America and around the world. It is for that reason that I rise once again to urge this House and this Congress to pass the remaining provisions of the Hunger Relief Act, H.R. 3192.

This legislation enjoys the support of 186 cosponsors in the House, Democrats and Republicans. The companion bill, S. 1805 enjoys the support of 35 cosponsors in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans. Nearly 1,400 national, State and local organizations in all 50 States have endorsed the Hunger Relief.

Editorial boards, columns, articles and op-eds from the East Coast to the

West Coast, from the far north to the far south, have expressed support for the act. Among those are The Washington Post, the Lincoln Journal Star, The New York Times, the Oregonian, the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Tulsa World, the Indianapolis Star, the Dallas Morning News, the Newark Star-Ledger and the North Carolina News and Observer.

In a recent letter, 25 leaders from the religious community urged the President and the Congress to make food stamp benefit restoration for legal immigrants a top priority during the final days of this session. Represented in that group of religious leaders are Catholic, Jewish, Methodist, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Mennonite, and other denominations.

More recently, more than 25 Members of this body sent a letter to the President urging him to help complete this task.

The National Conference of State Legislators, a group that supported the 1996 welfare reform bill, have also joined in that call. The U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National Black Caucus of State Legislators have also endorsed the Hunger Relief Act.

In short, Mr. Speaker, there is widespread support for finishing the job we started earlier with the passage of the agriculture appropriation conference report. As a part of that conference report we included two vitally important provisions from the Hunger Relief Act. We changed the vehicle limit so that families can retain a reliable car without losing food stamp benefits, and we changed the shelter cap so that families can obtain decent shelter without losing food stamp benefits. At the very least, we should now restore food stamp benefits for all legal immigrants.

Those legal immigrants who are now excluded from food stamp coverage came to America at a different time than our ancestors, but they should not be treated differently for that reason. They too embrace the promise of liberty etched on the statue in the harbor in New York. It seems strange that we must fight for food for those legal immigrants who cannot fight for themselves.

America is a strong Nation, and we are strong because we can provide quality food at affordable prices. There are many places in the world where the same cannot be said. But the real strength of America is not due to our advanced technology, our economic base, or our military might. The real strength of America is in its compassion for people. The real strength of America is caring and being concerned about those who live in the shadows of life: the poor, the weak, the frail, the disabled, our children, our seniors, the hungry. America's compassion makes us strong.

Less than 3 percent of the budget goes to help to feed the hungry, yet nearly 70 percent of legal immigrants are women, many of them with children.

Mr. Speaker, hunger is more than a mere word; it is a way of life for far too many legal immigrants. When we passed the welfare reform legislation, we did some things that were right, but there was one thing that was wrong. We excluded legal immigrants from the food stamp program.

With such broad-based bipartisan support from the Congress to the White House, from State legislators to governors' mansions and throughout the private sector, we have a chance to correct that mistake. Let us not go home to the comfort of our living rooms and to the refrigerators full of bounty while leaving legal immigrants without one of the most basic necessities of life, and that is food. Let us pass the other part of the Hunger Relief Act.

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

(Mr. WELLER 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. KIND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KIND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Social Security has really come to light, so I am going to spend 5 minutes talking about Social Security, the problem and the potential solution, and what the presidential candidates are doing in their suggestions to help resolve this serious problem of Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I came into Congress in 1993; and I introduced my first Social Security bill. I have introduced a Social Security bill every session, and the last three were scored by the Social Security Administration to keep Social Security solvent for the next 75 years.

I was selected to be chairman of the bipartisan task force on Social Security. I have found it is sort of like an automobile mechanic, the more the mechanic knows about the inside operations, probably the better he lubricates and adds the oil and greases his car. I am concerned, knowing some of the internal operations of Social Security, that there is a lot of friction there, that it is not solvent.

Just briefly, insolvency is certain. We know how many people there are. We know when they are going to retire. We know that people will live longer in retirement. We know how much they are going to pay in and how much they are going to take out. Payroll tax is not going to cover the benefits starting in 2015. It is a pay-as-you-go program. Current workers pay in their tax, and it is almost immediately sent out to current retirees. It is going to take $120 trillion over and above tax revenues over the next 75 years to accommodate the promises we have made in Social Security.

Some have suggested that economic growth is great now, that that is going to help solve the problem of Social Security. Not true. Social Security benefits are indexed to wage growth. So the higher the wages, the higher the benefits for everybody. When the economy grows, workers pay more in taxes, but also they will earn more in benefits when they retire. Growth makes the numbers look better now but leaves a larger hole to fill later.

The administration has used these short-term advantages as an excuse to do nothing. So if there is one criticism I would have it is the missed opportunity over the last 8 years of not really stepping up to the plate and fixing Social Security.

The Vice President has suggested that if we pay down the debt to the public, the debt we owe to the public is $3.4 trillion, the suggestion is that we use some of the Social Security surplus, pay down that debt, and then apply another IOU, or use the interest savings on that debt to help fix this big tall tower over here of $46.6 trillion. So the suggestion is that by paying down the debt, we will solve this problem. This next graph shows why that will not happen. The blue at the bottom represents $260 billion a year that we are now paying in interest on the debt.

So, look, it has to be a priority. Putting Social Security in the lockbox was a great thing the Republicans did. This year saying that at least 90 percent of the surplus has to go to pay down the debt was a good idea. But even if all of the $260 billion every year for the next 57 years was used to go into the Social Security Trust Fund, there would still be a shortfall of $35 trillion.

Look, this is a big-time problem. We have to do it now and not leave a big mortgage for our kids.

Very briefly, the biggest risk is doing nothing at all. I want to show these charts, because AL GORE has criticized Governor Bush of taking a trillion dollars out of Social Security, or using it twice. He is saying that the Governor is going to use it once to pay benefits and once to start private investment accounts.

Over the next 10 years, the revenues coming in to the Social Security Trust Fund are $7.8 trillion. The benefits, or the money going out, is $5.4 trillion. That leaves a surplus of $2.4 trillion. Governor Bush is suggesting we take $1 trillion of that and start using that to accommodate personally owned retirement accounts that individuals own; that if they die it goes into their estate, unlike Social Security, of course.

So as we can see, having current medium-income workers retire much

wealthier by having this kind of magic that will develop with the magic of compound interest is one way to increase retirement benefits and save the system.

Some people have said it is too risky. I show this chart just because this represents the up and down of a 30-year average. Over a 30-year average for the last hundred years, the average income is 6.7 percent.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE THOMAS EWING AND THE HONORABLE JOHN PORTER, MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

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 to pay tribute to two retiring Members of the Illinois delegation who have faithfully and effectively served their constituents and the citizens of this Nation.

First, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING), who spent 17 years in the Illinois General Assembly and rose to the position of assistant Republican leader and deputy minority leader before he came to Congress. In Congress, TOM EWING has focused much of his attention on issues relating to agriculture, crime prevention, education, economic growth and health care.

It has been a pleasure to work with him, and I wish him well as he returns to the very pleasant, peaceful, and friendly community in and around Pontiac, Illinois.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn my attention to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), who is completing his 11th term as a Member and is the very astute, sensitive, and effective chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education of the Committee on Appropriations. He is founder and cochairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus. He has been cited many times by various budget watchdog groups and has stood in the vanguard on environmental issues.

JOHN PORTER has been a strong supporter of biomedical research, a friend of community health centers, and has stood tall against the continuous spread of HIV/AIDS. The Core Center of Chicago stands today as a model to fight these dreaded diseases and is indeed a testament to the support which JOHN PORTER gave to its efforts.

One of the things that I have always liked best about JOHN PORTER is his ability to convey optimism even when the cupboard is practically bare. He is always eager to look, to see, to try and determine and figure out whether or not he can find greatly needed resources for these programs.

□ 1900

I thank him for his sensitivity to the issues facing America and especially my district and wish him well in retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I also take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Honorable Donald Lemm, Mayor of Bellwood, Illinois, on the occasion of his pending retirement.

Mayor Lemm has lived in Bellwood all of his life, he and his late wife and four children and five grandchildren. He and his current wife, Joy, live at 517 51st Avenue. Mayor Lemm is a graduate of DePaul University with a degree in business administration and accounting. He is a member of the VFW and served in Korea with the 71st Station Hospital as sergeant major.

Prior to becoming mayor, Donald Lemm was a CTA executive for 40 years, serving in the capacities of training specialist, methods analyst, superintendent of bus and rail transportation, and retired as manager of insurance and pensions. He also served as administrative assistant to the chairman of the CTA Board and was retained by the Chicago Transit Authority as a consultant for 3 years after retirement.

Mayor Lemm is active in St. Simeon parish, has served several times as president of the Holy Name Society, is a member of the St. Simeon Contemporary Choir and St. Simeon Traveling Troop, is a lector and minister of the cup, and has served as a member of the parish financial planning commission.

Prior to becoming mayor, Donald Lemm served for 16 years as village clerk. As mayor, he has led the Village of Bellwood into the new millennium, opening up opportunity, creating increased property values, and serving as the role model.

Mr. Lemm has demonstrated what it really means to be a true public servant, always putting the interests of his community and his people above any personal interests.

And so, I am pleased to congratulate him on an excellent public career and wish him and his family well in retirement.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4811) ''An Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut 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 Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STENHOLM 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 Illinois (Mr. CRANE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CRANE 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. KIND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KIND 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 gentlewoman 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 Kansas (Mr. MOORE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MOORE 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. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOEKSTRA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EDUCATION AND CONDITION OF SCHOOLS NATIONWIDE

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a few minutes to bring to the attention of the Members of the House some information with regard to education and the condition of schools around the country, both in the State of New York and nationwide.

In New York, for example, there are a total number of 4,172 schools currently operating in the State. The total State and local district school construction spending in the most recent year for which figures are available was $1.6 billion.

According to the Census Bureau, New York, along with Texas and Florida, spends the most on the cost of school construction. However, despite being among the top three spenders for school construction, the poor condition of too many New York schools sends a clear signal that State and local funding is simply not enough to meet modernization needs.

In New York, as is true in many places around the country, the local school districts rely on the local real property tax to pay for the cost of education, including construction and modernization of our schools.

Ninety percent of the schools report a need to upgrade or repair buildings in order to bring them up to a good overall condition. In other words, 90 percent are less than good. Sixty-seven percent report at least one inadequate building feature such as the roof, plumbing, electricity. Seventy-six percent report at least one unsatisfactory environmental factor such as air quality, ventilation, or lighting. There are computers in the schools, but there is only one computer for every 16 students, 16 students trying to use each computer.

In 1998 and 1999, New York paid $618 million in interest on school debt. Again, this money comes out of the local real property tax. Sadly, these statistics reflect the condition of school buildings in almost every place around the country.

Two years ago, I conducted a school modernization study in the district that I represent, which is a largely rural district in upstate central New York. It has five small cities, but the rest of the district is largely rural. In addition to finding similar results as those I have just mentioned, I discovered also that nearly one-third of the schools in the New York State district that I represent were built before 1940. More than one-third of the schools surveyed reported being cited for fire code violations at some point within the previous year. Over half the respondents said that overcrowding in their classrooms was a serious problem.

This is costing us. It is costing us in the education of our children and the ability of those children to perform in the future, and it is going to cost our economy unless we face up to this problem.

The Democrats in this House, along with President Clinton and Vice President GORE, believe very strongly that in order to get our schools into the condition that they should be in the Federal Government needs to help local school districts afford to repair and modernize our schools.

We have a bipartisan bill. It is sponsored by Republicans as well as Democrats. It would provide $22 billion in public bonding authority to help rebuild and repair over 5,000 public schools. This bill would bring $2.5 billion to New York State alone for school construction and modernization.

The bill is popular in this House. It has 228 sponsors, including a number of Republicans as well as Democrats. And yet, the Republican leadership has thus far refused to allow for any consideration, any reasonable debate or a hearing on the floor of the House.

According to the General Accounting Office, a record 52.7 million children are enrolled currently in elementary and secondary schools across the country. That number is expected to climb to 54.3 children within less than 8 years. Thousands of new public schools will be needed within the next few years to accommodate rising enrollments.

We cannot expect States and local school districts, relying as they do on local real property taxes, to shoulder this financial burden. We ought to bring this bill to the floor of the House. We ought to give it careful and thoughtful consideration. We ought to give the Members of this House an opportunity to debate and vote on the bill.

The 228 sponsors believe that if that happens the bill will pass and we will provide the relief that is necessary for school districts and the children and the families they serve across the country.

I hope that before we leave here this bill will come to the floor and we will give it the consideration that it needs. The future of our country and specifically the future of our children and communities all across America depend upon modernizing our schools, providing these school construction funds.

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

(Mr. LATHAM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AMERICA'S BETTER CLASSROOMS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to follow my colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) in speaking about our public schools.

Once again, I rise to express my deep concern over the state of the schools across this Nation, which are overcrowded and in disrepair. In these precious last few days of the 106th Congress, I call upon our leadership to pass comprehensive school modernization legislation.

I strongly believe that education is a local issue, but overcrowding is a local problem which deserves a national response.

Just 1 month ago, I stood here holding a letter signed by over 300 students from Peabody Elementary School in Santa Barbara, California, expressing their desire for passage of school construction legislation.

At this school, students receive a top-notch education. Unfortunately, the students also feel the disturbing effects of overcrowding. This is a school built for 200 students, but now it has an enrollment of over 600.

The added portable classrooms take up precious playground space, which should be used so that students can take part in physical education and activities.

I have visited other schools in my district which suffer from similar circumstances. In Santa Maria, the Oakley School's enrollment is currently over 800, while the school was originally built for 480 students. The first of four lunch sessions begins at 10:30. The last children do not finish until well after 1:30 in the afternoon.

In San Luis Obispo County, Cambria Grammar School was built to handle 200 students. With eight portable buildings, they now have 345. Students have very limited playground space here, and their kindergarten needed to move to a nearby middle school because of overcrowding. This kindergarten is now housed in a portable room with a small, fenced-in playground.

I spent over 20 years as a school nurse in the Santa Barbara school system. I have seen firsthand the damage that deteriorating school buildings can do. Students cannot thrive academically if they are learning in overcrowded and crumbling buildings at the most crucial time for learning in their lives.

We simply must do better for our students. I strongly support the America's Better Classroom Act. This legislation enjoys bipartisan support and has 225 cosponsors. It would provide approximately $25 billion in interest-free funds to State and local governments for school construction and modernization projects.

Such funding would help schools like Peabody, Oakley, and Cambria Grammar School to make improvements in classrooms and playgrounds that would help reduce class sizes.

When I think what our local educators are forced to deal with and the struggle they are engaged in to address all these problems, I am awed and impressed by how they pull it off each day. They all deserve our most heartfelt appreciation, and I applaud them for the work they do.

I believe that Members of Congress should come to the Central Coast of California and see the crowded conditions that students and faculty must contend with on a daily basis. Then I think we could see some action.

Here in Congress we must set our standards high to ensure that all children have a healthy and safe start. All children deserve to have safe, clean, modern schools to attend each day.

So, Mr. Speaker, I join with the students of the Central Coast of California and I ask that we bring H.R. 4094 to the floor for a vote before this session of Congress comes to a close. There is no excuse not to debate this important bipartisan bill. The 106th Congress is

coming to an end, but our students have a lifetime of learning ahead and they need our help.

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

(Mr. KINGSTON 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 New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAYNE 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. KNOLLENBERG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMPILATION OF PRESCRIPTION DRUG LETTERS FOR HOUSE FLOOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, beginning on April 12, for the 20 weeks that the House has been in session, I have read 22 letters from MI seniors who desperately need help with their high prescription drug costs.

In that time, I have been pushing consistently for prescription drug coverage under Medicare. Our time is nearly up, and we still have not passed this important legislation.

Looking back through the 22 letters that I have read on the House floor, I am reminded of why it is so important to modernize Medicare and provide prescription drug coverage for seniors.

From Shirley and Raymond Radcliff, Escanaba: ''We are a couple on a fixed income and cannot afford these drugs that continue to escalate. Our income cannot keep up with it. Fifteen pills of [one medication] are $41.99. I cannot afford that and discontinued taking them . . . A two month supply of [another medication] is $82.53. I no longer take those either, because I cannot afford them.''

From Concetta Lisuzzo, Dearborn: ''If you can bring these prices [down] I will be very grateful to you. It seems like a visit to the doctor adds one more prescription. Please help us, so we won't have to make choices between food or prescriptions.''

From Annabelle Lewis, Alma: ''I stopped taking [my medication] in January 1999, having cut pills in half.''

From Julia Kanopsky, Livonia: ''I just wish the government would take an interest in problems like this. To curb high prices, I eat two meals a day, and any more hike in health cost, I'll have to go on one meal.''

From Dolores Graycheck, Indian River: ''Each month we get deeper in debt and soon we, like a lot of other people, won't have anything left . . . I think it's a shame that our supposed Golden Years aren't Golden after all.''

From Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Crook, Hillsdale: ''We can't go [anywhere] or do anything because it takes all our income for the cost to live. Some weeks, I wonder how long we can go on. It keeps going up in cost and we cannot live.''

From Harriett Simmons, Detroit: ''We are senior citizens today but yesterday we were active, taxpaying citizens. Don't mistreat us now. We need protection.''

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

(Mr. SHERMAN 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 Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

USS LST MEMORIAL, INC.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is a story about a World War II LST that is coming home. She is one of the last of her kind. She has seen a lot in her time. And now, at about 65 years of age, she is about to take on one of the biggest challenges of her entire lifetime.

She was there on D-Day, June 6, 1944. Time and again, the gallant LST 325 returned to Omaha Beach, through murderous gunfire, to unload more men and more equipment to replenish the high casualty and death rate being suffered. She was repaired, and she survived.

At the close of World War II, she was transferred for service to Greece and her name was changed to Syros. After years of good service to Greece, Syros was no longer needed.

About 3 years ago, my constituent, James Edwards of Canton, Texas, contacted me with a request for assistance in the retransfer of the LST from Greece to the United States LST Ship Memorial, Inc., a nonprofit organization whose membership consists of former Navy service members, mostly World War II type guys. I understand the feelings, as I fall in that category, too.

The members of this organization had a dream and a goal that never died. They planned, dreamed, and worked for years to own their own LST. They had a vision of using the ship for educational purposes.

□ 1915

They wanted young people to tour the ship and experience the value of such a trip in helping to win the war and to honor the work it had done. They wanted young Navy midshipmen to train on her, and they wanted Americans of all ages to climb aboard and visit her and even sail on her. Therefore, the LST had to be a movable museum, one that could sail around the waters of the United States and even up the rivers, docking at cities along the way to welcome visitors aboard. That was a tall order, but a worthy cause.

After learning of this noble plan, I introduced legislation to secure the transfer from Greece, and I want to thank my colleagues who supported this effort and helped pass it. I think it should be noticed that the legislation never required one Federal dollar. Unique in itself, the Memorial Association has been raising money and saving funds for years, waiting for that day when they could bring a ''live'' LST back home.

Mr. Speaker, the good news is that the veterans have been in Greece for 3 months, at their own expense, renovating the ship in preparation for the journey back home. She is equipped with the newest radar, repainted and made safe and livable for this historic trip. LST 325 will be sailed home by these veterans, most of whom are veterans of World War II and many of them who are retired. The average age is reported to be at 74 years young.

Recently, the men took LST 325 for a 5-hour shakedown. They cruised around Crete, and she performed perfectly. The report came back to me that the veterans said how wonderful to feel the salt air in their faces again, and I heard that there were some tears of joy mixed in. These men are being cheered and supported by current Navy personnel stationed in Crete and by members of the Hellenic Navy. I am pleased to tell my colleagues that our Ambassador to Greece, Nicholas Burns, and officials of our American Embassy, have done much to make all of this good news possible, and I am sure my colleagues will join me in being appreciative of their assistance.

Finally, having planned very well and believing they had all loose ends tied up, these veterans discovered that their source for food was not going to be available. Neither was their source for fuel. That was the bad news. How were they going to get the LST back home?

This story is fraught with heroes. This epic, this ongoing saga of 40 courageous World War II veterans giving of their hearts to bring the LST 325 home, found another big heart and that is the heart of Mike McAdams, a vice president of British Petroleum, a fellow Texan and former staffer of mine, who went to other officials of BP with the story of this little band of veterans, so full of bravery and determination and so in need of fuel.

Mr. Speaker, the good news is that British Petroleum has donated over 40,000 gallons of fuel to the men and the

the memorial ship, enough to bring LST 325 back home to America. They are ecstatic and grateful and so am I.

The corporate leaders of British Petroleum have shown a responsibility to share which cuts across all generations in a salute to those who have given so much and served so proudly. Mr. Speaker, I say: thank you, Mike Mc Adams and thank you British Petroleum.

The transfer of documents will take place in Athens momentarily and the LST 325 will be on her way. The plan is to stop in Rota, Spain, taking the southern route home. She is expected in Fort Lauderdale sometime around Thanksgiving, as she travels only 7½ knots an hour. I hope to be there when she arrives. What a celebration that will be.

When the men, these veterans, come home, they will have realized a dream of many years and a vision for a memorial that will honor all veterans who have put their lives in harm's way. Many of their shipmates lost their lives during the amphibious assaults, and the LST memorial will honor these men who sail this ship today in the memory of all who have gone before them.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of the 106th Congress, I am honored to pay tribute to the veterans of the LST and all those who helped make this dream come true. I hope that my colleagues will join me in wishing them well and say a prayer for their safe journey back home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. FOWLER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE TOM BLILEY, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

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

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to provide a complete legislative record, I am providing the CBO cost estimates for H.R. 762, the Lupus Research and Care Amendments of 2000, and H.R. 3850, the Independent Telecommunications Consumer Enhancement Act of 2000, which were not included in the Committee's reports on the bills.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE
Washington, DC, October 4, 2000.

Hon. TOM BLILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 3850, the Independent Telecommunications Consumer Enhancement Act of 2000.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Ken Johnson, who can be reached at 226–2860.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
(for Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE, OCTOBER 4, 2000

H.R. 3850: INDEPENDENT TELECOMMUNICATIONS CONSUMER ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2000, AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2000

H.R. 3850 would exempt small telecommunications carriers from certain rules and reporting requirements administered by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). The bill would relieve small carriers from the requirement to maintain separate affiliates to provide advanced telecommunications services. This provision could alter payments that such firms receive from the Universal Service Fund. The legislation also would require that the FCC grant or deny merger petitions from small telecommunications firms within 60 days, and all reconsideration and waiver petitions within 90 days.

CBO estimates that H.R. 3850 would have no significant impact on the federal budget. The bill could, however, have small effects on both direct spending and governmental receipts (revenues), so pay-as-you-go procedures would apply. H.R. 3850 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Based on information from the FCC, CBO estimates that the agency would spend about $3 million a year to implement H.R. 3850. The commission would need more staff to investigate the costs incurred by small telecommunications carriers, which the bill would exempt from certain reporting requirements. The FCC also would have to hire additional personnel to review merger, reconsideration, and waiver petitions in order to meet the bill's deadlines for acting on such petitions. Under current law, enforcement and regulatory costs that the agency incurs are offset by fees charged to the industries that the FCC regulates. Therefore, CBO expects that the net effect on the FCC's appropriated spending would be negligible.

H.R. 3850 would affect governmental receipts and direct spending in two ways. First, it could allow small telecommunications carriers to receive larger payments from the Universal Service Fund to support the added costs of providing advanced telecommunications services. Using the Universal Service Fund established by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, the FCC seeks to provide universal access to telecommunications services, in part through assessments on telephone companies to finance payments to companies that serve high-cost regions. Receipts to the Universal Service Fund are recorded as governmental receipts, and payments do not require annual appropriation action. Based on information from the FCC and the Universal Service Administrative Company, CBO estimates that any change in the Universal Service Fund's spending resulting from this legislation would not be significant and would be offset by either lower payments to other companies or higher revenues.

Second, H.R. 3850 would affect application fees the FCC collects to offset costs associated with tariff filings and other applications from the telecommunications industry. Those licensing fees are recorded as offsetting receipts. Based on information from the FCC, CBO expects that H.R. 3850 could affect the number of tariffs filed by small telecommunications carriers. However, CBO estimates that the resulting change, if any, in receipts from application fees would not be significant.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Ken Johnson, who can be reached at 226–2860. This estimate was approved by Robert A. Sunshine, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 13, 2000.

Hon. TOM BLILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 762, the Lupus Research and Care Amendments of 2000.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Alexis K. Ahlstrom, who can be reached at 226–9010.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE, OCTOBER 13, 2000

H.R. 762: LUPUS RESEARCH AND CARE AMENDMENTS OF 2000, AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON OCTOBER 10, 2000

H.R. 762 would require the Director of the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases (NIAMSD) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to expand and intensify research and related activities of the institute regarding lupus. The NIH will spend approximately $50 million on lupus research this year. The act would require the Director to coordinate activities with similar activities conducted by other national research institutes and agencies of the NIH. The act also would require NIAMSD to conduct or support research to expand the understanding of the causes of lupus, and to increase research into finding a cure for the disease.

H.R. 762 would authorized grants for the establishment, operation, and coordination of delivery of essential services to individuals with lupus and their families. The act also would regulate charges (such as enrollment fees, premiums, deductible, cost sharing, copayments, coinsurance, or other charges) imposed by grantees on service recipients.

H.R. 762 would authorize the appropriation of such sums as necessary to carry out the act's provisions in fiscal years 2001 through 2003. At this time, CBS cannot estimate how much would be necessary to implement H.R. 762. However, because the act would not affect direct spending or receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply.

H.R. 762 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. State and local governments, as well as a number of community and nonprofit organizations, would be eligible for grants established by H.R. 762 for the purpose of delivering and enhancing health care and related services for individuals with lupus.

The CBO staff contact is Alexis K. Ahlstrom, who can be reached at 226–9010. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

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

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TODAY'S CHALLENGE: EDUCATION IN AMERICA

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, the challenge confronting us today is education. Before us is the future of education. We as a Nation must place education as the number one priority if we are to meet the challenges and needs of the 21st century; if we are to look where our children are going to be and if they are well prepared to meet those challenges.

We need to invest in education. We need to come together in a bipartisan effort and support H.R. 4094; 228 Members are cosponsors. This is not a partisan issue. This is a bipartisan issue. This is about education and putting a high priority and investing in the future of America.

We need to make sure that class size reduction for our children is there. We have got to make sure that our children have the same opportunity that many other individuals have where they have small classes, but it can only happen through modernization and class size reduction.

We need to fund education at the highest level. When a child comes into school, they must feel comfortable to know that the ratio is 25 to one, student to teacher. If the atmosphere is good, the students feel good, the teachers feel good. They are in an atmosphere that they can learn. That is positive for a lot of our students. The individual attention is important to a student, because a student has to develop self-esteem, self-confidence in themselves. If he or she has confidence in himself and they know that the teacher is working in areas that they need, then we can have the accountability to make sure that our students are progressing and learning in our public institutions. It can only happen if we reduce the class sizes.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we need teacher training; and, yes, we do need accountability. That is very important for us as well. But we must invest in education; we must allow that to happen. We must provide the tools and the instruments to make sure that our teachers have the resources and the funding. I know that it is very difficult in today's society. When we look at California alone, that has over 6 million students in our K through 12. More and more students are coming in, and yet we have a ratio of 45 to one in many of our schools. We need to make sure that we look across the Nation and we provide the funding.

My son, Joseph Baca, Jr., is a teacher in junior high, and he is going out and buying supplies. This should not happen to him and many other teachers because we are not providing the funds that are very much needed in our classrooms. We need to make sure that we provide not only the funding to make sure that teachers have the equipment, have the supplies, and create the atmosphere; we want to make sure that when children go into our schools, that they know very well that they are coming into a school that they do not have to worry about leaking roofs. They do not have to worry about not having any faucets that are fixed, and they do not have to worry about looking at windows that are broken. They do not have to look at walls that have graffiti. We want to create an atmosphere that is good for them.

If an atmosphere is good for them, then they will begin to learn. And if it is good for them, then teachers feel good about being energized in teaching.

At the same time, we have to make sure that we look at not only modernization, but the digital divide, to look at technology to make sure that we fund every one of our schools so that our children are well prepared to meet the 21st century and well prepared and well trained. If they are not, what is going to happen to our Nation? What is going to happen to our Nation? It is our responsibility that we provide the funding at a higher level. We have got to invest more. We are not investing enough in education.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the answer and the beginning and the right steps are in H.R. 4094. That is a step in the right direction. When an individual receives the funding, then that means we have the accountability. At the same time, when we look at where are our students, we must prepare them to meet the 21st century so they are ready to go to a community college and State college and our universities.

Are community colleges ready for them? We have to make sure that we provide tax incentives and tax rates and tuition that is available for our students to go on to our community colleges. More and more students are going to our community colleges right now, and we have to make sure that we provide the funding there. And as we look at those students who are transferring on to 4-year institutions, to make sure that they can get into a State college or university.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we have honors programs and other programs, but it becomes difficult when we do not have the funding and we do not have the financing that are available for a lot of our students. The tax incentives and tax breaks are there. Mr. Speaker, we need to invest more in education. We can take the right steps. The steps are ahead of us, but we have to come together in a bipartisan effort.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN RON PACKARD UPON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, the leader of our California delegation, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), has given me the honor of putting together a night to honor the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), one of our colleagues who is leaving the House, retiring at the end of this session.

We wanted to take a little time to talk a little bit of his accomplishments while here in the Congress. First of all, we will hear from our leader, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS). I yield to him such time as he desires.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate my colleague yielding. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues this evening in paying tribute to our friend from the Committee on Appropriations, RON PACKARD. RON is retiring from the House after 18 years of service to his constituents. He has had the privilege of representing one of the most beautiful parts of our State in south Orange County and north San Diego County, a small piece of Riverside County as well, as he would remind us.

It is understandable why RON would want to spend more time at home. He has just completed the building of a new home with his wife, Jean, seven children and too many grandchildren to count. He has got plenty to look forward to as he goes back home to his district.

RON came to the Congress after serving in the U.S. Navy and later as a member of the school board, active in the chamber of commerce. He served on the city council and was mayor of Carlsbad. RON was elected to Congress as a result of his success as a write-in candidate in 1982, one of the very few occasions in which a write-in candidate has been successful.

I have worked most closely with RON in the appropriations process where over the years he has been the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations, and is just completing a tour representing our State very well on the subcommittee that deals with energy and water appropriations, a most important appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to miss RON greatly as a member of our committee. He has been of great service to Southern California.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Long Beach, California (Mr. HORN).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, RON PACKARD is truly a man of the House of Representatives. He is a gentleman. He is civility. He is a good listener, and he has got a ready smile. He won friends all over this Chamber on both sides of the aisle; and, of course, that is what effective legislators do.

Of course, when we all learned that he had a total of 44 children and grandchildren, 7 children, 34 grandchildren, and three great grandchildren, we were envious. And I always wondered how he

remembered their names. I suspect Jean, his charming wife, maybe put a sort of easel up and when they were coming, said here are the names.

RON, in whatever he did as a legislator here, first on public works, now known as the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, but now on the Committee on Appropriations, he was very fair when he listened to all of us, Democrats, Republicans, Easterners, Westerners, Northerners, Southerners. On appropriations, he brought basic common sense to the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, one of the most difficult committees in this Chamber, because it involves floods, it involves ecology, it involves environment. RON could deal with all of those pressures.

He cared about our troops abroad, in particular. In the period when he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, our troops abroad in Korea were in Second World War barracks going to pieces, and RON knew that should not be. If we have families, as we do now in all the services, we need good facilities and we need a place where they can call home when it is abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank RON for all he has done in this Chamber, and all he will do when he goes back to, as the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) said, that beautiful part of the California coast.

So, Jean and RON, you are a great couple to have as a mentor and have as a model, and we thank you for what you have done in your 2 decades here, and we wish you well in the years ahead.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), a colleague of RON PACKARD's on the Committee on Appropriations.

□ 1930

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to wish our colleague RON PACKARD well in his retirement from the House of Representatives at the end of this 106th Congress.

Tonight a number of us have gathered in this Chamber during this special time to pay tribute to our colleague and our friend who has served with distinction in this people's House for 18 years. All of us know this very good-natured gentleman from California is one of only four Members of Congress to have ever won their first election to the Congress as a write-in candidate, a tremendous feat in and of itself. Little did we know that RON would go from that point in 1982 to become chairman of three very important House appropriations subcommittees.

As other Members have mentioned, many of us here tonight know RON for his years of service on the House Committee on Appropriations. I myself have had the honor of serving with him on that committee, and most recently I have had the pleasure of serving under his chairmanship on the appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water.

For the past 2 years, RON has been steadfast in reversing the President's decision to underfund our Nation's infrastructure needs. Due to his leadership, the Congress has maintained a strong commitment to partnerships with our local communities and States by providing these needed funds for flood control, shore protection and dredging our harbors and the like.

As a former businessman, school board member, city councilman, and mayor, RON has always believed that the Federal Government should provide a helpful hand but the true power and decisions should be returned to State and local government officials who know the best needs of their constituents.

On a personal note, in July of 1999, I traveled with RON and his wife, Jean, and other Members to Russia as part of our committee assignment on Energy and Water. RON and our colleagues toured the Russian ''closed cities'' or the former nuclear sites and met with numerous Russian officials. It was a trip to remember, in large part due to RON's leadership, his insistence that we see where U.S. dollars were being spent to dispose of or contain nuclear waste.

Throughout our trip within Russia, RON showed his dedication to our purpose for being there and to the American people by insisting on receiving a complete understanding of the current status of all of these nuclear sites. Additionally during this trip, I had the opportunity to get to know RON and Jean; and I can tell you, judging from our discussions about our families, that RON and Jean will definitely continue to be busy grandparents, taking a very active role in all of their 34 grandchildren's lives. The Congress' loss will be his family's gain.

I wish you well in retirement, RON. You have set a high standard for all of us to follow that remain. We will miss you. Good luck and Godspeed.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Riverside, California (Mr. CALVERT), another of RON's good friends and neighbors.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Valencia, California, for putting together this special order for our good friend, RON PACKARD; and I say that very sincerely.

I do not know if the gentleman remembers, but in 1982 we both ran for Congress in Republican primaries, and, something we have in common, we both lost. I lost my Republican primary, but RON went on to win a very substantial victory in a write-in campaign.

That has only happened four times in the history of the United States House of Representatives, which shows how popular and well loved he is in his district. I know that for a fact, because our districts adjoin each other in the Temecula-Marrietta areas of our district. And every year we would get together for the last 8 years I have been in the House, and we would meet and have what they call the RON and KEN show up there. And we would talk about issues that affect the Temecula-Marrietta Valley. I will miss that very much; and you need to come out, RON, to celebrate those times.

On issues out in those areas, Pierce's Disease, which is devastating the vintners out there in that area, and avocados, that we just successfully concluded here shortly, those I am sure are issues you are very proud of in the local sense. But, obviously, on a national sense, the service that you have done for the Committee on Appropriations in all the various subcommittees, legislative branch, certainly military construction, where you have helped a lot of young families get better housing and a better place to live, to help retention in our military forces, something I am sure you are very proud of. And certainly the energy and water account in which you have done many things throughout the country, and happily in our own area, the Temecula-Marrietta area that has devastating floods, that we can finally move toward flood protection for the many people that live in that area and the property we would like to protect.

So RON, it has been a privilege serving with you. I know that another thing that I do not know if a lot of people know, he is probably the finest golfer in the House. No doubt about it. He will be giving me at least a stroke a hole from now on. I really appreciate that.

I thank the gentleman for his service and look forward to many years to come of friendship.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), another golfer, a Member from the other side of the aisle, and also a neighbor and friend of RON's.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to be up here to say a few words about an individual. I am the new kid on the block. I just got elected not too long ago. I said, who is RON PACKARD? But, you know what, since I have gotten to know RON PACKARD, basically he reached out and touched the lives of many of us.

You may think the type of relationship he built here on a bipartisan is very important. I know we are going to miss you. I know I am going to miss you, since I am relatively new here. I know, not only because you are on the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Subcommittee on Energy and Water, but what you have done throughout the area is you really have left a legacy for many other individuals in the community, because truly your legislation and your policies have been bipartisan, in the interests of California, in the interests of the Nation.

That is important for people to remember when they look at a legislator

that is serving us. That is why not only is he well liked and loved in his district, but throughout the Nation and by many of us. You truly are a leader, a visionary, an individual who cares about not only our communities as a whole, and in your district, but you are an individual that is willing to listen on a bipartisan basis and say what is important for our Nation, what is important for California, and take action, which is very important on a bipartisan basis.

As the new kid on the block, I find that very energizing, I find that very enthusiastic, and I find that very motivating, because it is important to get motivated. Everybody told me, when you come up here, JOE, it is going to be so partisan. I found out that not everything is so partisan. Sometimes, yes, but there are individuals that are not, and you truly have developed a kind of friendship and you have opened the doors to many individuals to say what is it that you have to say that is good for California, what is it that is good for all of us. If it is good, I am willing to listen. That kind of relationship and kind of friendship, there is no dollar value that you can put on it.

It truly has been an honor to be your friend and know you this short period of time. I wish you were here longer. But I know that you left a legacy, not only the legacy in policy, but the legacy in golf. You truly are one individual that has been an outstanding golfer. A lot us are going to try to follow in the same footsteps, and hopefully we can. Thank you very much for serving the State of California and our Nation.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield to the gentleman from San Diego, California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank JOE BACA, a Member from the other side of the aisle, for giving tribute to someone that we cherish very, very much.

You know, RON PACKARD was a write-in, and what a rich legacy he gave the constituents of North County. Much of the district I now represent was RON's former district, and his legacy was hard to keep up with. As a matter of fact, when I go up there, they used to tell me, well, ''RON didn't do it that way, DUKE.'' But RON gave me a lot of guidance.

RON PACKARD, DUNCAN HUNTER, myself and BRIAN BILBRAY represent North County, San Diego and San Diego City, both on authorization and appropriations, and I want to thank you for your leadership and what you were able to help us with. Not only from the appropriations, but RON also knows how to breach partisanship and work with Members on the other side, as you just witnessed with JOE BACA.

But he is no nonsense, and his style is that of a grandfather to a child. If you were bad on this House floor, or very partisan, RON, through his leadership, was not above going after somebody that was partisan. He was also not afraid to call for removal of the President or a cabinet member when he thought it was within his value system, and he had the strength of a leader to carry that through.

RON loved public service. He loved his wife, Jean, and his family, but his family might be described as a covey, a herd, a flock, or just maybe a large group. RON has seven children, 34 grandchildren and three great-grandchildren, the last we heard; and I am sure that that number is going to go up.

But I think it also shows the competitiveness of RON PACKARD. I would like to give a story off the Hill. RON does love golf, with a passion, and if he loses a dime, I mean, he frets for a week if he loses a dime. He is a fierce competitor. As a matter of fact, right there where he is sitting at this moment he was sitting with DUNCAN HUNTER one night.

Now, RON is a very good golfer, in the 70s or 90s. DUNCAN HUNTER is of equal caliber, in the 70s or 80s. I am lucky to break 100, so I am always asking for strokes on the golf course on the weekends from these two rascals, but they will not give it. Sometimes they cave in.

They were discussing something, and I was sitting behind them waiting for them to finish. Come to find out, they were plotting on Saturday when we went to the Old Soldiers Home golf course, both of them were going to show up with their arms in slings so they would not have to give me a stroke a hole that game.

Well, they did not see me slip out behind, they did not know the stealthiness of one Member; and, when we showed up, I had my arms in two slings, so they had to give me a stroke a hole.

But I thought I would share this letter. I thought enough of this, I got this just a couple of years ago from RON, to show you what a competitor he is. I would like to read it. He says, ''Dear DUKE, you can have my wife, you can have my children, my grandchildren, my house, my car, my good name, but never, never, never, ever a stroke a hole. Signed, RON PACKARD.''

God bless you, RON. We love you.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be here tonight to honor RON PACKARD. It is not a happy occasion, however. It is not happy, and it does not make me happy and does not make us happy that we will not have RON PACKARD with us to help us and to guide us and direct us and to cheer us in the years ahead in this body.

We will remain friends, we will remain people who respect RON PACKARD forever, but we will sorely miss you. This is something that I say from the heart.

RON has been a father figure, especially for those of us in the Republican Party and the Republican delegation from Orange County. He has been truly a father figure, a kind father. He has been a hard-working father, he has been a caring father, and he has been a wise father, and all of the things you think of when you think about a good man and a person of integrity, of strength, that is what you think of, that is what we think of, the people who have worked with him so many years and relied upon his strength of character and his cheerfulness, that is what we think of when we think of RON PACKARD.

RON started his career as a dentist. I always find it is fascinating to talk to people, as I have spoken to RON for many hours, about what they did in the previous career before actually coming here to Washington, D.C. Actually I know it is hard to say you were thrilled to hear stories of his dentistry, but it made him a real human being to me, and realizing you could actually go into a dentist's office and have RON PACKARD there, you know, him leaning over you and saying this is going to hurt me as much as it is you, and you realize that is really true; that RON is such a sympathetic person and empathetic with people, that he was as a dentist and a human being was very successful outside of the political arena.

Also we know that RON PACKARD served in the Armed Forces. I know he has several stories which he will not tell in public about the Armed Forces. He served his country and he had a good time doing it, but he also was very dedicated to his country. RON is the true image of a Patriot, of an American Patriot. American patriots, some of us in the conservative movement think patriots are the solemn guys and just repeating slogans about the country. RON is an honest, honest patriotic person. He is an American, a true American, and you can sense that in his heart.

□ 1945

How one can tell that this is so evident, not only to us, but to his constituents, as has been mentioned here several times, RON did not win his first race right off the bat. RON won a write-in race. Now, with a name like ROHRABACHER, I can tell my colleagues that that would have been absolutely impossible, but even with a name like PACKARD, which anybody can spell, it has only happened 4 times in the entire history of the United States Congress.

Why did this happen? What was the issue which made people in his district take the time to fill out that name? What was it that motivated them? What was the crying need that said, we need RON PACKARD in that first election? It was one word, and the word is integrity. The people in his district knew that they needed integrity and they called out for it and they knew that RON PACKARD was the candidate, even though they had to go out of the way and do more work to get him in by writing his name in, to get him in this

position. Of course, since then he has been winning every election by huge majorities.

As a Member of Congress and the dean of the Orange County delegation, he has given all of us direction. We have looked at his hard work, we have looked at his fairness and his willingness always to lend a helping hand to others on both sides of the aisle, and yes, to give advice. We look at those things as a role model for the rest of us. I came in in 1988 and RON was already a veteran. I will have to say that what he has offered us and offered me personally has been very, very advantageous. He has given me a lot of professional guidance on how I should be operating here as a Member of Congress, but he has also served as a role model and given professional advice, or I should say personal advice.

RON is a model for us, both professionally and personally. RON, I might add, in the last election showed his values and showed how important values are to him by taking a lead in California in trying to pass the Save the Family or Protect the Family Act, which is basically designed to protect the institution of the family in California. Also, the efforts he has made to make sure that the Boy Scouts are not forced into lowering their moral standards or giving up the word ''God'' in their scout oath.

Mr. Speaker, I was just married 3 years ago, and I will close with this. I hope that I have as much happiness in my life and that it shows on my face and in my life as much as RON's family life and the happiness and joy that he has had has had on his life, because he has been a shining example to all of us of what marriage and what love between people is all about. We will miss you, RON. Your presence will not be forgotten; it will shine on as long as the rest of us are here. Thank you very much for all you have done for us and for what you have done for the United States of America.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to be very kind to RON, because as I have been listening to some of my other colleagues who are going to follow me, I think that this will end up as something other than a love fest. I have just heard a story that has not been shared with me that in fact our colleagues will get to hear from my dear friend and classmate, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) in a few minutes about RON's earlier life.

So let me take a couple of minutes and be very kind. I know that many people focus on the divisiveness that exists here in the Congress and the partisan antipathy that regularly goes on, but there is, in fact, a camaraderie. Then, when we look at the California congressional delegation, the California delegation is known for being extraordinarily divisive: Californians all hate each other; the Democrats and Republicans do not get along; the Republicans are all divided; the Democrats are all divided. If the truth were to be known, we rally, and RON PACKARD was key to putting together the kind of solidarity which we frankly do enjoy today.

I will always remember many late-night meetings which members of the California congressional delegation held, and RON PACKARD was always there. He had as a top priority bringing our delegation together, and he was key to that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard about his wife, Jean, and this huge family, and he is the only guy I know who will actually look you in the eye and say that he does not know the names of some of his relatives. Somebody talked about the fact that he has a number of grandchildren and 7 children, and that when they have family reunions, the Packards have hundreds, I think it may be even thousands, who gather together for family reunions. It is a very, very impressive family that he has. I hope one day he gets to meet all of them.

I will say that when we look at the work that he has done on the Subcommittee on Energy and Water, most recently, I have to say that this very soft-spoken dentist, the former mayor of Carlsbad, has stood up in meetings, and now that he is getting ready to leave, I think I can share this, that he has made it very clear that if Members of Congress have been fortunate enough to have their issues that are priorities for them included in legislation, they had better vote for the legislation. RON very calmly, very firmly makes that statement, and he does it with a kind of confidence that only a powerful cardinal can exercise around here.

So we are going to miss RON. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and I were just talking about the fact that RON is our junior colleague. We had the privilege of coming here with Ronald Reagan back in 1980 and then, as many have said, RON shocked the world of being the person, I guess the fourth, to win that famous write-in election, and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has all kinds of stories about that write-in election that he will probably share with us.

So let me just say to RON and Jean, his wonderful wife who has stood by him, and I have had the privilege of traveling with them and spending time with other members of their family, they will be sorely missed. The California delegation has come together in large part due to the commitment that RON PACKARD made to that goal, and I shall always be grateful to him for that.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to another strong member of our delegation, the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my thanks also to Mr. PACKARD who has done so much during his 18 years here in this body for the State of California and everybody not only who lives in his district, but in mine and in Mr. MCKEON's, Mr. HUNTER'S, Mr. DREIER'S, and others. I know the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has some great stories that are coming. We have heard them in our luncheons and been regaled with them. They are good. I hope that they are presented and taken in the spirit of camaraderie that we have.

RON has a quiet leadership style that, as the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) said, members of both sides of the aisle appreciate and, frankly, rally around. He has been very fair to all members, regardless of party affiliation. Frankly, I have only been here for just about 2 years now, but in my short time, I have tried to emulate his qualities: humility, fairness, honesty, accountability, and frankly, the integrity that just comes. If one gets the chance to work with RON, it just comes out. It is just so clear. His qualities have won him many friends and admirers here in Washington and in California, as we can see from him being returned 8 times from his initial election.

Mr. Speaker, on the Subcommittee on Energy and Water, Mr. PACKARD has provided critical assistance for the safety of Americans across the Nation and particularly for Californians and specifically for people who live in the Sacramento area. He understands our challenges along the Sacramento River and the American River, and his work has led to a significant increase in the level of flood protection for the people that live in my area, and for this I am grateful. It makes a difference.

Mr. Speaker, RON PACKARD, as others have said, is very devoted to his family, which is and always has been his most important priority in life. As he takes his bride, Jean, and returns to California and leaves this august body, I know that he will enjoy spending time again with them in the manner in which perhaps every one of us should, and devoting more time to those that he loves as family members. I say to the gentleman, I appreciate your leadership and guidance, and you will be missed. Godspeed.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a colleague of Mr. PACKARD's on the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Speaker, I too rise this evening to pay tribute to RON PACKARD, who I consider to be a distinguished statesman from the State of California, and on this occasion of his retirement at the end of the 106th Congress, I wish him well.

I have known RON and I have known his wife, Jean. I have not known the 7 children and, I believe, 34 grandchildren and the great grandchildren, but that will come. I have had the

pleasure to travel with he and Jean on some CODELs, I would not say around the world, but certainly to various parts of the world, and we have had I think some very interesting experiences on those trips and I have gotten to know he and Jean. We find that his dedication to his family and to his church is very, very strong. It is unwavering. The fact that he is a dentist and that he moved from being a dentist into Congress is a little bit of a change, I guess, but others do the same from the field of medicine, so that is not so unusual. But he has made the change and he has done it, as somebody has already said, several members have mentioned the fact that he was only the fourth member, only the fourth in history to actually come to the House via the write-in process. I never believed anybody could get here by the write-in process, but RON did. The residents of his district in southern California have seen fit to send him back to Washington, and by overwhelming majorities, every election since, back to 1982. I think well they should, because RON PACKARD has been a respected and dedicated member of this House ever since.

He has served his California constituents well. Not only that, he has served the Nation well, and that includes his service in the Navy and his time as the mayor of Carlsbad, California and, of course, the 18 years here in the House.

As we know, RON PACKARD is the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Energy and Water, and it has been my privilege to serve with him on that committee as well as on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations for the past few years. He has also served, as we know, on the Subcommittee on Military Construction and the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, as well as his efforts on the Subcommittee on Transportation.

I can assure my colleagues that the Energy and Water bill is no easy task, and let me say a little bit about why. It was only through RON's tireless dedication and self sacrifice that made difficult matters appear mundane. Energy and Water runs the gamut of issues, hitting upon matters of national and energy security. That bill provides vital important funding for such items as the Nation's stockpile stewardship, Cold War weapons plant cleanup and energy supply, only to name a few. But here is the part that gets tough. It not only funds hundreds, even thousands, of local water priorities performed by the Corps of Engineers and conducted in just about every Member's district, and the member from California has brought balance, he has brought common sense in approaching the Energy and Water bill discussions during his tenure. In fact, this year, RON PACKARD had to deal with some 3,000 requests. Now, those were not all Member requests, but a good many were and the rest came from a variety of sources. All of these have to come before the committee, all have to be dealt with. His hard work and dedication resulted in a timely and reasonable piece of legislation that covered all of those bases, and it took patience and it took thoughtfulness and it took courtesy, and he had all of those qualities to meet and deal with people and with their requests.

RON PACKARD's retirement will leave a set of shoes that will be difficult, if not impossible, to fill. Mr. Speaker, I think I echo the sentiments of all of the Members who have spoken here this evening in saying that this gentleman will certainly be missed.

I am certain that RON will make good use of his time in the coming months. I can only guess that golf courses around the country will be richer, will be the richer for it. RON, congratulations to you and to Jean. Enjoy your retirement, and thank you very much.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to another good friend of RON's and a member of the California delegation (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

□ 2000

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) for organizing this special order.

RON is obviously someone who is looked upon very favorably here in the House and who is a friend to all. And in the frenetic pace that we have, we do not take time to stop and pause upon the contributions of any given individual until the time of his or her retirement.

It is unfortunate that it is that way, but at least we do have this occasion to pause for that moment, and many things have been said. RON has a very interesting life and a number of significant accomplishments.

I just want to provide just two or three brief snapshots of my encounters with RON. When I was a brand-new Member here, 10 years ago, I would take the Metro in; and so if we stayed late at night, although I could have taken the Metro back out, RON lived out near us, and he was kind enough to give me a ride.

So he introduced me to an interesting way of getting home. But the best way, and I always take it whenever I am driving, and that is you go down 395 South. You get off at Maine Avenue. You go past the Jefferson and Vietnam Veterans and Lincoln Memorials right along the Potomac River.

There are quite a few little turns you have to know how to make, but you end up going up over the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge looking past the Kennedy Center, and you are on 66 West. And, RON, every time I go that way I have you to thank for that. I think of you. I think of you every single time. I do think of you teaching me how to get home that way.

We have another thing that is somewhat unusual. When we were not back in our districts and happened to be here for the weekend, RON and I were members of the same congregation, the Oakton Ward of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. And RON served for many days for the instructor of priesthood group.

I might add ORRIN and Elaine HATCH are members of that ward. And Jean, of course. RON and Jean's daughter Lisa. We miss them, I must say, as they have been wrapping up their affairs and making the transition completely back to California.

They have moved back with their family, and we do not see RON so much in that capacity, but we did see him there this last Sunday.

Anyway, I treasure those memories.

Lastly, but not least and most directly related to our legislative life, I had the privilege of working with RON on a very important issue to California, the subject of water and specifically, the subject of cow fed. RON is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and as we all know, there is an appropriations subcommittee that handles the money to be spent for each of the different policy committees.

The policy subcommittee that I chair is the Subcommittee on Water and Power. And so we worked rather closely together on this very contentious issue of water, and that is really not resolved as of this moment and will be taken up in the next Congress.

But I do want to say this, rather than simply doing whatever he liked as the appropriations chairman, because frankly, if that power is used in that fashion, legislating on appropriations bills can occur and can occur contrary to whatever the policy committee would like to have happen. I do not think that that is appropriate, but it occasionally happens around here.

It did not happen with RON and his subcommittee, and I really value, RON, how closely you worked with us and the authorizers to try to reach an accommodation on that. You and I and our committees were together, but not all the parties in this process were, and so it has not worked out yet; but you certainly gave it the maximum effort. I am convinced the foundation that we laid will eventually be built upon to resolve this problem.

Lastly, the last personal snapshot, as you heard what a great golfer RON is, and I think he is one of the best in the House. But he and his wife also love games, board games, and we had a couple of delightful evenings over the years enjoying those experiences together as couples.

So I want to say thank you. We will miss you, and Godspeed in your new endeavors.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from San Diego, California (Mr. HUNTER), another good friend.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) for putting this special order together, and we talked about the serious side of RON I think a little too much tonight. I need to tell you a couple of stories about this guy.

The first story is, a number of people have talked about his patriotic service to the Nation as a Naval officer, indeed, a dentist; and there is one story that is floating around Southern California about a certain dentist who was seeing a large number of recruits. They were running them through pretty rapidly, filling teeth, pulling a few here and there and getting them in shape to go overseas.

RON and his cohort there, the other dentist who worked in the office, decided they would have a little fun. It involved a new technique, the technique of utilizing dynamite to remove bad teeth. So they had a rather large, naive young man who was in the chair, a little bit apprehensive about this dental work that was to begin.

RON very ceremoniously opened up a large volume, a big book; and he said we are going to try the new blasting technique on your teeth. I hope you like it. It is experimental, and RON proceeded to take a piece, a little roll of gauze that he dipped in iodine that looked like a miniature dynamite stick.

And as this horrified recruit, who had been promised good dental care in the U.S. Navy, lay back in that chair with just a look of horror on his face, RON inserted this small stick of dynamite under one of the molars or on top of one of his molars, he looked back at the book and he said it now says we have to attach the fuse, and he pulled out a piece of dental floss, which if you light it will in fact fizzle and sputter and acted something like a fuse, then he plugged the fuse into the small stick of dynamite that was laying on top of a now horrified recruit's back molar.

RON then, a very, very solemn man. We all know RON can be a solemn person. When RON is solemn we all get solemn, and he very solemnly skipped a few lines in the book, and he says to his friend, his fellow dentist, that we have to take cover. So they led the fuse over behind the desk and got down behind the desk; and RON then lit the fuse, and as this fuse sputtered and fizzled and the flame, the spark got closer and closer to this young recruit, the recruit got more and more agitated, as you may imagine, and finally leaped up with a squeak and raced out of the office.

RON was required shortly thereafter to visit the commanding officer. And this is pure RON PACKARD. He has gotten away with stuff all of his life. He very solemnly went in and began to explain what had happened very truthfully, and his commanding officer wanted to be very severe, but after RON had gone about halfway through the story, his commanding officer could not help himself, and he burst out laughing.

He finally just admonished RON and his colleague to get out of there, so they left. They promised not to harass any more recruits, and that is one of my favorite Navy stories.

But that epitomizes the sense of humor that RON has and RON has carried that sense of humor over to today. In fact, he has a great sense of humor. He actually told the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and I we had good golf swings before he proceeded to take us for a small wager, of course not illegal; but we have had a lot of fun out there playing golf.

RON is a fairly tight-fisted guy. I had an opportunity to actually make a hole-in-one in a golf tournament that my colleagues played in, and I thought I would get a car. But I was informed that since RON was running the tournament, I would not get any car. And I think I got just a couple of dollars for making this fabulous hole-in-one, even though another member of the conference then got a very nice car after he made a hole-in-one a couple of tournaments later.

RON wanted to present me with my car this year, which I understand was a small model about 5 inches long; so, RON, I want to get that as soon as possible.

My other favorite story about RON PACKARD involves his family, and it involves where he comes from in that great area of the Snake River Plains in Idaho, where people work from dawn to dark and have a tremendous work ethic and where everybody looks the other guy right straight in the eye and where literally a big piece of American wilderness was carved into a very productive land, and that is where RON and his 16 brothers and sisters, 14 boys and 3 girls, grew up near Meridian, Idaho, and the Snake River Plains there.

His father was working for Morrison, Knudson just prior to the Japanese bombing in Pearl Harbor in World War II, and he was on Wake Island. He was working as a civilian worker. When Wake Island was taken shortly after the bombing of Pearl Harbor he was captured by the Japanese. His father became a POW.

I think what his father did in that POW camp represents the character that RON took on, and that has followed him all of his life, and that is that RON's dad who became a POW was taken on one of the so-called hell ships to Japan and treated very brutally, helped to take care of the other POWs.

He became the historian of the POW camp, and he wrote down the history of all of the members of that POW camp, and he kept a log on what happened to them. As you know, 30 percent of our POWs were killed in World War II that were incarcerated in Japan.

He hid that little history, as I recall, in a piece of bamboo. And when he came back to the States, he made sure that he contacted every family that had a loved one in that POW camp and gave them the history of their loved one, who in most cases did not make it back or in many cases did not make it back before he went back to his own family, and then like RON PACKARD, he told them, all the kids, what had happened, and then he talked very little about it. And that is RON.

He is the kind of guy who has got great character, a great caring and does not dwell on himself a lot. We have had little cabals, as the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) said in the California delegation. I like a good cabal myself, and a good secret meeting; RON PACKARD is a guy that likes to bring people together and likes to put oil in the water and bring out the best in everyone.

He really epitomizes what is best about this Congress. He has got a good heart. He looks you in the eye. He helps you whenever he can, and he is a great citizen. And I cannot help but think that it was that upbringing that the 17 boys and girls, 14 boys and 3 girls, on the Snake River Plains of Idaho and all that hard work that they had to endure and keeping that family going without a father that made RON PACKARD what he is.

We have been better for his presence. God bless you, RON.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to another good friend of Mr. PACKARD's, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), who served with him on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I sat in my office listening to speeches being made, and I thought to myself how many times I had shared in private conversations with so many people both in this Congress and outside, how much admiration and respect I had for RON PACKARD. I thought to myself, maybe this is a good time to share with the world at large exactly what some of my feelings are for him.

Mr. Speaker, I met RON first when I showed up to play in one of his golf tournaments, and I think when he saw me, he thought maybe I had strayed on to the wrong golf course. But we struck up a relationship on that day; and some time after that, I was elected by my party to serve on the Committee on Appropriations and of course I sought a seat on the Committee on Energy and Water Development, and much to my pleasant surprise, I found out that RON PACKARD was the Chair of that subcommittee.

I cannot think of anybody with whom I have worked since being in this body that I felt more fairly treated than the time I spent on that subcommittee. And of course, I took leave from the committee and am still on leave from that committee and his subcommittee. We still find time to interact with each other.

Quite frankly, I am not too sure he didn't treat me more fairly in my absence than he would have if I had been there to argue my case in person. But this past Members golf tournament I had the opportunity to play in a foursome with RON PACKARD, and I always thought of how much I admired and respected him, until that day when he politely taught me just how much better a golfer he is than I am, but he did it in such a way that I really enjoyed that thumping you gave me on that day.

□ 2015

But all of that aside, as I said earlier, in this body, I think, as some things

get contentious, we often plead our partisan cases in such a way that even we are often not proud of how we have done it. But I have never seen an instance when my interaction with RON PACKARD was not of the highest regards for each other.

I wanted to come to the floor tonight and say how much I appreciate serving with him, how much I appreciate my friendship with him, and to wish him Godspeed in all that is before him in life and let him know that, if ever he comes to South Carolina, I want to repay that thumping on the golf course that he gave me not too long ago. I thank him and Godspeed.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Orange County, California (Mr. COX), one of the leaders of our California delegation.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California very much for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with this distinguished group of Members on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to my friend and our colleague, this great national leader from Southern California, RON PACKARD.

I, too, have enjoyed listening to the stories tonight on the floor, and I hope the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) has, too. There are many to tell about a man whose time here in Congress has done so much to improve our national life and to improve this institution.

RON and Jean and their seven children and their 34 grandchildren are a family that the Packards have made us all feel a part of. I have met some, but not all of the Packard family. Perhaps someday I will be able to do that. But the family members that I have been introduced to and I have met are fine men and women that say a lot about RON and Jean.

I have my own much younger family. It seems to me, given the natural limits to mortal life, I can never catch up. But I know from the task of being a father what a measure of our own worth that is. That is one and only one, a big one, area of RON's life in which he has set an example for the rest of us.

When I first came to Congress, I had the opportunity to serve on the Public Works and Transportation Committee with my neighbor in Orange County to the south, RON PACKARD. RON was and is an expert in aviation, served on that as well as other subcommittees in the Congress, and continued to have even greater influence in that area on the Committee on Appropriations where, as has been remarked upon several times tonight, he is a cardinal, a term of reverence, well deserved in his case for someone who wields extraordinary power of the purse in our constitutional system.

I have had the opportunity even to have some vacation dinners with RON and Jean. Rebecca and I have shared a nice meal at some romantic spots in Hawaii together and gotten to know RON in that way personally, and it has been a lot of fun. I hope we have the opportunity to continue to do that even after he retires, because we are Southern California neighbors.

It has been mentioned because it is such an extraordinary fact of RON's career here how he got here in the first place, one of only four Americans in our national history to come to this people's House as a write-in candidate.

It is extraordinary in a time in election season right now when we are all talking about campaign finance reform and the nefarious influence of special interests to think about what this means in RON's case. RON got here in exactly the opposite way, not because of special interests, not because he was even the nominee of a major party. He was not. He had to run against the Democratic nominee, run against the Republican nominee as an individual. He was RON PACKARD first and became the party's standard bearer thereafter because the people wrote him in.

RON PACKARD and I share another distinction that I am very proud of. Possibly this means more to a Republican than a Democrat. But RON and I are the only Members to have our legislation become law, notwithstanding the veto of President Clinton, in two full terms of the Clinton administration: in my case, the Securities Litigation Reform Act; in his case something even more important, I have to say, and that is rebuilding our Nation's military.

Because as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of our Committee on Appropriations, he put before this House what was necessary to rebuild our military, to provide the resources that armed services needed. He convinced our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. They voted to support his legislation. The same was true down the corridor in the other body, the United States Senate.

We sent that legislation to the President. When the President made the rare decision to cast a veto that he should not have, the Congress reacted quickly and supported RON PACKARD, even against the wishes of the President of the United States, because they knew he was supporting the United States military and that he was right.

Now, it should be said about a Republican who serves on the Committee on Appropriations that there are temptations. The whole term limits movement has a reason in America because of those temptations, because people who serve too long in Washington find it too easy to spend other people's money on pork barrel projects, on wasteful Washington ways. Sometimes they forget about the people back home. It is sad to say that temptation is strongest when one is closest to the money on the committee charged with spending it, the Committee on Appropriations in the House and in the Senate.

So how honored have we been as American citizens to be served by a chairman on the Committee on Appropriations who took his trust so seriously that, in discharging it, he actually reduced spending.

When RON PACKARD first became a chairman on the Committee on Appropriations in 1995, he quickly sent a bill to the floor of the House of Representatives that did not just cut spending for the benefit of taxpayers, it cut spending at home where, presumably, it would hurt Members of Congress themselves most, in our own legislative budget. He cut spending by Congress on itself by fully one-third, an extraordinary achievement when we had a new majority, a new Congress, under the leadership of RON PACKARD.

In fact, throughout his career in the majority as a cardinal, as a chairman on the Committee on Appropriations, RON PACKARD has been garnering awards, not for bringing home the bacon, but from such groups as Americans for Tax Reform, which rated him a taxpayer's hero, and the National Taxpayers Union, which rated RON PACKARD an appropriator and a chairman and a cardinal in the top 5 percent of people in this entire Congress interested in cutting spending.

This is an extraordinary accomplishment and something, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) can not only be proud of, but that all of his colleagues here are proud of. He has made us all proud. Everything that he has done in his career, even before he came to Congress, as a local leader, as a mayor, as a member of the city council, as a dentist with his own practice has distinguished him.

But in this Congress for 18 years, everyone on both sides of the aisle, as the gentleman is hearing tonight from his friends, has found him to be scrupulously honest in his dealings, to be always fair, and, just as importantly, to be hard working and is represented by the fact that he got here as a write-in candidate, a citizen legislator. The gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) is, in short, everything that a Member of Congress should be, everything a national leader should be.

It is well said that ours is a government of, by and for the people. The for and by parts are very important. But remember that it is also a government of the people, and that this Congress, which manufacturers nothing, is simply the sum of the people who populate it, the people who were chosen by the voters to come back here.

Therefore, by being who he has been, the fine gentleman that he has been and is, the leader that he has been, the exemplar that he has been for all of us, he have improved this institution, the people's House. The Congress of the United States and thus our country is the better for it.

It has been a privilege to know the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and to work with him, and I look forward to continuing our friendship in the years ahead.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCKEON. 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 (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE RON PACKARD

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a response, but there is one or two others that would like to say a word.

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

Mr. PACKARD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) would also be pleased to be recognized before the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) speaks. If the gentleman would be willing to yield to him for 5 minutes, I will ask then for a 5-minute special order myself and yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD).

Mr. PACKARD. That will be fine.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, this has been a very enjoyable evening. I think there have been many great things said about a very great man.

Years ago, in 1982, my father-in-law, in one of his visits, said that he had been asked to help a great man in his Congressional District to run a write-in campaign for Congress. That man was RON PACKARD.

Whenever my father-in-law would visit, he would tell us stories of what they were doing and how they were preparing for the campaign. I knew not much about the Congress and knew nothing about running a campaign for Congress, and so I was not as impressed as I should have been.

Now, having run a campaign and been elected to Congress, I know that it is impossible to win on a write-in. I wish my father-in-law were still alive, and I could tell him how great a job I think he did in helping elect such a great man as RON PACKARD to Congress.

RON is in stature shorter than I am, but he is a man that I always look up to. There have been a couple of stories told about how tight he is with a penny or a dime. I think that if one knew his background one would understand why the story told about how he was raised with 16 brothers and sisters and how every penny, every dime counted I think is really important. It is reflected in one story that I have heard RON tell that I think shows how important money was to him and to his family as they were growing up.

His family had a .22 and a shotgun, and it was very expensive for them. It was hard for them to buy ammunition. But he tells of a story one time that he and his brother went out hunting ducks, and they had to wait till the ducks got in a line because they had to get as many as they could with one shot.

The one brother shot as many as he could when they got in line with the .22. Then, as the rest of the ducks took off, the second brother shot with the shotgun. Then they went around and gathered up all the ducks. They got 23 with one .22 shell and one shotgun shell.

The meat was important. The feathers were important for their pillows and their quilts. They used every bit of those 23 ducks. Life was not easy for them in Meridian, Idaho. But they did great things with their lives.

We have heard lots of stories about RON and his family. I know some of his brothers. I know what great people they are. There are so many things that we can learn from this great man.

He and I are from the same faith, and we believe the words of a prophet that lived many years ago that said, ''whatever you achieve outside the home is not as important as what you achieve within the home.'' RON has done a great thing both within and without the home, but he has never forgotten his family.

Now, as he retires, he is going back to live in San Diego by other members of his family. We will miss him here but know that he will continue to do great things as he has throughout his life.

□ 2030

I am very fortunate to call this great man a friend.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE RON PACKARD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I come tonight because I think it is a testament of any Member of this House when someone on the other side drops what they are doing to come and speak favorably on the departure of a Member. I have come tonight because RON PACKARD is a friend of mine, one whom I admire immensely.

When I came to this House, I began to serve on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. There were a lot of times when I was not quite clear as to what I would do in terms of asking for more funding for California, but then I met a man who was from California who knew exactly what I should be doing and how I should do it. That man was RON PACKARD.

RON PACKARD represents the best in all of us in this House, whether we are a Republican or a Democrat, because he simply puts his hands out to give advice when one who was a freshman sought that advice. He made me feel quite welcome to come to him and comfortable to come to him and to seek that advice. I remember one time when I was asking for perhaps more money than I should have for California, and he simply said, let us get together and see what we can do to work this out.

I will always have fond memories of RON PACKARD. And as he leaves this House to go and be with his family and children and grandchildren, I know that he will look back upon this House with fond memories, but we want him to leave knowing that he had friends on both sides of this aisle who not only recognized his experience and his expertise on transportation and appropriation issues but also recognized his friendship, his putting his hands out to both those across the aisle as well as those who worked directly with him on the Republican side.

We wish the very best for RON as he goes back to California. I know he will not miss the traveling, coming back and forth from California, but I hope he will miss us as his friends, because we certainly will miss him and all of the great things that he has done to make the people of California feel proud of him and to make this Nation feel proud of him. I am happy to call him my friend.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our colleague, Mr. PACKARD, of California for the many years of service and dedication he has given to this body and to the American people.

Mr. PACKARD is retiring from this House after 18 years, and during these years we have served together on the House Appropriations Committee. He has risen in service to Chair one of our most important subcommittees, and he has displayed outstanding leadership for the nation in this capacity. Water resources and energy resources are vitally important to the quality of life for our citizens, and RON's leadership has moved the U.S. to new levels of achievement in addressing those needs. The confidence of those he represents was well exemplified by the fact that RON was only one of four in the history of our nation who was elected by a write-in vote.

RON, I join your many friends in the House in wishing you and Jean years of happiness and good health.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California Representative RON PACKARD, Chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee on Appropriations. I am proud to recognize the gentleman for this accomplishments and wish him continued success as he retires from the United States Congress.

I have had the honor and pleasure to serve with Chairman PACKARD in the Appropriations Committee and I can tell you from personal experience that he is one of the hardest working and most effective members of Congress.

As Chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee on Appropriations, he has done an extraordinary job of balancing the national and regional needs; and has always been a good steward of federal funds. He is a leader who has proven he can get things done.

He is a strong friend of Florida and a great American. I thank him for the continued support in working with me on various projects in my City of Miami and my state of Florida. I know I speak for Members on both sides of the aisle, when I say that Chairman Packard's calm judgement, strong leadership, unfailing courtesy and good humor have been truly appreciated in our deliberations and will be sorely missed.

Chairman PACKARD was first elected to Congress in 1982 by a write-in vote, becoming only the fourth successful write-in candidate for Congress in the history of the United States. Prior to his election to Congress, he served four years as mayor of Carlsbad, California, in the district he now represents. A dentist by education and profession, he was always active in civic affairs and public service.

Chairman PACKARD, you can be very proud of your accomplishments here and in the imprint that you have made in this institution and on the nation. I wish you the very best in the new challenges you undertake.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman's PACKARD's retirement is a loss to this institution, to his colleagues and in particular to his constituents. He will be remembered for his commitment and leadership. The people of California's 48th Congressional District will miss him, and so will we.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues from the California delegation in congratulating Congressman RON PACKARD on his retirement after serving the people of Southern California for over 20 years. I would like to take a moment to honor him and his record of service to California and the United States. Congressman PACKARD began his long career of public service as a trustee of the Carlsbad Unified School District. After serving on the Carlsbad City Council, and later as Mayor of Carlsbad, RON was elected to the House of Representatives from California's 48th District. In his first election to the House, he was only the fourth successful write-in candidate in U.S. history.

The citizens of Orange County, San Diego County and Riverside County, who placed his name on that first ballot, returned RON PACKARD to the House eight more times. I join the other members of the San Diego delegation in recognizing that the people of his district, of Southern California, and of the United States have been well served by his exemplary career.

As Chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee on Appropriations, Chairman of the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee, and Chairman of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, RON PACKARD was a model of bipartisan leadership. He always worked with Members on both sides of the aisle in a fair and balanced manner to bring important legislation to a successful conclusion. He represents how one can be a friendly and helpful person even to those, like myself, with whom he disagreed on most policy issues.

RON, as you look toward the future and a well-deserved retirement, the people of Southern California and your colleagues from the California delegation thank you for your fine example and wish you and your wife, Jeanne, the best of luck.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my great privilege to serve in this body for the last eighteen years with my California colleague, RON PACKARD, and on the Appropriations Committee for the last eight. I also served on the Military Construction Subcommittee when he was its chairman and with him on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

I have very much enjoyed his friendship, our common interest in the great game of golf (at which he is very proficient, and I am, unfortunately, not very), as well as the opportunity to work with him on matters of mutual interest. He has always been fair, courteous, and forthcoming in all our dealings, a man of impeccable honesty and integrity, and the kind of representative for his constituents that does this body proud.

While we have our differences philosophically—for example, on voluntary family planning—I respect his commitments to his core beliefs. People of good will in our system can always hold differing convictions so long as they are mutually respected.

I wish RON and his wife, Jean, a rich and full and enjoyable life in retirement, the joys of his wonderful family, and, of course, lots of superlative rounds on his favorite courses.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE RON PACKARD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD).

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) for yielding to me.

I am overwhelmed by my colleagues and the generous, kind things that they have said. I have had the privilege to serve in Congress for 18 years now. I shall be eternally grateful to my constituents, the voters of my district, in San Diego County, Orange County, and Riverside County for allowing me to represent them here in Congress. To participate in the greatest legislative body in the world is a privilege that only a few have experienced, and I have been blessed beyond measure with that privilege.

When I first came to Congress, there were several major goals that I had hoped we could achieve together in our government. We were awash in deficit spending, adding to the national debt between $200 billion and $400 billion a year. I wanted to see our government live within its revenues and balance its budget. I wanted to restructure the entitlements of welfare and Medicare and Social Security. I wanted to reduce the heavy tax burden of our taxpayers. I wanted to strengthen our defense. I wanted to reduce the size of government and make it more efficient and more effective.

Who could have dreamed 18 years ago that we would be able, Republicans and Democrats together, to accomplish these remarkable goals? It has been a great time to serve in the House of Representatives. The opportunity to serve with each Member of Congress has been a wonderful treat, both sides of the aisle. I have not found it any more difficult to love and appreciate my Democratic friends than my Republican friends.

To work with a competent and loyal staff has been a great privilege. I have had great staff members throughout my career.

To serve with President Reagan and President Bush and, yes, with President Clinton, has been a very memorable experience for me.

I sincerely appreciate the kind and generous remarks of my colleagues from California and from all the other States that have been here. I love them dearly.

Lastly, I must express my deep love and admiration that I have for my wife, Jean. This job is particularly difficult for spouses and for family members. No Member of Congress could enjoy love and support and devotion more than I have from my wonderful wife and family. I am so fortunate.

I love what I do in this hallowed Chamber. I love America. I will miss dearly my colleagues, my constituents, my staff. I will miss the work. I love what we do here. I will not miss the uncertain schedule. I will not miss the fund-raising nor the campaigning. I will not miss the regular traveling from coast to coast. But I have learned that there are only three ways to leave this place, and two of them are real bad. I am leaving the right way, at the top of my career.

I am a praying man. I pray every day. And I will pray daily for all of my colleagues who continue this great work and service in this great deliberative body. I will miss you all very dearly. I love you and I love the work. I bid you a very fond farewell.

I want to thank those that put together this most memorable hour together. I deeply appreciate my colleagues, all of you. Thank you very, very much.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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, this evening I am going to be joined with some of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle to discuss health care and what we believe should be done in the waning days of this Congress. Unfortunately, most of what we are about to discuss is part of the unfinished agenda here which I have been somewhat critical of the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives for because these health care issues have not been resolved; yet they

are very important to the average American.

When I talk about health care concerns, I believe that they are the Nation's number one priority right now. They concern matters that affect the daily lives of our constituents and which I think, if they were resolved and if they were attended to by the Republican leadership and passed and sent to the President in legislative form, would actually make a difference in people's lives. So for that reason I regret that on the issues such as prescription drugs for seniors under Medicare, HMO reform, and also increasing access to health care for those who are uninsured this Congress really has not accomplished much.

I do not really expect much to be accomplished in the next few days that we are here, but I do think it is unfortunate that the Republican leadership has so far, and has over the 2 years, refused to address these issues in a meaningful way.

I just wanted to summarize, if I could, and put them also in the context of the presidential debate, because I think that health care policy has really been one of the defining issues in the context of the presidential debate and the presidential campaign.

Let me mention first the issue of prescription drugs. We know that our senior citizens and the disabled, people who currently are eligible for Medicare, many of them do not have access to prescription drugs because it is not a basic benefit under the Medicare program. What the Democrats have been saying is that we would like it to be a basic Medicare benefit. We would like it to be included under the rubric of the Medicare program because we know that Medicare has been very successful in addressing the problems of hospital care, the need for hospital care and the need for physicians' care.

If a person now reaches the age of 65 or is eligible because they are disabled, they do get their hospital insurance taken care of under Medicare. And if they pay a certain amount a month, about $40 or so per month, then they have also their physician's care taken care of. But that is not the case with prescription drugs. Some seniors are able to get a prescription drug benefit if they are fortunate enough to have an HMO in their area that may cover it in some way. But that is not the majority.

Some senior citizens outside of Medicare are able to get coverage because they have it as part of an employer retirement plan or maybe they are eligible for veterans benefits as part of the Federal Government; but generally most seniors do not get either adequate prescription drug coverage or, in many cases, no prescription drug coverage at all.

Basically, using the example of Medicare part B for physician's care, what the Democrats have been saying and what Vice President GORE has been saying is that we will establish a new part D, for example, under Medicare. And just like with part B for the physician's care, seniors would pay so much per month. It would probably start as little as $25 a month; but as the benefits increase, it might get to be more. They would then get a certain prescription drug benefit that would be guaranteed, which would make it possible for them to simply go to their local pharmacy, and it would be covered. They would have a choice of a pharmacy to go to, and any prescription drug that is recommended by their physician or by the pharmacist as medically necessary would be covered.

Very simple concept, really. No magic here. It is simply included under the Medicare program. Well, the Republican leadership and the Republican presidential candidate, Governor Bush, do not like this. I think, frankly, though they may not admit it, that they do not like Medicare very much, and they do not like the idea of a public program like Medicare including prescription drugs. So what they propose I call a voucher. Basically, they say they are going to give a certain amount of money in the form of a subsidy or a voucher to seniors who are below a certain income, not the majority of seniors, but just those who are below a certain income. Those seniors can take this voucher, and they can go out in the private marketplace to see if they can find an HMO or some other kind of insurance plan that will cover them.

There are a lot of problems with that. First of all, it is not under Medicare, so it is not going to be universal. Most seniors would not be able to take advantage of it. In addition to that, with the exception of the HMOs, they are probably not able to buy a prescription drug policy. Most insurance companies do not sell prescription drug policies. So they may be able to get it through an HMO, but we know what the problems are with HMOs. We do not know how much the deductible is going to be; we do not know how much the copayment is going to be. We do not know whether all drugs will be covered. A lot of problems and a lot of inability, I would say ultimately, to get a good insurance program that covers prescription drugs.

So I would suggest that this Republican proposal and the one that comes from Governor Bush is not realistic. It is not something that is going to help most seniors. But even so, basically they have not paid a lot of attention to it here in the House of Representatives. They talked about it at one time, but that was it. There has not really been any movement to get this accomplished. That is unfortunate, because our seniors are crying out for an answer on the issue of prescription drugs.

Now, on a second issue, and that is the issue of HMO reform, once again the Democrats, and if we listened to the last debate, Vice President GORE was very specific that what we need in order to cure the abuses in the HMO system is the Patients' Bill of Rights, the Norwood-Dingell bill that was passed by the House of Representatives, mostly with Democratic votes but with some Republican support.

I will not get into all the details of the Patients' Bill of Rights, but basically it changes a lot of things that exist under current law in terms of the abuses we face with HMOs. Right now, the decision about what kind of medical care a person gets, whether that person gets a particular operation, how many days they stay in the hospital, what kind of equipment they get, these decisions are made by the insurance company, and many times without the patient's input or without the doctor's input. That is what leads to abuses.

HMOs deny care. People do not really have a way to redress their grievances because if they have to appeal the decision of the HMO, usually it is to the HMO itself, and they, of course, deny it again.

□ 2045

What the Democrats have been saying with the patients' bill of rights, with the support of a minority of Republicans but not with the Republican leadership, is that we have been saying that we want to make sure that decisions about what kind of care they get, what is medically necessary, are made by the physician and the patient, not by the insurance company. That is what the patients' bill of rights says.

And secondly, it says that if the HMO denies them care that they think they should have or that they need, then they have a legitimate way of redressing their grievance by going into an outside board that is independent of the HMO, or, failing that, they have the right to go to court and bring suit, which is not possible now for most people who are in HMOs.

Well, if we listen to the third debate, Governor Bush said that he was in favor of HMO reform. But then when we look at his record in Texas, on one occasion when something like the patients' bill of rights came to his desk, he vetoed it. And then on another occasion when it came to his desk he basically was told, if you veto it again, we will override your veto, we have the votes in the legislature to override; and so, he let it become law without his signature, basically protesting it but indicating that he could not do anything about it because if he did veto it, it was going to be sustained anyway.

So we do not have much support here. We have a Presidential candidate on the Republican side that basically opposed HMO reform as Governor. And then we have a Republican leadership that still reluctantly allowed the patients' bill of rights to come to the floor of the House and it passed, but the Senate is holding it up and the Republican leadership continues to oppose it here in the House of Representatives.

The last major issue, and there are others but I want to get to my colleagues, the last major issue with regard to health care reform that faces

many Americans is that many Americans, something like 44 million Americans right now, simply have no health insurance. They are not covered through their employer. They are not eligible for Medicaid because they are working and their income is a little too high and they cannot afford to go out in the private market and buy their own health insurance.

Well, the Democrats have been saying, let us try to solve that problem. We solved it to some extent in a significant way with children, which was the largest of this 44 million who did not have insurance. We passed the CHIP bill, and we gave money to the States so they could sign up kids for a health insurance program for the children of working parents. And that has been successful in probably signing up about half the children around the country that were previously uninsured.

But again, when it came to Governor Bush, he said that, although he was getting the money from the Federal Government, he wanted to keep the income levels for the kids' care program, for the CHIP program fairly low. And he had originally proposed, I think, 150 percent of poverty, and it took the Texas legislature basically to insist that the eligibility requirements be higher than that. And for a long time, essentially, he made it difficult for the CHIP program, for the Children's Health Insurance Program, to be implemented in the State of Texas in a way that would be helpful to more and more children.

Now, what the Democrats have been saying and what Vice President GORE has been saying is we want to expand the eligibility for this CHIP program to even higher incomes, maybe 250 percent of poverty. And at the same time, the Vice President and the Democrats have been saying we want to address the problem with the adults who are uninsured, so let us let the parents of the kids who are in the CHIP program enroll in the CHIP program as well so that they are insured. It certainly makes a lot of sense. But again, we do not see the Republicans supporting that initiative or taking any action here in the House of Representatives to address that concern.

Lastly, the other large group of people that we know are uninsured are the near elderly, the people between 55 and 65 that are not eligible for Medicare but who often lose their job or take early retirement and find themselves or their spouse without health insurance.

President Clinton and Vice President GORE and the Democrats have been advocating that those near elderly be able to buy into Medicare for maybe $300 or $400 a month, and again we have seen opposition from the Republican leadership and the unwillingness to bring this up in committee or on the floor of the House.

So whether it is the issue of access and covering the uninsured, whether it is the issue of HMO reform, or whether it is the issue of prescription drugs, over and over again the Democrats have put forward proposals supported by the Vice President which have been opposed or scuttled, if you will, by the Republicans and again not supported by their Presidential candidate, Governor Bush.

We are only pointing out the facts here tonight. I am joined by a number of my colleagues who would like to address this issue.

First, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) who also happens to be a physician.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) said, the big issues that remain before us as we come close to the end of the 106th Congress are the same ones that we have not been able to get the Republican leadership of this body to adequately address through several Congresses, not just this one, education and health care.

Last week I was able to join some of my colleagues to call for passage of our education agenda. But tonight I want to join my colleague in talking about health care.

A few weeks ago, I joined Senator BYRON DORGAN of North Dakota, along with the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) and others at a hearing in the other body to call on their leadership to bring the patients' bill of rights to the floor for a vote and to pass it. To date nothing has happened. That is despite the testimony of patients, of a mother who lost her daughter because she was denied the test and care that she needed, the testimony of health care professionals who said how their professional judgment and their values were daily compromised by having to work under the current managed care system.

The system has to be reformed to allow doctors and other providers to make decisions in consultation with their patients on what medical tests and care is indicated in each instance, to have the system better respond to the needs of patients for access to emergency services and specialists, and to make those who are making decisions on health care to be accountable for those decisions.

People all over this country are dissatisfied with managed care. They want the system revamped. They want a patients' bill of rights. The Vice President is poised to make that happen and we, their Representatives, need to respond.

I want to spend the rest of my time on the Medicare give-backs that are being proposed as a remedy for the cuts that took place in the Balanced Budget Amendment of 1997. It is important that, in this measure, the one that is proposed, those who are on the front lines providing health care to those in need be treated fairly and be given precedence since they are the ones who have suffered the most along with the patients who rely on them for service.

In my district, our only private home care agency was forced to close and our public health agency forced to cut back because of the cuts that were imposed in BBA 1997. This is a situation that has been repeated in towns, cities and rural areas around the country. Our hospitals and nursing homes in the Virgin Islands are lucky to still be open, although it has been a struggle to continue to provide care. Others have had to close their doors.

I want to say to the Nation's hospitals, do not accept the Trojan Horse that is being offered to you. The recommendation as it now stands is wrong. Do not let us be picked off one by one and pitted against each other. We can all win if we stand together on this issue.

As a doctor, I know how difficult it is to meet overhead costs and to keep providing services when the fees keep getting smaller. Our expenses and our operating overhead are not going down. They are going up. Our patients need, at the very least, the same level of care, and they deserve to have their needs met.

I resent the fact that the Republican leadership wants to give HMOs any part of that give-back. For what? They promise nothing in return. They have left Medicare patients, our elderly, stranded because they could not make the desired profit. They are holding out their hands for more money now, and they are not even being made to increase the service to the special population.

For too long, HMOs have been allowed to take the care out of ''health care,'' and we say enough is enough. We need to give the dollars back to the providers of health care, to the doctors and nursing homes, hospitals and home health care agencies. The people of this country deserve the full range of health services, and giving our providers fair reimbursements and helping them to stay in business makes that possible. We in the Democratic Caucus say give the money to those who care, give it to the providers, not to the HMOs.

I must also mention an issue that is important to my district. That is the increases in Medicaid that the administration is seeking and the redistribution of the Children's Health Insurance Program funds that are not used by the States. In my district and the other territories, we have a cap on our Medicaid dollars; and we receive CHIP funds under a formula which does not allow us to provide the level or the scope of health care that our residents need. With our cap, we are unable to provide Medicaid to people even at the poverty level. So we have a large gap between those who are covered by Medicaid and the uninsured.

The Journal of the American Medical Association today reported a study on uninsured adults showing that when

they are uninsured they are just not able to access any care, they go without even preventive services. And Sanda Adamson Fryhofer, the President of the American College of Physicians American Society of Internal Medicine, which funded this study, is quoted as saying, ''Studies such as this one,'' the one on the uninsured adults, ''prove that living without insurance,'' which many of the people in my district do and have done for years, ''is a serious health risk that needs to be treated with the same sense of urgency as not wearing seatbelts or drunken driving.''

In my district, close to one-third of the children are estimated to be uninsured. Kids count. The Community Foundation of the Virgin Islands recently released a report that showed that 41 percent of our children live in poverty, twice the national rate, and that deaths among Virgin Islands children under 14 are also nearly twice the national rate.

Health care is a right for all, not a privilege for the few. We have to get that straight before we adjourn and leave for this election.

This means passing a meaningful patients' bill of rights. It means adding prescription drug coverage to Medicare. It means making up for the damage we have done to hospitals, home health agencies, nursing homes, doctors and other providers with the cuts in 1997. And it means making CHIP and Medicaid fair and equitable to all Americans.

In closing, I want to take this opportunity because some of my colleagues will be on the floor later to pay tribute to another of our colleagues. I want to wish the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND) well and thank him for his service to our class in the Congress. I want to especially thank him for the interest and help in the national park and other issues in my district. And although we hate to see him leave this body, it is good to know that they will be able to count on his able leadership in the other body. He will make a great Senator from Rhode Island. We thank him for his service.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, we all respect and know the profession of the gentlewoman as being a physician. And she certainly has outlined here tonight some issues that I know are something that we are all very concerned about. Most of them deal with the choices that our constituents and the profession that she also represents feel is so important in the health and the welfare of our citizens in the country.

I want to ask the gentlewoman a question because I think it does go to the issue of the Medicare prescription drug benefit.

I am going to talk a little bit about a report that was just released that was done to look at the prescription drug coverage. And the loss of prescription drug coverage in Florida has gone from something like 26 percent to 41 percent within just 2 years for our senior population.

In the estimation of the gentlewoman, and particularly as we look at the buy-back bill that we are talking about on the Medicare, on the home health care agencies and hospitals and other things, in her professional career, would the gentlewoman agree that because of the hardship that people face in buying prescription drugs, and in fact we know that they are not taking the medicines as they have been prescribed, they are cutting them in half, they are taking them a different day, they are giving us the excuses that they want to make sure their spouse has them instead of them. What does the gentlewoman believe is not number-wise but just the cost to this country in medical expenses that we are having to pay for because people are not taking the life-saving medicines that they need to be taking on a regular basis?

□ 2100

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I cannot give you a specific number as you asked, but I know that it is multiplied severalfold because of the inability to take the drugs. For example, we know that if someone is able to take their hypertensive medication or their diabetic medication and maintain their hypertension or diabetes within the normal range, they can expect to live a normal life span and avoid the complications which put them into the hospital and greatly increase the cost of medical services. If we focus on prevention in health care instead of worrying about the cutting costs, if we focus on prevention, we will cut the costs of health care in this country.

Mrs. THURMAN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. PALLONE. I think that that is a very good point. The point is that a lot of these preventative measures, particularly including prescription drugs, although initially there is a cost to the government and we know a rather large cost over the long term it may save costs in hospitalization and other kinds of nursing home care and institutionalization. It is a very good point.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Absolutely.

Mr. PALLONE. Also I wanted to mention, it has to be so difficult as a physician with these HMOs when a decision is made that you think is not in the best interests of the patient. I imagine you go through that many times and this is really sad.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I was fortunate that I was in a fee for service. But if you listen to the doctors who came to the Senate a few weeks ago, they talked about the fact that they just in good conscience sometimes had to just take the risk of going against the HMO's decision because they just could not deny an examination that they felt was needed for a patient. The testimony of the mother whose daughter's name is the same as mine, Donna Marie, who died because she did not have the appropriate test was a testimony to that. We took an oath. To make some of the decisions that the HMOs place on us goes against the oath that we took as physicians.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank you for joining us this evening and for all that you have done as part of our health care task force and drawing attention to this issue as well.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I think that this could not be a better discussion, but it is a distressing discussion. And I believe that the dialogue between my good friend the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is an important one as it relates to the human factor.

I would like to yield to a moment to the gentleman from New Jersey because I was getting ready to recount and take our historical journey back to how long we have actually been discussing the patients' bill of rights. I know we are discussing sort of a whole purview; and I have so many burning issues as relates to health care. And in Texas, right now, I am facing the catastrophe of HMOs closing up shop; and, of course, they would argue there is no money. And I would argue my seniors are left with distress and inability to be served. So we have to find a solution. Part of that solution was the patients' bill of rights.

As my memory seems to serve me, it looks as if as I came to Congress, and I came in the 104th Congress which was in 1995, I remember beginning the debate on the patients' bill of rights. I would simply like to yield to the gentleman so we all can understand where we are with the numbers of Members who signed up on the legislation, I think there are 280 plus, why we have not passed it.

My recollection, the bill was named Norwood-Dingell, that is a Republican and a Democrat. I remember physicians from both sides of the aisle coming to the floor pleading for that particular version to be passed. Might I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey to tell us where we are and why we are in this predicament at this point.

Mr. PALLONE. Basically as I think you remember, when we tried to bring up the patients' bill of rights, we were opposed by the Republican leadership; and we actually were only able to get it up because almost a majority of the House signed a discharge petition, including some Republicans. And as it got close to that magic 218 they decided we better bring it up, otherwise it is going to be discharged to the floor without the leadership's support.

But even when it passed the House, the Republican leadership made it clear that they opposed the bill because when we had the conference with

the Senate every one of the conferees they appointed on the Republican side with one exception voted against the bill. I am one of the conferees. When we went to the conference, not surprisingly the majority of the Members there between the Senate and the House were against the Norwood-Dingell bill.

My colleague from Arkansas knows that that is a fact because he has also been part of the conference. I think the conference met officially once and then there were some smaller meetings after that, but the Republican leadership in the House and clearly the Republican leadership in the Senate made it quite clear that they were not willing to support the Norwood-Dingell bill and essentially scuttled the whole effort. It is nowhere now. The conference has not met in months. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. THURMAN. What you are actually saying to us tonight and obviously I have been here, too, but sometimes I think we need to make these points very clear, because I think quite frankly that the American public is tired of people who have not been trained as physicians making decisions, that this House, in a fairly good vote, a bipartisan vote, Democrats and Republicans coming together, a consensus, believing that the patients' bill of rights that would allow the choices, the decision making to return to physicians was passed. And if I remember correctly, there were actually instructions on this floor even after the conferees had been chosen that we said in again a bipartisan fashion that we asked for the conferees to at least be Members who had voted with the majority of the membership of this House, the people's House. They said to us, put the conferees on that believe as we do. And that passed.

Mr. PALLONE. That is correct. I would say even further that it is quite obvious from the composition of the Senate right now that if the bill were brought to the floor of the Senate and we just did not have a conference, just took the House bill and sent it over to the Senate and brought it up on the floor of the Senate, the votes would be there to pass it. So it is the Republican leadership in both Houses that is preventing this from happening even when we certainly had a majority here and probably even have the majority in the Senate to pass it.

Mrs. THURMAN. So it is those who control the agenda today, the Republican leadership, that is blocking not only the will of the House of Representatives but the majority of the people in this country's ability to have health care delivered by their doctors and not by untrained people.

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely. I do not think there is any question that if there were a vote once again here or a vote in the Senate that this would pass, would go to the President and be signed into law.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I might add a third component because I think the third component is most onerous and slightly evil if I might use that terminology and that is, of course, the special interests, that has this legislation frozen, literally frozen, and that is insurance companies.

We have given them very nice names, HMOs, which are health maintenance organizations, but they are, in fact, insurance companies that are frightened beyond their expectations of what will happen if you restore to that really sacred relationship the patient and the physician assessing their particular status. I would like to just explore that, because that is why I believe it is so important that we move the Nation's health agenda along, and, that is, because people are not being served well by the HMO/insurance dominance.

I just wish to take you back to a very moving moment on the floor of the House by our colleague from Iowa, a physician from the other side of the aisle, brought in, I believe what was a quadruple amputee, I think all of us saw that and there was certainly a lot of debate about that young boy.

He was one of the most pleasant children that any of us have had a chance maybe to encounter, but it was not a pleasant experience. And he was here for what I think was a moment of drama that was necessary, and I am appreciative of it. Because when we heard the story of this little boy that in fact his parents after the tragic accident, I think they were camping, I think that what happened is that he got a rusty nail or some accident while they were camping and they rushed him to the hospital, to the nearest hospital emergency room and were told, your HMO does not cover you here.

The delay which required them to go some 50 miles away caused this little boy to have enormous reaction, I do not want to misplace the story, it might have been gangrene, but it resulted in him being a quadruple amputee, meaning hands and feet.

I think these are the kinds of stories that are not to be taken lightly nor are they only to suggest that we are creating an atmosphere of crisis. This is what is happening to Americans day by day, week by week and month by month and maybe even hour and minute and second. I believe the longer that we frustrate this system by not pushing forward the patients' bill of rights, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for giving the procedural structure as we have now, conference to those who do not understand is where you are supposed to come together, people of reasonable minds, and say how can we work this out.

It is well known that your conference was an opportunity for obstruction and that really what could happen is come to the floor of the House, and we could have this passed. I want to just move quickly to that obstruction, the patients' bill of rights, and then this clear choice on the prescription drug benefit. All of us have been part of that.

I see the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) on the floor. I come from the State of Texas. Frankly I can say that we have a record that is not one to be proud of. But we certainly appreciate the fact that we have a situation where we can explain the difference between the plan that AL GORE has and the plan that we have been pushing here in the House as Democrats and what the Republicans with George Bush at the helm are trying to push on us.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, knowing that the gentlewoman is from Texas, I would be interested to know what her experience with the Governor has been in Texas on a patients' bill of rights.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. The gentleman raises a very interesting question because I have certainly been confused by the debates that have occurred and the explanation that the Governor has given. I think it is well known that the Governor did not sign a real patients' bill of rights. In fact, the one that is now being emulated here in this Congress which has been cited as a Texas bill really was passed without his signature. It came to his desk, and we have a procedure in the State of Texas where if you do not sign it, it becomes law. So in actuality, there are Members in this body, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for one and other Members who are not in this body who are now still State legislators who were the moving forces behind the patients bill of rights. But it was never signed by the Governor.

And so even as we argued in committee, in the Committee on the Judiciary, in the Committee on Commerce about the patients' bill of rights and we cited the Texas bill, it is a Texas bill but it was never signed. One of the reasons that it was not signed, and I cannot read the minds of the leadership at that time of our State, the Governor but certainly there was some argument about special interests who were still opposing it because it did give the right of the aggrieved person, the person who lost a loved one, the right to sue.

I just want to say something about that because you do not hear anyone raising their voices about that other than those who are continually denying service, because everyone knows patient and physician, no one who is dealing with health care and the life or death of a loved one is eager to rush to the courtroom. What they are eager to do is rush to the recovery room, because they want their loved one, they want to be well, they want their child to be well, they are not interested in playing out health care in the courtroom. And so it really is a minimal issue.

Mr. PALLONE. If I could ask the gentlewoman to yield a minute, I remember when we were discussing this at the time the patients' bill of rights passed, that I do not think there were more than a handful of cases since the

Texas law became law where anybody had gone to court. Less than five or so at the time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Absolutely. As we have seen, all of the testimony talks about the loss of my loved one and the fact that I would have wanted to have gotten the care from the physician as opposed to a denial of care. That is what we are on the floor to do.

Let me close my remarks by pointing out again about Texas, and I am glad my good colleague and neighbor from Arkansas pointed to distinctive differences between what we are debating on the floor of the House and what the Democratic caucus and a very large number of Members of the other side of the aisle are fighting against with the Republican leadership.

□ 2115

That is, again, pointing not only to the Patients' Bill of Rights, but this prescription drug benefit. And I just want to highlight, I have interpreted it this way. We now have to kind of say it is voluntary, because we hear the other side saying we want to force seniors into something. The only thing that we want to force seniors into is happiness, because we want seniors to be able to secure prescription drugs that they need and they can take the full amount, so that they are not choosing rent, they are not choosing food, and they are not choosing utilities over their full amount that the physician has prescribed.

What do I have in my offices? Seniors after seniors and letters after letters saying ''I cannot take the full complement of the prescription; I do not have the money.'' So what our plan, the many who have worked on this plan who will speak tonight about their plan and the plan, and what AL GORE is proposing is a mandatory guaranteed benefit. Let me say the term ''mandatory.'' It is under Medicare. It is mandatory that every senior does have a choice, but it is a guaranteed benefit under Medicare.

That makes a world of difference, because what it says is seniors can get the same low cost that local hospitals can and will not have to suffer the consequences of shooting up blood pressures from not taking their full prescription of blood pressure medicine, or their sugar going up because of the diabetes, which I hear so often from seniors.

The last point is on BBA 1997. We all tried to do the right thing. But it is interesting, we have been trying to fix it to ensure that we take care of our hospitals for a long time. Now, the tragedy is, I wish that for once we would have a bipartisan response to a problem that is hurting all of us. In rural communities, hospitals are closing. Urban communities, hospitals are closing. But yet we have a proposal on the table that does not answer the question of providing for the ones who are on the front lines, home health care centers, hospitals, and public hospitals.

So I hope that we can turn our attention to putting the right kind of legislation on the floor, because my public hospital system is watching. And I would hate to have to vote against this legislation because all of the money goes to HMOs. That is not keeping my public hospitals' doors open. That is not good health care. That is not preventive health care. That is not anything, because my hospitals, and when I say ''my hospitals,'' I am sure others will talk about their hospitals. But the Harris County Hospital District doors will still be in trouble if this legislation passes with a large sum of the relief going to HMOs.

Mr. Speaker, I frankly think we can do better by the American people, and I think the American people will demand of us that. We have a short period of time. I hope that we can put the focus of health care back in the hands of the people and not in special interests.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas. She points out the fact that this is affecting real people in their lives, and that is what is so crucial about this tonight.

I yield now to the gentleman from Arkansas, who is one of the conferees on this ill-fated Patients' Bill of Rights conference, unfortunately.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey and appreciate the leadership he has provided on this matter over the time that I have been in the House of Representatives. I appreciate our distinguished colleagues, especially the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), for the great job that she has done and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), and the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN). They have been working on these issues all the time we have been in the House, and I appreciate them very much.

The American public is outraged that we have not done anything in the 106th Congress on health care. Here we are 25 days into October, should have already finished the Congress' business and gone home. Yet we are here today because the Republican leadership has refused to deal even with the basic appropriations matters. We have not passed a prescription drug benefit for our seniors. We have not passed a Patients' Bill of Rights. We have, as the gentlewoman from Texas just referred to, hospitals and nursing homes closing almost daily now because of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 that needs to be repaired.

Our seniors that do not have medicine cannot wait until the 107th Congress. What are we expecting them to do? They cannot wait when they do not have medicine and do not have the money to buy it. Our citizens that do not have a Patients' Bill of Rights, and they are not getting the health care they need from their insurance companies, they cannot wait.

Our nursing homes and hospitals and providers, particularly in rural America, cannot wait. It is time that we did something. The Republican leadership in this Congress should do something tomorrow to rectify this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say it reminds me of the story of two men in the community where I grew up. One of them was named Dude and the other one's name was Possum. Now Possum could not see very well and he was getting on up in years and needed to go to Little Rock to the doctor about a hundred miles away, and Dude decided he would take him. So they got in the car and started to Little Rock, and they got to Little Rock and it was the first stop light that they encountered after traveling 100 miles and Dude came up to the stop light and slammed on his brakes. He sat there and waited until the light changed and then just floorboarded the automobile and roared off to the next stop light. When he came to it and it was red, he slammed on his brakes again. After doing that three or four times, Possum said, ''Dude, what in the world are you doing?'' And he said, ''I don't understand this.'' And Dude said, ''You know, an ignorant so-and-so irritates me. Can't you see I'm fighting the traffic?''

That is what the Republicans have been doing here for 2 years, is fighting the traffic. They are not getting anything done. They are slamming on their brakes, and they are stomping the accelerator. They are ripping and roaring and tearing around and declaring all of this great concern about America's health care, and the fact is they have not done anything and do not intend to.

It has been interesting to listen to Governor Bush talking about working in a bipartisan way. We are certainly willing to work with him. He better bring some new Republicans with him if he is going to get any cooperation. The Democrats are already there ready to pass a prescription drug benefit.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, he is eloquently crafting the whole scenario. But I do want to comment on the point of the Governor and his constant refrain about working with Democrats and Republicans in the State of Texas. The gentleman just hit on the point.

I think it should be made very clear that the last Patients' Bill of Rights, which is in fact almost a replica of what we have in the House for which we have bipartisan support, which was under legislative Democratic leadership in Texas, was a bill he could not bring himself to sign. And rather than fight it by a veto again, realizing that he could not get a sustained veto, he let it languish and it went into law.

So this refrain of working with Democrats and Republicans on health care is somewhat, I might say, hypocritical; and the gentleman from Arkansas has hit the nail on the head. I would simply say that a good thing he might be able to do in this time frame is to call this leadership here and ask

them to move forward on the Patients' Bill of Rights.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman from Texas makes a very good point. It is time that the Republican leadership in the Congress realizes what the American people want and do something about it. It is past time. Our seniors cannot afford to wait another day for prescription drug coverage, for our hospitals to get the money that they need, and for a Patients' Bill of Rights to be passed so that we have the ability for our doctors and patients to make the health care decisions that they are involved in; so that we can hold the insurance companies accountable in the event that they do cause some serious damage or injury to our loved ones.

It is unbelievable to me that one more Congress has already just about expired and nothing has happened. I continue to be amazed at this rhetoric that the Republicans put out every day: oh, we are for Patients' Bill of Rights. We are for prescription drug benefits for our senior citizens. We are for that 100 percent. The fact is they have been in control of this Congress since 1995 and have done absolutely nothing to move these issues forward.

As the gentleman from New Jersey explained a few minutes ago, we have done discharge petitions. We have done everything that we have; every tool that we have available to us has been used by the Democrats to try to get prescription drug coverage and a Patients' Bill of Rights and to change the Balanced Budget Act so that our health care providers, particularly in rural America, can stay in business, and yet nothing has happened. This is an abomination for this Congress to be this close to adjournment and still nothing has happened.

I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding me. I would like to follow up what he has been saying, because it is not just the Republican leadership here, though they certainly have not brought to the floor, they have not helped the process of passing a Patients' Bill of Rights or certainly not fought for our seniors.

But there is another group out there. The gentleman knows in the Fourth District in Arkansas, Citizens for Better Medicare is running television ads all across this country. Citizens for Better Medicare is a group, but it is not citizens, and they are not for better Medicare. Citizens for Better Medicare is funded by the pharmaceutical industry. And it is not the only organization that is funded by the pharmaceutical industry.

What they are doing is trying to go out and make heroes of those who have been fighting against a prescription drug benefit for seniors and to attack those who have been supporting a Medicare prescription drug benefit for seniors. The world is turned on its head and that little tag line under the TV ads which says ''Citizens for Better Medicare'' means that they are the pharmaceutical industry and they are going to do everything they can to stop seniors from getting a discount, stop seniors from getting a prescription drug benefit.

The Republican National Committee is doing the same thing, trying to confuse the American people. There is an ad being run by the RNC, and it says that the Gore plan would force people into a big government HMO. Not true. There is no such animal as a big government HMO. The HMOs are the folks, the private sector, they are the folks who are allowed by the Balanced Budget Act to come into Medicare and offer managed care to Medicare beneficiaries around the country.

My parents are two of the 1,700 people in Maine who are the last people to be covered by managed care under Medicare. And why? Because the managed care company could not make enough money in Maine, so they have pulled out. I will say one thing about Medicare. Medicare does not leave a State just because it is not making money. And the truth is if we are going to provide effective, reliable, voluntary prescription drug coverage for our seniors, it will only be through Medicare.

Just contrast George W. Bush's plan. This is a plan which he calls ''Immediate Helping Hand.'' It is not immediate, and it is not much help, because here is how it works. For the first 4 years, there is $48 billion that will go to 50 different States to run 50 different programs to help only those who are low income. What is low income? Those who are taking in $14,500 a year or less. A widow earning $15,000 a year on Medicare, they wait. They wait for 4 years. And after 4 years, what they get to do under the Bush plan is call up an HMO who is operating in their State and hope that maybe, just maybe they will be providing a prescription drug plan.

Now, the chances are slim that they will be, because one thing the health insurance industry has made clear is that they will not provide stand-alone prescription drug coverage, which is at the heart of the Republican effort in the House, the Republican effort in the Senate, and the George W. Bush plan. That is how the Republicans say they are going to provide for our seniors, through HMOs that are saying themselves that they do not want any part of this business.

□ 2130

It is a scandal.

Mrs. THURMAN. I would just ask a question, because we talk about in these numbers of poverty or somebody under $14,000, that is not after expenditures. That is what they get at the beginning of the year, or what their allocation would be, would be $14,500. So if you were somebody who was 70 years old and if we look at the average of what a senior takes in medicine, life-sustaining medicines, then they could pay anywhere between $4,000 to $5,000 a year, not on anything else, but just on medicines, dropping now their income to $9,000, $9,000 which they have to live on, after the medicine which allows them to live.

Mr. ALLEN. The point is a very good one. I was at an assisted living facility just 2 weeks ago and one of the women there said, you know, I am spending $700 a month for my prescription medication, and, she said, I hope you do something soon. It is very clear, she could not continue spending $700 a month very long.

Yet, under the Bush proposal, it is 4 years, you wait 4 years, if you are taking in more than $14,500 a year, and you wait, and then after 4 years you call up your HMO and hope that maybe they are offering a plan that today they say they will not offer under any circumstances.

There is another issue here that we have not talked about, that I find is very important in Maine, and I will bet it is true in Arkansas and Florida, and New Jersey as well. When I talk to small businessmen and women in Maine, they say to me now, we cannot afford the kind of health insurance that we used to buy. And what are they buying, if they are buying anything at all? They are buying catastrophic coverage only. They are basically getting health insurance, and they will wind up paying for the first $5,000 of their health care.

That is not health insurance as we know it. Under that system, there is no incentive, financial incentive, to do preventive care. That is basically the individual, small businessman and woman, carrying the burden of their own health care, and getting insured only for expenses over $5,000.

I just was noticing that this is an area where AL GORE's plan really makes a difference, because he creates a 25 percent tax credit for small businesses who are purchasing health insurance for workers, number one; number two, he allows those who are 55 to 65 years old to buy into Medicare; and, three, he provides access to coverage for all children by expanding the children's health insurance program to 250 percent of poverty and allowing a buy-in to the CHIP program for families with incomes above that level.

So, by focusing on small businesses, by focusing on children and by focusing on those people between 55 and 65, you are attempting to get to the place where we can expand coverage. It will happen, if it happens, because Democrats are willing to stand up and fight the HMO industry and fight the prescription drug industry, because these industries cannot do it, and in some cases will not do it.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate my colleague's comments. Let me just say, we have about 4 or 5 minutes left. I certainly will yield to any of my colleagues. The gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BERRY. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey again. One of the things that I wonder about is our Republican leadership here, as I have said, they have refused to pass a patients' bill of rights and a prescription drug benefit for our seniors, and I wonder how they are going to face these seniors and say, well, wait 4 more years. How are they going to face these seniors that are thrown into terrible situations and say, well, we did not do it, but we are going to. We are with you. We are going to do it some day. How are they going to face a little boy that has lost his limbs?

Mr. PALLONE. What I find is a lot of times they will try to address maybe the individual's problem who comes to their office and see what they can do to help, but the bottom line is that everyone is suffering from this. Everybody in an HMO has the potential, no matter how wealthy they are or what their situation in life is, where the insurance company comes along and says to them that you cannot have a particular procedure. I do not care what your situation is you find yourself in. I noticed people that are the head of the company, the CEO of the company, that has had that situation. So this is something that affects everybody. This is not just something that applies to a few people.

I think they just pretend like they are doing something about it and hope that people forget.

Mrs. THURMAN. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. We have been doing a lot of surveys and different studies across the country, and then in particular within our districts, by the governmental operations staff to look at the different costs of what it costs in the United States for medicine, what it costs in Canada and what it costs in Mexico.

Just recently we have also looked at another study which has been done through the State of Florida, and looked at the prescription drug coverage for Florida seniors. I found it very interesting, which just tells me this issue is getting more difficult because we are getting more seniors who are losing their coverage, and probably a lot because of the pullouts of our HMO-managed care, managed-choice program.

The survey collected during 1999 showed that 41 percent of the Medicare beneficiaries surveyed in Florida reported now that they had no prescription drug coverage, and in 1998 it was 29 percent of surveyed Florida seniors that reported that they did not have. So just 1 year later, we have already seen an increase to 41 percent. That is almost 50 percent of the population of seniors in the State of Florida.

It would seem to me, and what I am most saddened about is, that we leave the 106th Congress after debating, after recognizing the problem, still with no prescription drug benefit, no relief in sight, and for why not, I do not have the answer, and I do not know what to tell them at home. It is because they would not have accepted the bill that was passed on this House. They understand that to depend on the very same people who have left them out with managed care and insurance companies, it is unacceptable.

ISSUES AFFECTING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. I have come this evening, colleagues, first of all I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you. Of course, we are trying to wrap up the session. I have got several comments that I want to make this evening in regards to a great bill that passed today on the Sand Dunes of Colorado, making it a new national park. I want to comment a little about the Colorado canyons. I want to talk a little about the death tax and the marriage penalty. I have a full agenda.

But I have to tell you before I start this, I cannot allow this last hour to go unrebutted. Colleagues, as you know, there were no Republicans involved in the last hour of discussion. It was all Democrats. And the four Democrats, whom I respect as individuals, but professionally, let us call it what it is. All four of these are supporting AL GORE for the presidency, and there is nobody to stand up for George W. Bush.

The best way to criticize George W. Bush is to go out and frighten the senior citizens, throw out these scare tactics. I could not believe what I heard in the last few minutes; scare the senior citizens, tell them how terrible it is, George W. Bush, how terrible the Republican leadership is in the House of Representatives; tell them how nothing is ever going to get done.

That is not how we accomplish things around here. I have urged my colleagues on the Democratic side over there, join with us.

We had a panel, and my colleague knows this, we had a panel, a non-partisan panel, put together to save Medicare; nonpartisan, meaning we had Republicans and Democrats, and we had Republicans and Democrats who worked together. You know what? After a long, arduous journey, with lots of technical roadblocks to overcome, they came up with a good solid recommendation. And it was not the Republican leadership that rejected it in the House. The Senate leadership did not reject this. Who rejected it was the President. The President rejected the nonpartisan solution.

So where are we with this? When we talk about health care, when we have a nonpartisan coalition, Democrats and Republicans, who have come together for a solution, and that solution is rejected at the last minute by the administration, what do we have to do? We have to start at square one, and that is what is happening.

We have got to come up with a solution. We are not going to come up with a solution, and I say with due respect to my Democratic colleagues who spoke in the last hour, we are not going to accomplish it with scare tactics. Really, you may get some political advantage here in the next 2 weeks, but the fact is, in the long run, it does not serve anything to scare these people.

My parents are seniors out there too, and I know most of my colleagues out here have colleagues who are seniors. We do not want to scare them. Let us figure out a solution for them.

My rebuttal, these are my remarks, this is my rebuttal page. I want to go over a couple of these things they talked about.

You know, they talked about a solution. I am not sure what solution they are talking about, but it seems to me that the solution that they talk about, which is not the solution that the bipartisan panel came up with, the solution they talked about is to increase the size of the government responsibility in your health care. One-size-fits-all. One-size-fits-all.

In other words, you, citizen A, and you, citizen B, go to the same doctor, whether you like it or not, and here is how much you are going to get, regardless of what you think your needs are.

By the way, the government, I heard one of my colleagues, with due respect, one of my Democratic colleagues who spoke in the last hour, he said there is no such animal as a government-run health care HMO.

You know what? The largest health care system in the Nation is run by the United States Government. Medicare. Medicaid. Look at the Veterans system. And the worst run system in the United States is run by the United States Government, Medicare and Medicaid. And you are willing to stand up and say, increase the government's involvement in everybody's health care, have the government really run the program to provide health care for the people of America?

That is exactly what Hillary Clinton attempted to do. That is exactly what she attempted to do 8 years ago. But now what you are trying to do is piecemeal.

Look, be up front with the people that we represent. Tell them that on a piecemeal basis we are going to try and put a cloud on top of you called ''socialized health care.'' It means a lot bigger government. It means a system just like Medicare, that is run just as poorly as Medicare.

To my Democratic colleagues who like throwing scare tactics out, go talk to your local medical provider. Ask him what it is like to do business with Medicare. Just ask him. Ask him what it is like to do business with Medicaid. Go out there. I know this is true in the rural parts of the country, because I represent a rural part. Go out and ask rural doctors and rural hospitals, hey, is it a good deal doing business with

the government? How efficient is the government Medicare reimbursement system?

Ask them about it. Ask them how efficient the Medicare coding system is in our health care system that the government runs. And the response? You know what the response is going to be. It is terrible.

I have got doctors in my own district ready to stop taking Medicare patients. They are ready to stop taking them because it is such a hassle to deal with the government-run health care program.

Now, it is fundamentally unfair for anybody to stand up here and say that any colleague, whether they are Republicans or Democrats, that any colleague does not care about the health care of our seniors. That is nothing but an abused and overused scare tactic.

I am a Republican, obviously. I do not know one Democrat, I do not know one Democrat, even the Democrats that I have the most vigorous differences with, I do not know one Democrat who is opposed to some kind of health care, you know, wants to provide health care, wants to help our seniors or help all of our citizens. On the other hand, I do not know one Republican that is against helping our seniors, that is against trying to improve our health care system for all citizens.

So, for some of my colleagues to stand up here and say the Republican leadership is against the senior citizens, George W. Bush's plan is against them, come on, be fair about this.

Look, let us have a fair dispute. Let us have a fair debate on this floor. We can begin the debate by acknowledging that there are certain facts upon which we all agree. Everybody in these Chambers, everyone in these Chambers agrees that our health care system constantly needs to be revised.

□ 2145

We have to look for ways to improve prenatal care. We have to look for ways to make sure every woman gets a mammogram. We have to make sure our seniors have the kind of care so that they can afford prescription services. We all agree with that.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen a Congressman or Congresswoman in my career, never seen one, that stood up and said that they are against mammograms and we should not offer them. I have never seen a Congressman or Congresswoman in my career that stood up and said that they are against senior citizens and that they want them to have high prescription care services. I have never seen a Congressman or Congresswoman, Republican or Democrat, in any of these cases that says that they are against better health care for the citizens of the United States.

So to stand up here and have the audacity to say, well, the Republican leadership does not want health care for seniors, and George W. Bush does not care about seniors and there is no big government thing. Come on. That is not a fair shot. That is not a fair debate.

Look, we can take shots. We can take the shots, but my colleagues have other people listening to them. They have seniors listening to them and they can be scared. These people can be scared. That is exactly the same type of tactics we are seeing being used on Social Security. George W. Bush comes up and says we cannot exist with the current status quo. Oh sure, my generation can make it. The generation ahead of me can make it on the current status quo with Social Security. But what about the young people of this country, who, by the way, their contributions are funding our generation?

So we get these scare tactics thrown in. How are we ever going to have a government that can really come up with good solutions if we are going to have these scare tactics over and over again?

It was amazing to me that in this last hour, unrebutted, that my four colleagues from the Democratic sides, unrebutted, time after time after time, threw out scare tactics about the Republican Party. They never said one decent thing, not one decent thing about the Republicans. Never. They implied, no, they made it very clear. They did not imply, they made it very clear that Republicans do not want prescription services; they do not want to help the senior citizens; they do not want this; they do not want that; they help fund these TV advertisements, as if the Democratic party is never doing anything like that at exactly the same point in time.

Come on, we need a solution here, and to do it we have to work across the aisle. To do it we have to commit to each other, Republican to Democrat, Democrat to Republican that we will not begin the process with scare tactics. Darn right we can scare the senior citizens. And what my colleagues are trying to do is scare them to the ballot box instead of helping them to a solution. They are trying to scare them to the ballot box instead of helping them to a solution. That is wrong.

Those seniors out there, every citizen in America, those young people out there, those people without insurance, those people who have to pay $700 a month for prescription services, they are not looking to be scared to the polling booth. They are not looking to be scared into their vote. They are asking us, they are begging us to help them with a solution. After listening to this last hour of unrebutted statements and scare tactics, I want to say, look, calm down, come back and go to work with us, just like we did with the bipartisan commission.

Take a look at the Republicans and take a look at the Democrats that were on that bipartisan commission. This was not loaded with Republican leadership. This was not loaded with Democratic leadership. Neither party had a ringer in there. We had some very dedicated people who wanted to come up with a solution, who thought the best way to approach it was a committee with both parties involved in it, with people who were respected and knowledgeable on the subject. And that is exactly what occurred. Unfortunately, it was rejected at the last moment by President Clinton.

We did not use scare tactics in there. We came up with a solution. And that is the way this should be done. Come back, come to work with us. That is what we are asking our colleagues to do.

Now, let me move on for a few minutes. I want to talk about a good bipartisan effort that we had today, and it shows that bipartisanship can work. It shows that when we put aside the vigor of our party right before the election, we can work on something and we can come together and do something pretty darned fruitful. And that is what we did today. We created a new national park in this country. This national park is a diamond in the rough. It is a national park which will exist for thousands of generations to come. It is a national park that 200 years or 300 years from now people will look back upon our generation, just like we look back on the generation that created Yellowstone and Yosemite and places like that, and say that somebody was really thoughtful about this, somebody was smart enough to put this into a park and save it for future generations.

Today, on a strong bipartisan vote, we created a new national park, America's newest national park, and it is located in the State of Colorado. I would like to spend a little time tonight first of all thanking my colleagues for their bipartisan support. There was opposition to this, and I will go through some of the points that the opposition made, but first of all I want to give my colleagues some dynamics of where this park is located.

First, a little about the 3rd Congressional District of the State of Colorado. The 3rd Congressional District is here outlined in the blue, where my pointer is. To give my colleagues an idea, this is Colorado, that is Denver, Colorado, that is Colorado Springs, Colorado, and down here is Pueblo. This is a highway called I–25, which goes from Wyoming, up here, down to New Mexico.

The 3rd Congressional District is a very interesting district in our country. First of all, almost all of my colleagues vacation in this district. We have the world premier ski resorts in this district. This district is the highest district in the Nation in elevation. I like to joke about the 3rd Congressional District, and in good humor say that once you go out of the district of the 3rd, it is downhill from there. It is because we live in the highest place in the Nation. Our ski resorts, Aspen, Telluride, Beaver Creek, Steamboat, Durango, Grand Junction, Breckenridge, and I could just go on and on with these premier ski resorts, the Alpines, the Rocky Mountains, the 14,000-foot

peaks, the 56 mountains in Colorado, 54 of them in the 3rd Congressional District, over 14,000 feet.

It is a spectacular area of the country. It is also an area which has huge amounts of Federal land ownership. Take a look, for example, at our borders, then go east of our borders to the Atlantic Ocean. There is very little Federal land ownership. But go from our border in Colorado and come throughout this district and go on to the Pacific Ocean and there are tremendous amounts of Federal land ownership. So for those of us in the West, geographically, there is a dramatic difference in the West versus the East. One, in rainfall. It does not rain in the West like it does in the East. And number two, the location of Federal lands. Most, by far the majority, the greatest majority of Federal lands are located in the West. They are not located in the East.

So when we talk about Federal lands and what happens with Federal lands, there is very little pain felt in the East. The pain is all felt in the West. That is why we have heard people say ''the war on the West.'' A lot of times we in the West are concerned about people in the East dictating to us our life-style, which does not apply to them in the East because they do not have the Federal lands. So we have very fragile feelings because we are very dependent on a concept called multiple use. These lands of the Federal Government were created and originated with the idea of lands of many uses, many uses: environmental uses, park uses, transportation uses.

For example, in my district almost every power line, every road, every cable TV, all our water, many of our rivers, they all have to come across on Federal land; or the water is stored on Federal land or it originates on Federal land. The key to our life-style, just the survival of our life-style out there are these Federal lands. We take a lot of pride in them, and I think that was demonstrated today with the creation of this national park.

Now, the national park that I am going to talk about involves the Sand Dunes. We see here an arrow pointing where the Sand Dunes are. That is the Sand Dunes, the national park we have created. It is a big chunk. This district, for example, the 3rd Congressional District, geographically is larger than the State of Florida. It is larger than the State of Florida, just this congressional district that I am privileged to represent. Down here, tucked away, is something that is absolutely amazing. It is a unique situation of one. Nowhere else in the world do we find what I am about to show my colleagues, and that is what we today put into a national park.

Let me point it out. We call them the Great Sand Dunes. We call them the Great Sand Dunes. Take a look at this. Maybe my colleagues would like to look at this picture here and say, well, they are sand dunes. Amazing, but somebody must have painted in all these Alpine rocky peaks behind it, these 14,000-foot peaks. Somebody must have painted that in, because nowhere in the world would there be massive sand dunes tucked in between 14,000-foot Alpine peaks. Well, there is somewhere in the world. It is located right here in the Sand Dunes at Alamosa, Colorado.

There are a lot of dynamics to these sand dunes that the average person, in fact some of our opponents to this called it nothing. They said this was nothing but a pile of sand. Fortunately, 366 of my colleagues today were able to have a vision beyond the so-called pile of sand. They had the ability to realize the diamond we held in our hands was a lot more precious than the opponents realized it was. We had the vision to look into the future and say, my gosh, look at the ecosystem, look at the ecological system, the biological system, the environmental, the water resources, the wildlife resources. Look what is contained within this unique setting found nowhere else in the world.

These mountains are not painted in. That is the exact setting. We see these sand dunes. Take a look at the sand dunes in one month. By the way, a human being would be about, well, we could not even see it. It would be at the end of a pinpoint. Probably not even that. A little teeny, teeny dot on these sand dunes, to give an idea of how massive these sand dunes are. If we took a big semi-truck, it would look about like this little thing out here right here.

If we looked at these sand dunes a month from today, a month from today, they would be different. Someone might say, wait a minute, it does not look quite the way it looked a month ago, and it is not. These sand dunes are constantly changing. Nowhere else in the world do we have a stream, a mountain stream that runs in waves. It runs in waves and that is how it carries the sand. The stream dries up just about the same day every year, within the same period of time every year. The stream water all of a sudden disappears, and then what happens is the winds start to come in, and the winds at first are slow but they are dry.

As my colleagues know, in the West it is a dry climate. We are not a humid area. It is a dry arid area. The winds come in slow at first. They dry the sand without blowing it. They dry the sand and prepare the sand to be moved from down here in the streambeds that come off these high Rocky Mountains as a result of the snow. It comes down these streambeds, and at the right time the sand is dried, and then the winds start to pick up more velocity. Then pretty soon the winds are heavier winds, and that is what begins to carry the sands. Then all of a sudden we see formations on these sand dunes, like you have never seen in your life.

We could observe it on a daily basis if we had the kind of technical binoculars, or whatever type of thing would measure that. But on a monthly basis with the human eye we can begin to see those changes, and it is all a matter of sequence. It is all a matter of sequence. And the people of the San Luis Valley for generations have known how special this is. They know how unique it is, and they have come to the government of the United States and they have said help us preserve it as a national park. This is so beautiful, it is so basic to the heritage of our families, we want it to be basic to the heritage of all future generations. We want all future generations to enjoy what families like the Salazars enjoy down there in the San Luis Valley, or like the Kriers, or the Santis, or people like that down in that valley, the Entzes and families like that.

They have come to us, and today we have responded on a bipartisan basis. Both Republicans and Democrats got together to give 366 votes in favor of this. There were only 34 people in this Chamber who voted no against naming this a national park. Only 34. I can tell my colleagues that they put up a heck of a fight. We met opposition to name this as a national park from the first day we proposed it. But the facts overcame the opposition.

I have to say there was a lot of support to name this a national park. It did not start with my colleague Senator ALLARD in the Senate, who did a fine job carrying this and passed it out of the United States Senate without one ''no'' vote. It passed out of the U.S. Senate with no ''no'' votes. Unanimous. It did not start with myself, who decided to carry the bill in the House, and 9 years ago stood on one of those mounds with a gentleman named Bob Zimmerman and his family, and he said to me this should be a national park. Bob Zimmerman told me this should be preserved for all future generations; that we have to preserve the system that we have.

□ 2200

It did not all start right there. It started from the generations and generations of families. What happened in the last year, in fact on of these sand dunes stood Senator WAYNE ALLARD; Senator BEN CAMPBELL; Ken Salizar, the Attorney General of the State of Colorado; myself; Bruce Babbitt, the Secretary of the Interior. And during that little conversation we had on one of those sand dunes, of which we were just a tiny spec in this vast wonderful world of sand, we decided that we should respond to the community's wishes.

And we began to respond. First of all, the State legislature in Colorado, the State House of Representatives, passed overwhelmingly supporting this designation as a national park. Then the State Senate did the same thing on their resolution, overwhelmingly.

I can tell my colleagues, Gigi Dennis, a good friend of mine, she led the fight over there on the Senate side. And I

can tell my colleagues that Lola Spradly on the House, she led over there. Russell George, Speaker of the House. I can name name after name. Matt Smith. A lot of different people got together in the State House and out of the House and the Senate they sent a message to the Government of Washington, D.C., make this a national park. We support your efforts. Help those communities preserve this for future generations.

But it did not stop there. The Governor of the State of Colorado, Bill Owens, a well-respected, very powerful, powerful in a positive sense, the Governor of the State of Colorado and his wife, the First Lady of the State of Colorado, they gave this their strong endorsement. The Attorney General Ken Salizar, and Ken Salizar has generations of family down there, Ken Salizar went to bat. We had the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL). We had the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE). We had a number of different people who have come together as a team to create the new national park in Colorado.

I hope all of you, just as you have experienced the ski areas in the Third Congressional District, most of you have skied in either Aspen or Vale or Telluride or Purgatory or Powder Horn or Steamboat or Breckenridge or any of these different areas, come enjoy this. Many of you in this room have enjoyed the Rocky Mountain National Park.

Colorado will now offer to the people of the United States, to the people of the world, the State of Colorado will soon have four national parks in that pristine country that I talk to you about all within a 2½ hour drive or 3 hour drive. It is exciting. It is spectacular. I invite my colleagues to come down and see it.

Let me talk just a little more about what else is contained here. We know that within this range there is an underground aquifer. We do not have the technical expertise to understand all of the fingers of that aquifer. In other words, we have a large pool of water underneath the ground, and we know it contains a huge quantity of water and we know that that water is fundamental, it is basic to the entire system that operates here. We know that that water is fundamental to the farmers and to the ranchers and to the communities and to the crops that they grow.

But we also know one other thing. We know that if that water is sucked out of this aquifer underneath this, there is not a human being alive that can describe the consequences. Oh, we know they will be negative. We know that taking the water from underneath this and moving this out of a valley to help the growth of another region to move it out of this region and move it to another, we know that the result would be, at a minimum, like the Owens Valley in California where they dried up an entire region for the benefit of the growth of another region. But what we do not know are totally the consequences of draining that aquifer because we technically do not have the expertise today to figure out where all that water goes.

And water is a sustainable resource. It is the only renewable resource known to man. It is the only resource that can be used and reused and reused and reused. It does not disappear. It recreates itself. And with water, one person's waste or excess water is another person's water. And so we have to be very careful about those water resources.

We had a lot of people involved in water, a lot of water experts: Dave Robins; Ray Kogovsek, former Congressman; Kristine, who works with Ray; the Northern Water Conservancy District; Colorado River District. We had a number of different water experts that say this is a good national park, this should be named a national park. And that water, if ever they could get to the water, you need to leave that water in the valley or you stand the chance of collapsing something that is unique, as I said, known nowhere else in the world.

This is exciting. It is kind of fun. You can get up there in the summertime actually and you are able to literally ski down there without skis on your feet. The wildlife is unbelievable.

What we are hoping to do with this, by the way, and some of the opponents, as I said earlier, some of the opposition to this bill today said, well, this is nothing but a pile of sand. And I am quoting them. ''This is nothing but a pile of sand.'' Let me tell you, on this pile of sand, 34 people bought the argument that this is nothing but a pile of sand. But 366 of you realized, and it is like you had telescopic eyes, you realized that this is not just a pile of sand, that these mountains, these 14,000 peaks, these sand dunes represent a remarkable geographical finding. It is like hitting pay dirt. And it is something that ought to be preserved. And 366 of you today on both sides of the aisle said this should be a national park, this should be honored by all Americans for all future generations for its uniqueness.

What we know about the park today, and I could go through a lot about what we do know, but what we do know about the park today is a fraction of what we will know about the park in just 10 years. It is a minute fraction of what we will know about the park in 20 years. And there is no comparison of what we know today as compared to what we will know about that park in 30 years.

And every year the knowledge we get about this park will only further justify, will only further justify the fact that we had enough gumption to stand up here despite the opposition and with the assistance of the U.S. Senate and with the assistance of the State House of Representatives, the State Senate, the Governor, and the Attorney General, we had the gumption to stand up and preserve it for future generations.

Now, I want my colleagues to know that I am a strong advocate of private property. There are no takings as a result of this national park. There are no in-holdings in this national park that are not aware of this. In fact, the major in-holdings are held by the Nature Conservancy District.

We have elk herds. We have elk. We have falcons. We have eagles. You name it. We have a lot of wildlife in this area. We have a ranch called the Baca Ranch. The controlling owners of that ranch want to see this national park, and they want the Baca Ranch to be a part of it.

Right now the Baca Ranch is inaccessible to the ordinary person, inaccessible because it is private property. These owners would like to see it a part of the park so that people regardless of their economic standing, regardless of where they come from, whether it is the United States or Mexico or Canada or South America, regardless, they are going to be able to go onto the Baca Ranch and enjoy the full diversity of the sand dunes.

Take a look at just the watershed resources that we have on the great sand dunes. I will just hold this up temporarily long enough to read the paragraph.

''The dunes watershed consists of two unique mountain streams originating in the pristine Alpine tundra. These waterways flow through ancient forests of spruce and fir. Slipping quietly past culturally scarred ponderosa pine and colorful aspen groves, they cut along the base of the tallest sand dunes in North America. They flow through the vast grasslands. And they end in a closed desert basin, all within a span of a few miles. This area, combined with the tall dunes and the integral sand deposits, encompass an entire system containing abundant diversity and special scenery. These dramatic contrasts, snow-capped mountain peaks and green forests above towering dunes, constitute a unique American landscape with scenery and diversity comparable to other national parks in our country and stand out as one of the best in the entire world.''

That is what it is about. I want to congratulate the 365 Members, or 365 Members because obviously I voted for it, 365 of my colleagues that were able to see beyond this so-called pile of sand, that their vision allowed them foresight into the future and gave them vision into the future about future generations.

We were just talking about health care. We talked about Social Security. I am going to talk for a few minutes here shortly about taxes. The fact is we need as leaders people who have the vision to look into the future.

I think the greatest accomplishment I can have as a United States Congressman and I think the greatest accomplishment that my colleagues can have as United States Congressmen is that years down the road somebody will look back and say, you know, we are

glad that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) or we are glad that so-and-so or we are glad that this person had the vision to see just how important it was that the Ray Blunts, that the different parties involved here had that kind of vision. Because it is so important, because it is so important in our leadership role that is we provide something for the future.

And in the meantime, while we have provided it for the future, all of us get to enjoy it. All of us can go out there. We get to run in the sand. We can watch the wildlife. We can hunt. We can fish. We can travel around and see exactly what it is. And we do it without taking. There is no taking it. It has to be willing seller. There are no inholdings that are getting taken advantage of. That is the beauty of this thing, and that is why 366 people stood up today despite intense opposition, which by the way only resulted in 34 votes, but despite intense opposition on a ratio greater than ten to one, the people of these Chambers stood up today and said, future America, all of the world deserves to have this as a national park.

I can tell my colleagues I stand up here with a great deal of pride and honor, first of all to be a congressman from the State of Colorado, and, second of all, to represent the Third Congressional District of Colorado, and I stand up here with a great deal of honor to be the Congressman of the district that has America's newest national park, the Great Sand Dunes. And we are going to change it, no longer a national monument, the Great Sand Dunes National Park.

In conclusion on the park, first of all, many of my colleagues have been to Colorado to the Third Congressional District. They have skied it. They have hiked our 14,000-foot peaks. You have rafted our rivers. As you know, we are famous for fly fishing, mountain biking, you name it, horseback riding, off-road vehicles on designated trails. We have got lots of things to draw you to this district. Now we have one more thing.

For those of you, I want you to know that the communities of Alamosa, of Mount Vista, San Luis, Conejas, all of these different areas down there, the valley will welcome you with open hands. And study the history and the historical basis of the people and how they have lived on these lands all of these years. And you are going to walk away from this, you will walk away from these great sand dunes, you will walk away from there very, very inspired, not just by geographically and biologically and environmentally that you have seen, you are also going to walk away from there inspired to know that every United States Senator serving today by unanimous vote supported this and 366 Members of your Congress stood up and voted just today to create this new national park. I am proud of all of you for having done that.

Let me move now to an entirely different subject very briefly. I should point out here the Colorado canyons. I pointed this out today. My posters are a little worn, colleagues. You will have to excuse that. But last night it was signed by the President. This is the State of Utah. This again is a big chunk of the western portion of my district. This is the Colorado River.

Colorado is very unique when it comes to water. I thought I would spend a couple minutes and talk about water. Colorado is the only State in the Union where all our free-flowing water goes out of the State. We have no free-flowing water that comes into the State of Colorado for our use. And in Colorado, within the boundaries of Colorado, in our district, the Third Congressional District, again it is outlined by this blue line, within this district right here, 80 percent of the water in Colorado comes from that district. Eighty percent of the population of Colorado resides outside that district.

So you can see that because of the tremendous water resources that are in my congressional district, we have lots of trees, lots of understandings, and we have lots of discussions that are ongoing as to the best utilization of that water.

□ 2215

One of those discussions that came again just like the Great Sand Dunes National Park, that started at a community level, was the Colorado Canyons. That bill was signed by the President last night. It was supported again on the bipartisan basis. And it protected the water rights of the Colorado River for Colorado people. Although I can tell you the water in the Colorado River, it is called the mother of rivers, it provides drinking water for 23 million people, including the country of Mexico. It is a huge water resource. We know how to protect it. But we want to protect our rights, too. This bill protected Colorado water rights for Colorado people. This bill created a national conservation area. It created a wilderness area up on the top. We got in our community everyone from our county commissioners to our city council to our environmental organizations to our ranchers, to just community citizens, to people who cared, we put all of this together. I as a facilitator and others as a facilitator were able to come up with this compromise and we call this the Colorado Canyons bill. I am very proud of that. Again, another accomplishment by the people of Colorado to protect the resources of Colorado for future generations, while at the same time allowing current generations to enjoy the utilization of the resources that we have in the fine State of Colorado.

Let us shift gears completely and let us talk for a minute about taxes. I think it is very important. Because I have heard a lot of political rhetoric lately about tax cuts. There are some tax cuts that have taken place and there are a couple of tax cuts that ought to take place that I think when you sit down with the average American, one, they appreciate the fact that the taxes were cut or, two, they think these taxes should be eliminated. I can start out with the death tax. Do you think that our forefathers when they drafted the Constitution had in their wildest imagination that this government that they were creating, this new concept of democracy that they were putting together, would see death as a taxable event? That your death would result in a money-making revenue source for the government that they were creating? Can you imagine our forefathers thinking that as a revenue-raising, income-raising event for the Federal Government there should be a tax on your marriage? That when you get married that we should have a marriage tax?

Both of those taxes, the death tax and the marriage tax, should be eliminated. How can you argue with that? Regardless of the impact on the budget. Look at the basic concept, the fundamental question. Should we tax the event of death? Is death a taxable event? By the way, when we tax it, are we not a nation that wants to encourage family farms and ranches and small businesses to go from one generation to the next generation? And furthermore ask the question, does the death tax not in fact discourage that going from one generation to the next generation? Is this a country that should be discouraging families from transferring their business from mom and dad to kids, from those kids to their kids, from those kids to their kids? What made America great and what makes us great today is our family, the family foundation, the family block. A death tax has no place in our society in my opinion. I do not care who it taxes. By the way, it does not just hit 2 percent of the population as some like to say. It hits everybody in the community. When that money is taken out of a local community and is sent to Washington, D.C. for redistribution, and it never goes back anywhere close to the percentage back to that community from whence it came, in the same proportion, not even close. And there is a difference out there on this tax and there is a difference in this presidential election. George W. Bush has made it a commitment, he will eliminate that tax. And by a bipartisan vote on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, although the President vetoed it, in fact the President not only vetoed the elimination of the death tax which both sides of this aisle supported, he and Vice President GORE proposed it actually increase this year by $9.5 billion. In their budget this year they actually had an increase of $9.5 billion in the death tax. That is a fundamental difference between the bipartisan, Republicans and Democrats, conservative Democrats, not the liberal Democrats but the conservative Democrats that supported that elimination, that is the difference between that team and the liberal Democrats'

and AL GORE's proposal on the death tax.

I am not trying to be partisan here, but let us call facts as they are. Let us call it as it is. Who is for the death tax and who is not? Who is going to stand up and be counted to get rid of this death tax? The same thing for the marriage penalty. That was vetoed by the President. By the way, there are Members, conservative Democrats and Republicans, who say get rid of this marriage tax. No, what you hear from the liberals is, ''Hey, let's tax the rich, let's transfer the wealth, let's move money from those who work, let's move money, let's transfer money, not create capital, transfer.'' It is all a question of transfer. The transfer agent is the United States Government. It is right here in Washington, D.C.

Let me ask you this: If one of my colleagues just won the lotto tomorrow and you won $50 million, and you want to distribute it around the country, help people out, help people with health care, help people buy open space, help people with hardships, would you send that $50 million to Washington, D.C. for redistribution to be handed out on your behalf? Of course you would not. Do you think Ted Turner or the Kennedys or any of those people send their money to Washington D.C. for disbursement? No, they create their own foundations because they know through their own foundations they can with some efficiency, a great deal more efficiency, put that money to work. It is the same concept with taxes. Do you think those tax dollars are more efficient in your pocket or more efficient in the pocket of the United States Congress and the President of the United States?

Clearly we ought to have some taxes. We have to fund the military. We have to fund highways. We have to fund social services. We have to fund Social Security. Medicare, Medicaid. We have obligations. The average taxpayer out there does not disagree with those obligations. What the average taxpayer disagrees with is the lack of efficiency. The government waste, the size and the increasing size of the government. This is a distinguishing issue in this upcoming presidential race.

Take a look at which side really has the history and has a record. Forget all the talk they talk about. Just look at the record. Which side, the conservatives or the liberals, increase the size of government? Take a look at the Great Society of Lyndon B. Johnson and figure out, was it the liberals who got the government to increase, was it the liberals who put it into the deficit for 40 some years or was it the conservatives? I am not talking about right-wing conservatives, I am talking about moderate people who say, I understand I have to pay some taxes but I want some justification.

Let me talk to you about a couple of the tax cuts. There is one very important tax cut to every one of you and every one of your constituents that we in the Republican Party with the help, by the way, of conservative Democrats passed and it benefits every one of your constituents that owns a home. Probably the largest tax break they have gotten in their life. We passed it off here and guess what happened? Nothing collapsed. Washington was able to survive. No program on social services collapsed. No child went hungry in a school. Our military did not miss any planes or jets as a result of this. All the dire circumstances of allowing the person who made the money to keep a little more of the money, none of these dire circumstances of not letting that money go to Washington occurred.

I hear the same kind of scare tactics today. George W. Bush talks about a tax reduction, a cut in the taxes for everybody, not just this group, not just this group but everybody. George W. Bush said the other day, the target ought to be everybody, it should not be a little tiny target based on class warfare. It should be a target for everybody. I will show you a tax that we made a target for homeowners which is a broad target. It used to be when you sold your home, if you sold your home for a profit, for example, you bought a home for $100,000, you sold a home for $350,000, which means you made a profit of $250,000, you were taxed on a $250,000 profit. That was what you were taxed on, $250,000. On a couple if you bought a home for $200,000, you sold the home for $700,000, you had a profit of $500,000, you were taxed on $500,000. That is the old regime. That is the old let the government grow bigger. That is the old look for anything you can to make it a taxable event. Tax death, tax marriage, tax an individual's sale of their home.

Most people in this country, the biggest investment of their lives will be their home. The proudest investment they will have in their lives outside of their children, but physical investment will be their home. Where most people will spend time in their lives will be their home. And the government has to tax it when you sell it? Come on.

A couple of years ago, the Republican leadership, with almost complete support, I think complete support from the Republican Members of Congress, as well as support from conservative Members of the Democratic Party, and granted the liberal side of the party will never vote to reduce your taxes. I can assure you, take a look at the history. You can tell that the liberal aspect, the liberal politicians will always want to grow the size of your government. The liberal politicians will always want to take individual rights and form it as a pool, as a group. They sacrifice the individual right to the benefit of the group right. They will transfer wealth, they will transfer money from those who work and give it to those who do not. It is just a liberal concept. There is a fundamental difference.

The same thing showed up on this tax cut, this tax reduction bill. These are the kind of reductions that George W. Bush talks about. These are the kind of tax reductions that we put into place. After our bill, and this says ''After Republicans,'' and I have got to tell you, we had a lot of Democratic support, conservative Democrats, not the liberal but the conservative Democrats who supported this. Now, look what happens. Our individual, let us say Jane Adams bought the house for $100,000, she sold it for $350,000, she made 250. She was taxed on 250. Under our bill Jane Adams buys the house, same conditions, for 100, sells it for 350, makes $250,000 and that is her tax right there. Zero. That is her tax. Zero. And this is now law.

Even in the old days under the old regime, you only got one tax break in your entire life on the sale of your home and that is if you were older than 62 and you only got a tax break, I think up to $140,000. We did not just give that tax break to individuals. We said, in our country, most homes are owned by couples. Most homes are owned by couples. What are we going to do for couples? We said, hey, for couples, we double it. If you have got a couple, we are going to allow the first $250,000, the first $250,000 per person to be tax free. So if you live in a home, and most of us live in homes that today have appreciated. In other words, they are worth more today than they were when we bought them. That is called profit. I am not talking about equity. I am talking about profit. Most of us live in homes where if we sold the home, we could sell it for a profit. Under the old regime, money would have come out of your pocket and sent to Washington, D.C. simply because you sold your home. That is the only reason that money would be taken out of your pocket and sent to Washington, D.C., simply because you sold your home. We changed that. When we changed it, now when you sell that home for a profit up to $250,000 per person regardless of your age, renewable every 2 years, that money goes in your pocket for redistribution in your community instead of going out of your pocket to Washington, D.C. for redistribution in the bureaucracy that Washington uses it for.

You should have heard the cries back then. Just like I hear today when George W. Bush talks about a modest tax reduction for everybody, you hear these scare tactics: ''Oh, my gosh, we're going to have the deficit tomorrow. School children won't get lunches. We're not going to get medical care. It's going to cost us.''

Look at what happened. It is the same thing when we reduced the capital gains tax, which again with the help of conservative Democrats, again no help from the liberal Democrats, but we did get help from the conservative Democrats and the Republicans, we reduced capital gains from 28 percent to 20 percent. We had the same scare tactics out there. Oh, my gosh, the sky is falling. Reducing taxes on

the American people? What a disaster. How could the Republicans and the conservative Democrats even possibly envision a tax reduction? It will destroy the country. Lowering capital gains from 28 percent to 20 percent, boom, the economy went up. Just like that. More tax dollars came in. You lowered the taxes, you had more economic activity, you had more creation of capital and your economy shot up like a rocket and we have been enjoying that for 3 or 4 years now since the reduction of capital gains.

□ 2230

Same thing on this. Did the sky fall in when people started to keep the money they made on the sale of their house? Did the sky fall in because the money individuals, regular working folks out there, because the money they had they made on the sale of their house did not come back to Washington, D.C., was not redistributed by Washington, D.C.? Did the sky fall in as a result of that? No, of course it did not.

We now have more than any other time in history greater homeownership by a larger population than ever in the history of this country. Our economy has improved. It did not go down. The sky did not fall in.

So when I hear these people out there talk about scare tactics because George W. Bush has the courage to stand up and say, look, it is easy to criticize. It is easy to envision that Washington, D.C., ought to be managing our money instead of us. We earned it. Washington did not earn it. We earned it. It is amazing that these scare tactics seem to be working out there. That somehow a tax cut, allowing the person who made the money to keep a larger percentage of that money to reduce the size of government, the sky is going to fall in.

Not being presumptuous, but if George W. Bush is fortunate enough to be elected President, we are going to see a tax cut not for a targeted group of people, not for the low income or the high income, but for everybody. And we are going to see a tax reduction that benefits the economy. Just like when the Republicans took capital gains and dropped it from 28 percent to 20 percent; just like when the Republicans took this tax on the sale of a home and reduced it for the first $500,000 for a couple to zero. Let Americans keep that amount of money in their pocket and renew it every 2 years, we will see an economic resurgence.

We are going to see a healthy economy because the fact is the more dollars we allow our citizens to keep, the dollars which they worked for, the stronger our economy will be. If we take a look, and by the way the Wall Street Journal has done splendid editorials on this, if we take a look at the three or four major tax reductions this last century in our government and take a look at what happened to the economy after that tax reduction, we will find that in every case, no exceptions, the economy improved. The economy was strengthened, and we actually had an economic boom which followed every one of those.

Why? Because the person that makes the money has a deeper appreciation for the money and is wiser in the utilization of that money than is the bureaucracy of Washington, D.C., which does not have to work for the money. It is simply getting their money by transfer. Our constituents get their money by work. They go out and create something and work and offer a product, they offer something of benefit. They create that capital. In Washington, we do not create capital. We get our money by transfer. We reach out to the people who work. We reach out to the people that create a profit, and we suck that money out of their pockets by transferring it to ours.

As a result of that, since the government did not have to work for the money, the government tends to be much less efficient, much sloppier, could care less in many circumstances how the dollars are spent, and we could show example after example of government waste, than does the individual.

The individual, that young man or young woman or that person, middle age or seniors that went out and spent their working day putting that money in their pocket, at 5 o'clock they get off shift and go home, they are very careful about how they spend their money. They watch their budgets. They try not to waste their money and they manage it. The taxpayer knows how to manage the money much better than we do in Washington, D.C.

What happens? The consequence of what I am saying, what happens when we allow the taxpayer to keep a few more dollars in their pocket and the government reduce its size and take the dollars that are absolutely necessary but no more? What happens when we allow that taxpayer to manage more money? The money is managed in a much more efficient way. And when the money is managed in a much more efficient way, what happens is that the economy strengthens and it begins to grow.

Mr. Speaker, what happens when the economy strengthens and begins to grow? There are more tax dollars that are originated that come to feed the government. It is a plus for the government. It is a plus for the taxpayer. It is a plus for our society.

So when we hear these scare tactics, just like we heard the hour previous to mine, scare tactics about health care, when we hear these scare tactics about Bush's tax reductions or the Republicans, take a look at examples that have occurred. Take a look at the capital gains taxation. Take a look at this household tax, and we will find out that is exactly what it was. Just like the health care, nothing much more than scare tactics.

Mr. Speaker, let me wrap up by saying to my 366 colleagues who voted for the creation of America's newest national park, let me say to those 366, their vision will come back generation after generation after generation. They can be proud that during their congressional career this should stand out as one of the highlights. Many generations into the future will look back and say: they did the right thing. They had the vision for future generations.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Report concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel by the House of Representatives, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, by a miscellaneous group during the third quarter of 2000 is as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 4 AND JULY 10, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Christopher Smith	7/5	7/10	Romania		1,229.25		(3)				1,229.25
Hon. Steny Hoyer	7/5	7/6	Romania		489.90		(3)				
	7/6	7/7	Croatia		50.00		(3)				
	7/7	7/10	Romania		734.85		(3)				1,274.75
Hon. Benjamin Cardin	7/5	7/6	Romania		491.70		(3)				
	7/6	7/7	Croatia		50.00		(3)				
	7/7	7/10	Romania		737.55		(3)				1,279.25

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 4 AND JULY 10, 2000—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Bob Clement	7/5	7/6	Romania		491.70		(3)				
	7/6	7/7	Croatia		50.00		(3)				
	7/7	7/10	Romania		737.55		(3)				1,279.25
Hon. Robert E. "Bud" Cramer, Jr	7/5	7/6	Romania		491.70		(3)				
	7/6	7/7	Croatia		50.00		(3)				
	7/7	7/10	Romania		737.55		(3)				1,279.25
Hon. Alcee Hastings	7/5	7/10	Romania		1,224.75		(3)				1,224.75
Hon. Joseph Pitts	7/5	7/10	Romania		1,229.25		(3)				1,229.25
Hon. Matt Salmon	7/5	7/6	Romania		491.70		(3)				
	7/6	7/7	Croatia		50.00		(3)				
	7/7	7/10	Romania		737.55		(3)				1,279.25
Hon. Louise Slaughter	7/5	7/6	Romania		491.70		(3)				
	7/6	7/7	Croatia		50.00		(3)				
	7/7	7/10	Romania		737.55		(3)				1,279.25
Dr./RADM John Eisold	7/5	7/10	Romania		1,224.75		(3)				1,224.75
Ms. Dorothy Taft	7/5	7/10	Romania		1,224.75		(3)				1,224.75
Mr. Ronald McNamara	7/5	7/10	Romania		1,224.75		(3)				1,224.75
Mr. Ben Anderson	7/5	7/10	Romania		1,224.75		(3)				1,224.75
Mr. John Finerty	7/5	7/10	Romania		1,224.75		(3)				1,224.75
Mr. Bob Hand	7/5	7/6	Romania		489.90		(3)				
	7/6	7/7	Croatia		50.00		(3)				
	7/7	7/10	Romania		734.85		(3)				1,274.75
Ms. Marlene Kaufmann	7/5	7/6	Romania		489.90		(3)				
	7/6	7/7	Croatia		50.00		(3)				
	7/7	7/10	Romania		734.85		(3)				1,274.75
Ms. Maureen Walsh	7/5	7/10	Romania		1,224.75		(3)				1,224.75
Mr. Mark Gage	7/5	7/8	Romania		734.85		(3)				734.85
Ms. Marilyn Owen	7/5	7/10	Romania		1,224.75		(3)				1,224.75
Mr. David Abramowitz	7/5	7/10	Romania		849.75		(3)				849.75
Mr. Fred Turner	7/5	7/10	Romania		1,224.75		(3)				1,224.75
Delegation Expenses									2,635.48		2,635.48
Committee total					25,286.35				2,635.48		27,921.83

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

CHRISTOPHER SMITH, Chairman, Oct. 19, 2000.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

10708. A letter from the Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Stamp Program: Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (RIN: 0584–AC41) received October 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10709. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule: Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Update of Small Business Specialist Functions—received October 23, 2000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

10710. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report on the OMB Cost Estimate for Pay-As-You-Go Calculations; to the Committee on the Budget.

10711. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Labor, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule—Small Pension Plan Security Amendments (RIN: 1210–AA73) received October 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

10712. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Fluorescent Lamp Ballasts Energy Conservation Standards [Docket No. EE–RM–97–500] (RIN: 1904–AA75) received October 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10713. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a report on the Strategic Plan for 2000; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10714. A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting a report on the Commercial Inventory for FY 2000; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10715. A letter from the Director, Employment Service, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Reduction in Force Retreat Rights (RIN: 3206–AJ14) received October 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

10716. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's annual report on the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act for fiscal year 2000, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3810; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10717. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a report on the Strategic Plan for FY 2000—2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10718. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the 1999 Annual Report of the National Institute of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10719. A letter from the General Counsel, Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities; Play Area [Docket No. 98–2] (RIN: 3014–AA21) received October 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10720. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Federal Airways in the Vicinity of Dallas/Fort Worth; TX [Docket No. 00–ASW–6] received October 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10721. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Transportation, FAA, transmitting a report on Pilot Records; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10722. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, FAA, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–600–2B19 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–312–AD; Amendment 39–11914; AD 2000–20–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received October 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10723. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, FAA, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–600–1A11 (CL–600) and CL–600–2A12 (CL–601) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–26–AD; Amendment 39–11902; AD 2000–19–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received October 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10724. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Licensing and Safety Requirements for Operation of a Launch Site [Docket No. FAA–1999–5833; Amendment No. 401–2, 417–1 and 420–1] (RIN: 2120–AG15) received October 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

10725. A letter from the Program Manager, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Labeling of Flavored Wine Products (RIN: 1512–AB86) received October 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10726. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Department of Treasury, U.S. Customs Service, transmitting the Department's

final rule—Import Restrictions Imposed On Archaeological Material From the Prehispanic Cultures of the Republic of Nicaragua (RIN: 1515–AC70) received October 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10727. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update—received October 23, 2000, 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. 1689. A bill to prohibit States from imposing restrictions on the operation of motor vehicles providing limousine service between a place in a State and a place in another State, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–1003 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[Omitted from the Record of October 24, 2000]

H.R. 4725. Referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than October 26, 2000.

[Submitted October 25, 2000]

H.R. 1882. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than October 26, 2000.

H.R. 2580. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than October 26, 2000.

H.R. 4548. Referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than October 26, 2000.

H.R. 4857. Referral to the Committees on the Judiciary, Banking and Financial Services, and Commerce for a period ending not later than October 26, 2000.

H.R. 4585. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than October 26, 2000.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

H.R. 1689. A bill to prohibit States from imposing restrictions on the operation of motor vehicles providing limousine service between a place in a State and a place in another State, and for other purposes, referred to the Committee on Transportation for a period ending not later than October 26, 2000, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(q), rule X.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

482. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to review the actions of the Food and Drug Administration, whose marketing guidelines appear to promote and advance the best interests of the drug companies and their advertising outlets rather than the consumer and also, the FDA move to prohibit direct consumer marketing or in the alternative to impose tighter restrictions; to the Committee on Commerce.

483. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to a resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to proclaim and designate the week of October 8 through 14 this year and each year hereafter as ''The Mighty Eighth Air Force Week''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

484. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of The Mariana Islands, relative to Resolution 12–85 memorializing the United States House of Representatives to oppose the application of the U.S. federal minimum wage to the Commonwealth; to the Committee on Resources.

485. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to a resolution memorializing the United States Congress to enact additional Balanced Budget Act relief in 2000 through adequate payments to Medicare insurers and Medicare providers; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.