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The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.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.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

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

Senate

(Legislative day of Friday, September 22, 2000)

The Senate met at 11:01 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of mankind
Forgive our feverish ways . . .
Take from our souls the strain and stress,
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Your peace.—Whittier.

In this time of prayer, we claim the assurance given through Isaiah. You promise to keep us in perfect peace if we allow You to stay our minds on You. This is the peace we need today. The conflict and tension of these days threaten to rob us of peace in our souls. It is easy to catch the emotional virus of frustration and exasperation, criticism and consternation, party spirit and quid pro quo manipulation.

Then we remember that Your peace is the healing antidote that can survive any circumstance. Give us the peace of a trusting and committed mind guided by Your Spirit. May Your deep peace flow into us, calming our impatience and flow from us to others claiming Your inspiration. In the name of the Prince of Peace who whispers in our souls, ''Peace I leave with you, My peace I give to you; not as the world gives do I give to you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.''—John 14:27. May this be a great day of working cooperatively to finish the work of the 106th Congress for Your glory and the good of America. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, a Senator from the State of Ohio, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The able acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, speaking on behalf of the leader, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m. today, with Senators DURBIN and THOMAS in control of the

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 "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

time. At 12:30, the Senate will recess until 2:15 for the weekly party conferences to meet. The House is expected to consider the continuing resolution this morning and the conference report to accompany the foreign operations appropriations bill this afternoon.

Therefore, the Senate will begin its consideration of those bills as soon as they become available. It is expected that the final votes regarding S. 2508, the Ute Indian water rights bill, will be this afternoon. Senators should be prepared to vote beginning around 4:30 this afternoon and throughout the remainder of the week in an effort to complete all business by the end of the week.

The leader thanks all Senators for their attention to this schedule.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

The Senator from Alaska.

DAIRY MARKET ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Agriculture Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2773, and the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2773) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to enhance dairy markets through dairy product mandatory reporting, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 4340

Mr. STEVENS. Senator CRAIG has an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. CRAIG, proposes an amendment numbered 4340.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

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.''.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be agreed to, the bill be read for the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and any statements relating to this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 4340) was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2773), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

NATIONAL RECORDING PRESERVATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4846, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4846) 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 4341

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is my understanding Senator DASCHLE and others have an amendment at the desk and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. DASCHLE, for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 4341.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

In section 101, insert ''and collections of sound recordings'' after ''recordings''.

In section 102(a)(1), insert ''and collections of sound recordings'' after ''recordings''.

In section 102(a)(1), strike ''10 years'' and insert ''25 years''.

In section 102(a)(3), insert ''and collections of sound recordings'' after ''recordings''.

In section 102(b), insert ''or collection of sound recordings'' after ''recording''.

In section 103(a), insert ''or collection of sound recordings'' after ''recording'' each place it appears.

In section 103(b)(1), insert ''or collection of sound recordings'' after ''sound recording''.

In section 103(b)(4), insert ''or collection of sound recordings'' after ''sound recording'' the first place it appears.

In section 103(c), insert ''or collection of sound recordings'' after ''sound recording''.

In section 103(c), strike ''recording,'' and insert ''recording or collection,''.

In section 104(a), insert ''(including electronic access)'' after ''reasonable access''.

In the heading for section 122(d)(2), insert ''OR ORGANIZATION'' after ''ORGANIZATION''.

In section 124(a)(1), insert ''and collections of sound recordings'' after ''recordings'' the first place it appears.

Add at the end of section 124 the following new subsection:

(c) ENCOURAGING ACCESSIBILITY TO REGISTRY AND OUT OF PRINT RECORDINGS.—The Board shall encourage the owners of recordings and collections of recordings included in the National Recording Registry and the owners of out of print recordings to permit digital access to such recordings through the National Audio-Visual Conservation Center at Culpeper, Virginia, in order to reduce the portion of the Nation's recorded cultural legacy which is inaccessible to students, educators, and others, and may suggest such other measures as it considers reasonable and appropriate to increase public accessibility to such recordings.

Insert after section 125 the following new section:

SEC. 126. ESTABLISHMENT OF BYLAWS BY LIBRARIAN.

The Librarian may establish such bylaws (consistent with this subtitle) as the Librarian considers appropriate to govern the organization and operation of the Board, including bylaws relating to appointments and removals of members or organizations described in section 122(a)(2) which may be required as a result of changes in the title, membership, or nature of such organizations occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Redesignate section 133 as section 134 and insert after section 132 the following new section:

SEC. 133. ENCOURAGING ACTIVITIES TO FOCUS ON RARE AND ENDANGERED RECORDINGS.

Congress encourages the Librarian and the Board, in carrying out their duties under this Act, to undertake activities designed to preserve and bring attention to sound recordings which are rare and sound recordings and collections of recordings which are in danger of becoming lost due to deterioration.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read for the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and the title amendment be agreed to, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 4341) was agreed to.

The bill (H.R. 4846), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

The title amendment (No. 4342) was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title to read as follows: ''A Bill to establish the National Recording Registry in the Library of Congress to maintain and preserve sound recordings and collections of sound recordings that are culturally, historically, or aesthetically significant, and for other purposes.''.

DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement about the discretionary spending caps that will be coming before the Senate on the foreign assistance appropriations bill. There is a provision on that bill which is required to adjust the spending caps because of the limitations in the 1997 Budget Act.

Subsection (a) of the amendment that will be before the Senate increases the discretionary cap for budget authority under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 from $541.1 billion to $637 billion, and increases the discretionary cap for general purpose outlays under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 from $547.3 billion to $612.7 billion.

When discretionary highway and mass transit outlays of $32.3 billion—separate cap categories—are added to this amount, we will have allowable discretionary spending of $645 billion under this raised cap.

Subsection (b)(1) includes emergency spending already committed during this session under the new cap limits. Emergency spending is usually excluded from cap limits. In this instance, we have included such spending within the cap limits in order to be assured we will not invade the Social Security surplus.

We have another subsection, (b)(2), that provides for adjustments under these caps to continue, as permitted by current law, for continuing disability reviews, CDRs: $450 million in budget authority; the earned-income tax compliance initiative, EITC, that is $145 million in budget authority, and adoption assistance of $20 million in budget authority; and for an outlay adjustment of 0.5 percent.

Subsection (c) provides for a 0.5-percent adjustment for budget authority to cover the differences between CBO and OMB scoring methods. A similar adjustment was provided last year.

These caps assure us that we will have the funds available to deal with the remaining two bills that are very contentious; the State-Justice-Commerce bill and the Labor-Health and Human Services bill. For each of those bills, we allocated portions of the 302(b) authority that was given to our Appropriations Committee under the budget resolution for the year 2001. However, after those bills had passed and gone to conference, we recovered portions of the 302(b) allocation and allocated that to Housing and Urban Development and the energy and water bill. The result is that these two bills that are in conference now do not have the full funding that would be required to bring them back across the floor to the Senate.

This adjustment to the 2001 discretionary spending caps, as contained in the foreign assistance bill that will be before the Senate, I hope this afternoon, are necessary in order that those two bills can be reallocated funding sufficient to assure that they will be able to be considered and passed by the Senate.

It has been a very difficult year for the Appropriations Committee because of the circumstances, because of the differences between the President's budget and the congressional budget resolution. There is a substantial gap

between those two documents, and we have done our best to work with them. This action that we have taken now to lift the spending caps will give us the opportunity to work out the differences with the administration. I do believe that should and can be completed today. It is my firm hope we will complete action on the other two bills today so the House may commence consideration of them tomorrow and that the Senate will consider them Friday. That, of course, is going to take a lot of understanding and cooperation from all Members of the Senate, and I for one urge that take place.

I have not been home since the first week of August. We, on the Appropriations Committee, have been working around the clock on this process since the second week of August. It is time this come to an end. The disputes and conflicts between the bills, and between the administration and the Congress, between the House and Senate, and between Members of each body and within each body, are the most intensive I have ever seen. But it is time we realize that at the end of this week we will be 1 week away from the elections. I do not think Congress ought to be in session in the week before the elections, and I am going to do my utmost to see that we finish these bills by Friday.

If that is not possible, the leader will have to decide what we do. I, for one, intend to go home Saturday.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business. Senators are to be recognized for up to 5 minutes each.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POLITICS AND ELECTIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, there is so much happening in the world of politics and elections, it is almost hard to know what topic to talk about. Education is certainly No. 1 on the agenda of the American people, and we are now in the final stages, I hope, of agreeing—I am hopeful—on an education bill for our country. We have made some good progress. I am very glad; it appears President Clinton's budget priority for afterschool programs is winning out. I am hoping that is the case.

Many of us have worked long and hard to make the point that afterschool care is crucial, that it is the best antidote to high crime, juvenile crime that occurs in the afternoons after school. It is a no-brainer. We know if kids are kept occupied after school, it keeps them out of trouble. We have seen these programs work. We have seen that juvenile crime occurs between 3 and 6 p.m. If children are engaged in stimulating activity after school, it helps.

President Clinton and the Democrats have been trying to ensure that the 1 million children who are waiting for afterschool programs, in fact, get afterschool programs. After reading press reports, I am glad to report to my colleagues that this looks as if it is on the way. However, we still have a major disagreement on school construction. I have seen some of our schools that are falling apart. Again, I hope we can reach agreement on this crucial issue.

The two candidates for President have been arguing over education. The good news is that education is the topic of the day. It is important, when we realize we have to import people to come into this country to take the high-tech jobs, and what a tragedy it is that our young people are not trained. So education is key.

Of course, there is an argument between the two candidates on whether or not education should be a national priority, which is Vice President GORE's view, or Governor Bush's view that really the National Government should not get very involved. This is a key distinction.

I side with Dwight Eisenhower, a Republican President, who said it is crucial to our national defense to have education as a top priority and to make sure that our young people are educated in math, science, and reading, everything they have to know—even in those days before high tech. I think Vice President GORE is correct.

There is also a flap over some claims that the Texas students were doing really well. It turns out that the independent Rand report issued just yesterday says, in fact, those Texas students were not tested with national tests. If one looks at the national tests, they are just not making it. Clearly, this education issue is going to go on.

I come here as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee to talk about another issue, a very important issue, and that is an issue that is being debated in the Foreign Relations Committee right now. I am not on the particular subcommittees that are holding this hearing, but it seems to me the hearing going on about U.S.-Russia policy in 1995 are really aimed at trying to take a hit at Vice President GORE.

It is interesting that Republican officials who are speaking up 2 weeks before the election never even talked about the agreement that came out of those meetings in 1995. They did not talk about them for 5 years, but 2 weeks before an election they are out there trying to hurt the Vice President. This is politics at its very worst.

Frankly, what we ought to be talking about is foreign policy in the years 2000 and 2001 in this century because some of the comments made by Governor Bush and his advisers are raising all kinds of alarms throughout the world. It is important that they be put on the table. These remarks have to do with the U.S. policy in the Balkans. Advisers to Governor Bush have followed up on his statements he made in the last debate that if he was elected President, he would negotiate for the removal of all U.S. peacekeeping troops from the Balkans. As one can imagine, this announcement has set off alarms in capitals of our European allies who rightly believe that such a policy would weaken and divide NATO.

One of the things that alarmed me about Governor Bush's comments was he said our military is really there to fight wars and win wars, not to keep the peace; that is our role. That puts our people in a very difficult position because if, in fact, we have a situation where suddenly our military is no longer involved in peacekeeping but only in fighting, then I think our NATO allies will say: OK, you do the fighting, we will do the peacekeeping. And it means that our troops will be in harm's way and our pilots will be in harm's way. This is a great concern to me.

According to today's New York Times, Lord Robertson, the NATO Secretary General, has regularly told visiting American Congressmen that the Bush proposal could undermine the whole idea of risk sharing, which is precisely the glue that holds our alliance together.

The Washington Post quotes one European Ambassador saying:

> If the U.S. says it will not perform certain tasks, then the basic consensus of ''all for one and one for all'' begins to unravel. . . . The integrated military command could fall apart and so would [our] alliance.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mrs. BOXER. I will be happy to yield as long as I do not lose time and do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the Senator from California.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 4:30 p.m. today, provided that the Senate has received the papers, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the 1-day continuing resolution, and no amendments or motions be in order, and that the Senate proceed to an immediate vote on final passage of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I just want to find out if this was cleared on our side.

Mr. ENZI. This was cleared on both sides.

Mrs. BOXER. Then I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. In light of this agreement, the first vote today will occur at 4:30 p.m.

I thank the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend.

POLITICS AND ELECTIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Let me take us back from before the unanimous consent request was made and kind of summarize where I was going.

We had a statement by Governor Bush. The statement was that he wanted to see all of those peacekeeping troops come home from the Balkans. He said we should not be involved in peacekeeping, only in fighting. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am concerned and clearly our NATO allies are concerned. Lord Robertson, the NATO Secretary General, again, has said this could undermine our relationship with our NATO alliance.

The Washington Post says one European Ambassador was quoted as saying: If the U.S. says it will not perform certain tasks, then the basic consensus of NATO begins to unravel.

Now, I remember being very surprised, because I was at the second debate, when Governor Bush made the point that we were carrying the load in the Balkans in terms of the peacekeeping troops. I knew that was incorrect. The fact is, American troops are no more than 20 percent of the total. American aid represents no more than 20 percent of what is being provided to Bosnia and Kosovo.

I would hate to see us walk away from peacekeeping and tell everyone we are the fighters; and then have our allies say: OK, you do the fighting; we do the peacekeeping. It is of great concern to me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some editorials that have been written on this subject by the New York Times, the Washington Post, and USA Today.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 24, 2000]

RISKING NATO

Gov. George W. Bush wants a new ''division of labor'' within NATO, the U.S.-European alliance that has helped keep the peace for the past half-century. His proposal would more likely lead to a division of NATO itself—to the end of the alliance.

Mr. Bush hinted at this view before, with his denunciation of U.S. ''nation-building'' in the Balkans, but it was his national security adviser, Condoleezza Rice, who spelled out exactly what he means in a New York Times interview published Saturday. Ms. Rice said that America's allies in Europe should furnish the ground troops for missions such as peacekeeping in Kosovo and Bosnia, while the United States should offer ''the kind of support we can provide, such as air power.'' In other words: You Europeans take all the risks while we hover safety above the fray. No allies would long accept such a deal, nor should they be expected to.

The proposal is particularly misguided given that European allies already are bearing the brunt of peacekeeping duties in the Balkans. They provide about four-fifths of needed troops. The United States has deployed some 11,000 troops in Kosovo and Bosnia, less than one percent of its active duty force. For the United States, this is a win-win situation: Its policy is implemented, but the burden of implementation is widely shared. Under Ms. Rice's proposal, which was officially endorsed by Bush campaign headquarters, the United States would lose its ability to steer policy, risk the world's most successful alliance—and very likely inherit a far larger burden once the Balkans erupted again.

The Clinton Administration has picked an unfortunate argument in response. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, again to the Times, said that even raising the issue was dangerous to U.S. interests. This recalls the Gore-Lieberman campaign's contention that Mr. Bush's criticism of U.S. military readiness is dangerous because it comforts U.S. enemies. This effort to squelch debate is preposterous; these are precisely the kinds of issues that should be aired in a campaign.

The more sensible response would be to point out that the Clinton-Gore policies seems to be having an effect. The Balkans are at peace; democracy is sprouting almost everywhere; even the apparently invulnerable Slobodan Milosevic has been knocked from his perch. Of course many problems remain, the gains are fragile and, yes, U.S. troops will be needed for some time. But surely helping democracy take root throughout Europe is worth the modest price of that modest deployment.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 24, 2000]

NO TIME FOR A BALKAN EXIT

Sharp contrasts emerged over the weekend in the way the Bush and Gore campaigns view America's proper military role in Europe. The debate began when Condoleezza Rice, one of Gov. George W. Bush's leading foreign policy advisers, told The Times's Michael Gordon that a Bush administration would ask European members of NATO to gradually take over full responsibility for providing peacekeeping forces for Bosnia and Kosovo. Vice President Gore countered that carrying out such a policy could destabilize the Balkans and jeopardize the future of NATO, America's most important military alliance.

Debates over how and where United States military forces should be stationed are a healthy part of presidential contests. Ms. Rice's proposal is consistent with the Bush campaign's view that extended peacekeeping missions degrade the combat readiness of American military forces and that the Pentagon should concentrate its resources on preparing for crises where Washington alone has the might to deter, and, if necessary, combat aggression, whether in the Persian Gulf, the Korean Peninsula or a future military conflict in Europe.

But on the specifics of America's role in the Balkans, Ms. Rice's proposal is misguided for several reasons. The job of securing peace in Bosnia and Kosovo is far from complete. The American share of the peacekeeping has already been substantially reduced. Finally, the NATO alliance has been built on a concept of shared risk that is inconsistent with a total withdrawal of American ground forces from Balkan peacekeeping.

It is true that military conditions in Bosnia are now more stable than they were when NATO troops were first introduced five years ago and that the situation in Kosovo has also improved in the year since Serbian forces withdrew. But in neither place is there yet enough security for displaced refugees to return to their homes or for elections to take place without the risk of physical intimidation. The departure of Slobodan Milosevic from Yugoslavia's presidency creates new opportunities for easing tensions in both Bosnia and Kosovo, provided local troublemakers can be kept in check. That will require a continued strong NATO presence.

The Clinton administration, meanwhile, has done a good job of insisting that America's share of peacekeeping responsibilities be steadily reduced. There are now only 11,400 American troops in the Balkans, about one-fifth of the NATO total. When NATO first went into Bosnia, about a third of its 60,000 troops were Americans. Balkan peacekeeping costs account for just over 1 percent of the Pentagon's $280 billion budget, leaving more than enough for military needs elsewhere.

Asking Europe to accept a total withdrawal of American ground forces from the Balkans needlessly challenges some of the basic assumptions of the Western military alliance. NATO was formed not just to counter Soviet bloc military threats. It was also designed to eliminate some of the historic military rivalries in Europe that led to two world wars. NATO provides a framework for European and American forces to cooperate in joint operations under a single overall commander—traditionally an American. Europe cannot be expected to accept an alliance in which Washington exercises political and military leadership but does not subject its own forces to any of the risks of ground operations. The Bush campaign is right when it insists that the United States must be selective in where it stations ground forces. But the Balkans is not the place to cut back.

[From the USA Today, Oct. 24, 2000]

BUSH TAKES UNWISE STEP AWAY FROM PEACEKEEPING

TODAY'S DEBATE: U.S. AND EUROPE

OUR VIEW: FOR THE U.S. TO LEAD NATO, IT MUST PARTICIPATE

Most Americans want to see their country as a world leader, but they are unenthusiastic about the human and financial costs of doing what may be necessary to lead. So it's no surprise that both presidential candidates have treaded carefully on defining America's future role in peacekeeping.

But during the weekend, the Bush campaign refined its position in a way that's likely to win votes while weakening the United States' leadership role in Europe.

In a proposal that plays into the public's ambivalence, George W. Bush's senior national security aide, Condoleezza Rice, suggested that a Bush administration would tell NATO that Europeans should take over peacekeeping in the Balkans. The U.S. would focus instead on potential trouble spots where it alone can act, she said, such as the Persian Gulf and the Taiwan Straits.

Her remarks were an effort to flesh out Bush's repeated theme that U.S. forces should focus on the ability to fight wars, not what he derides as ''nation building.'' It's appealing logic to a country that has never been enthusiastic about long-term foreign commitments. But it is rooted in the dubious assumption that the United States can effectively lead NATO, the West's primary defense alliance, without being a full player.

Both the recent history of the Balkans and the longer-term history of Europe say that is shortsighted.

The tragedy of post-Cold War Europe in the '90s was that our allies were unable to deal with chaos, ''ethnic cleansing'' and the serious threat of an expanding war on their doorstep until the United States belatedly got involved. In both Bosnia and Kosovo, European governments squabbled among themselves until the United States finally agreed to share some of the risk on the ground. The ethnic cleansing was curtailed without a single U.S. casualty.

Today, Americans comprise less than 20% of the Bosnia-Kosovo peacekeeping force, a contribution former NATO commander Wesley Clark calls the bare minimum if the United States wants to have any influence on NATO actions there. If the United States were to pull out, the record suggest it would be naive to expect Europe to respond meaningfully to the next Bosnia or Kosovo.

The deeper risk extends beyond the Balkans to the overall U.S. role in NATO. Since NATO's formation in the wake of World War II, it has served to quiet the continent's longstanding rivalries. Weakening U.S. leadership would set off a counterproductive race to fill the gap, with unfavorable consequences for U.S. interests.

A core part of the Bush argument is that the armed forces are too stretched to manage peacekeeping and prepare for war effectively. But the U.S. deployment to the Balkans is less than 10% of our military in Europe, and the cost is scarcely 1% of the Pentagon budget. Whatever shortcomings there may be in defense readiness or troop morale, blaming them on Balkans peacekeeping defies logic.

Vice President Gore, who played a central role in the Clinton administration's policy in the Balkans, accused Bush of a ''lack of judgment and a complete misunderstanding of history.''

Expecting Europe to act decisively on its own or to accept U.S. leadership without at least token U.S. involvement in the field is sadly unrealistic.

Mrs. BOXER. I am going to read a little bit from those editorials when I can find my glasses, which is an important thing. Here they are. When I started out in politics, I did not need these reading glasses. So that shows you how long I have been around.

This is from the Washington Post:

The Balkans are at peace; democracy is sprouting almost everywhere; even the apparently invulnerable Slobodan Milosevic has been knocked from his perch. Of course, many problems remain, the gains are fragile and, yes, U.S. troops will be needed for some time. But surely helping democracy take root throughout Europe is worth the modest price of that modest deployment [of peacekeeping troops].

The New York Times says that George Bush's adviser's proposal is misguided. That is the proposal to say that we will no longer participate in peacekeeping.

The job of securing peace in Bosnia and Kosovo is far from complete. The American share of the peacekeeping has already been substantially reduced. Finally, the NATO alliance has been built on a concept of shared risk that is inconsistent with a total withdrawal of American ground forces from Balkan peacekeeping.

Now, we know that America's share, they say, of peacekeeping responsibilities is steadily reducing.

There are now only 11,400 American troops in the Balkans, about one-fifth of the NATO total. When NATO first went into Bosnia, about a third of its 60,000 troops were Americans. Balkan peacekeeping costs [are only] 1 percent of the Pentagon's . . . budget. . . .

Asking Europe to accept a total withdrawal of American ground forces from the Balkans needlessly challenges some of the basic assumptions of [our] western military alliance.

Our Western military alliance has served us well. Why would we now—when we see the tinderbox over in the Middle East—come up with a plan that would shake up our allies, that would worry our friends? This is the time not to make those kinds of proposals. And those proposals themselves are dangerous for the world.

I will also quote from USA Today. So you are seeing a whole number of newspapers coming out against this Bush plan.

They say:

The deeper risk extends beyond the Balkans to the overall U.S. role in NATO. Since NATO's formation in the wake of World War II, it has served to quiet the continent's longstanding rivalries. Weakening U.S. leadership would set off a counterproductive race to fill the gap, with unfavorable consequences for U.S. interests.

I have to believe this kind of a policy—either it was not thought out or it is a radical departure from what has worked for us not only through the cold war but after the cold war. Governor Bush says we can't do all this alone. And I agree with him; we can't do all this alone. But the bizarre thing is, he is pulling us out of a situation—or would want to, if he were President—where we are only about 20 percent of the force. This is an example of the way we ought to integrate all of the responsibilities of the various allies. I find it amazing that this policy would come up at this time when we have the world in such a precarious position as we look at what is happening in the Middle East.

So in any event, in closing, I will make these points in two areas: education and foreign policy.

I think there are some interesting new developments the American people ought to look at. One, we have a candidate for President, who is the Governor of Texas, who is using Texas as the model. We just learned that Texas is almost dead last as a place people would want to raise their children. That is an unbiased report that came out. We have a Rand study, which is a study that Bush himself has cited, which says these kids in Texas are simply not making it.

We now have this foreign policy fiasco. While the Republicans want to look at what went on in 1995 between Russia and America, we now realize that what we ought to be looking at is this latest proposal by Governor Bush, and to try to debunk it, that would say we ought to pull our peacekeeping troops out, that America should not even have a role in peacekeeping. It is rattling our NATO allies.

Again, NATO has served us well. Why? Because we all cooperate and we work together and we come up with plans together. And to have this, if you will, ''Molotov cocktail'' from George Bush just thrown out—unprovoked—to shake up our NATO allies, and say, ''We are not going to do peacekeeping; we are going to do fighting,'' I say to this Senate that I do not like that division of responsibilities, where America does all the fighting and our NATO allies do the peacekeeping.

I do not like shaking up our allies at this time. I think it shows a certain recklessness, a certain lack of experience, a certain misunderstanding of history of what it has been like for us to build these alliances. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am very concerned by this proposal. I believe it will have a very negative impact.

I am someone who has fought long and hard for burdensharing. I have offered a number of amendments in the House and the Senate asserting that it is important our allies carry their fair share. I will go on record as saying 80 percent of the troops in the Balkans is a fair share; 80 percent of our commitment in the Balkans is being paid by the Europeans, 20 percent by the Americans. That is good. That is a fair share. That is working.

To throw this kind of a proposal out there at this time when the Middle East is in crisis, when we need our allies at the table, when we need good relationships with our friends, shows a certain irresponsibility and riskiness upon which the American people are not going to look very kindly. And certainly, while the Foreign Relations Committee is beating up on the Vice President 2 weeks before an election about Russia-United States relations; our problem today isn't Russia-United States relations; our problem today is trying to do the best we can with our allies in the world to end some of these tragedies going on in the Middle East, to work for a new Yugoslavia that is democratic, to make sure we build on Madeleine Albright's seeming success in North Korea where, by the way, we have 37,000 troops. Maybe my friend from Illinois knows this. I did not hear any comments about pulling out troops from the Koreas, but maybe that is his next proposal, where we have kept the peace and stability.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator from California will yield.

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DURBIN. She has raised an important point. Most people would agree that the Governor of Texas has limited personal exposure and experience when it comes to foreign policy issues. That does not mean he is disqualified. There have been Presidents who have been Governors. But we have to judge him on what he has said.

His suggestion of the withdrawal of troops in some parts of the world raises serious questions as to whether or not he has considered the consequences. The United States made a commitment, for example, in Europe after World War II to stop the spread of communism. It cost the American people

trillions of dollars. It paid off: 250 years later, communism is virtually wiped off the map and these countries, the Balkans and eastern European countries, now enjoy democracy and freedom.

There was only one country in the world that could do that, and that was the United States. We have military skill, the great men and women in uniform, and we have a reputation of involving ourselves in foreign policy—not to come away with any property or treasure; we are there to try to promote the ideals and values of our country.

So when Governor Bush suggests withdrawing troops in some parts of the world, you have to wonder, has he really reflected on this? Has he taken the time to try to measure why he would change policies that even his father supported, perhaps President Reagan supported, and now he wants to change these policies and approaches?

This is an important element. Thank goodness we live in a world that is generally at peace, but it is a dangerous world that at any moment can flare up. We need leadership in the White House that understands the consequences of its actions.

I salute the Senator from California. What we are seeing happen today in North Korea—where they are finally talking to us; they are finally agreeing to perhaps end the missile testing—is a very positive development. It is only because the United States made a commitment in South Korea with the lives of our service men and women and then kept troops there to protect it that we have reached that point today.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator DURBIN be given 5 minutes following the completion of my time.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask that Senator DURBIN be given 5 minutes when I conclude my time.

Mr. KYL. I object, Mr. President, on the ground that I was going to speak at a quarter till.

Mr. DURBIN. May I make an inquiry of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I want to be fair to my colleagues. It was my understanding that the Democratic side would have the first 25 minutes in morning business and then the Republican side. But in the interest of my colleagues who have given up their own time, I am happy to work out an arrangement with them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the objection over adding 5 minutes or taking the 5 minutes?

Mr. KYL. Let me withdraw the objection.

Mrs. BOXER. I was just making sure that Senator DURBIN would be recognized for the next 5 minutes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I withdraw my objection. I did not understand the Senator's request. My understanding was that the minority time would have expired about now. I understand that is not the case. Therefore, I do not object to the request of the Senator from California to have Senator DURBIN speak next. I was hoping to be able to speak before noon, but that may not be possible.

Mr. DURBIN. May I ask for clarification? How much time does the Democratic side have remaining in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic side has a little over 24 minutes. The Republican side has 20 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Chair make an inquiry of my two Republican colleagues as to how long they would like to speak.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if I could clarify, it is no big deal. What we had was the morning business time divided between Republicans and Democrats. The leader's time took some of that, so we didn't have enough. We ought to share equally what remains. Whatever that division is, it ought to be divided between the two of us.

Mrs. BOXER. If I may restate my unanimous consent request, understanding that we have 24 minutes remaining, I would appreciate it if Senator DURBIN could follow my remarks so we have some train of thought. Then we can take the next 10 minutes from the Republican time, if they would like to use it. I don't think Senator DURBIN has a problem; I don't have a problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. If we would determine exactly the time that is remaining and then maybe add to that my opportunity to speak after Senator DURBIN.

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to.

Mr. KYL. If we could suspend one moment.

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I ask if we could suspend the request for one moment. Senator THOMAS is technically in control of the time on our side. He should be the one who understands this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the Senator from California finishes, the Senator from Illinois will speak for 5 minutes, followed by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Out of the 10 minutes I originally had, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used her time.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent for 60 seconds to recap what I said before the time goes to Senator DURBIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. We have taken longer deciding who is going to talk than we have on what we really want to say. I will sum up my points today.

I think two issues are coming to the floor in this election. Education is one of them. We have the Governor of Texas saying his kids in Texas are doing great. We learned today that was based on a State test, not a national test. So that is something we have to look at. We have a new study showing that Texas is one of the worst places to raise a child. That is from another objective, nonpartisan study.

Now we have a hearing going on in Foreign Relations beating up on Vice President GORE for something that happened in 1995, when not one Republican ever complained about it until 2 weeks before the election, when Governor Bush has now made a proposal that in essence threw a bomb into NATO—figuratively, not literally—and our NATO allies are worried and concerned that suddenly we have on the table a proposal—not very well thought out, in my view—that would drastically change NATO and would say, in essence, that the United States will be the fighters, someone else will be the peacekeepers.

I think it is more dangerous for our people to take that on alone. It is a big worry I have. It shows in this sensitive time why we need proven, effective, experienced leadership in the White House. We don't want to have someone coming in and throwing this kind of proposal into NATO. We need our NATO allies now more than ever. We have great opportunities for peace in the world. We are not going to make them come true if we dissect NATO and destroy it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for the sake of my colleagues on the floor, Senator THOMAS and others, it is my understanding that I am to speak for 10 minutes, and then the Republican side will be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request was made for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Five minutes, fine. I will confine my remarks to 5 minutes in the interest of my patient colleagues. After Senator THOMAS and Senator KYL, I would like to reclaim the Democratic time under morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAKING TOUGH CHOICES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in 2 weeks the American people are going to face one of the toughest choices they have had perhaps in modern memory.

This Presidential race is not just a choice between two individuals and whether, frankly, one has a better image on television, or more experience, or a better speaking voice. It comes down to basic questions of values envisioned for this country. There

are two contrasting views to be chosen. I can recall 4 years ago coming to the Senate when the Republicans all lined up and said that our economy was in such terrible shape, and the Federal budget was in such bad shape, we would have to amend the Constitution with a balanced budget amendment because of our deficits. They were so desperate they wanted to give the power to the Federal courts to stop Congress from spending.

Four years later, look at the difference. We are not talking about deficits; we are talking about how to spend the surplus, and we are talking about an economy which, for 8 years, has been cooking, creating 22 million new jobs. There is more home ownership than at any time in our history. Welfare rolls are coming down and crime rates are coming down. Opportunities for businesses, for minorities, for women are unparalleled in our history. When you look at advanced placement courses in schools, we have more Hispanics and African Americans enrolling in them than ever before in our history.

America is moving forward, and I am glad to say we have been part of it in Congress. We can't take credit for it anymore than the President can or Alan Greenspan can. It is a joint effort of families and businesses across America. But make no mistake, the right policy in Washington set the stage for this to happen. When President Clinton said, ''I am going to make a meaningful effort to reduce the national deficits,'' frankly, we didn't get a single Republican vote to support us. Not one. Vice President GORE came to the floor of the Senate and cast the tie-breaking vote, and we started on a path in 1993 that led to where we are today. There are some people who think this is automatic in America, that prosperity is a matter of standing aside and watching it happen.

I know better. I have been in the Congress long enough to know that the wrong policies in the White House can jeopardize economic prosperity. Do you remember the early days of the Reagan years when they came up with an idea called ''supply side economics'' and the appropriately named ''Laffer curve''? We followed that crazy notion long enough to find ourselves deep in red ink, with the biggest deficits in history, the largest national debt and America on the ropes. Thank goodness we have broken away from that.

Should we experiment again? George W. Bush suggests he wants a $1.6 trillion tax cut going primarily to wealthy people in America. Can we run that risk? The highest 1 percent of wage earners who will see over 40 percent of the George W. Bush tax cut are people who are making more than $300,000 a year. I can't understand why a person who has an income of $25,000 a month needs a $2,000 a month tax cut. But that is what Governor Bush has proposed. He says it is only fair and right; these are taxpayers, too. Think of Bill Gates. He has been very successful with Microsoft. He is worth billions of dollars. According to George W. Bush, he needs a tax cut. I don't think so.

George W. Bush should take into consideration that the net worth of Bill Gates is greater than the combined net worth of 106 million Americans. He doesn't need our help. The people who need our help, frankly, are families struggling to pay for college expenses. We on the Democratic side believe that we need tax cuts targeted to help families in a real way so they can deduct college tuition and fees up to $12,000 a year to help kids get through college and have a better life.

We also believe we ought to help families who are going to work trying to find something to do with their children. Day care is an important issue for so many families. We want to increase the tax credit for day care and also give a tax credit for stay-at-home moms who are willing to make the economic sacrifice for their children.

Finally, when it comes to long-term care, so many of us have seen aging parents and grandparents who need a helping hand. I have seen families making extra sacrifices for those parents. Our tax program would give a targeted tax cut to help those families.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

CAMPAIGNING ON THE SENATE FLOOR

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I think it is somewhat unseemly to use the Senate floor for campaign purposes with respect to attacking the qualifications of one of the two candidates for President of the United States. I would like to do some business here and suggest that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who use their time to engage in campaign tactics really ought to be helping us take care of a bit of business that I think ought to move to the top of the agenda, such as fighting terrorism in the aftermath of the attack on the U.S.S. *Cole*.

ENHANCING THE FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, we now have more reports of specific credible evidence of planned attacks against the United States—terrorism that must be prevented. We have not done everything we can do to prevent terrorism. According to a Commission that has reported to the Congress, there is more to be done. I have incorporated that Commission's recommendations into a bill. We are trying to get the bill passed. It runs into objections from the other side. Today, I am going to lay it out because there isn't much time left.

Earlier this month, I introduced the Counterterrorism Act of 2000, cosponsored by my friend and colleague, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN. This should have bipartisan support. As the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism, and Government Information, I have held hearings, along with Senator FEINSTEIN, on steps that would better prepare this country to thwart and defend against and prevent and respond to terrorist attacks. Our legislation will do that by capturing many of the recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorism.

The Commission was mandated by the Congress, and it released its report earlier this year. It is bipartisan, led by Ambassador Paul Bremer and Maurice Sonnenberg. They have a long record—both of them—of experience and expertise in this matter. The Commission, with 10 members in all, came to unanimous conclusions on the gaps in America's counterterrorism efforts and made extensive recommendations in their report.

In addition to Ambassador Bremer, who formerly served as Ambassador-at-Large for Counterterrorism and Mr. Sonnenberg, who serves on the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, the Commission included eight other outstanding experts in the field: former CIA Director, James Woolsey; former Assistant Director-in-Charge of the FBI's National Security Division, John Lewis; former Congresswoman Jane Harman, who served on the House Armed Services and Intelligence Committees; former Under Secretary of Defense, Fred Ikle; former Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Special Operations Command, Gen. Wayne Downing; Director of National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, Richard Betts; former foreign policy adviser to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Gardner Peckham; Harvard professor Juliette Kayyem, who formerly served as legal advisor to the U.S. Attorney General.

In June, the members of this Commission testified before the Intelligence Committee, of which I am a member, with their findings and recommendations. A week later, the Commission's report was the subject of a Foreign Relations Committee hearing. At the end of June, Senator FEINSTEIN and I invited the Commissioners to testify at a hearing of the Judiciary subcommittee which I chair. The purpose of our hearing was to explore the findings of the Commission and clarify some recommendations that have been mischaracterized. So the Senate thought that this Commission report was important enough to hold three specific hearings on its findings and recommendations.

Senator FEINSTEIN and I then decided to take action on the recommendations by drafting the Counterterrorism Act of 2000. We believe this is an important first step in addressing shortfalls in America's fight against the growing threat of terrorism.

In summary, this is what the bill would do:

First, it expresses the sense of Congress that the United States Government should take immediate actions to

investigate the unprovoked attack on the U.S.S. *Cole*, should ensure that the perpetrators of this cowardly act are brought to justice.

It directs the President to establish a joint task force to develop a broad approach toward discouraging the fundraising of international terrorists.

It directs the Director of the CIA to report to Congress with a response to the Commission's findings regarding guidelines for recruitment of terrorist informants and whether those guidelines inhibit the recruitment of such informants.

In effect, what the Commission said is if you are going to try to infiltrate terrorist organizations, you are probably dealing with nefarious characters. They are not Boy Scouts. And you can't demand of them the same clean standards that we would in trying to recruit informants against other governments. When you are dealing with terrorist organizations, you are dealing with terrorists.

The bill also directs the Attorney General to conduct a review of the legal authority of various agencies, including the Defense Department, to respond to catastrophic terrorist attacks, and it requires that a report be provided to the Congress.

It directs the President to establish a long-term research and development program relating to technology to prevent, preempt, interdict, and respond to catastrophic terrorist attack.

It directs the FBI Director to report to Congress on the feasibility of creating an intelligence reporting function within the Bureau to assist in disseminating information collected by the Bureau on international terrorism and other national security matters.

It directs the President to report to Congress on legal authorities that govern the sharing of criminal wiretap information between law enforcement agencies and the intelligence community. The Commission noted there is currently a great deal of confusion in this area. We have to get that squared away so the agencies know how they can share information with each other.

The bill would direct the Attorney General to report to Congress the recommendations on how to improve controls on biological pathogens and the equipment necessary to produce biological weapons. It directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to report to Congress with recommendations for improving security and physical protection of biological pathogens at research laboratories and other facilities.

It authorizes the full reimbursement for professional liability insurance for law enforcement or intelligence officers performing counterterrorism duties.

And finally, the bill expresses the sense of Congress that Syria should remain on the list of states that sponsor terrorism, as should Iran, until they meet certain conditions.

I recently received a letter from Ambassador Bremer and Mr. Sonnenberg, expressing very strong support for the Kyl-Feinstein legislation. I also received letters from the American Israeli Public Affairs Committee, the Zionist Organization of America, and the Anti-Defamation League applauding the bill. In addition, the American Jewish Congress released a statement in support of the legislation.

I ask unanimous consent at the conclusion of my remarks these documents be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. KYL. The text of the Counterterrorism Act 2000 should be familiar to Members because we tried to move it as an amendment to the intelligence authorization bill. We were open to comments by Senators and we made several modifications to the language in order to suit Senators and the Department of Justice. We agreed in the end to withdraw the bill at that point so the intelligence bill could move forward but indicated our desire then to move the bill as a separate bill, which is now what we are doing.

Among the Senators who have talked to us is Senator LEAHY. We have tried to address his concerns with respect to the bill. Originally his staff advised that if the Justice Department didn't object to the bill, Senator LEAHY would consent to its passage. The Justice Department has cleared the bill. After that, Senator LEAHY's office advised us they desired to have 10 other changes considered and sent another list of 4 other changes. Senator FEINSTEIN and I agreed to make changes to the bill to accommodate 12 of those 14 requests of Senator LEAHY. Yet he still remains in opposition. Under the rules of the Senate prevailing at this time, any Senator can object to the consideration of the legislation and thus block it, which Senator LEAHY, I understand, has done.

This morning my office received some additional concerns purportedly coming from Senator LEAHY. I find them, frankly, not to rise to the level that should take the Senate's time. For example, he objects to a provision, or his staff objects to a provision, that requires the President to report to Congress on the Commission's recommendations about sharing law enforcement information with intelligence agencies on the grounds that this would help set ''a dangerous precedent for blurring the line between law enforcement and intelligence activities.'' A report to Congress on legal authorities on the state of the law sets no dangerous precedent. There are similar types of concerns expressed.

We have to get serious about this. At the very moment that our forces are on a heightened state of alert, at the very moment our embassies are telling people not to travel to certain countries because of terrorist threats against Americans, the Congress has before it a bill embodying the recommendations of the Terrorism Commission, and we are not acting on it because, as far as I know, one Member of this body is not willing to allow it to move forward.

I plead with him, I plead with other Members, if there are concerns, let's talk about them. But the time is short. Perfection cannot be the enemy of the good considering the nature of the challenge that we face with terrorists around the world and the need to do more about it. This isn't simply something that has been pulled out of thin air to try to deal with this problem. We have embodied most of the recommendations of the Terrorism Commission specifically mandated by Congress to give us recommendations about what else we need to be doing in this legislation.

I say to Senator LEAHY and any others, time is short. We need to visit. We need to talk about these things. We need to clear them away so we can pass this legislation. After the Senate acts, the House will need to act. They are expected to act with alacrity. For example, Representative GILMAN, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Representative GOSS, chairman of the Intelligence Committee, and I understand the leadership is prepared, if we can pass this bill, to take it up very quickly. However, I don't know how many days or hours are left in this session.

I think it would be a travesty, given the events of the past month, given the threats that currently have been made against the United States, for the Congress to ignore the recommendations of the very Commission that we asked to give us advice, to ignore the recommendations of that Commission and conclude this Congress without acting to pass those recommendations to take additional steps to deal with the terrorist threat.

Let's leave politics aside. This is a bipartisan effort of Senator FEINSTEIN and myself. It has broad support on both sides of the aisle. I encourage my colleagues to please come forth if they have additional concerns so we can get this done.

EXHIBIT 1

SEPTEMBER 22, 2000.

Senator JON KYL,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KYL: In our capacities as former Chairman and Vice Chairman of the National Commission on Terrorism, we have been asked to comment on the proposed legislation which we understand you intend to introduce to the 106th Congress (called the ''Counterterrorism Act of 2000'').

As you know, our bipartisan Commission concluded that the threat to Americans from terrorism is changing and becoming more serious. To meet this threat, the Commission made a number of important recommendations to the President and Congress in its final report of June 5, 2000.

We have reviewed the draft bill and wish to commend you and your colleagues for the job of translating into law a number of the Commission's most important recommendations. We are particularly pleased to see the bill address issues such as state sponsorship of terrorism, better collection and dissemination of terrorist intelligence, a broader strategy for disrupting terrorist fund-raising, and

efforts to prevent or deal with catastrophic terrorism in the United States.

We hope that this important bill will become law and that Congress and the Executive branch will do everything possible to implement it expeditiously.

Respectfully,

L. PAUL BROMER, III,
Former Chairman, National Commission on Terrorism.
MAURICE SONNENBERG,
Former Vice Chairman, National Commission on Terrorism.

AIPAC,
Washington, DC, October 16, 2000.

Hon. JON L. KYL,
U.S. Senate, Hart Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KYL: On behalf of AIPAC, we are writing to express our appreciation for your introduction of the Counterterrorism Act of 2000. This legislation takes a number of important steps to address the growing problem of terrorism in our country and abroad.

This bipartisan measure adopts many of the key recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorism, particularly with respect to long-term research and development efforts and methods of improving controls over biological pathogens. We believe this legislation will encourage cooperation among states like the United States and Israel that have worked so closely in fighting the scourge of terrorism. Of course, we also endorse the legislation's intent that Iran and Syria should remain on the list of states that sponsor terrorism until they cease their support for terrorist actions.

Thank you again for your leadership, and please let us know if we can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

HOWARD KOHR,
Executive Director.
MARVIN FEUER,
Director of Defense & Strategic Issues.

ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA,
New York, NY, October 11, 2000.

Senator JON KYL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KYL: On behalf of the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), which is the oldest and one of the largest Zionist organizations in the United States, I am writing to express the ZOA's enthusiastic support for S. 2507, the Counterterrorism Act of 2000.

This vital legislation will ensure that our country takes swift and effective action to impede the ability of terrorist groups to receive funding, acquire technology for use as weapons, and recruit new members. We have all seen, in recent years, the kind of devastation that terrorist groups can wreak. Our government must do everything possible to combat terrorist groups—and S. 2507 will mandate specific and important steps that will play a crucial role in the fight against terrorism.

We are also pleased to note that the S. 2507 urges that Syria be kept on the U.S. list of terror-sponsoring states until it takes concrete anti-terror steps, such as shutting down terrorist training camps and prohibiting the transfer of weapons to terrorists through Syrian-controlled territory. The legislation also appropriately urges that Iran be kept on the list of terror-sponsors until there is concrete, indisputable evidence that Iran has changed its ways and forsaken terrorism. In the absence of such actions, governments such as those in Syria and Iran must be treated as the rogue regimes which they are.

With gratitude for your leadership role in this effort,

Sincerely,

MORTON A. KLEIN,
National President,
Zionist Organization of America.

ADL,
New York, NY, October 12, 2000.

Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: We welcome your leadership in introducing legislation to codify several important proposals of the bipartisan National Commission on Terrorism. As an organization committed to monitoring hate groups while safeguarding civil liberties, we support the bill's tough, constitutional approach to investigating and prosecuting terrorist crimes.

The bill's mechanism for allowing classified evidence to be used within a sound due process a framework represents the kind of balanced approach which would prevent the improper treatment of individuals, while allowing the government to protect sources. The legislation would also implement useful steps to prevent the US from being used as a fundraising base for terrorism.

It is well established that the government has the constitutional right—and the duty—to keep our nation from being used as a base for terrorist activity. The legislation you have crafted makes vital improvements in our nation's capability to investigate, deter, and prevent terrorism.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. BERKOWITZ,
National Chairman.
ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN,
National Director.

AJCONGRESS WELCOMES LEGISLATION RESPONDING TO THREAT OF BIOLOGICAL AND CHEMICAL ATTACKS BY TERRORISTS; CALLS MEASURE 'A BEGINNING PLAN' TO DEAL WITH THE DANGER

American Jewish Congress Executive Director Phil Baum issued the following statement today following the decision by Senators Jon Kyl and Dianne Feinstein to introduce legislation responding to the recent report of the National Commission on Terrorism:

The danger not only to this country but to all of civil society from the threat of biological and chemical weapons is becoming ever more real and apparent. For some time now, commentators have been warning of the growing risk of terrorist attacks with these weapons unless effective counter measures are quickly put in place.

Those most expert and familiar with these matters warn that the question is not whether there will be an attack, but when.

A sobering report released recently by the National Commission on Terrorism has documented these concerns and has begun the process of alerting Americans to the danger we face and the steps that can be taken to meet that threat.

Until now, little has been done concretely to implement the Commission's report. Fortunately, there are now plans in the Senate to attach as an amendment to the fiscal 2001 Intelligence Authorization Act a measure which is attempting to respond to this challenge. Introduced by Senators Jon Kyl (R–Ariz) and Dianne Feinstein (D–Calif), the legislation lays out at least a beginning plan for dealing with these problems.

The bill for the first time would impose rigorous restrictions on procedures used in research labs handling pathogens; calls for presidential leadership in the development of new technologies to counter terrorist attacks; limits the capacity of terrorist groups to raise funds in this country—which is often done under the guise of raising funds for social programs; and mandates the CIA and the FBI to report on the continuing effectiveness of anti-terrorist measures currently in place.

One provision of the bill—authorizing the FBI to share foreign intelligence information obtained from domestic wiretaps with the CIA and other intelligence agencies—has quite properly met with criticism has consequently has been dropped by Senator Kyl. We are convinced that an effective fight against the new terrorist threat can be waged without violating Constitutionally guaranteed civil liberties—protections which must remain our first priority.

As the American people begin to focus on the dangers of chemical and biological terrorism, two equally unacceptable dangers present themselves: that we remain indifferent to the threat, or that we overreact, at the expense of our civil liberties. Neither is acceptable. A measured response is necessary, and the Kyl-Feinstein bill begins that process.

The legislation presents the Senate with the opportunity to move the American people off dead center and to address the danger in a composed and rational manner, without endangering American freedoms or our country's sense of confidence in its future. The new legislation rests on the premise that the future can be best assured by a realistic address to the dangers we confront.

New technologies have been a blessing for this generation. In the hands of terrorists, they become a curse for all generations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

SENATE BUSINESS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I join my colleague from Arizona in requesting the business of the Senate be allowed to go forward. We have seen many filibusters all year. That is what has gotten us into this situation where we are past October 1 and still working on the budget.

I think we ought to be doing the business of the Senate. My predecessor, Alan Simpson, who had this seat in the Senate, said several times, an accusation that isn't answered is an accusation accepted. There are a couple of things I have to clear up from this morning.

First, we did all this work on a balanced budget without the balanced budget constitutional amendment. Yes, we did. But the debate on the balanced budget constitutional amendment is what made the people of America rise up and tell every single one of their representatives that they wanted the budget of this country balanced. And it was the heat the people of this country put on the Congress that led Members to balance the budget. That wouldn't have happened without the debate on the balanced budget.

That is the reason we have what is being referred to as a ''surplus'' today. It isn't a surplus. It is tax overcharge. We have collected more from the people than we had planned to spend. We ought to refer to it as that.

I could not begin to cover all of the accusations that were misaccusations. Another real important one I have to cover is the Reaganomics attack. Yes, giving the money back to the people, as Reagan suggested, resulted in a 30-percent increase in revenue to this country. So why do we have such a big deficit? Because people spent it. We cannot spend more than we take in. It is a pretty basic principle of economics. Reaganomics increased revenue.

The other side, who was in control of the Congress at that time, outspent what he was able to bring in by increasing business in this country. The balanced budget amendment increased the economy of this Nation. Everybody agrees balancing the budget has done that. If we get back to a position where it isn't balanced, people will lose confidence in the economy, and we will be back where we started, with ever-increasing deficits, particularly if we dramatically increase spending each year.

I notice the Secretary of the Treasury took an unusual approach yesterday and got into the debate on Social Security.

The Social Security issue does come down to: Whom do you trust? Every year that I have been here, there has been a promise that there will be Social Security reform. I went to a White House conference. I have to say it was one of the best planned, best organized, and best done conferences I have ever seen. One of the reasons was that Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate, were invited to be a part of it. When it finished, there was a special part for everybody from the House and Senate to participate in—again, Republicans and Democrats. We sat down with the President and we agreed there needed to be Social Security reform and that reform had to have the fingerprint of everybody on it, that it could not be used as a Social Security scare.

We have saved bill No. 1 for the President's Social Security reform. Every year that I have been here, the President in his State of the Union speech has said: The most important thing for this country is to solve the Social Security problem. We saved bill No. 1 for him. We never got a solution.

The President of the Senate, who is the Vice President of the United States, has been a part of these efforts. He says he has delivered on all his promises. That is a promise that was made. That is a promise that has not been kept. Social Security has not been reformed.

There has been another effort involved in this, too, and that has been a bipartisan commission—again, Republicans and Democrats sitting down to talk about how to save Social Security. They came up with a plan. They had to have a supermajority to have that plan actually presented to us, and the President's nominees to that committee were the ones who objected and made it one vote short of being a request that could be presented to us. Again, a bipartisan solution. That bipartisan solution is what you are hearing Governor Bush talk about. It is something that has been presented in a number of plans here in the Senate, but it needs the endorsement of both Republicans and Democrats, and the elimination of a veto threat at the Presidential level, to be able to solve that problem.

Why do we need to solve it? You have heard how far we extended it and how we are getting extra money into the Social Security trust fund. The money in the Social Security trust fund is IOUs, T-bills. Now we are using the Social Security surplus to pay down the private debt for the United States. Do you know what that does? That lets us spend more money. When we have private debt out there, we pay the interest on a regular basis. When we spend Social Security surplus to pay down the national debt, the private part of the national debt, we increase the Social Security debt and we just put in IOUs to pay the interest.

Why is that important? Sometime the debt will come due. You hear a lot of different numbers about when the debt comes due: 2013 is the magic time when the baby boomers move into the group of recipients of Social Security and start jerking out enormous amounts of money from Social Security—2013. They say Social Security is secure until 2037. That is until the last dime is drawn. It will not work that way. Here is why it will not. In 2025, the ones of us who are here—with the exception of maybe one or two—will not be here. There will be a different generation that will be in the Senate and in the Congress. These will be people who have paid into Social Security their whole life and will realize they will not get a dime out of it.

Here is another little problem. When it comes appropriations time, all they are going to do is decide how big the check for interest is going to be, because the national debt will be so huge at that time that we will not build a road, we will not do anything for the military, we will not do anything for education—we will pay interest. How excited do you think the people of this country are going to be to just be paying interest on a debt from the last century and to have no benefit coming their way? I suggest there could be a revolution in this country, an end to Social Security. Future generations may not feel the same need to take care of their parents and other elderly in the country because they themselves are not going to get any benefit. It is not going to be there to take care of them. So it needs to be solved now.

We are also talking about prescription drugs. This is a very complicated issue. There are at least six plans out there, any one of which could provide prescription drug coverage for seniors. It is something in which we are all interested. It is something that needs to be done. We need to be sure that every person in this country can get the prescription drugs they need, and we need to be sure every person in this country doesn't have to make a choice between food or their prescription drugs. There have been two plans proposed. They are quite different.

One of the things I like to use is this chart. I think it lends a little validity to the decisions between the two principal plans. One is provided by Governor Bush, one is provided by Vice President GORE. Those are the two main ones. I have to tell you, the biggest difference between the two is that Governor Bush's plan provides for choice, your choice. Vice President GORE's plan calls for a national plan. The decisions will be made in Washington. You will not have the flexibility.

Since we are talking about how some of Mr. GORE's drug proposals work, I suggest they lack a little sincerity and are going to make life much harder for working Americans. Here are some thoughts on the Medicare prescription drug plan. This is the biggest secret out there. Mr. GORE's plan would cover 2.6 million fewer low-income Americans than the plan offered by Governor Bush and introduced in the Senate by Republicans. That is because Mr. GORE's plan offers low-income subsidies only up to 150 percent of poverty, while Mr. Bush's plan would help seniors up to 175 percent of poverty.

Mr. GORE's plan would not even become effective until 2002. On top of that, Mr. GORE's plan would also displace the coverage that 70 percent of the current Medicare recipients already have. For those seniors whose employer offered a retirement benefit, there is now no incentive for the company to continue that coverage, leaving the senior with no option but the HCFA-run program. For all the stock Mr. GORE puts into the agenda, and the advice of the AMA, he apparently has not been concerned by their assertion that the HCFA—that is, this national organization that will run his prescription drug plan—is the IRS of the new millennium. I, for one, do not see the sincerity in putting more people on the *Titanic*. As my friend from Texas often says about putting people on programs under the care of HCFA, it would be a disaster.

If Mr. GORE had sincere concerns about the health and welfare of seniors, he would focus on real solutions that stabilize the Medicare program, offer seniors comprehensive health care, and enable seniors to select coverage, including prescriptions, that meets their needs and budgets. That is a commitment Governor Bush has already made. Governor Bush would provide immediate drug coverage for those seniors who right now cannot afford it. He doesn't cross his fingers and take his chances with HCFA. Instead, he builds on the existing drug assistance programs in the States.

Here are a few statistics about the immediate impact of the proposal. Half of women beneficiaries who are currently without coverage would gain immediate coverage. Almost three-

fourths of the minority seniors currently without coverage would gain immediate coverage. And the most frail of our seniors, those over 80 years old, would improve their access under the Bush plan.

Another important part of the Bush proposal is that States will not be restricted from offering low-income subsidies above 175 percent of poverty. Under the Gore plan, there is no option for States to pool funds and ease the expense of drug coverage for even more seniors.

Why is this chart important? This chart was done by the Washington Post. People who understand newspapers in this country understand what the Washington Post does will not be favorable to Governor Bush. They have a tendency to be favorable to the other side. So when they do a chart, a person ought to pay a little bit of attention to it. This is from the article that came with the chart:

Bush details Medicare plan, September 5: Texas Governor George Bush today proposed spending $198 billion to enhance Medicare over the next 10 years, including covering the full cost of prescription drugs for seniors with low incomes.

Bush's plan was modeled on a bipartisan proposal by Senator John Breaux, Democrat from Louisiana, and Senator Bill Frist, Republican from Tennessee.

This is the commission I was talking about.

Bush's plan proposes ''fully subsidizing people with incomes less than 135 percent of the poverty level and creating a sliding scale for people with slightly more money. But Gore would stop the sliding scale at 150 percent of the poverty level, while Bush would extend it to 175 percent.

As I mentioned, a lot of States like that flexibility. A newspaper that normally would not give good reviews, gives a good review. One problem is the cost over the next 10 years would be $198 billion. The chart they did comparing the two shows $158 billion. They were charging him with $40 billion more in costs than what their chart actually shows.

I hope people will pay some attention to the comparisons. I ask unanimous consent that the chart be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 6, 2000]

Bush	Gore
PREMIUMS	
25 percent of health plans' monthly charge.	$25 per month starting in 2002, increasing to $44 by 2008.
COPAYMENT FOR EACH PRESCRIPTION	
Not spelled out. Would be determined by individual plan.	Government would pay 50 percent up to maximum of $2,000 when the program starts, increasing to $5,000 by 2008.
COVERAGE FOR CATASTROPHIC EXPENSES	
Government pays all costs above $6,000 per year.	Government pays all costs above $4,000 per year.
DEDUCTIBLE	
Not spelled out. Would be determined by individual health plan.	None.
HELP FOR LOW-INCOME ELDERLY	
Pays premiums and all other costs for individuals with incomes less than 135 percent of the poverty line—that is, $11,300 or couples with incomes less than $15,200. Partial subsidies for people with incomes up to 175 percent of the poverty level.	Same, but partial subsidies available for people with incomes up to 150 percent of the poverty level.
WHEN BENEFITS WOULD START	
Help for low-income people and catastrophic coverage would be administered by states, starting next year. Premium subsidies for other people and broader Medicare reforms to make the program rely more heavily on private HMOs would start in 2004.	2002.
COST	
$158 billion by 2010	$253 billion by 2010.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, the comparison shows pretty conclusively that you get more benefits under the $158 billion plan than you do under the $253 billion plan. The $158 billion plan goes into effect right away. The other one does not go into effect until 2002, and people have to pay, under the Democrat plan, $600 whether they get any benefits or not. It is my understanding the $600 has been subtracted from the $253 billion to make that cost a little bit lower. So it is a another tax for a proposal that provides for Federal control as opposed to your control.

HCFA versus your decisions: Talk to your doctors about HCFA and how it participates and interacts with them. Talk to them about the crisis that HCFA has already caused in this Nation in medical care and ask yourself: Do I want to give them the added burden of a prescription drug plan and only give myself one option? That is what we are looking at here.

I hope you will do some comparisons and see the difference and concentrate on this bipartisan solution to providing prescription drugs. The one thing about the Governor from Texas with which I have really been impressed has been his ability and effort to work with both sides in the Texas Legislature. I used to be in the Wyoming Legislature. I know how important it is for people to work together. It is a little different atmosphere than we have in Washington.

How did Governor Bush do that when he moved in and had a Democrat legislature? He sat down with them one on one, face to face, and talked to them about his priorities and their priorities, and they worked together. What excites me is following the history of Presidents, they tend to repeat what they have done successfully before, and I am really excited about that because I see a Governor coming to Washington and sitting down with both sides, one on one, face to face—a long process; there are 535 of us, but it is doable. That is what is needed in Washington: more effort across the aisle, effort like the Medicare Commission that has provided a solution for prescription drugs that can be done. I thank the Chair and yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining under morning business on the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. I want to use those 6 minutes to sum up.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, when I finished speaking, the Senator from Arizona came to the floor and said it is unseemly that we would be discussing the Presidential race. The race has been discussed by Senators on both sides of the aisle, as it should be. There is no more important decision to be made by the American people than the choice of the President of the United States, and that choice will determine what this body considers for the next 4 years.

Frankly, we ought to reflect on what has happened with this Republican-led Congress. If you take a look at the fact that we are approaching the Halloween holiday, in that spirit we might consider the fact that Congress has become ''Sleepy Hollow,'' the final resting place for priorities of American families.

Take a look at the list of things that have been offered by the Democratic side but have not been acted upon by the Republican side: A real Patients' Bill of Rights. When you go to a doctor, who should make the decision; a doctor or insurance company clerk? That is an easy choice for me. I want the doctor to make the call. When we tried to pass that bill in the Senate, the Republicans defeated us.

Prescription drug coverage under Medicare: Not one of these convoluted schemes we just heard described that would somehow give prescription drugs to the States for 4 years, take it back, give it to the insurance companies—we know how it should work. Medicare has been on the books for 35 years. It is proven. It is universal.

Frankly, we think all seniors and disabled in that category should be able to make the choice themselves, voluntarily, whether or not they want the benefit under Medicare. The Republicans do not care for Medicare. They called it socialized medicine when the Democrats proposed it and, frankly, they are still criticizing it, doing little to help that system.

Most Americans know how valuable Medicare has been to their families. We think a prescription drug benefit under Medicare should be the law. The Republicans and pharmaceutical interests have stopped us.

We also believe in an increase in the minimum wage. Ten million Americans went to work this morning for $5.15 an hour, and they are not just kids in their first jobs. Over half of them are women and many of them are raising children and trying to eke out a living at $5.15 an hour. We used to give them a periodic increase in the minimum

wage without even debate, but the Republicans now think this is unacceptable; that we cannot give a minimum wage increase without lording billions of dollars in tax breaks on businesses. For goodness' sake, give these people—400,000 of them in Illinois—an increase in the minimum wage of at least 50 cents an hour for the next 2 years. That bill has not passed, and the Republican Congress has had ample opportunity to address it.

We believe on the Democratic side we need tax cuts; use the surplus for tax cuts for families for the deductibility of college education expenses. That is a concern I hear from families as soon as the baby is born. How are we going to pay for this kid's education? When you see the cost of education going up over a 20-year period of time, from the time that child was born until they will be in school—it goes up 200 percent, 400 percent—people ask: How can we possibly do this?

On the Democratic side, we want to give the families deductibility of tuition and fees to help them pay for college. The Republicans oppose it. We support it. That is the difference. When we offered it, they stopped us.

Also, we are talking about education funds to improve our Nation's schools, to reduce class size. This does not take a Ph.D. in education to understand. If you were a teacher, would you rather walk in on the first day and see a classroom with 30 kids or 15 kids? Are you more likely able to help a struggling student if there are 15 children in the classroom or 30? It is not rocket science. It does not take a Ph.D.

We on the Democratic side believe reducing class size is the first step to helping kids from falling behind and helping those better students get a little more attention.

We also believe we ought to be supporting afterschool programs for students. Letting kids go now at 3 o'clock is just a gamble because very few of them have parents at home. They do not have Ozzie and Harriet waiting with cookies and milk anymore. They are by themselves.

Some do pretty well, but a lot of them do not. We think afterschool programs, supervised, so kids have a chance to maybe catch up on their school subjects, maybe appreciate the arts a little more, maybe become better on a computer, or even just play some basketball, makes some sense as long as there is supervision. We support afterschool programs and fought the Republicans every step of the way trying to put this valuable money back into education.

We also believe in commonsense gun safety legislation. The No. 1 story in 1999 in the news was the Columbine tragedy. What has America done to keep guns out of the hands of children and criminals? Congress has done nothing. Nothing.

The National Rifle Association and its leader, ''Mr. Moses,'' have decided we are not going to do anything to keep guns out of the hands of children and criminals, and that is criminal. The Republican-led Congress should be held accountable for that.

If you have an aging parent or grandparent, the Democrats believe you should have a tax break to help pay for their care.

How many folks and families do you know worried about that aging parent and how their last years are going to be? They need a helping hand. We support it, as we support increased targeted tax cuts to help people pay for day care, so kids can be left in a healthy, safe environment and families can afford to pay for it. Stay-at-home moms, who sacrifice for their kids, should get a tax break, too. They are making a sacrifice that will enhance that child's future. We should invest in them as well.

When it comes to these myriad issues I have just given you, these are the issues with which working families, middle-income families, and single people as well can identify. Yet we have had no help whatsoever on the Republican side of the aisle. The Republican Congress has failed to address the basic issues of education and health care, taxes that are reduced and targeted tax cuts and credits for families who really need them, prescription drug coverage under Medicare, and a Patients' Bill of Rights.

We came to this Congress with all kinds of lofty goals. We are leaving now, unfortunately, with appropriations bills as large as the Washington, DC, telephone book, scarcely read, that serve too many special interests and too few families across this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:33 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:13 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ALLARD).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVACY LEGISLATION

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, we live in a period of unprecedented prosperity and opportunity.

We can go more places than ever before. We are living longer and healthier lives than ever before. We are employed in jobs today that were unthinkable just a few years ago.

Our lives have changed dramatically because of computers, the Internet and technology.

But with all the good that comes with technology, there are elements that cause us concern. One such concern that has captured our attention is the issue of privacy.

As more of us use the Internet to shop and conduct business, more of our personal information is being spread throughout the web. That information, in many instances, is used properly and in a way that is good for consumers. But as in any field, there are those who abuse the public trust by using this personal information in unethical ways.

Because of concerns about consumer privacy, the Senate has considered how we might do better at protecting consumers while not unwittingly turning off the Internet engine that is such a key part of the economic prosperity we currently enjoy.

The Senate Commerce Committee recently held its third hearing this year on the privacy of information gathered from consumers who use the Internet. Since the Federal Trade Commission recommended legislation in this area earlier this session, I, and I believe a substantial number of my colleagues, have come to agree that we must act on this issue in the not-too-distant-future.

I have come to believe that Federal legislation is needed to protect consumers. I don't think that the current voluntary privacy policies are sufficient. Consumers who use the Internet should be given more information about what data is being gathered about them, and they should be given greater control over how this data is used.

I have also come to believe that Federal legislation is needed to protect and improve Internet commerce which, of course, benefits consumers and businesses alike. Not only will the assurance of adequate, enforceable privacy standards increase consumers' comfort with on-line transactions, but the possibility of States acting to protect consumers in the absence of a Federal law threatens to create a patchwork of conflicting privacy mandates that could be hard to apply to a medium that does not recognize State borders.

Though I know that I support Federal legislation regarding the on-line collection and use of consumer information, I confess to not knowing at this time exactly what should be legislated. At the last hearing in the Senate Commerce Committee we considered three different bills, and additional, and more varied, bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives. I don't know which of these approaches or combination of approaches will best protect consumers without making on-

line transactions overly burdensome. On-line merchants, providers of both goods and services, have touted the benefits to consumers of using the Internet to gather information that facilitates targeted marketing. This could very well be the case but I want to know that consumers are informed of and agree with these marketing practices.

Determining more specifically what consumers want from privacy legislation is something that I hope we can do in the next session of Congress.

While much, through certainly not all, of the discussion in Congress about privacy is focused on the issue of the on-line collection and use of consumer information, I think it is also important that Congress remain cognizant of the fact that ''privacy'' as it relates to the Internet is a far broader and more complex issue. For all of its salutary effects, the ease with which the Internet allows for the compilation and sharing of private information gathered in the physical world, information about financial transactions, medical histories, reading habits, eating habits, sleeping habits, information about almost every aspect of one's life raises legitimate concerns that Congress should and will continue to address.

The privacy of medical information, which can be intensely personal, is one such issue about which Congress must remain vigilant. Improved technology along with changes in health care delivery, billing systems, information gathering and genetic testing all increase the number of people who have access to health records. Americans should know that personally identifiable health information is private and they should have control over who has access to it. At the same time our challenge is to find a way to balance legitimate needs for health care information—for example, medical research—and individual privacy rights.

Future Congresses will adopt additional health care reforms. We clearly need to improve our Nation's health care system. Although most Americans are satisfied with their health care, most Americans are also concerned about those in our country who have inadequate health care and no hope of improving their situation. I support reforms that improve access to quality health care for those who have none, that keep intact our wonderful system of hospitals and clinics in all areas of our country and that provide people with meaningful choices.

When future Congresses address this area, one issue I will watch most carefully is the amount of health care information that is provided to the Government, and how this information is used. We must be careful not to adopt measures that give Government regulators the ability to peek into people's private medical records. A few years ago, my home State of Washington embarked on several health care reforms. Most of these reforms were in the wrong direction. Our legislature adopted reforms that put the government in charge of health care decisions for people and gave a government commission the ability to cancel private health insurance coverage in our state.

I found both of those moves bothersome, but our legislature didn't stop at just controlling health care decisions for our citizens. No, our legislature took one additional chilling step. It decided that if the government was providing health care, as well as dictating which private health plans could remain in business, the government should have access to personal, private medical records.

That is going way too far, and fortunately, the good people of Washington made sure that radical change was not placed into the law.

Over the next year, I am convinced that Congress will adopt meaningful health care reforms that help people, but as we do that, I must constantly advise my colleagues to follow the ''do no harm'' rules of medicine and not fall prey to those who believe that government-run health care, along with all that it brings, is the right solution to this challenge.

No matter the type of information in question—consumer or medical—Americans have the right to a reasonable expectation of privacy. Thoughtful legislative action is needed at the federal level to address the legitimate concerns many Americans currently have in this regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE UNITED STATES AND NATO

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, there has been an effort in recent days to score partisan political points by misrepresenting Governor Bush's commitment to NATO and southeast Europe. Unfortunately, some of my Senate colleagues have been involved in this effort.

No one in the Senate has been more involved in our policy toward southeast Europe, and no one cares more than I do about that part of the world. I have traveled to the region three times this year—on a factfinding mission, to participate in the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, and to participate in the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. I have been to Kosovo twice and visited with troops.

I have been involved in efforts to bring about alternative leadership in Serbia—something that has finally happened. I have been a leader on the Stability Pact with the belief that its successful implementation is crucial to the long-term stability, prosperity, and peace in the region. I have also constantly watched the situation in Kosovo, outraged at the ongoing ethnic cleansing going on there today.

With this background and involvement, I can say definitely that Governor Bush understands the importance of the region to our national security interests.

I think it is important that we set the record straight. Governor Bush has said that he would systematically review our military commitments internationally upon his inauguration. He will look at them across the world. This will include a review of our deployments in the Balkans. He has said that he will work with our allies to develop a strategy to remove our troops from the region when it is possible to do so without threatening peace and stability in the region or our relationship with our European allies. He understands the important relationship we have with our NATO allies.

There never was and never will be any statement by Governor Bush or, if he is elected, President Bush, regarding a reduced commitment to NATO. He understands how important NATO is.

Vice President GORE has joined Governor Bush in saying that we should pull out of the Balkans when we are no longer needed.

Governor Bush is committed to political stability and security in the Balkans. He emphasized this point repeatedly—that stability in southeast Europe is vital to Europe and hence to the U.S. In other words, we have strategic interests in southeast Europe, which are important to Europe and to the security of the U.S. and, for that matter, peace in the world. So Governor Bush is committed to political stability.

Without the Governor's involvement in the Byrd-Warner debate on our troop commitment to Kosovo, the next President would be facing a July 1 deadline to decide whether to stay or go. Governor Bush stood up and was counted at the time of the Byrd-Warner discussion in the Senate. He demonstrated leadership at a time when leaders from both parties were considering having the U.S. unilaterally withdraw from a NATO commitment. That was a very important thing that he did at that time, because if he had not stood up and said he thought it was overreach, we would have lost that on the floor of the Senate and would have done irreparable damage to our relationship with NATO.

We must remember that the Clinton-Gore administration promised the American people in 1995 that our troops would not be in Bosnia for longer than a year. That promise was never kept. Rather than set a misguided deadline, Governor Bush is simply saying we should not, and will not, be in the Balkans forever. Nothing more.

Governor Bush has said time and again that he would actively consult our European allies in the formation and implementation of our policies in NATO and in southeast Europe. I hope Lord Robertson, who heads up NATO, understands that. I made that very clear when I was at the NATO Assembly in Budapest. We understand how

important our leadership and our commitment is to NATO.

Governor Bush is an internationalist who is committed to NATO and our European allies.

These attacks are just partisan politics designed, in my opinion, to turn attention from a growing scandal involving Vice President GORE.

Just this morning, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held a hearing to examine Vice President GORE's dealings with former Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin regarding weapons sales to Iran. It has been widely reported that the Vice President failed to fully and properly inform relevant congressional oversight committees regarding agreements reached with Russian officials. He has to be more forthcoming about what went on there.

The hearing was in response to new and critical information on this matter which surfaced in the New York Times report dated October 13. Governor Bush remains fully committed to NATO and American leadership in Europe. Repeating, he remains fully committed to NATO and American leadership in Europe.

He understands our unique role and is committed to maintaining that leadership. We know how important our leadership is to NATO. We certainly found that out during the Kosovo-Serbian war that we had. To suggest that he doesn't understand is just plain hogwash.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

THE FAILURES OF THIS CONGRESS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, over the period of the past weeks and months, as the ranking member of our Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, I have tried to point out the failing of this Congress and the fact that we have not addressed reauthorization of the elementary and secondary education bill, which we are charged to do—we had 22 days of hearings and we had a markup and legislation was reported out of our committee.

It has been several months since that legislation was on the floor and then withdrawn by the majority leader. In spite of the efforts of many of us to bring that measure back on the floor of the Senate, we have been unable to do so. We think it is enormously important that we have an opportunity to do so.

We are now some 3 weeks after the date that was suggested that we move into the adjournment for this Congress, and we have seen days go by, quorum calls held, and still no action. Now pending before the committee, we have the bankruptcy legislation, which is going to benefit in a substantial way the credit card industry. But we are not having the opportunity to address the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which can benefit families all across this country, with support for State and local communities.

This issue, I think, is back before the Senate because, during the period of our national debate between the Vice President and Governor Bush, great attention has been given to the issues of education. Assurances were given to the American people representing the different positions of the candidates. We have pointed out—I did last week—some of the realities and some of the facts about what is happening in our public schools across this country. And also I pointed out the fact that Texas has not been keeping up with the rest of the country on objective tests. That was challenged by some colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Now we have the Rand Corporation—virtually a nonpartisan organization—which has done a very careful review of the Texas experience, and they agree with us and, in effect, agree with Vice President GORE on the issues of education.

I am glad we are getting some clarification. We only have 2 weeks left in this campaign, but I am glad we are beginning to get some clarification on this issue. First of all, I remind our colleagues about what assurances were given to the American people about the commitment of our majority leader on the issues of elementary and secondary education. We only provide some 7 cents out of every dollar that goes into the local communities. States have the primary responsibility. Nonetheless, we can give some focus and attention to programs that have demonstrated positive results in terms of academic achievement and accomplishment. That really is the purpose for which these resources are out there, and also to give special emphasis to the most economically disadvantaged children in this country so they are not going to be left out or left behind.

We come to this debate and discussion looking over the period of recent years. We wonder whether the positions that have been accepted by the Republican leadership are very much in conflict with the age-old positions of the Republican Party with regard to education, where they believe there should not be a role for any Federal aid to education. We had that debate in the early sixties. We have had it many times since then.

Nonetheless, we have seen in the early 1990s when the Republican leadership assumed control of the Senate the first order of business for them was a massive rescission of moneys that had been appropriated and were going to be allocated to school districts that would have provided help and assistance to needy schools across the country.

That money had been appropriated by the House and Senate and agreed to by the conference, signed by the President of the United States. One of the first orders of business by the Republican leadership was to rescind that money. We saw a rescission of about $2 billion. The initial request was considerably higher. It was reduced, but we had the rescission.

Then in the 1990s we faced the onslaught of our Republican leadership who wanted to abolish the Department of Education. I think most Members and most parents across the country believe that when the President of the United States sits down with the Members at the White House, we want someone sitting at the President's elbow when there is a discussion and debate about domestic priorities in the United States, someone who is always going to say: What about education? What about education, Mr. President?

Those voices are there, appropriately so, in terms of the security interests of the United States and defense, for the foreign policy of the United States, the Secretary of State. We have them there with regard to housing. We have them there in terms of the environment. We have them there in terms of commerce and transportation. Many Members believe we should have them there with regard to the issues of education.

That was not the position of the Republican leadership. They said: No, we don't want to have that there. They tried unsuccessfully to eliminate the Department of Education. Nonetheless, we find the Department is there. It is considerably downsized. It has had an extraordinary record, with great improvement over the previous Republican Secretaries of Education in collecting the debts that are owed to the Department. They have reduced the student loan default rate from 22.4% in 1992 to 6.9% in 2000. Both the guaranteed and student loan collections have been much more efficient.

Now there is a different attitude by the new Republican leadership. It is expressed by the Republican leader himself, going back to January of 1999:

> Education is going to be a central issue this year. . . . For starters, we must reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

January 29, 1999:

> But education is going to have a lot of attention, and it's not going to be just words. . . .

June 22, 1999:

> Education is number one on the agenda for the Republicans in Congress this year. . . .

Chamber of Commerce, February 1, 2000:

> We're going to work very hard on education. I have emphasized that every year I've been majority leader . . . and Republicans are committed to doing that.

February 3, 2000:

> We must reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. . . . Education will be a high priority in this Congress.

May 1, 2000:

> This is very important legislation. I hope we can debate it seriously and have amendments in the education area. Let's talk education.

May 2, 2000:

> Question: . . . have you scheduled a cloture vote on that?
>
> Senator LOTT: No, I haven't scheduled a cloture vote. . . . But education is number one in the minds of the American people all across this country and every State, including my own State.

July 10:

I, too, would very much like to see us complete the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

July 25, 2000:

We will keep trying to find a way to go back to this legislation this year and get it completed.

The fact is, for the first time in 35 years we do not have a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. That is against the background, Mr. President, of what is happening out there across this country and what young children are doing.

We have challenges in our education system. Here is a chart: ''More Students are Taking the SAT.'' That test, by and large, is necessary to gain entrance into the colleges; not virtually unanimous, but by and large it is required. Look at what has happened since 1980, when 33 percent of the children took it: 36 percent in 1985; 40 percent in 1990; 42 percent in 1995; and now in 2000, it is 44 percent.

This is a reflection of the attitude of children in our high schools. The percentage of children taking the SATs is going up significantly. The children want to take those tests. They understand the significance of the SAT and the importance of a college education. The SAT test is demanding. It is hard. It is difficult. Children have to work extremely long hours to prepare for these SATs. The increasing numbers of students taking the SAT is a clear indication from the children of this country that they are serious about education and they want to be able to try to improve their academic achievement.

Not only do we see their willingness to take the most strenuous of tests, which are the SATs, but they are also willing to take the advanced courses in math and science, probably the most difficult courses in our high school.

We see what has been happening in precalculus: In 1990, 31 percent of students enrolled in precalculus; in 2000, 44 percent did. In calculus, the rate increased from 19 percent to 24 percent. In physics, 44 percent to 49 percent. These are the percentage increases of students who are taking the advanced courses in these subject matters—all on the rise. The number of children who are taking the SAT tests is on the rise.

Let's take a look at the results. We have now more children taking the SAT tests. They are taking more demanding courses. What have been the results? We see across the board, going back from 1972 and 1975, 1980, the constant downward movement in terms of results. What we have been seeing since 1990 is the gradual, slow—and I admit it has been slow, but it is going in one direction, and that is up. There has been an improvement in SAT math scores and they are now the highest in 30 years. More kids are taking them, more kids are doing better. That is true across the board in terms of males as well as females.

We have challenges in our education system. This is a reflection on what is happening generally across the country. These are the matters the Vice President has talked about, how he wants to strengthen those.

Now we see what has been happening in the State of Texas. We saw what is happening generally across the country, that all the indicators are going up. Here we have Texas, falling far below the national average on the SAT scores from 1997 to the year 2000.

I brought this up to the Senate floor last week, and a lot of my colleagues were dismissive. But let's look at this. This is the national test, the SAT. These are not homegrown tests in Texas and homegrown tests in Massachusetts, homegrown in other States. The SAT is a national standardized test. I will come back to that in a minute.

These are the national averages for the SAT test. Notice the national average total scores since 1997 has gone up. That, I think, is a clear indication that the children, working harder, taking more challenging courses, have a greater desire, more of them, to go on to the schools and colleges. It is a very definite upward swing, although not great in terms of the total numbers. All of us want these higher. However, the fact remains that progress has been made and the national average is going up.

But not, Mr. President, in the State of Texas. From 1999 to the year 2000, we have seen it flatten out. Going back to 1997, scores have declined; Texas scores have gone down. It is also interesting that Texas scores are well below the national average in the SATs.

I think this is a pretty fair indication about the facts in the State of Texas. With all respect, I am not getting into criticizing the Governor or commenting on his desire to try to do better. But I do think that when he talks about it and he claims how well Texas is doing, it is fair enough to look at the facts and examine whether this is so. We have this as a result of these Scholastic Aptitude Tests that show Texas is well below the national average, and under Governor Bush it hasn't improved on the national average in the last several years, at least while he has been Governor.

These are the earlier facts. Then we have the blockbuster report, the Rand Commission report, which basically sustains that argument that the schools may not have been making as large of improvements as claimed. It has been an important indictment of what has been happening on education in the State of Texas.

Mr. REID. Could I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to yield while we do a unanimous consent request, and the Senator as part of the request would retain the floor?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am glad to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alaska.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 4811

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask consent that following statements by Senator KENNEDY and Senator BAUCUS ongoing now, the Senate proceed to the conference report to accompany the foreign operations appropriations bill, that it be considered as having been read, and time be limited to the following: 1 hour equally divided between Senators MCCONNELL and LEAHY or their designees, 10 minutes equally divided between myself and Senator BYRD or our designees, and 30 minutes under the control of Senator GRAHAM of Florida. I further ask unanimous consent that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on the adoption of the conference report without any intervening action.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding there is already scheduled a 4:30 vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. REID. If this debate is not completed prior to that time, we will have to complete it after that vote is taken?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. That is my understanding, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank Senator KENNEDY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

EDUCATION TEST SCORES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I was just pointing out that we have this extraordinary report. I have it in my hand. It is the October 24, 2000 Rand Commission report: What do test scores in Texas tell us? It is an excellent report. I will have excerpts of it printed in the RECORD. But I hope those who are interested in this issue, trying to make up your minds over the period of these last 10 days, will have a good opportunity to examine that report.

Let me just mention a few of the highlights of the report. First of all, the study was released, as I mentioned, on October 24. It raises serious questions about the validity of gains in Texas math and reading stores. The study compares the results of the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills, the test taken by Texas students, with the results achieved by those same students on the National Assessment of Education Progress tests. There were large discrepancies between the results of the Texas TAAS test and the national NAEP test. The student gains on the TAAS, the Texas test, are far greater than what has been found with the same group of students on the NAEP or other standardized national tests.

Do we understand what we are saying? Significant improvement on the

test just given to Texas students; but for the Texas students who took both the Texas and national test, we found a very dramatic disparity. In Texas, many teachers say they are spending especially—these are the conclusions of the Rand report—large amounts of class time on TAAS test preparation activities. Teachers in low-performing schools reported greater frequency of test preparation than did teachers in higher-performing schools. While this preparation may improve the TAAS scores, it may not help students develop necessary reading and math skills. Also, this could lead to a superficial appearance that the gap between minority and majority students is narrowing when no change has actually occurred.

The exclusion of students with disabilities increased in Texas while decreasing in the Nation. Texas also showed an increase over time in the percentage of students dropping out of school and being held back. These factors produce a gain in average test scores that overestimates actual improvement in student performance.

We understand now what is happening. Regarding those individuals with disabilities, students we have worked long and hard to make sure they are going to be a part of the student body and have the opportunities for educational advancement, if you can exclude some of them from test taking, as in Texas, plus most likely some of the poorer performing students have dropped out and won't be able to take any of those assessment tests, this is going to have an artificial inflator on test scores.

That is the Rand Corporation that is making that conclusion.

Also, Rand researchers hypothesize that a small but significant percentage of students may have topped out on the TAAS. In other words, some students may have scored as high as the TAAS would allow them to. If that happened, it would artificially narrow the gap on TAAS between white students and students of color because white students tend to earn higher scores than minority students. Thus, the reduced gap on the TAAS relative to NAEP may be a result of TAAS being too easy for some students.

As with other tests, there have been documented cases of cheating on the Texas TAAS test.

The NAEP is a national test, which students from around the country can take so States and communities—and parents, most importantly—are able to evaluate the differences between how their children are doing in school compared with how those in other parts of the State and other parts of the country are doing. According to the NAEP, Texas fourth graders were slightly more proficient in reading in 1998 than in 1994. However, the country as a whole also improved to the same degree. Thus, there was nothing remarkable about the reading score gains in Texas. Small improvements in Texas eighth grade math scores were also consistent with those observed nationally.

There is nothing remarkable about the NAEP scores in Texas, and students of color did not gain more than whites. Score increases in Texas are identical to those nationwide when using the NAEP data. However, the gains on TAAS were several times larger than they were on NAEP.

That is what we are hearing the good Governor talking about. That is what he is talking about. This puts it all in the light that that is not a true reflection of what is happening among the young people. The gains on TAAS were greater for students of color than they were for whites. The large discrepancy between the TAAS and the NAEP results raises concern about the validity of the TAAS scores and validity of claims regarding student achievement.

According to the NAEP results, the gap between white students and students of color in Texas is very large and also increasing slightly.

In 1998, the average fourth grade reading score for black students was at the 38th percentile compared to the average white student at the 67th percentile. This gap was slightly larger than the gap between these groups in 1994. In other words, the black-white reading gap increased during this 4-year period. The gap between the blacks and whites had actually increased during this period.

In fourth grade math, the white-Hispanic NAEP gap grew in Texas but not nationally, and the white-black gap remained constant in Texas but actually shrank nationally. In short, the gap sizes between the whites and minorities on the NAEP were improving nationally but getting worse in Texas.

That is not a satisfactory prescription for improving education. It suggests the Texas system is more an education mirage than an education miracle. I think it is important for parents—as they are looking now, trying to get beyond the cliches, beyond the slogans, beyond the set statements, beyond the give and take, even in those debates—to look at the record, and the record is very clear. That is that we have not seen the kind of advancement that has taken place in many other States that are doing a number of things that have been recommended, as we were going to have a chance to hear about in the debate on the ESEA.

We find out the States that made the greatest advancement are States that had smaller class sizes, where they had continuing enhancement and proficiency for teacher education, mentoring with teachers, afterschool programs, accountability. They had a number of those programs and even benefited from early education help and assistance as well.

What we wanted to try to do is to have a debate on those particular matters that have made a difference in States around the country, where we had seen advancements in education. But we have been denied that opportunity. What basically the leadership, the Republican leadership, has denied us is the opportunity to have that debate, denied us the opportunity to raise these issues. What the American people are being asked is, let's just look back on what has happened in Texas.

When we examine Texas, not out of partisanship, but using the objective standards for the SATs—they do not benefit a Democrat or Republican; they are focused on children—and if we take the Rand study which has been available and can be reviewed by anyone—we are finding out that this has been a mirage in terms of education.

I want to spend a few moments going into another area which I think the American people ought to give some focus and attention to in these final few days, and that is on the critical issue of the credibility gap in health care. Few, if any, issues are of greater concern to American families than quality, affordable health care. Americans want an end to the HMO abuses. They want good health insurance coverage, they want a prescription drug benefit for senior citizens under Medicare, and they want to preserve and strengthen Medicare so it will be there for today's and tomorrow's senior citizens. And they want these priorities not only for themselves and their loved ones but for every American, because they know that good health care should be a basic right for all.

The choice in this election year is clear. It is not just a choice between different programs. It is a choice based on who can be trusted to do the right thing for the American people. AL GORE's record is clear. He has been deeply involved in health care throughout his career. The current administration has made significant progress in improving health care in a variety of ways—from expanding health insurance to protecting Medicare. He has consistently stood for patients and against powerful special interests.

AL GORE lays out a constructive and solid program that is consistent with his solid record. He is for expanding insurance coverage to all Americans, starting with children and their parents. He is for a strong Patients' Bill of Rights. I daresay, when AL GORE is elected President, a Patients' Bill of Rights will be the first major piece of legislation that passes this Congress. I am absolutely convinced that will be the case, Mr. President.

He has a sensible plan for adding prescription drug coverage to Medicare. He will fight to preserve Medicare without unacceptable changes designed to undermine Medicare and force senior citizens into HMOs and private insurance plans.

George W. Bush's approach is very different. His proposals are deeply flawed. But even worse than the specifics of his proposals is his failure to come clean with the American people about his record in Texas or about his own proposals.

On health care, George W. Bush does not just have a credibility gap. He has a credibility chasm. He has consistently stood with the powerful against the people. He refuses to take on the drug companies, the insurance companies, or the HMOs. His budget plan puts tax cuts for the wealthy ahead of every other priority, and leaves no room for needed investments in American families. His health care values are not the values of the American people.

On the issue of the Patients' Bill of Rights, George Bush said in the third debate that he did support a Patients' Bill of Rights. He said he wanted all people covered. He said he was in favor of a patient's right to sue, as provided under the Texas law. And he said he brought Republicans and Democrats together in the State of Texas to pass a Patients' Bill of Rights. That is what he said. But the reality is very different, as was pointed out in the New York Times after the debate on October 18. ''Texas record: Taking credit for patients' rights where it is not necessarily due.''

That is the understatement of the year. The reality is George W. Bush vetoed the first Patients' Bill of Rights passed in Texas. He fought to make the second bill as narrow and limited as possible. He was so opposed to the provision allowing patients to sue their HMOs that he refused to sign the final bill, allowing it to become law without his signature.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. Briefly for a question, and then I would like to make a presentation, and then I will be glad to yield.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I am very concerned about what I see as attacks on my State of Texas on the Senate floor. I certainly think it is legitimate to have a Presidential campaign out in the light of day where people can see it. I just ask the question: Is the Patients' Bill of Rights the Senator is referring to the law today in Texas?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, it is law.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Does the Senator think it would be law in Texas today if the Governor had not allowed it to become law?

Mr. KENNEDY. I think another Governor would have gotten the bill faster. If the Senator——

Mrs. HUTCHISON. The question is, Is it law today?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am going to reclaim my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts reclaims his time.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I ask if the Senator will give me some time to rebut what I consider to be an attack on my State.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will be glad to yield to the Senator after I spell out exactly what happened in Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, then I ask unanimous consent that I have some time before we go to the foreign ops bill. I ask unanimous consent that I get up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will lay out the facts—and if I can have the attention of the Senator from Texas now—I will lay these facts out, and if the Senator from Texas finds a problem with these facts, then I will be glad to yield for that purpose to listen to what the facts are.

These are what the facts are: George Bush said in the third debate that he did support a national Patients' Bill of Rights.

He said he wanted all people covered.

He said that he was in favor of a patient's right to sue as provided under Texas law.

He said he brought Republicans and Democrats together in the State of Texas to pass a Patients' Bill of Rights. That is what he said.

The reality is different. The Governor vetoed the first Patients' Bill of Rights passed in Texas. He fought to make the second bill as narrow and limited as possible. He was so opposed to the provision allowing patients to sue their HMOs that he refused to sign the final bill and allowed it to become law without his signature. That is not the record of a person who is candid about where he stands and what he has done. Those are the facts.

It is not a record that recommends him for national office for any citizen concerned about a strong, effective Patients' Bill of Rights. It is the record of a candidate who stands with powerful insurance companies and HMOs, not with American families. He was forced effectively to take a Patients' Bill of Rights. So when the Senator says, isn't it law today? yes, but it was required because of what happened in the legislature, not the leadership that was provided by the Governor on that issue.

On health insurance, the record is equally clear—and equally bleak. Governor Bush claims he wants insurance for all Americans. He blames Vice President GORE for the growth in the number of the uninsured. But Governor Bush's record in Texas is one of the worst in the country. Texas has the second highest proportion of uninsured Americans in the country. It has the second highest proportion of uninsured children in the country. Yet Governor Bush has not only done nothing to address this problem, he has actually fought against the solutions.

In Texas, he placed a higher priority on large new tax breaks for the oil industry, instead of good health care for children and their families. When Congress passed the Children's Health Insurance Program in 1997, we put affordable health insurance for children within the reach of every moderate and low-income working family. But George Bush's Texas was one of the last in the country to fully implement the law.

Do we understand that? Texas was one of the last States in the country to fully implement the law. Despite the serious health problems faced by children in Texas, Governor Bush actually fought to keep eligibility as narrow as possible.

This is what happened in 1994: The Governor takes office; Texas ranks 49th. The year 2000: Bush runs for President; Texas ranks 49th.

These are the facts. People might not like those facts. People might not want to talk about those facts, but these are the facts. If you have different facts, let's have them.

Texas: One of the last States to implement CHIP. October 1997, CHIP funds were available. November 1999, Texas implements the full CHIP program. We had a program where the funds were there. We did not have to appropriate the additional funds. Still it took 2 years. Children cannot wait 2 years when they are sick. They cannot wait when they have a sore throat, or cannot see the blackboard, or cannot see the teacher. They need help and assistance, and the fact it took 2 years, I think, is inexcusable.

Bush places a low priority on children. Bush fights to restrict CHIP eligibility to children below 150 percent of poverty. Most of the other States, a great majority of the other States, went to 200 percent of poverty. Maybe the Senator from Texas has an explanation for that.

Texas has been one of the only States that has been cited, not by the Senator from Massachusetts and not by Democrats, but by a Federal judge for failure to enroll children in Medicaid. That is the record, Mr. President. You might not want to hear about it, but that is the record.

Now, perhaps the most ominous revelation about the Governor's attitude towards this issue came in the third debate when he said:

> It's one thing about insurance, that's a Washington term.

Insurance a Washington term? Governor Bush should try telling that to hard-working families across the country who don't take their children to the doctor when they have a sore throat or a fever because they can't afford the medical bill. He should try telling that to the young family whose hopes for the future are wrecked when a breadwinner dies or is disabled because an illness was not diagnosed and treated in time. He should try telling that to the elderly couple whose hopes for a dignified retirement are swept away in a tidal wave of medical debt.

Insurance is far more than a Washington term. It is a Main Street term in every community in America, and its lack of availability is a crisis for millions of families across the country.

Prescription drug coverage under Medicare is another major aspect of the health care challenge facing America. Few issues are more important to

senior citizens and their families. They deserve a prescription drug benefit under Medicare. And we should try to provide it in a way that strengthens the promise of Medicare, not in a way that breaks that promise and breaks faith with the elderly.

The differences between Vice President GORE and Governor Bush on this issue are fundamental. Governor Bush stands with the big drug companies. The Vice President stands with the senior citizens. Governor Bush has sought at every turn to blur the differences between their two plans in a way that is so misleading as to make a mockery of his own attacks on the Vice President's credibility.

Vice President GORE has clearly pointed out the many flaws in Governor Bush's prescription drug plan for senior citizens. But Governor Bush has no response on the merits. Instead, he hides behind phrases like ''fuzzy numbers'' and ''scare tactics.''

But the numbers are not fuzzy, and senior citizens should be concerned. Let's look at the facts.

Prescription drug coverage under the Bush plan is not immediate and most senior citizens would be left out.

As the Vice President has pointed out, for the first 4 years, the Bush plan would cover low-income seniors only. AL GORE cited the example of a senior citizen named George McKinney. He said:

> George McKinney is 70 years old, has high blood pressure. His wife has heart trouble. They have an income of $25,000 a year. They cannot pay for their prescription drugs. And so they're some of the ones that go to Canada regularly in order to get their prescription drugs.

Governor Bush responded:

> Under my plan, the man gets immediate help with prescription drugs. It's called immediate helping hand. Instead of squabbling and finger-pointing, he gets immediate help.

He kept accusing Vice President GORE of using ''fuzzy math'' and ''scare tactics.''

But Governor Bush's own announcement of his Medicare plan proves AL GORE's point. This is what Governor Bush said:

> For four years, during the transition to better Medicare coverage, we will provide $12 billion a year in direct aid to low income seniors . . . Every senior with an income less than $11,300–$15,200 for a couple—will have the entire cost of their prescription drugs covered. For seniors with incomes less than $14,600–$19,700 for couples—there will be a partial subsidy.

George McKinney has an income of $25,000. He would clearly be ineligible for help under Governor Bush's plan. If Governor Bush thinks that is fuzzy math, then education reform is even more urgent than any of us realized.

In the third debate, Governor Bush finally admitted that the first phase of his program is only for ''poor seniors.''

George McKinney is not alone. The vast majority of senior citizens would not qualify for Governor Bush's prescription drug plan, and many of those who did qualify would not participate.

Even this limited program for low-income seniors would not be immediate, because every State in the country would have to pass new laws and put the program in place, a process that would take years in many States.

George Bush's prescription for middle-income seniors is clear—take an aspirin and call your HMO in 4 years.

Governor Bush's prescription drug plan would also require senior citizens to go to an HMO or an insurance company to obtain their coverage. In the first debate, Vice President GORE pointed out that most senior citizens ''would not get one penny for four to five years, and then they would be forced to go into an HMO or an insurance company and ask them for coverage. But there would be no limit on the premiums or deductibles or any of the terms or conditions.

Again, Governor Bush did not respond to the Vice President's specific points. Instead, he claimed that the Vice President was trying to ''scare'' voters.

The facts are clear. George W. Bush's policy paper states that:

> Each health insurer, including HCFA-sponsored plans that wish to participate . . . will have to offer an ''expanded'' benefit package, including out-patient prescription drugs. . . . This will give seniors the opportunity to select the plan that best fits their health needs.

In other words, to get prescription drug coverage under the Bush plan, you have to get it through a private insurance plan. How high will the copayments be? How high will the premiums be? How high will the deductible be? Governor Bush has no answer. Those important points are all left up to the private insurance companies.

Governor Bush says senior citizens will have the opportunity to select the plan that best meets their health needs. But what they will really have is the opportunity to select whatever plan private insurers choose to offer. If it costs too much, senior citizens are out of luck. If it does not cover the drugs their doctors prescribe, they are out of luck. The Bush plan is an insurance industry's dream, and a senior citizen's nightmare.

On prescription drugs, and every other aspect of Medicare, the choice between the two Presidential candidates is very clear, and it is clear on every other aspect of health care. The Bush record in Texas is one of indifference and ineptitude—of putting powerful interests ahead of ordinary families.

The Bush record in the campaign is one of distortion. The Bush proposals are at best inadequate and at worst harmful. Tax cuts for the wealthy are not as important as health care for children and prescription drugs for seniors. The American people understand that, but evidently Governor Bush does not.

AL GORE has a career-long record of fighting for good health care for families, for children, and for senior citizens. The current administration has a solid record of bipartisan accomplishment, ranging from protecting the solvency of Medicare to improving health insurance coverage through the enactment of the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill and the Child Health Insurance Program. AL GORE's program responds to the real needs of the American people with real resources and a detailed action plan.

I am hopeful that every American will examine the records of the two candidates carefully. On health care, there should be no question as to which candidate stands with the powerful special interests and which candidate stands with the American people. The choice is clear. Governor Bush stands with the powerful, and AL GORE stands with the people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from Texas.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to refute everything the Senator from Massachusetts has said about my State and my Governor.

Mr. President, I think it is legitimate to talk about a person's record when you are running for President of the United States. But, Mr. President, I object to the use of the Senate floor to trash my State of Texas. And I object to a misrepresentation of the record of my State.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I will yield on your time—on the time of the Senator from Massachusetts, not on my 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has no time.

Mr. KENNEDY. But there is not a time limitation, is there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is under a time limitation.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask my response not be charged to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Texas deny that Texas is 48th out of 50 States in terms of the total number of uninsured children? Does she deny that?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I deny that that is the relevant point. Because, in fact, 41 States are behind in the CHIP program sign-up because when Congress passed the Children's Health Care Program, they gave the States 3 years to spend the money. It just happened that our State meets every other year in the legislature. By the time they were able to meet and start the CHIP program, the State had had a very steady influx of children. We are on the way, and 40 other States are in the same situation.

So I am going to reclaim my time. I would like for the rest of my 15 minutes to start now because I thought the

Senator from Massachusetts was going to ask a question. But I am not going to yield further.

The Senator from Massachusetts has been speaking for quite awhile about my home State of Texas. If there is more than 15 minutes before we start the foreign operations bill, I ask unanimous consent to be able to continue speaking until Senator MCCONNELL comes and have the full time to refute what I think are misrepresentations of the Texas record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator should be advised, there is an agreement to recognize Senator BAUCUS. But subject to that agreement, without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I ask unanimous consent that I have up until the time that the foreign operations bill starts. What is the agreement with Senator BAUCUS?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an agreement that Senator BAUCUS be recognized with no time limit before the foreign operations bill. However, the Senator is not here at this point.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak until I finish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, the State of Texas has just surpassed New York as the second largest State in America. That didn't happen because our State wasn't well run. It didn't happen because we have a sorry education system. It didn't happen because we don't take care of our children. It happened because we have a great quality of life. We have a Governor, George W. Bush, who is doing a great job, and we have a legislature led by our Lieutenant Governor, Rick Perry, and our House Speaker, Pete Laney. One is a Democrat; one is a Republican. They work together. That is the way we do things in Texas.

There has been a gross misrepresentation about Texas throughout the campaign for President and on the Senate floor today. I will tell the Senate why the State of Texas is in great shape and why it is absolutely unconscionable to trash Texas in order to get an advantage in the Presidential race.

Let's take education. Everyone would acknowledge that we have a problem in the public education system of our country. Our Congress, the Republicans, and our Governor in Texas have tried to open up our public education system. Governor Bush has tried to take the problems we have and put creativity and more State resources into those problems so that every child will have a chance to reach his or her full potential in our State of Texas. That is what we have tried to do in Congress for the entire United States. We have tried to put creativity into the schools. We have tried to give parents more choices.

Every time we do, however, it is the people on the other side of the aisle who throw up the roadblocks, who want to have the Federal Government, from the top down, dictate what the local governments and the school boards would do all over our country.

If you think that Governor Bush disagrees with that, you are right. And so do I. He believes in local control. He is very pleased that Congress is going to put more money into public education, but he wants the decisions made by the people who know the children and who know what the children's needs are.

Let me tell you what he has done in Texas. We were very concerned about the high school dropout rate in Texas. It was especially high in our Hispanic community. Governor Bush believes, as do I, that if our young people are dropping out of high school, that is trouble—T-R-O-U-B-L-E—for all of us. It means those children will not have a chance to succeed, and it means our society is losing the benefit of a productive citizen.

Governor Bush said: Let's find out what the problem is. Well, we found out what the problem is. Many of those young people who are dropping out of high school can't read very well. So he said: We are going to attack this so that every child will be able to read at grade level, so that every child will be able to participate in public education all the way through the system. So we start testing our children in Texas in preschool, kindergarten, in the first grade, in the second grade. And in the third grade, the child must read at grade level. The child is tested. And if the child cannot pass the test, the child will not progress to the fourth grade.

That child will be given extra help to learn how to read until that child can read at grade level. Then that child will go to the fourth grade. Governor Bush believes that a child is not going to be able to learn multiplication tables if a child can't read in the third grade. Governor Bush wants to go back to basics in education. He wants reading, writing, arithmetic, and history to be the core subjects that are taught in our schools. That is what he has done in Texas. The test scores are going up, and especially they are going up among our minority students. In fact, we have phenomenal increases in the test scores of our minority students, which is the emphasis we have put in the program, because we are so hopeful that by starting at that third grade level, every child will be able to reach his or her full potential.

Texas is one of two States that has made the greatest recent progress in education according to the congressionally mandated National Education Goals Panel. African American fourth graders in Texas ranked first in the Nation in math. Since 1992, African American fourth graders in Texas have made the greatest gains in math, and Hispanic fourth graders have made the second greatest gains.

African American and Hispanic eighth graders in Texas ranked first and second in the Nation in writing. Texas eighth graders, as a whole, ranked fourth in the Nation. Under Governor Bush, the number of students passing all parts of the State skills test has increased by 51 percent. The number of both minority students and economically disadvantaged students passing all parts of this test increased by 89 percent.

I think that is a record of which our Governor should be very proud.

We have had problems in our public education system. We have had children who don't speak English in great numbers in our education system. We are a border State. We value education. Our Governor was the first to step up to the line and say we would educate every child in Texas regardless of whether or not that child was a legal resident of Texas. The children of illegal immigrants are educated in Texas, and that is under the leadership of our Governor.

So I think it is very important that we set the record straight because it is a good record. We take care of our children, and we believe a strong system of public education is the ticket to success in our country. We believe Texas is leading the way.

Now the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out that a Federal judge had said we are not doing enough for the children in the insurance program that has been a part of Medicaid. I think that is very interesting because that lawsuit was filed when we had another Governor in Texas, not Governor Bush. That lawsuit was filed when Ann Richards was the Governor of Texas. Governor Bush has been in office for 7 years, so that lawsuit has been pending for over 7 years. I wonder what it was that made Federal Judge William Wayne Justice decide to rule in the last 6 weeks in that case. I wonder why he waited for over 7 years to declare that Texas was not meeting its responsibilities. Furthermore, I wonder why he waited until October 30 to ask for the report from the State—October 30 of an election year in which our Governor is running for President. I just ask that question about the timing.

As a matter of fact, it happens that our State is going to report that they are doing everything they can to cover every child with Medicaid and under the CHIP program because 41 States were not able to meet the 3-year mandate of the CHIP program, for a combination of reasons. Partly, it was regulations put out by the Federal Government that our States had to digest before they would be able to go forward and put the program in place. Our State legislature meets every other year, as do many other State legislatures. So once they met, they put the program in place. Texas has been going full steam ahead ever since that point. Mr. President, 100,000 children are now covered under our CHIP program; 400,000 are expected to be covered by the end of next year.

Under Governor Bush, the percentage of Medicaid-eligible children who get

prevention care has doubled from 30 percent to 60 percent. Congress is going to pass legislation that is going to help all 41 States that haven't been able to get their programs up completely and running, so that all of them will be covered and they will have the money they need, including Texas. So 41 States had to get the program up and going with legislatures that meet every other year. So the States and the Federal Government are working together to make sure children are covered, and our Governor is leading the way.

I want to discuss the Patients' Bill of Rights, which was mentioned by the Senator from Massachusetts. He acted as if we didn't have a Patients' Bill of Rights in Texas. We do have a Patients' Bill of Rights in Texas, and the Governor worked very hard to get that bill passed. The disagreement between the Governor and some of the people in the legislature, which was the subject of the negotiation, was how much the caps on pain and suffering lawsuits would be. The Governor thought they were too high. He didn't veto the bill; he let it go into law. In fact, because he did that, it is the basis of the law that eventually Congress will pass, because it has very clear internal reviews and very clear external reviews and because those reviews are so comprehensive and independent, there have been virtually no lawsuits filed, which is exactly what you want. You want patients to be covered; you want them to get the care they need. You don't want a bunch of lawsuits in which the patient is a person forgotten in the process. You want a Patients' Bill of Rights so that you can get the care and because the internal and external reviews have been so good, the system is working.

It is law in Texas today because Governor Bush was the leader who worked to get those internal and external reviews, who worked to have reasonable caps, who let the bill become law, and who now, I hope, will lead our country to a Patients' Bill of Rights that will not be a lawsuit machine but will give patients and their doctors the ability to make their decisions.

The Senator from Massachusetts said our Governor, in running for the Presidency, has a prescription drug benefit for our elderly, but he said it was ''fuzzy.'' It is not fuzzy. He wants a prescription drug benefit for our elderly people who need it. He wants to do it immediately. He does not want one person to have to decide between a necessity in life and a prescription drug. So he is advocating exactly what we have been trying to do in Congress, which is to get money to the States immediately to help in a transition until we can have a real addressing of the issue of prescription drug benefits. He is advocating an option in Medicare so that every person will have the ability to have coverage, if that is the option the person in Medicare chooses to have—prescription drug benefits—something that would operate like Medicare Part B or Medicare Part C.

I think we should not have to criticize a State in order to make a point in a Presidential race. I don't think the people of America are very persuaded, and if Vice President GORE doesn't have anything else to talk about but the State of Texas, he should not be the leader of our country because I think most people would like to know what Vice President GORE and what Governor Bush are planning to do in the future for our country. I think their platforms are pretty clear. I don't think you have to say that the State of Texas is backward when we have one of the best qualities of life of any State in our Nation, and people are voting with their feet because they are moving to Texas by choice. Texas is a great place to live. We have wonderful people, and we have a legislature that operates in a bipartisan way. I don't think you would hear one of our legislators stand on the floor of the House or Senate and trash another State in order to make a point, because it is just not necessary.

We have a system of public education that is improving every day in Texas. It is under the leadership of Governor Bush that that is happening. We are covering our children in the CHIP program, and our outreach is comprehensive. We are trying to do the education efforts today so that every child who is eligible will know through that child's parents that they are eligible.

We have a Patients' Bill of Rights that is the leader in the Nation for patients in our State, with their doctors having control of their health care. We did it under the leadership of Governor Bush.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, let me say I have been busy all morning trying to work out our Medicare and Medicaid Improvement Act and work on finalizing actions so we can, hopefully, finish the business of the Senate tomorrow or Friday. I have not had an opportunity to come over, though I understand Senator KENNEDY has gone on at great length talking about Texas.

Let me respond in the following way. There are a lot of States in the Union I wouldn't want to live in. But I know there are people who love those States. I am proud when people ask: What State do you represent in the Senate? I am proud I can say I am a Senator from the greatest State in the Union. I am a Senator from Texas.

Now, Texas does not need defense against TED KENNEDY. The fact that TED KENNEDY is not for George Bush for President is a very good reason to vote for George Bush for President. The fact that TED KENNEDY does not like our Patients' Bill of Rights in Texas is a pretty good indication we have a good Patients' Bill of Rights in Texas. After all, it was TED KENNEDY who joined the Clintons in proposing that the Government take over and run the health care system in America.

I don't have to defend Texas because people vote with their feet. We have had 321,666 people move from other States to Texas since George Bush has been Governor. They must think things are pretty good in Texas. We have created 1.6 million permanent, productive tax-paying jobs for the future in Texas while George Bush has been Governor. While America has lost manufacturing jobs, we have gained 100,000 manufacturing jobs in Texas. Come to think of it, wouldn't it be great if America were a little bit more like Texas?

I quote from the rules of the Senate, rule XIX, clause 3: No Senator in debate shall refer offensively to any State of the Union.

Now I don't intend to come over and say bad things about Massachusetts. Some great Americans have come from Massachusetts. Massachusetts is a great and wonderful State. I don't choose to live there, but I know the people who live there love it.

It is interesting that we are gaining two congressional seats because so many people are moving to Texas; Massachusetts keeps losing congressional seats. But I am not going to come out here and criticize Massachusetts.

I say to Senator KENNEDY and to others: if you want to run for President, you want to campaign, go out and do it. But I don't think we ought to turn the floor of the Senate into the fulcrum of that campaign.

I thank my colleague for coming over. She does a great job in defending Texas and defending its interests. I am always proud to be associated with her. Texas doesn't need any defending. But obviously the rules of the Senate do. I call on my colleagues to abide by the rules. I don't think we help each other if we try to tear down other people's States. I think it behooves us to try to build up our own States—to try to build up our own country. I think when we do that, the country benefits.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I wish to discuss for a moment this Rand report that has been quoted so many times by Senator KENNEDY and others. It seems there are some people in the Rand organization who have put something out showing Texas in a bad light in the education system.

That was not a full study. Rand actually did a full and comprehensive study. It was released July 25 of this year. I will read a few highlights of the comprehensive study. The study examined and compared the results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress Tests taken between 1990 and 1996 among 44 States. They judged the States according to State score improvements, raw achievement scores, and scores comparing students from similar demographic groups.

Results from the Rand study show that math scores in Texas had improved at twice the rate of the national average. Texas was second among all States in improved math scores. Texas leads all States in a comparison of students from similar socioeconomic and family backgrounds. Texas African

Americans and non-Hispanic white fourth graders ranked first on this test in math in 1996. Texas Hispanic fourth graders ranked fifth. The study confirms earlier reports that Texas is one of two States that has made the greatest overall academic gains in recent years.

The report went on to say one reason why Texas has been so successful, according to the Rand study, has been the higher percentage of teachers who are satisfied with their teaching resources. Governor Bush provided those resources. He wants to do the same thing through initiatives such as Reading First, at the Federal level, which would offer training and a curriculum for teaching reading to K-through-12 teachers.

Governor Bush thinks reading is fundamental. I think his mother is the one who started that when she started the Reading First Program for America. He believes if a child can read, that child is going to be able to take the next steps in public education. That is why Governor Bush put the resources there in Texas. That is why the real Rand study that was comprehensive showed the great improvement in Texas. That is why his education plans for America will work because we want no child to be left behind in Texas or any other State.

I hope the campaign rhetoric doesn't hit the Senate floor again. I am not going to stand here and I am not going to sit in my office and listen to anyone else use Texas as a whipping boy, A, because Texas is a great State; B, we have a great Governor; C, the things that are being said are misrepresentations; and D, in Texas, where we have been behind in the past, Governor Bush has said we are going to get ahead.

We are tackling our problems. Every State has problems. I am proud of the leadership in Texas of our Speaker, Pete Laney and our Lieutenant Governor, Rick Perry, and our Governor, George Bush, who have worked together in a bipartisan way to make sure the resources are going into public education and into our children's health insurance program. It was our legislative leaders working with Governor Bush who said our entire State tobacco settlement would go to fund the children's health insurance program, and they took a huge part of our State tobacco settlement and put it in a trust fund in which every county in Texas will participate in perpetuity for the treatment of our indigent health care patients all over Texas. That was the leadership of our State legislature, and our Governor. Because they do want quality health care for all our Texas residents.

Maybe I am a little biased, but I think I come from a very great State. I think the statistics prove it. I do not want to hear anyone else say that Texas is not meeting its responsibilities in education, in health insurance, in patients' rights—because we are a leader. We are a leader and we want everyone in America to have the quality of public education that we are building to get in Texas. We want every child in America to reach his or her full potential. We want every child to have health insurance coverage. We want every person in Texas to have quality health care. That is why all of our tobacco settlement is going for health care or education programs to educate young people on the hazards of smoking. That is it, that is the entire use of our tobacco money: to educate young people on the hazards of smoking and health care for every citizen of Texas who needs it.

I am very proud of our record. I am proud of our Governor and I think he is the person who can bring these qualities to the United States.

I yield the floor.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate on the bill H.R. 4811, ''Making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes,'' having met, have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, and the Senate agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The report was printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of October 24, 2000.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the conference report on the foreign operations bill.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the Senate is a half billion dollars below last year's appropriation—the fiscal year 2000 bill was $15.4 billion—this year we are presenting a $14.9 billion bill. This includes $14.5 billion in fiscal year 2000 funds plus an additional $466 million in supplemental funding for debt relief, Southern Africa, and the Balkans.

Although we are below last year's level, we have managed to substantially increase key priorities, including providing $865 million for Ex-Im, a nearly $100 million increase over last year, $1.3 billion for development assistance, again a $100 million increase, within child survival we surpassed the request for AIDS funding and provided $315 million. Overall child survival funding was also increased to $963 million. In addition to over $1 billion in supplemental funds for Colombia, the Narcotics and Law enforcement account was increased by $20 million over the request to $325 million. For the first time in years, we managed to increase security assistance. This account is of real concern to our friends and allies in Central and Eastern Europe. We exceeded the request and provided $3.545 billion. To respond to crises from Chechnya to Sierra Leone, we substantially increased funding both over last year's level and this year's request for refugees to $700 million. In this account we were able to work out a compromise that will improve management and oversight of UNHCR while affording the administration flexibility to respond rapidly to any real emergency.

Finally, we provided funds for the fiscal year 2001 and the supplemental request for debt relief. In addition to language on IMF reforms recommended by Senator GRAMM, we have included a number of HIPC conditions worked out between Senator HELMS and Congressman LEACH, representing the authorizing committees. There are a number of policy provisions which are also important to mention. Within the $675 million account for Eastern Europe, we have provided up to $100 million for Serbia. Senator LEAHY and I agree that we will never be able to withdraw troops and help stabilize the Balkans as long as Milosevic and other criminals responsible for outrageous atrocities across the Balkans are allowed to go free. No government in the region will have confidence in Belgrade if the rule of law is not upheld.

The administration lobbied heavily against our arguments that U.S. support for the new government should come with specific conditions attached. We thought aid should flow only if the Serb government met three specific conditions: First, they need to cooperate with the War Crimes Tribunal. Second, they must take steps to end support for organizations in the Republic of Srpska which prevent effective integration of Bosnia Hercegovina. Finally, given Belgrade's vicious track record, we thought it was important to seek assurances that the new government will implement policies which respect the rights and aspirations of minorities and the rule of law. Each of these conditions was designed to serve our interests in stabilizing the region so that an exit strategy for U.S. troops can be safely and effectively executed. The bill modifies this approach and includes an agreement which will give this administration and the new government in Belgrade a 5-month window in which assistance can move forward. After that period, only humanitarian aid and support to local mayors will be allowed if Belgrade refuses to meet the conditions which I have outlined.

I must confess my reservations about this approach. I listened to the arguments for flexibility, but I have little confidence in the administration's past record of support for the Tribunal and

standing up to Belgrade. I believe that there is no problem in Serbia that will be made easier by Milosevic's predatory presence. No regional government will have confidence in Belgrade as long as he is allowed to go free. It is in their interest and ours to see him turned over for trial. In the end I agreed to this compromise because funds for Serbia are made available subject to the committee's notification. If there is no sign of cooperation or progress on our conditions during the next five months, the administration should understand that I will put a hold on funding. This compromise is not a free pass to spend for five months—Senator LEAHY and I will be expecting concrete progress. The second area of tremendous concern addressed in the bill is Russia's action in Chechnya. Since launching this war, Moscow has blocked all humanitarian relief operations or international human rights investigations from proceeding in Chechnya. While we cannot always change the views in Moscow, I was extremely disappointed by the administration refusal to support the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights call for an international investigation. Instead Secretary Albright testified the administration preferred to allow Moscow to conduct its own internal investigation. The State Department has also rejected support for non-government groups providing relief and preferred instead to work through the Russian government.

To address these problems, we have earmarked $10 million for the more than 400,000 displaced families in Chechnya and Ingushetia which can only be provided through NGOs. Aid to the Russian government is also made contingent upon cooperation with international investigations in Chechnya. We have also made aid to the Russian Government contingent upon a certification that Moscow has terminated support for the nuclear program in Iran. In the past we have withheld 50 percent of the Russian government funds until this certification is made—this year we have increased the withholding to 60 percent. Putin has said Russia must build a dictatorship of law—what remains unclear is whether his personal emphasis will be on dictatorship or law. I think our aid should be leverage to secure a result which serves American interests and nuclear armed Iran certainly is not in U.S. interests.

Finally, let me mention debt relief. Senator HELMS and Congressman LEACH reported out bills which conditioned U.S. support to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative managed by the IMF and the World Bank. The Foreign Relations Committee bill requires the Secretary of Treasury to certify that it is World Bank policy to—(1) suspend funding if loans are diverted or misused, (2) not displace private sector funding, and (3) disburse funds based on the implementation of reforms by the recipient country including the promotion of open markets and liberalization of trade practices, the promotion of projects which enhance economic growth and the establishment of benchmarks to measure progress toward graduation from assistance. Similar conditions are required of the IMF. In addition to including language supported by Senator HELMS and Congressman LEACH, we have included House language limiting resources to countries engaged in a pattern of human rights abuses. I supported stronger language which would have required that the Secretary of Treasury certify that the IMF and Bank actually were implementing new policy conditions before Treasury was allowed to disburse funds—this approach was recommended by Senator GRAMM, the chairman of the Banking Committee. That was my view of how it should have been handled. Instead, my colleagues on the conference supported Helms-Leach language which releases the funds and then requires reporting on performance over the course of the next year.

While I completely agreed with Senator GRAMM, I also shared the problem he has with his committee—there simply were not the votes to sustain this position. I think we have made progress on conditioning debt relief, but the Treasury Department should understand that I will continue to consult with Senator GRAMM when we receive notifications on intended debt relief recipients. Performance benchmarks are essential if we are to avoid seeing the same groups of countries and banks back in 5 years seeking the same relief all over again. Separate from the HIPC relief, we did include binding requirements that the Treasury Department withhold 10 percent of our contribution to any multilateral bank until specific conditions are met on procurement and management reforms. Not only will the banks have to improve internal management practices through audits, they will have to improve recipient country procurement management and financial practices. This is an important step in our battle against fraud and corruption. Once again, I think we have produced a balanced bill which funds U.S. priorities within sound budget principles and I urge its favorable consideration.

Finally, I repeat, this bill is below the amount spent for foreign operations last year. That makes it somewhat unique among the appropriations bills we have been in the process of passing, and I am proud to say we were able to bring this bill in under last year's total.

Mr. President, are we under some time agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is under a 1-hour time limit.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum and further suggest the time during the quorum call be equally charged to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Senator BENNETT is here and wishes to speak in morning business. It seems to me he ought to speak on the bill time so we do not have to move the vote any later in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. The ranking member is here. Maybe Senator BENNETT can comment after the ranking member addresses the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Absolutely.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am glad we are here. I commend Senator MCCONNELL and also our counterparts in the House, Chairman CALLAHAN and Mrs. PELOSI. The chairman, Senator MCCONNELL, and I have worked closely together on this bill. In the same way I tried to accommodate those concerns of his side of the aisle, he has tried to do the same on our side. As a result, we have a good bipartisan bill.

We tried to meet everyone's concerns without putting in unnecessary earmarks or taking away the appropriate flexibility the President should have. We funded the President's important priorities, and I note that both sides of the aisle supported those.

I am disappointed, of course, as I am sure the Senator from Kentucky is, with the amount of time it took to get here. Finally, we are here. Had it been left to the two of us, we could have finished this bill before the August recess, but while we were told to make sure the cars in the train would follow, we were not allowed in the engineer's seat to get it down the track. It is here now, and it is a good result.

I am glad that we found an acceptable compromise on family planning that does not restrict what private organizations can do with their own private funds. That is only wise. After all, we have heard speeches forever from people here about how the government should get off the backs of individuals. We have finally agreed to do that. It was not easy. I give very high praise to Congresswoman PELOSI for her work on this.

I am also pleased that we include $425 million, the Senate funding level for family planning. This is not money for abortions. No funds in this bill can be used for abortions. This is money for family planning. So many countries I have visited are among the poorest of the poor, and they tell me that reducing the rate of population growth is one of their highest priorities but they lack the money to do so. They also say that when they have money for family planning, the number of abortions in their country goes down.

We provide adequate authority and funding for debt forgiveness. That had overwhelming support at the meeting the President had with Republicans and Democrats, members of the clergy across the ideological spectrum, representing all faiths and persuasions. I felt honored to be in that meeting.

One of our Senate guest Chaplains that week, Father Claude Pomerleau of the University of Portland, accompanied me there. I thank him for his advice and help on this. I should also say that Father Pomerleau is my wife's brother, my brother-in-law. Even the President said that it was probably Father Pomerleau's recommendation that got me into the White House, rather than my position that got him in.

In seriousness, on the issue of debt forgiveness, we want to help the world's poorest countries get out of debt. We also want to be sure they make the necessary economic reforms so they can stay out of debt in the future. It is not enough to say, look, we are going to pay your bills so you can get out of debt. It does nothing if then within a few years they are back in debt.

We provided aid to Serbia, subject to important conditions relating to Serbia's cooperation with the War Crimes Tribunal. Chairman MCCONNELL, myself, as well as Senator BIDEN and others, strongly support these conditions.

The conditions do not take effect until March 31, 2001, and we do not intend the aid spigot to be opened wide before then. We expect the administration—this administration and the next one—to proceed cautiously. We will be watching, as appropriators, just how cautious they are. After all, administrations come and go, but the Appropriations Committee stays here, and we will be here to watch what is done next year.

We want to support the new Serbian Government, but only if it is truly democratic and respects the rights of its neighbors and also the rights of minorities. We expect the administration to treat the apprehension and prosecution of war criminals as a priority.

I am pleased with the amount of funds for HIV/AIDS. It is a $100 million increase above last year's level. We provided up to $50 million for child immunization, and substantial increases for programs to combat TB, malaria, and other infectious diseases.

There are a lot of other provisions I could mention, from restrictions on assistance for Peru—we did that because of the recent efforts to subvert democracy there. We hear the President of Peru make promises, but then take actions that belie what he has said. We put in additional funding for refugees. Unfortunately, we know that the reality throughout the world today is that there are more and more refugees. However, I strongly object to one House provision that was included. And I told the conferees that I objected. It is a $5.2 million earmark for AmeriCares. This is a private organization that does work in Latin America and other places. I cannot recall a single instance—certainly not since 1989, when I became chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee; nor in the 5 years I have been ranking member, and the Senator from Kentucky has been chairman—when we have earmarked funds for a private organization such as this.

It was done here, as I understand it, because a 6-year, $5.2 million proposal of AmeriCares was rejected by AID. According to AID, the proposal was too high-tech to be sustainable in the country in question, and because some of the work was already being done by others. I suspect it was a proposal which would buy a lot of expensive equipment from some manufacturer somewhere but might not be something appropriate for that country.

Although AID suggested to AmeriCares that they submit a revised proposal, AmeriCares opted instead to seek a congressional earmark, ignoring the usual practice, and basically saying: Just give us the money. We will decide what to do with it.

I have no opinion on the merits of their proposal. But if you are going to be applying for Federal funds, you ought to follow the same rules everybody else does.

There are literally hundreds of PVOs that submit requests to AID, and many are rejected—some because they do not make sense, and others because there is not the money to fund them. Are we now going to give those other dissatisfied PVOs their own earmarks? It is a terrible precedent. It does not belong in this bill.

I will give you an example. I have fought to ban landmines all over the world. We have the Leahy War Victims Fund that spends millions of dollars every year for landmine victims. I wrote the legislation that was the first piece of legislation ever in any country to ban the export of landmines.

There are many NGOs and PVOs—that is, nongovernmental organizations and private voluntary organizations—that have come in and worked to get rid of landmines and care for landmine victims. Some are funded through the foreign aid bill or the defense appropriations bill. Some are funded through private donations that they raise. Many contact me because of my identification with this and say: Could I get Federal funding?

One of the nice things is that a lot of these—they are screened just before the money goes out. But can you imagine how it would be if we simply gave them the money just because it was requested by a Senator who wants to eradicate landmines?

It has always been my view we should let the experts judge the merits of these proposals, rather than just hand over the money to whichever organizations have the most political clout.

Some have complained—and I heard this morning—that this is a Republican bill. Others have said it is a Democratic bill. They are both wrong. Neither side got everything they wanted. There were significant compromises on funding and on policy by both sides. That is as it should be, especially for a bill that deals with foreign policy. And that is why I am proud to be here with the Senator from Kentucky, because we should not have a Republican foreign policy or a Democratic foreign policy. We should have a foreign policy that represents the interests of the United States.

We have had somewhat of an uneven record since the time when Senator Vandenberg spoke about ''politics ending at the water's edge.'' But on this bill, at least, Republicans and Democrats have come together.

It is interesting, too, because the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Appropriations Committee has probably the smallest staff of any committee around here—on the Republican side, with Robin Cleveland, and Tim Rieser on our side, aided by just a couple of people whom I will mention later—to put this together. We don't have huge armies of people to help us, but maybe that is just as well because as a result, in the end, Senators talk to Senators. That is the best way to do things around here.

I see the Senator from Utah is on the floor.

I yield the floor and retain the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

THE RAND STUDY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont for his courtesy. I was more than happy to give him whatever leeway he wanted, but I appreciate the opportunity to make a comment. Given the nature of the session in which we find ourselves, we have to take every opportunity as it comes along. As the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Kentucky, indicated, the time will be taken off the bill.

I rise to take the opportunity to respond to the comments that were made earlier by the Senator from Massachusetts in his scathing attack on the education system in Texas. The Senator from Massachusetts, as well as Senator HARKIN yesterday, referred to a Rand Corporation study on the State of Texas schools. They would have us believe that based on that study, the Texas schools are terrible and, further, that those of us who are saying nice things about Texas schools are deliberately misleading the public.

I want to make it clear that the people who are missing this story are the people who sit in the gallery above the Chair. The press has missed the story here because they have bought the line laid down by the Senator from Massachusetts and others in his party that somehow the Rand Corporation has denounced Texas schools as being terribly inferior. The Rand Corporation has done no such thing. Democrats

have used the recent Rand study to try to tell everybody that the Rand Corporation has done that. If I may, too many journalists have taken the press release as it has come out of the Democratic headquarters and not read the record for themselves.

I took a class in journalism. The first thing they said was, check the facts yourself. I didn't follow that career, but I have tried to remember that advice. So I have checked the facts myself. The place I went to begin with, with the help of my staff, was the Rand Corporation. Let us go back to the Rand Corporation and see what they have to say about Texas schools. I will leave aside the argument as to whether or not they are right. There is always the possibility that even these so-called experts could be wrong in their analysis. Let us set that aside for just a minute and ask ourselves, what does the Rand Corporation have to say about Texas schools?

This is what the Rand Corporation has to say about Texas schools. I am reading from a news release issued by the Rand Corporation itself. I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENNETT. The Rand Corporation says:

> The education reforms of the 1980s and 1990s seem to be working, according to a new RAND report, but some states are doing far better than others in making achievement gains and in elevating their students' performance compared with students of similar racial and socioeconomic background in other states. Texas and Indiana are high performers on both these counts.

I will repeat that last sentence:

> Texas and Indiana are high performers on both these counts.

This is not a Republican speaking. This is not the Bush campaign speaking. This is the Rand Corporation speaking. Texas, a high performer.

It goes on:

> Math scores are rising across the country at a national average rate of about one percentile point per year, a pace outstripping that of the previous two decades and suggesting that public education reforms are taking hold. Progress is far from uniform, however. One group of states—led by North Carolina and Texas and including Michigan, Indiana and Maryland—boasts gains about twice as great as the national average.

This is the Rand Corporation, Mr. President, saying Texas is boasting rates of improvement twice the national average.

Back to the report:

> Even more dramatic contrasts emerge in the study's pathbreaking, cross-state comparison of achievement by students from similar families. Texas heads the class in this ranking with California dead last.

Interesting. They go on to say:

> Although the two states are close demographic cousins, Texas students, on average, scored 11 percentile points higher on NAEP math and reading tests than their California counterparts. In fact, Texans performed well with respect to most states. On the 4th-grade NAEP math tests in 1996, Texas non-Hispanic white students and black students ranked first compared to their counterparts in other states, while Hispanic students ranked fifth. On the same test, California non-Hispanic white students ranked third from the bottom, black students last, and Hispanic students fourth from the bottom among states.

How can this be, for the Rand Corporation to be saying such wonderful things about Texas and then having Democratic Senators come to the floor and quote the Rand Corporation as saying terrible things about Texas? If I were a conspiracy theorist, I would think the release of the latest Rand study might have something to do with the fact that there is an election in less than a week. But the president of the Rand Corporation has insisted that is not the case. He has insisted that the timing of the release of this second study, which is being used to trash Texas, was entirely coincidental and had nothing whatever to do with the election.

All right. Let's take him at his word and read his words to see how he reconciles the earlier Rand statement with the later one. I didn't tell you, but that first study I quoted from was released in July, before either of the conventions took place, before the question of Texas performance in education became a national priority or a national issue.

How does the president of Rand reconcile these two apparently irreconcilable positions, one where Rand says, in July, Texas is No. 1, Texas comes in first with California last, and the two States are demographically very similar—how do they reconcile that statement with the statements we are hearing on the floor today?

Read what he has to say, I say again to my journalist friends, who take the press release from the Democratic headquarters, put it in the headlines—top story in today's television—that the Rand Corporation has trashed the Texas record. I don't think any of them read what the president of Rand had to say because if they had, the story would have been different on this morning's news.

This is what he has to say:

> The July study ''Improving Student Achievement'' touched on the Texas schools and received widespread press play. Both efforts—

Talking about the July study and this last one—

> draw on NAEP scores. The new paper suggests a less positive picture of Texas education than the earlier effort, but I do not believe these efforts are in sharp conflict. Together, in fact, they provide a more comprehensive picture of key education issues.

So Rand is not backing away from their earlier statement that Texas is No. 1 in the areas that they quoted and covered in their first statement. They are not repudiating that.

They are not contradicting it. They are not backing away from it. Again, the president of Rand says:

> I do not believe that these efforts are in sharp conflict.

It is the politicians who have put them in sharp conflict, not the researchers. Let's examine the research and see what it says. Quoting again from the president of Rand:

> The July report differed in scope.

Then in parentheses he says:

> (It covered almost all States, not just Texas.)

Therein lies the answer to this dilemma. The July report that says Texas ranks No. 1 was a comparative study of Texas against other States. In that study, they said: In these areas we are checking, Texas is the best. The Rand Corporation said ''Texas is the best.''

Now, they came back to Texas to do a different study on an entirely different issue, and the issue they studied the second time was whether or not the Texas test system was a good one. They came to their own conclusion that the Texas system of testing needs to be improved. Their judgment, their opinion. Never at any time did they say that Texas was not getting better results than any other States, even with a system they claim needs to be improved.

I see the chairman of the subcommittee has returned. I will be happy to yield the floor now and get back to the foreign operations bill, which is before us. I could not pass the opportunity to straighten out the Record.

The Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Iowa have misled us because they have not read the fine print of the report they are quoting from, and they have not consulted the opinion of the president of the organization they are citing. At no time, in no place, in spite of what the political headline said, has the Rand Corporation backed away from its conviction that Texas is first in many, if not all, of the categories they examined on education. The Governor of Texas and the two Senators from Texas who spoke earlier are rightly entitled to be very proud of the progress that has taken place in education in their State.

EXHIBIT 1

RISING MATH SCORES SUGGEST EDUCATION REFORMS ARE WORKING

STATE ACHIEVEMENT DIFFERENCES TIED TO SPENDING, POLICIES TEXAS FIRST, CALIFORNIA LAST IN TEST SCORES OF SIMILAR STUDENTS

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 25—The education reforms of the 1980s and 1990s seem to be working, according to a new RAND report, but some states are doing far better than others in making achievement gains and in elevating their students' performance compared with students of similar racial and socioeconomic background in other states. Texas and Indiana are high performers on both these counts.

The study is based on an analysis of National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) tests given between 1990 and 1996. The authors rank the 44 participating states by raw achievement scores, by scores that compare students from similar families, and

by score improvements. They also analyze which policies and programs account for the substantial differences in achievement across states that can't be explained by demographics. Here are the key findings:

Math scores are rising across the country at a national average rate of about one percentile point per year, a pace outstripping that of the previous two decades and suggesting that public education reforms are taking hold. Progress is far from uniform, however. One group of states—led by North Carolina and Texas and including Michigan, Indiana and Maryland—boasts gains about twice as great as the national average. Another group—including Wyoming, Georgia, Delaware, and Utah—shows minuscule gains or none at all. Most states fall in between.

Even more dramatic contrasts emerge in the study's pathbreaking, cross-state comparison of achievement by students from similar families. Texas heads the class in this ranking with California dead last. Wisconsin, Montana, Iowa, Maine, North Dakota, Indiana and New Jersey cluster closely behind Texas. Louisiana, Mississippi, West Virginia, Alabama and Rhode Island perform almost as dismally as California.

Although the two states are close demographic cousins, Texas students, on average, scored 11 percentile points higher on NAEP math and reading tests that their California counterparts. In fact, the Texans performed well with respect to most states. On the 4th-grade NAEP math tests in 1996, Texas non-Hispanic white students and black students ranked first compared to their counterparts in other states, while Hispanic students ranked fifth. On the same test, California non-Hispanic white students ranked third from the bottom, black students last, and Hispanic students fourth from the bottom among states.

Differences in state scores for students with similar families can be explained, in part, by per pupil expenditures and how these funds are allocated. States at the top of the heap generally have lower pupil-teacher ratios in lower grades, higher participation in public prekindergarten programs and a higher percentage of teachers who are satisfied with the resources they are provided for teaching. These three factors account for about two-thirds of the Texas-California differential. Teacher turnover also has a statistically significant effect on achievement. (California is now implementing class-size reduction and other reforms but these steps began after the 1996 NAEP tests.)

Having a higher percentage of teachers with masters degrees and extensive teaching experience appears to have comparatively little effect on student achievement across states. Higher salaries also showed little effect, possibly reflecting the inefficiency of the current compensation system in which pay raises reward both high- and low-quality teachers. However, the report points out that salary differences may have more important achievements effects within states than between states. Also, they may have greater impact during periods when teachers are in shorter supply than during the 1990–1996 measurement period.

To raise achievement scores, the most efficient and effective use of education dollars is to target states with higher proportions of minority and disadvantaged students with funding for lower pupil-teacher ratios, more widespread prekindergarten efforts, and more adequate teaching resources. As for teacher salaries and education, the report adds, ''efforts to increase the quality of teachers in the long run are important, but . . . significant productivity gains can be obtained with the current teaching force if their working conditions are improved.''

The most plausible explanation for the remarkable rate of math gains by North Carolina and Texas is the integrated sets of policies involving standards, assessment and accountability that both states implemented in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

The RAND study, led by David Grissmer, is based on NAEP tests given in 1990, 1992, 1994 and 1996 to representative samples of 2,500 students from the 44 voluntarily participating states. Five tests were given in mathematics and two in reading at either the 4th- or 8th-grade level. Not all of the states took all of the tests. And there were too few reading tests to permit a separate analysis of those results. Taken together, however, the tests provided the first set of data permitting statistically valid achievement comparisons across states. The researchers used data from the census and from the National Educational Longitudinal Survey to establish the student samples' family characteristics.

The 1998 NAEP reading and math scores became available too late to be incorporated in this analysis. ''We're examining those data now, however, and we find that the state rankings change little and our findings about which policies make the most difference aren't affected at all,'' Grissmer declares.

''Our results certainly challenge the traditional view of public education as 'unreformable','' he concludes. ''But the achievement of disadvantaged students is still substantially affected by inadequate resources. Stronger federal compensatory programs are required to address this inequity.''

Grissmer's coauthors include Ann Flanagan, Jennifer Kawata and Stephanie Williamson. Improving Student Achievement: What NAEP Test Scores Tell Us was supported by the ExxonMobil Foundation, the Danforth Foundation, the NAEP Secondary Analysis Program, the Center for Research on Education Diversity and Excellence and by RAND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Utah has made an extraordinarily good point. If he would like to speak further, I can wait. I am going to propose a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BENNETT. I have probably exhausted my indignation on that subject, I say to the Senator from Kentucky. I will be available again if someone comes along to try to misinterpret and misquote these studies.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend for his very important contribution to what has become an issue across America.

Mr. President, with relation to the foreign operations bill, I ask unanimous consent that the vote regarding the foreign operations conference report occur beginning at 4:30 p.m., and that there be 4 minutes for debate immediately following the vote for closing remarks with respect to the pending Feingold amendment and S. 2508, and that that vote immediately occur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I was told this had been cleared on both sides. We will propound the unanimous consent request later when it is cleared.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I had to leave the floor for a moment. Am I correct that the continuing resolution will not be here for a 4:30 vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, would it be his intention, once all time is finished or yielded back, to go to a rollcall vote on this bill?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am told that is fine with our side. We will be happy to finish up the debate and vote.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I know we are discussing the underlying bill. I ask unanimous consent to be yielded 7 minutes.

Mr. REID. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President: It is my understanding that we have a vote scheduled at 4:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not correct; that has been changed.

Mr. REID. I don't understand how we are not having a vote at 4:30. How could it have been changed?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I propounded a unanimous consent agreement to which the Senator from Florida objected and that is how we found ourselves where we are.

Mr. REID. So what I stated earlier on the floor—that we had a vote at 4:30—was really not accurate, is that true?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote was to occur at that time, but the measure on which the vote was to occur has not yet arrived from the House.

Who yields time?

Ms. LANDRIEU. I have requested time. I understand under a previous unanimous consent request, Senator GRAHAM of Florida was granted 30 minutes. He is yielding me a part of his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield the time to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I know we have been discussing a variety of subjects in the last few hours. The matter before the Senate is the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

One of the difficulties all Members are having, is trying to get some accurate information about what is actually in these bills, as they come to us rather quickly. That is one of the things we have been talking about today. I think Senator LEAHY raised an excellent point. There are provisions in

foreign ops about which I also have some serious concerns. But right now, I just wanted to take a few minutes to discuss the Adoption Tax Credit.

ADOPTION TAX CREDIT

Mr. President, the adoption tax credit is broadly supported in this Chamber by Democrats and Republicans. It is one of the issues we seem to be able to come together on to say, yes, we believe in adoption. Adoption affirms life. It affirms families. It helps us to build families in very special ways. It provides an opportunity for children who don't have parents, and for parents who desperately want children, to get together.

Over the last couple of years, together, Democrats and Republicans, the White House, President Clinton and the First Lady, have been aggressive advocates of adoption. We have made great progress.

Just last week, under the tremendous leadership of Chairman HELMS, we passed the first ever International Treaty on Adoption. This treaty is going to reduce corruption, minimize the costs of international adoptions, and expedite this process so the children all around the world can find homes. We believe there are no unwanted children, just unfound families. We passed historic legislation a few years ago to help break down racial barriers to allow people of all different races to adopt children in need, in order to build families. We all know that love knows no color lines.

We are doing a wonderful job. I am on the floor today to encourage my colleagues to just try to do a little bit better. I am concerned that we are not going to expand this adoption tax credit and increase it in ways that are meaningful, in ways that will make a difference.

Just two months ago, many members of this body gathered in Philadelphia and vowed that under their leadership, no child would be left behind. This is a laudable goal, and one I think that every member of this body embraced. Here is our opportunity to prove it.

Let me briefly explain what I mean. Right now, as many people know—particularly those who have adopted children, or who have been touched in a positive way in their life through adoption, either as an adoptee, as a birth mother who is happy with the choice she made, or an adoptive couple—there is in place a $5,000 tax credit for adoption. We adopted this tax credit in 1996, in an effort to provide assistance to families wishing to adopt. It allows parents who adopt a child to receive a maximum of $5,000 in credit on their taxes. If that child is what we call a special needs child, the amount of the credit is raised by $1,000. In addition, reimbursements for adoption expenses from a private employer are also excluded from an adoptive parent's gross annual income.

The National Adoption Clearinghouse estimates that a private adoption costs anywhere from $4,000 to $30,000. International adoptions are reported at between $10,000 and $30,000. About six months ago, I was at a citizenship ceremony for newly adopted children. One mother came up to me and told me that, without the tax credit, she could not have even thought about adopting a second child.

So this is an important tax credit. It helps waiting children find homes. It helps working couples who want to be parents experience the sheer joy parenting brings. But it is not working for everyone. Unfortunately, the way the credit is currently structured, it is not helping all adoptive families, just some. Let me show you why.

As you can see, I have pictures of three children here, all of whom were adopted. The first Elena, a child from Guatemala, who was adopted when she was one year old. She has no known health conditions. This second child is Jack, a little boy from the United States, who was given up for adoption when he was born. Jack was immediately placed through a private adoption agency. Jack also has no known health conditions.

And this is Serina, a little girl, also from the United States who was also recently adopted. Serina was taken into foster care immediately upon her birth. She was born with prenatal cocaine addiction. She is small, in a wheelchair, and has difficulty seeing and hearing. She suffers from Cerebral Palsy, as well as multiple other problems.

As I mentioned, these two children, Elena and Jack, are relatively healthy. The third child, Serina, has multiple challenges. Under our current system, one would think all of these children and their families would deserve some help with adoption. But right now under our system, Elena and Jack have received help. Elena's parents received $9,786, while Jack's family claimed $5,890. Serina's parents, on the other hand, received nothing.

Under the current tax code, only expenses which are incurred in the act of adoption are eligible. Although adopting Serina meant that her adoptive parents had to renovate their car and make their home wheelchair accessible, such costs are not ''qualified adoption expenses.''

As I mentioned, the difficulty lies in the tax code. One can be reimbursed for expenses related to the adoption. But, as is widely known in the adoption community, when you adopt a special needs child, perhaps one who is not physically handicapped, or one who has emotional or mental difficulties or has been in foster care, there are little or no expenses related to the active adoption.

Serina is a special needs child, just like the 100,000 special needs children who are freed for adoption in the United States and yet are still waiting for a home. These are all children like Serina, waiting for a family to love and care for them. We want that adoption tax credit to work for these children, as well. The Department of Treasury estimates that, not including step parents, there were 77,000 adoptions in 1998, 31,000 of which were special needs. That is almost half.

Therefore, under our current system, the very children and families we are trying to help, encourage, and reward for opening up their homes and hearts to these children are actually being left out.

Here is a report to Congress from our own Department of Treasury, a report we received just in the last week. I brought this to the attention of our ranking member on the Finance Committee, Senator MOYNIHAN. This has also been transmitted to Chairman ROTH from Delaware, to help my colleagues understand that, according to this report, special needs children are being left out. I know that in the final days of the session, negotiators have been trying to reach a final agreement on a tax package. However, I am told that, while this package does include a provision to extend the non-special needs tax credit for two additional years, it does not include any relief for special needs children.

I know some people might say: Senator LANDRIEU is not right. She couldn't possibly be right. This can not be happening. We are not giving a tax credit for healthy kids and no tax credit for special needs kids.

That wasn't our intention. At least I believe it wasn't our intention.

Let me conclude by saying, when people stand up on this floor, or in Philadelphia, or in California, giving speeches all over America, and say they don't want to leave children behind, that ''no child will be left behind'', we are about to leave 100,000 children behind, because we will not take the time and the energy to fix this adoption tax credit. Children such as Serina, children in my State and a number of others, all of these beautiful children from different States—these are the kids who are about to be left behind.

If I have to come to this floor every day until we are finished—and Lord only knows how long we will be here—I will continue to do so, to speak for the children who are being left behind. We can fix the tax credit; it costs very little to fix it. If we are truly a body which vows to leave no child behind, then we must do something to help both special needs and non special needs children.

Mr. President, I will come to the floor every day if necessary to ensure that these children are not left behind.

I thank the Chair. I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, how much time remains under my 30 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-one minutes 10 seconds.

FISCAL POLICY

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as is necessary.

For the last several weeks, I have been raising concerns about the direction of our fiscal policy. Today, we reach a historic moment. Many were here in the 1980's and 1990's when the Federal Government, through annual deficits, acquired a record national debt of almost $5.5 trillion. In 1992, we reached the peak of this when we had a 1-year deficit of in excess of $290 billion.

In the 1990s, we took a number of steps to try to rectify this situation and to mitigate this constant increase in the national debt.

A key part of that process occurred in 1997. In 1997, we set spending limits for ourselves, including spending limits on the discretionary accounts of the Federal Government such as the account that we are dealing with today. We promised ourselves and the public that for every tax dollar cut there would be $1 less spent, and vice versa. That is the way in which a family would approach having to restrain its budget in order to come into line with its income. It would buy the holiday gifts that it could afford but not necessarily the ones that everyone in the family wants because for those family budgets there are some very real caps.

But, for Congress, the commitment to realistic budget and fiscal responsibility was a novel, even a radical idea. We had not even thought about it that much in the preceding 20 or 30 years. Apparently, it was so radical that it was too much to ask. It is almost as if this Halloween season we have all turned into Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. On the campaign trail we put on one costume; that is, the costume of our better selves where we boast about the courage and foresight it took to balance the budget. We talk about all the good things we are going to do, whether it is saving Social Security, providing a prescription drug benefit for Medicare, cutting taxes, or adding spending in other favorable programs. Then we return to Congress and we take off our mask. We begin grabbing for what we can get, a few billion here, a few billion there, regardless of the long-term consequences.

We have doled out treats to line our political pockets while we are playing a trick on the American public. That trick is that we are sleepwalking through the surplus. We are about to deny ourselves and future generations one of the greatest opportunities that we have had in American political and economic history: to use this enormous period of prosperity to deal with some of those long-term issues that will affect, not just ourselves, but future generations.

But as we vote to set the deficit monster free, we make the promise that this is only for this year. We are not really going to let him out of the cage; we are just going to open the door a bit and let him sniff some of the desirable consequences of profligate spending. This year we tell the American public this is our chance to celebrate this American prosperity. Next year we will cut the monster down to size, put him back in his cage, and no long-term harm will have been done. But the truth is for our children and our grandchildren this could be a very scary Halloween.

My friends, are we really so humble as to believe that what we do today will not resonate through future years? I personally find it hard to believe that this will be just a 1-year exception to a constancy of fiscal discipline.

In 1997, we planned for the future because we knew that what we did with the taxpayers' dollars would have real consequences. They are having real consequences.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Washington Post article aptly entitled ''Binges Becoming Regular Budget Fare'' be printed in the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, this story chronicles the crumbling of our wall of fiscal resolve in the face of a behemoth of appropriations bills. The bill we have before us, the foreign operations bill, carries a $14.9 billion price tag.

It has been stated that this bill is actually lower than the bill that we passed last year. If I am in error—and it is very difficult to respond since we have only in the last few hours gotten a copy of a multipage bill, but as I read through the bill, it is my analysis that in calculating last year's $15.5 billion expenditure, we have included an almost $2 billion item, the Wye Plantation commitments for the Middle Eastern peace, which are nonrecurring. So if you are comparing apples to apples, those things that we spent money on last year and those things we are going to spend money on this year, actually last year's comparable appropriation for foreign operations was closer to $13.5 billion. So instead of the $14.9 billion being a reduction, it actually represents approximately a 10-percent increase over the spending that we had on this same account last year, a 10-percent increase, while we are operating under the rule that we are only supposed to spend the rate of inflation, which is 3.5 percent, as an increase from 1 year's budget to the next.

But that is not what is the true monster in this bill. The true monster in this bill is stuck into the appropriations language, which for us on the floor is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, since we do not have a copy of the actual bill and conference report. It is specifically stuck on page H10776, nestled in between a provision that relates to gifts to the United States for reduction of the public debt—and I am glad to know that we get some gifts to reduce the public debt—and a provision that provides debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries. It may be appropriate that this language I am about to quote is inserted in between those two provisions.

In section 701(a), this language appears:

> Section 251 (c)(5) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 . . . is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:
>
> ''(A) for discretionary category: $637,000,000,000 in new budget authority and $612,695,000,000 in outlays;''.

That might seem fairly unexciting, but let me tell you what we are preparing to do. In that Balanced Budget Act of 1997, we provided a spending limit for discretionary accounts for each of the future years. For the fiscal year 2001, the year for which we are now appropriating, the spending limit was established at $542 billion. The legislation we are about to vote upon will increase that figure from $542 billion to $637 billion, a 17.5-percent increase in the allowable expenditure in this 1 year alone. That is the scale of the monster that we are about to let out of the cage by adopting this legislation.

This figure will put far more than a dent in the surplus that we promised. It will put a massive hole in our budget projections. The fact is, by the time we are done, Social Security is more likely to be floundering midstream without a life vest than to be in a secure lockbox on dry land. Instead of fiscal responsibility, we are now practicing fiscal myopia. We are honing in on the magic number, a $4.6 trillion surplus over the next 10 years. However, what we are forgetting to completely level with the American people about is that that $4.6 trillion is predicated on the assumption we are only going to spend $542 billion this year. We are about to authorize a number that is almost $100 billion larger.

The forecasters of the Congressional Budget Office do not have a crystal ball. They can only see the future the way we look at it and the degree of confidence they place in our actions. The CBO numbers, upon which the $4.6 trillion surplus is predicated, are based on those commitments made in 1997.

This appropriations bill demonstrates that we are not committed to those commitments of 1997. The surplus projections assume that discretionary spending increases each year would be restrained to the rate of inflation. We are about to completely abandon that facade.

What are we about to do as we go into this new reckless era? The best case scenario—and we can assume under that that we will, indeed, be able to increase discretionary spending for the future only by the rate of inflation, that this is just a 1-year aberration through which we are living; that Halloween is going to be repealed for future years—if we have that best case scenario, we can anticipate that our surplus will sink by about $100 billion over the next 10 years—$100 billion less than the projections.

I do not think that is a credible scenario. I do not believe there is any reason to believe that what we are doing today is exceptional. Rather, what we

are doing today is going to be precedential for the future. And assume that it is precedential. The discretionary spending each year increases by the same rate that we are increasing it this year; that is, approximately 9 percent, or 5.5 percent more than the rate of inflation.

If we act in each of the next 10 years with the same abandon that we do this year, we will spend the entire 10-year projected surplus on this increased spending. There will be no money to strengthen Social Security. There will be no money to finance a tax cut. There will be no money to provide for prescription drugs through Medicare. In fact, spending at this rate will not only eliminate all of those potentials, but Congress will be forced to dip into the Social Security surplus, that thing which it has committed it would never ever do, by $400 billion over 10 years.

So we are making some very serious decisions as we pass this appropriations bill with its enormous increase in the limitation on discretionary spending.

Save Social Security, indeed. Could it be that when we talked about saving Social Security, we really meant preserving it as a museum piece so we could talk to our grandchildren about what it used to be like? We will tell them that back when we were young, the Government actually sent you money when you grew older and deserved a rest. But if discretionary spending will dent the surplus, the direction we are taking on mandatory spending will virtually hollow it out.

Our lack of fiscal discipline is not only to be found in the appropriations bill but also in the creation of new entitlements. We have already passed the Defense Department authorization bill that changes the health benefits as a new entitlement and will reduce the surplus by $60 billion over the next 10 years.

We are poised to approve give-backs to Medicare providers that will cost another estimated $75 to $80 billion of our surplus over the next 10 years.

Another $260 billion disappears if we pass a tax bill, which it is rumored that it is about to be presented to us by our colleagues from across the hall in the House of Representatives.

So when you add up all of this laundry list, you will find that we have reduced our surplus to another return to deficits.

It is very easy to add up these numbers and simply say it is too much, but I am well aware that much of the spending is for worthy causes, many of which I myself support. But what these individual pieces of legislation do not add up to is a solid plan for the future. What they do not add up to is the requirement that we make choices, that we set priorities, that we decide which of all of these good things is most important, and that we have the discipline to stick to those priorities.

I ask again, whatever happened to ''Save Social Security first''?

Can we really say we have done anything to shore up the Medicare system which is desperately in need of an infusion if it is to remain viable for today's seniors, their children, and grandchildren?

Are we ever going to be able to pay down the debt?

Our colleagues in the House have suggested that 90 percent of the surplus for this year go to debt reduction. That proposal was for this year only, for fiscal year 2001, however, because they cannot do it over the next 10 years. Ten percent of the surplus would be $456 billion. Congress may very well enact legislation in the next few years that will exceed that amount by in excess of $100 billion.

We have already committed ourselves to more spending than the House of Representatives pledge would require using 90 percent of the surplus to pay down the national debt.

Mr. President, $100 billion is more money than most Americans can ever conceive of.

In a few short months, history will move forward again and we will gather together in the Chamber of the House of Representatives to greet a newly elected President to hear his first State of the Union Address.

By almost any measure, the state of our Union is strong. Our economy is the envy of the world. Incomes are up. Unemployment is down. Home ownership is up. Inflation is low. Mortgage rates remain modest.

As we await a new President, and the first State of the Union Address from that new President—the first new President elected in the 21st century—I am reminded of the historic State of the Union speech delivered by President Clinton at the beginning of 1998.

To provide context from that time, we, as a nation, were on the verge of shifting from annual deficits to a hope for a promised projected surplus. We were looking at a prospect we had not faced in years: What do we do with a possible surplus?

In his 1998 State of the Union Address, President Clinton answered that question. If I could quote from his eloquent words of that evening:

> For three decades, six Presidents have come before you to warn of the damage deficits pose to our nation. Tonight, I come before you to announce that the federal deficit—once so incomprehensibly large that it had eleven zeros—will be, simply, zero.
>
> If we balance the budget for the next year, it is projected that we'll then have a sizable surplus in the years that immediately follow. What should we do with this projected surplus?
>
> I have a simple, four-word answer: Save Social Security first.

Mr. President, that simple four-word answer, ''Save Social Security first,'' brought all of us to our feet in January of 1998. And, Mr. President at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, your greatest legacy will be the restoration of fiscal discipline here in Washington.

Mr. President, you are being challenged as to the fidelity and sustainability of that commitment to fiscal discipline. We should now resist the temptation to allow the deficit monster to escape from the cage again.

We should give to President Clinton the rightful recognition for reversing decades of rampant borrowing and, as a result of that courage, producing sustained national prosperity and the potential for even more prosperity.

But, Mr. President, at the end of your administration, we need you to remain true to the principles that have produced this legacy. If we in the Congress are unable to exercise fiscal discipline, we will have to turn to you to provide us with the necessary restraints.

We are talking here about our children and our grandchildren. Are we again going to return to the days when we expect them to pay our bills or are we going to accept the responsibility that virtually every generation of Americans—but for those who have lived in the last 30 years—were prepared to accept? And that is that we would—each generation, each year—pay our bills and not ask future generations to do so. That is the fundamental issue we face with this appropriations bill. Because I believe it fails to meet that test, I will vote no.

Thank you, Mr. President.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 25, 2000]

BINGES BECOMING REGULAR BUDGET FARE

(By Eric Pianin)

Rules created more than two decades ago to impose fiscal restraint on Congress have broken down, helping fuel a year-end spending spree that is resulting in billions of extra dollars for highways and bridges, water projects, emergency farm aid, school construction and scores of other projects.

Many budget hawks have derided the binge as a typical election year ''porkfest.'' But key lawmakers and experts on federal budgeting say another less visible problem is that the law aimed at reining in such spending has been effectively gutted by the congressional leadership.

In particular, lawmakers are increasingly ignoring the annual congressional budge resolution, the document that is supposed to guide spending and tax decisions in the House and Senate every year. In years past, lawmakers might miss their budget targets by a few billion dollars, but now they are busting the budget by as much as $50 billion a year.

This year's budget resolution, for instance, called for about $600 billion in spending this fiscal year on defense, health, education and other non-entitlement programs. When Congress and the White House finally complete their negotiations, probably this week, the total will be $640 billion or more.

One reason, lawmakers say, is that the GOP congressional leadership has adopted—largely for political reasons—unrealistic budgets that understate the amount of spending members want. Another is that the emergence of big surpluses has made Congress much less vigilant bout living within its means—and more prone to make up the rules as it goes along.

''I think the budget process has been destroyed and I think, unfortunately, Republicans have been heavily numbered among the assassins,'' said Sen. PHIL GRAMM (R–Tex.), a veteran of budget skirmishes. ''I think we've made a mockery of the process and it will be very difficult to revive it.''

Stanley Collender, a prominent expert on federal spending, added: ''What we're seeing is budget decision-making by the seat of their pants.''

Collender and other experts say the increased spending being approved by Congress could begin to cut into projected surpluses, leaving less for the spending and tax cut initiatives proposed by Vice President Gore and Texas Gov. George W. Bush. Outside of the Social Security program, analysts have projected the federal government will run a $2.2 trillion surplus over the next decade. But the Concord Coalition, a bipartisan budget watchdog group, estimates that the forecast surpluses are likely to shrink by two-thirds, to about $172 billion, if congressional spending patterns persist.

Congress is on track to boost non-defense discretionary spending by 5.2 percent above the rate of inflation during fiscal 2001—the sharpest spending increase of its type in 25 years—according to a new analysis by Democrats on the House Budget Committee.

The decision to ignore the budget resolution is only one sign of a general brreakdown of fiscal discipline on Capitol Hill, according to fiscal experts. Congress and the Clinton administration are also ignoring spending caps both agreed to as part of the 1997 legislation to balance the federal budget.

Congress's enthusiasm for real budget constraints began to wane almost as soon as deficits gave way to surpluses beginning three years ago. Until then, the specter of towering annual deficits of as much as $290 billion had fostered a series of hardnosed policies, including a 1990 budget deal that for the first time imposed caps on spending and required Congress to offset tax cuts by reducing spending or raising other revenue.

The emergence of surpluses has left it to lawmakers to produce budget plans that would impose spending discipline with an eye to the time when Medicare and Social Security will begin to run short of money. But that has not happened.

In the politically charged environment of Capitol Hill, the House and Senate budget committees in recent years produced plans that budget experts say were more GOP political manifestors than practical blueprints. The problem came to a head in 1998, when House Budget Committee Chairman John R. Kasich (Ohio), then a Republican presidential aspirant, produced a House budget resolution so top-heavy with tax cuts and tough on domestic spending that he could not sell it to Senate Republicans or the White House.

For the first time in nearly 25 years, Congress completed that year without a budget. The following year Republicans managed to agree among themselves on a budget, but the document was largely ignored by GOP leaders when they negotiated a final spending agreement with the White House.

This year's plan was somewhat more pragmatic, but even so it called for $150 billion of tax cuts—about twice what Congress will finally settle for—and spending cuts in many areas that GOP members of the appropriations committees refused to accept.

Some of the additional funding this year will go for emergencies, such as restoration of western forest lands hit by fires last summer and security problems at the national nuclear laboratory at Los Alamos, NM. But much of the additional money will go to satisfy the election year demands of Clinton and special projects sought by GOP and Democratic lawmakers—ranging from $2 billion for extra highway and bridge projects to $5 million for an insect-rearing facility in Stoneville, Miss.

''The budget process can only do what the political will can support,'' said G. William Hoagland, the Republican staff director of the Senate Budget Committee. ''I would argue that, if anything, what this year shows is that you need a [tough] budget process even more in times of surpluses than in times of deficits.''

Another phenomenon in recent years has been a growing propensity on the part of congressional leaders to overrule key committees—even in promoting big policy changes. Last year, for example, Republican leaders waited until late in the year to unveil details of a plan to wall off the Social Security surplus from the rest of the budget. They returned from this year's August recess with a new idea for using nine-tenths of next year's surplus for debt reduction.

While both proposals, arguably, will help to impose some limitations on spending, they were presented without any meaningful debate or review by the committees with jurisdiction. House Majority Leader Richard K. Armey (R–Tex.) defended the practice, noting that ''the leadership can't have any idea that holds water unless the [GOP] conference holds it with them.''

BUSTING THE BUDGET

[Dollars in billions]

Fiscal year	Budget resolution	Actual spending	Excess spending
1997	$528	$538	$10
1998	531	533	2
1999	533	583	50
2000	540	587	47
2001	600	[1] 640	40

[1] Estimate.

Source: Senate Budget Committee.

THE CUBAN TRANSITION PROJECT

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I would like to engage Senator MCCONNELL, Chairman of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee in a colloquy regarding an important project addressed in both the Senate and House Committee Reports. This project is the Cuban Transition Project located in Miami, FL.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would be pleased to engage in such a colloquy.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, my purpose for entering into this colloquy is to seek clarification from the Chairman regarding the Conferees' intent to support the Cuban Transition Project. The House Committee Report states that it supports $3.5 million be provided through USAID for this important initiative to provide policy makers, analysts and others with accurate information and practical policy recommendations that will be needed over a multi-year basis to assist this country in preparation for our next stage of interaction with the Cuban community and nation. The Senate Committee Report similarly supported this project, and it is my understanding that you support this project and intend that it receive support from USAID.

Mr. MCCONNELL. That is correct. Support for the Cuban Transition Project was clearly stated in both the House and Senate Reports, and it is the Committee's intention that the project be supported by USAID as indicated. This project is envisioned as a critical component as we prepare ourselves for dealing with Cuban issues in the future. It is our intent that the Cuban Transition Project receive funding this year.

Mr. MACK. I thank the Chairman for reiterating his support and clarifying the intent of the subcommittee. This project has the strong support of the Chairman of the House International Relations Committee, and I know that this committee will also be expressing support to the agency. I would like to ask if you will be willing to further advise the Agency formally of your position on this matter.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the subcommittee will further clarify this matter with USAID and I would be happy to work further on any concerns that my colleague from Florida may have.

Mr. MACK. I thank the Chairman for his comments.

POLIO ERADICATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I would like to engage in a colloquy with Senator LEAHY, ranking member of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee. It is my understanding that the Senate Appropriations Committee report recommended $30 million for the global polio eradication campaign at USAID and the House recommended $25 million. It is also my understanding that the Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund received a $248 million increase for Fiscal 2001 and that there are sufficient funds for the USAID to provide the $30 million for global polio eradication, am I correct?

Mr. LEAHY. Yes, we have provided sufficient funds to fund polio eradication at the Senate level of $30 million.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator work with me to ensure that the current USAID Administrator and the Administrator in the new administration provides $30 million for global polio eradication for fiscal 2001?

Mr. LEAHY. Yes, I would be happy to work for the Senator.

Mr. HARKIN. Thank you, Senator LEAHY for your commitment and leadership on this issue.

MICRONUTRIENT FUNDING

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. Senator LEAHY would engage in a brief colloquy about funding for USAID programs in micronutrients?

Mr. LEAHY. I would be delighted to do so with the distinguished Senator from Maryland, a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. MILKULSKI. It is my understanding that the conference report currently under consideration makes no reference to micronutrient programs funded through the Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund. However, the Senate provided $30 million for this activity in its version of H.R. 4811, while the House provided $25 million. Given that the conference report before the Senate provides $963 million for child survival and disease prevention activities, an increase of almost $250 million that I strongly support, I was wondering if the Ranking

Member would join me in working to obtain the Senate level of $30 million for micronutrient programs.

Mr. LEAHY. I would be happy to. As the Senator has correctly pointed out, the conference report includes a significant increase for child survival activities at USAID. AID is strongly encouraged to dedicate more recourses to the micronutrient programs.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank my colleague.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to comment on the conference report on the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

I reluctantly voted against that conference report, because it contained a provision dramatically increasing the budget caps, effectively throwing fiscal discipline to the wind.

But I want to go on record indicating that, if the amendment busting the budget caps had not been included in the bill, my vote would have been an enthusiastic yes. Substantively, this is a remarkably good bill, and I commend the managers, Chairman MCCONNELL and the ranking member, Senator LEAHY, as well as Chairman Callahan and Congresswoman PELOSI for their excellent work.

An unprecedented commitment to fighting HIV/AIDS abroad and full funding of the Administration's request for debt relief initiatives are among the many laudable provisions in the bill that complement this year's authorizing work of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The conference report contains significant assistance for important family planning work, which can help to bring better health and economic development to families and especially to women around the world. Moreover, I am pleased to see that the bill does not contain restrictive, so-called ''Mexico City'' language designed to limit what private organizations can do with funds raised from non-U.S. government sources.

During the debate on the Senate's version of this bill earlier this year, I asked for, and received, the commitment of Senators MCCONNELL and LEAHY to pursue full funding for flood recovery assistance in Mozambique and southern Africa, a region of the world utterly devastated by a series of cyclones earlier this year. This was especially tragic, because prior to the flooding, Mozambique had been making progress toward climbing out of poverty, enjoying economic growth rates of 10 percent per year. I want to thank both Senators for keeping their word. This conference report contains $135 million in flood recovery assistance for the region. This is the right thing to do.

I took a particular interest in the southern Africa issue, in part because I serve as the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's Subcommittee on African Affairs. In that same capacity, I have joined with a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to insist that the Administration make accountability a top priority in the context of our policy towards Sierra Leone. I am gratified to note that the statement of the managers accompanying the conference report includes language urging the State Department to provide support for the Special War Crimes Court for Sierra Leone. The support of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee for this key Congressional priority in West Africa should not be overlooked.

In another area of interest, I note that the conference report retains language suspending certain types of military and security assistance to Indonesia until a set of conditions relating to the disarmament and disbanding of militia forces and accountability for gross human rights abuses have been met. At the same time, it maintains an appropriate level of assistance for the people of East Timor, who are seeking to rebuild their communities and to fully realize their independence each day.

Finally, the conference report provides strong support for the Peace Corps and for important development assistance accounts which, when responsibly administered and monitored, can serve U.S. interests in building a more stable, prosperous, and democratic world.

All of these sound provisions make it all the more unfortunate that the bill has been tainted with the budget-busting amendment, so that my vote would have been an accurate reflection of my support for this bill. Too often in the past, the Congress has failed to understand the critical link between U.S. engagement with the rest of the world and our national interests—our security, our health, our economic stability, and even our national values. This bill recognizes those links and moves in the right direction. It's a shame that a bill that makes such sensible policy choices, so casually busts the budget caps that we rely upon to ensure fiscal responsibility.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Conference Report for Foreign Operations Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001.

The bill before us includes much that is good; in fact, it includes much that is important for our national security. For example, with the Middle East experiencing a level of turmoil not witnessed since the 1973 Yom Kippur War, the assistance in this bill for Israel and for other friends and allies in the region constitutes an essential component of our policy there. Vital humanitarian assistance programs are funded, including debt relief for especially poor countries.

However, I cannot support this conference report because it raises fiscal year 2001 discretionary spending caps to $637 billion from the $600 billion that was provided for in the budget resolution passed in April. Assuming that will be the new total amount of spending allowed, that would be nearly $40 billion more than the budget resolution, $13 billion more than what the President requested, and $50 billion more than what was spent in fiscal year 2000.

In addition, there remains the usual plethora of parochially-driven spending directives. While the bill appears to avoid legally restrictive earmarks, the effect of numerous provisions intended to do precisely that: direct funds where Members of Congress want them to go, usually for parochial reasons. I will be submitting a list of such items for the RECORD.

The decision to vote against this bill, irrespective of the usual pork-barrel provisions, however, was difficult. I recognize the importance of aid to Israel during this crucial period in its history, and I agree with the imperative of relieving the poorest countries of the burden of their international debts. The fiscal irresponsibility of Section 701 of this bill adjusting the spending caps upward to accommodate greater levels of pork barrel spending is too much to ignore. I'm not ignoring it, Mr. President. I oppose passage of this bill because I abhor the continuing disregard for fiscal responsibility it represents. And I abhor the cynicism illuminated by a decision to attach such fiscally irresponsible language to a spending bill so important to our national security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD earmarks, Member-adds, and directive language.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4811, FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001—EARMARKS, MEMBER-ADDS, AND DIRECTIVE LANGUAGE

International Fertilizer Development Center: $4 million;

United States Telecommunications Training Institute: $500,000;

National Albanian American Council training program: $1.3 million;

Section 536 Impact on Jobs in the United States: restrictive language intended to curtail trade that adversely affects employment in the United States;

Section 545 Purchase of American-Made Equipment and Products: Requires the Secretary of the Treasury to report to Congress on efforts by heads of Federal agencies to ensure that directors of international financial institutions make full use of American commodities, products and services;

Kiwanis/UNICEF Iodine Deficiency Program: $5 million;

University of California, San Fransisco: $500,000 to develop detailed epidemiological HIV/AIDS profiles for priority countries;

Gorgas Memorial Institute, University of Alabama: AID is ''urged'' to work closely with the institute, drawing from the $60 million alloted to address global health threat from tuberculosis;

Notre Dame's Vector Biology Laboratory Tulane University's Department of Tropical Medicine: AID is ''urged'' to direct $2 million to these institutes to establish Centers of Excellence for malaria research;

Carelift International: AID is ''urged'' to direct $7 million to Carelift International;

University of Missouri-St. Louis International Laboratory for Tropical Agriculture

biotechnology program: AID is ''urged'' to allocate $1 million;

University of California, Davis: AID is ''urged'' to allocate $1 million for the university to train foreign scientists;

Tuskegee University, Alabama: AID is ''urged'' to allocate $1 million to establish a Center to Promote Biotechnology in International Agriculture at Tuskegee University;

Marquette University, Wisconsin: AID is urged to allocate a sum of money similar to that received under this bill as other universities to the Les Aspin Center for Government;

United States Telecommunications Training Institute: $500,000 ''should'' be made available for the institute;

Habitat for Humanity International: Department of State is urged to coordinate with AID to ensure the program receives $1.5 million;

Foundation for Environmental Security and Sustainability: AID is ''urged'' to allocate $2.5 million to support environmental threat assessments with interdisciplinary experts and academicians;

Alfalit International: earmarks $1.5 million to combat adult illiteracy;

University of San Fransisco: earmarks $1 million for the Center for Latin American Trade Expansion to assist in the development of trade promotion initiatives;

Patrick Leahy War Victims Fund: earmarks $12 million;

American Center for Oriental Research: DoS and AID are ''urged'' to allocate $2 million for the center, headquartered in Amman, Jordan, with operations in Boston, MA;

Dartmouth Medical School: AID is ''urged'' to allocate $750,000 for a joint program with the University of Pristina to help restore educational programs;

Florida State University: AID is ''urged'' to allocate $2 million for a distance learning program;

Synchrotron Light Source Particle Accelerator project (SESAME): ''the managers intend that $15 million of the funds made available for Armenia should support this or a comparable project.'' Berkeley, California, partnership;

University of South Alabama: $1 million to study the environmental causes of birth defects in Ukraine;

Ohio Center for Economic Initiatives National Telephone Cooperative Association, Arlington, VA: $3.2 million for industrial sector management tours;

University of Alaska/Alaska Pacific University/Alaska Native regional governments (North Slope Borough and Northwest Arctic Borough): $20 million for the activities of these institutions in the Russian Far East;

World Council of Hellenes/United States-Russia Investment Fund: allocates an unspecified sum to the World Council of Hellenes and the United States-Russia Investment Fund to support the Primary Healthcare Initiative in Ukraine, Georgia, and Russia;

Notre Dame University: The Department of State is directed to support the university's program of human rights, democracy, and conflict resolution training in Colombia;

Naval Post-Graduate School, Monterey, California: DoS and AID are ''urged'' to allocate $150,000 for development of a peacekeeping initiative at the school;

Jamestown Foundation: $1 million to disseminate information and support research about China.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, in June of this year I expressed my displeasure with the foreign operations appropriations bill when it came to the floor of the Senate. The overall funding level was too low, security assistant accounts were unfunded, burdensome conditions were placed on contributions to international organizations and an inadequate appropriation was made for debt relief.

I'm pleased to find that the conference report has corrected some of these problems in a very satisfactory way. Appropriators have done the right thing on debt relief, by fully funding the amounts requested. As the wealthiest nation in the world, there is no excuse for us ignoring the plight of the world's poorest countries which are laboring under an untenable debt burden.

I'm also relieved to see that the overall funding level of the bill comes far closer to the administration's request than the bill that the Senate passed in June. That bill, to my dismay, was $1.7 billion short of what was asked for. The conference report is a vast improvement. It is still some $200 million below what the executive branch has projected that it will need to undertake foreign operations. Obviously this is quite a large sum and there is a very serious need for Congress to reverse the trend of undercutting State Department and Agency for International Development programs. However the conference report brings the money requested and the money appropriated substantially closer.

The bill contains a provision for assistance to Serbia with which I am in agreement. To unilaterally lift sanctions, or to open up the aid spigot fully would be both premature and naive. The United States should adopt the more measured response reflected in this provision. The language in the conference report sends the right message that we must condition our aid to the new regime in Serbia until it has clearly demonstrated that it will cooperate with the Hague War Crimes Tribunal, respect the independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina and not undermine the Dayton Accords, and that it will unequivocally renounce the use of force in Kosovo and take steps to implement policies that reflect a respect for minorities and rule of law.

Finally Mr. President, let me say that I am also relieved to see that the level of funding dedicated to the Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, De-mining and Related Programs (NADR) has been increased substantially. The amount is almost $100 million more than the level in the Senate passed bill, and slightly higher than the President's request. Although I would like to see more resources dedicated to the International Science and Technology Centers program, I welcome the plus up in the larger account. These programs are a crucial element in our strategy to halt the spread of nuclear weapons, and combat terrorism.

One NADR account that received more than the amount requested was export control assistance, and I truly applaud that. The assistance that we give to other countries in developing export control laws, regulations, and enforcement is absolutely crucial from the non-proliferation standpoint, and it can also help combat international terrorism. As we plus up that program, however, we must remember to provide the personnel to implement it. Many of those personnel are in the Department of Commerce, and more are needed. Unless appropriators provide elsewhere the requested 7 additional personnel (which translates into 5 additional FTE in Fiscal Year 2001) for the Bureau of Export Administration, the additional funds that we make available in this bill simply will not be implemented as effectively as we would wish.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Conference report. It has taken some time to reach an agreement satisfactory to all interested parties, but I believe that the bill before us goes a long way toward advancing American interests abroad. Furthermore, this bill contains important provisions to help poor and vulnerable world citizens.

First of all, I am especially pleased that appropriators have agreed to fully fund the President's debt relief package for third world countries, and that language has been included to allow the International Monetary Fund to release $800 million from the sale of gold reserves so that the interest earned on the proceeds can be put to work providing debt forgiveness to heavily indebted poor nations in Africa and parts of Latin America. The burden of external debt has become a major impediment to economic development and poverty reduction in many of the world's poorest countries—a reality I have witnessed first-hand throughout my travels in Latin America. Until recently, the United States government and other creditors sought to address this problem by rescheduling loans, and in some cases, providing limited debt reduction. Despite such efforts, the cumulative debt of many of the poorest countries has continued to grow beyond their ability to repay, and thus, developing economies are struggling. And, even worse, it is the most vulnerable citizens in these fledgling democracies that are suffering from this debt. When already poor governments are investing vast amounts of their budgets in debt maintenance, little remains for social services for those most in need. As a result, women, children, and the poor end up suffering and living in want.

Throughout my tenure in the Senate, I have supported efforts to target assistance for programs designed to address the special needs and concerns of the poor, and I am grateful that we have had some success in this undertaking. United States assistance programs, together with other international aid efforts, have made basic human necessities available to many of those most in need. However, I believe that the debt reduction initiatives included in the Foreign Operations bill

today build upon that success, and hope that they will dramatically increase the quality of life for citizens in indebted countries. We still have a long way to go to ensure that all people live free of hunger and want, but I think that today we are taking a dramatic leap forward toward that end.

I am also pleased with the increase in funding for children's health programs included in this bill. This conference report provides $963 million for child survival and disease programs, $413 million more than the administration requested. Besides providing funding of $110 million for UNICEF, this money will be used for immunization programs, prenatal care, polio eradication, combating illegal trafficking in women and children, and the establishment of orphanages for displaced children. My colleagues know of my deep commitment to child welfare both at home and abroad. Indeed, too often children are overlooked because they do not vote and have no voice in our political system. I am extremely happy that children's welfare programs have been so generously funded in this bill, and hope that this represents a trend that will continue in the years to come.

Finally, I would like to comment on the family planning provisions in the bill. I believe the problem of overpopulation is an extremely important issue and population stabilization is crucial to the well-being of the planet. Overpopulation threatens to exert tremendous social, ecological, medical, and economic hardship on much of the world, and we must take strong action to limit it.

For families living under the conditions that exist in many developing nations, family planning is critical. Without it, mothers have great difficulty spacing their births and limiting the number of children they bear and, as a result, they suffer the tremendous physical stress of repeated childbirth—often without the aid of physicians or midwives. Furthermore, women are not the only ones who suffer in these cases; their children suffer too. Children in large families find themselves competing for food with other siblings. As a result, they suffer from higher incidents of malnutrition and hunger.

Under the compromise included in the conference report, family planning groups abroad can finally use their own money to provide family planning services, although the restriction on federal funding of abortions continues. In addition, Congress has boosted the general funding available for international family planning from $370 million to $425 million which will be available for expenditure after February 15, 2001. By helping women avoid pregnancy before conception, this funding will help mothers in developing countries better plan their child rearing, and will reduce the number of abortions performed annually. Moreover, it will ensure that every child born is a wanted child and will reduce the number of children born to parents who do not have the resources to care for them.

I believe that this is a good bill. It helps those who need it most, and provides funding for our international priorities. It includes money to help end the devastation of AIDS in Africa, assists women, children, and the poor, and allows governments to finally get out of the shadow of crushing debt that both economic circumstance and mismanagement caused to be accrued. On balance, the programs funded in this appropriations bill advance America's foreign policy and national security interests. In short, it is good for the people of the world, and the people of America. When we invest pro-actively in global stability we encourage peace and commerce, and everybody wins. For these reasons, I will vote in favor of this bill and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise as a member of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee to express my strong support for this conference report. I want to extend my congratulations to Senator LEAHY and Senator MCCONNELL as this is clearly one of the best Foreign Operations bills produced in recent years.

This is a good bill which will advance U.S. interests on many fronts. This is a good bill for my constituents who are engaged in global affairs in everything from international trade to humanitarian relief efforts. This is always a tough bill to finish because it address several very controversial issues. Unlike years past, however, this bill is being widely praised by both parties and by the Administration. Again, that is a tribute to the leaders of our subcommittee who worked so hard to bridge very difficult issues.

Perhaps the most significant agreement within this bill is the commitment to fulfill U.S. obligations on debt relief. By providing the requested $435 million for debt relief, this Congress is sending a powerful message to the poorest countries in the world. The U.S. and the international community, by following through on debt relief to the world's poorest citizens, can give new hope to millions of people. I am proud to have supported this effort. And I am so proud of my constituents who embraced campaigns like Jubilee 2000 which made debt relief an issue no one could ignore.

I want to single out one gentleman in particular who touched so many of us here on Capitol Hill with his work. The Reverend David Duncombe from White Salmon, Washington was a heroic champion for debt relief. On two occasions in the last year, Reverend Duncombe staged hunger strikes here in Washington, D.C. to demonstrate the effects of starvation on the human body. Reverend Duncombe visited my office almost every Wednesday morning when he was in Washington, D.C. He stood before us all, day after day, in solidarity with the millions of people affected by this issue. Passage of debt relief is a genuine tribute to people like David Duncombe who rallied Americans to the debt relief cause all across our country. I'm proud Americans came together to ensure our foreign aid dollars will make a difference for poor citizens around the world.

I am strongly in support of this bill's increased funding for international family planning. This bill also repeals the global ''Gag'' order which has crippled our international family planning efforts in previous bills. We know that more and more women in the developing world are starting businesses and contributing to the economic health of families. These women want access to family planning programs and information to build strong, sustainable families. It is time to take our domestic political debate out of the international family planning appropriations process once and for all. International family planning programs help save the lives of women throughout the world. International family planning in a health issue and should be treated that way.

This bill is also strong in the area of export promotion. This bill provides more than $900 million to the Export-Import Bank of the United States which facilitates job creating exports from throughout our country. Other trade promotion entities like OPIC and TDA will receive increased funding under this bill as well. These programs are tangible, real proof that our foreign aid program generates jobs and economic opportunity for Americans.

There's so much more in this bill which will benefit America's interests. We continue our strong program of microcredit lending. Our commitment to UNICEF and important organizations like the Peace Corps continues with this bill. And we are providing increased funding to confront AIDS, tuberculosis and other health threats to the developing world. I am particularly supportive of the bill's $50 million contribution to the Global Alliance for Vaccines & Immunizations. The Foreign Operations Subcommittee has devoted much energy to the GAVI effort, and I encourage the Senate to continue its involvement in this promising program.

Our efforts to assist Russia and the former Soviet states as they continue to struggle with reform are key parts of this bill. Washington state is particularly interested in the Russian Far East. This bill funds democracy-building initiatives, economic transition and other programs for most regions of the former Soviet Union. It's frustrating work, but I support this assistance because it is important to our national interest. In other parts of the world, this bill funds human rights work, environmental protection programs, and other important democracy-building initiatives. From Burma to Serbia to Latin America, this bill works to advance America's interests in so many areas.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this important conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Who yields time?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida still have time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I yield back my 30 seconds.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Is there any other time remaining under the agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has 5½ minutes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator LEAHY has 9 minutes. Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS have 5 minutes each remaining.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier I had mentioned Robin Cleveland and Tim Rieser. I also want to thank Jennifer Chartrand and Billy Piper on the Republican side, who are always very helpful and did a superb job. On the Democratic side, Mark Lippert, who recently joined my staff from the Democratic Policy Committee, is mastering the Appropriations Committee process. I saw Jay Kimmitt on the floor earlier of the committee staff. Not only is he a good friend but a repository of all knowledge and the one to whom we can all turn when we need to know just how to get out of whatever mess we have stumbled into.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank Tim Rieser and Mark Lippert, a representative of Senator LEAHY's staff, Jennifer Chartrand, and, of course, my longtime associate, Robin Cleveland, and Billy Piper as well, for their great work on this bill. I thank Senator LEAHY. It was good to work with him again this year.

Having said that, I understand there are 5 minutes that Senator STEVENS has reserved. I am told he is happy for me to yield that time back.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I also yield back the time of the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Let me also thank Jay Kimmitt, majority appropriations staff, for his outstanding work as well. With that, I believe we are ready.

Mr. President, I will propound a unanimous consent request before we go to the vote. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the vote regarding the foreign operations conference report, to be followed by 4 minutes of debate with closing remarks with respect to the pending Feingold amendment to S. 2508 and that vote immediately occur following those closing remarks, to be followed by a vote in relation to the continuing resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Therefore, Mr. President, there will be three back-to-back rollcall votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) would vote ''yea.''

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 280 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Abraham	Gregg	Murray
Baucus	Hagel	Nickles
Bennett	Harkin	Reed
Biden	Hatch	Reid
Bingaman	Hollings	Roberts
Bond	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Boxer	Hutchison	Roth
Brownback	Inhofe	Santorum
Bunning	Inouye	Sarbanes
Campbell	Jeffords	Schumer
Chafee, L.	Kennedy	Shelby
Cochran	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Collins	Lautenberg	Snowe
Crapo	Leahy	Specter
Daschle	Levin	Stevens
DeWine	Lott	Thompson
Dodd	Lugar	Thurmond
Domenici	Mack	Torricelli
Dorgan	McConnell	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Wellstone
Gorton	Moynihan	Wyden
Grassley	Murkowski	

NAYS—27

Allard	Enzi	Landrieu
Bayh	Feingold	Lincoln
Breaux	Fitzgerald	McCain
Bryan	Graham	Miller
Byrd	Gramm	Robb
Cleland	Johnson	Sessions
Conrad	Kerrey	Smith (NH)
Craig	Kohl	Thomas
Edwards	Kyl	Voinovich

NOT VOTING—8

Akaka	Feinstein	Helms
Ashcroft	Frist	Lieberman
Burns	Grams	

The conference report was agreed to.

COLORADO UTE SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2508.

Pending:

Campbell Amendment No. 4303, in the nature of a substitute.

Feingold Amendment No. 4326 (to Amendment No. 4303), to improve certain provisions of the bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I ask unanimous consent that Senator FEINGOLD and I have 2 minutes to address the Senate before the vote on the motion to table Feingold amendment No. 4326.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT NO. 4326

Mr. FEINGOLD. My amendment is supported by the administration because it improves the bill. It actually makes the bill comply with Federal reclamation and environmental laws. It makes it clear that only the features of the latest version of the Animas-La Plata Project will be constructed, and the result of that, my colleagues, will be a better return for the taxpayers than the underlying measure. This is important.

The Ute and Navajo tribes will have their claims settled and paid for, even under my substitute, 100 percent by the Federal Government, but the nontribal water recipients will have to repay their share of the construction, fish and wildlife mitigation, and recreation costs. That kind of repayment is only fair. It is what other water users and other projects such as the California central valley and central Utah have to pay.

If my colleagues will look at the fact, this is not unprecedented. This is actually the way other water projects are handled now. The water users have to pay these fair costs. This amendment not only does not kill the bill, it just makes sure there is a fair opportunity for court review. The bill does not undercut; the non-Native American users actually pay their fair share.

Most importantly, this greatly expanded project that has now been scaled down to a reasonable level does not somehow get put back into this large wasteful project. It is both strong in terms of environmental concern and very strong in terms of the taxpayers.

I hope by supporting this, my colleagues, the Senator from Colorado could have this water project that he has worked on for so long, but that it be done in a responsible way which the administration supports.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I am joined by Senator BINGAMAN, Senator DOMENICI, and Senator ALLARD in asking the Senate to support our version of the Animas-La Plata water project by voting to table the Feingold amendment. In 2 minutes they will not have time to speak, but I believe I am speaking for them.

Our version of S. 2508 is truly bipartisan. By the way, it is not an expanded project. This is a much more reduced project. The Republican Governor and the Democratic attorney general of Colorado strongly oppose the Feingold amendment. By voting to table the Feingold amendment, we will leave intact a bipartisan version of S. 2508, supported by the administration, the States of Colorado and New Mexico, the Ute tribes of Colorado, the Navajo nation, and rural and municipal water users of southwest Colorado and northwest New Mexico.

In doing so, we will be saving the taxpayers over $400 million by downsizing the currently planned Animas-La Plata water project. If the Feingold amendment is not tabled, most of those entities will withdraw their crucial support

for the historic compromise and it will be dead.

If the Feingold amendment is adopted and the compromise collapses, then our only option for satisfying the tribal water right claims will be to build the entire huge Animas-La Plata water project as authorized in 1968.

In addition to killing our bipartisan solution to a regional water conflict, the Feingold amendment unfairly singles out rural water users and small municipalities in both of our States to pay higher costs for their domestic water supplies than the residents of big cities such as Phoenix and Tucson that are served by the central Arizona and central Utah projects, which were also authorized in 1968 at the same time the Animas-La Plata Project was authorized.

As chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, the Feingold amendment sends the wrong message by penalizing a region for participating in historic water rights settlement. If the Feingold amendment is not tabled, there will only be losers because the Indians and non-Indians will be locked into needless and expensive litigation and taxpayers will have to pay the costs of litigation on both sides. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join with me, along with Senators BINGAMAN, DOMENICI, and ALLARD, to support our bipartisan effort in voting to table the Feingold amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the next votes in the series be limited to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I move to table the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 4326. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would each vote ''yea.''

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 281 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Abraham	Gramm	Miller
Allard	Grassley	Moynihan
Baucus	Gregg	Murkowski
Bennett	Hagel	Murray
Bingaman	Hatch	Nickles
Bond	Hollings	Roberts
Breaux	Hutchinson	Santorum
Brownback	Hutchison	Sessions
Bunning	Inhofe	Shelby
Campbell	Inouye	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerrey	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Landrieu	Thompson
Daschle	Lincoln	Thurmond
DeWine	Lott	Torricelli
Domenici	Lugar	Voinovich
Dorgan	Mack	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	

NAYS—34

Bayh	Fitzgerald	Reed
Biden	Graham	Reid
Boxer	Harkin	Robb
Bryan	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Chafee, L.	Kerry	Schumer
Cleland	Kohl	Snowe
Collins	Lautenberg	Specter
Dodd	Leahy	Wellstone
Durbin	Levin	Wyden
Edwards	McCain	
Feingold	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—10

Akaka	Frist	Lieberman
Ashcroft	Gorton	Roth
Burns	Grams	
Feinstein	Helms	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Campbell substitute.

Without objection, the Campbell substitute is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4303) was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would each vote ''yea.''

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 282 Leg.]

YEAS—85

Abraham	Gramm	Moynihan
Allard	Grassley	Murkowski
Baucus	Gregg	Murray
Bayh	Hagel	Nickles
Bennett	Harkin	Reed
Biden	Hatch	Reid
Bingaman	Hollings	Robb
Bond	Hutchinson	Roberts
Breaux	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Brownback	Inhofe	Santorum
Bryan	Inouye	Sarbanes
Bunning	Jeffords	Schumer
Byrd	Johnson	Sessions
Campbell	Kennedy	Shelby
Cleland	Kerrey	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kohl	Snowe
Conrad	Kyl	Specter
Craig	Landrieu	Stevens
Crapo	Leahy	Thomas
Daschle	Levin	Thompson
DeWine	Lincoln	Thurmond
Dodd	Lott	Torricelli
Domenici	Lugar	Voinovich
Dorgan	Mack	Warner
Edwards	McCain	Wellstone
Enzi	McConnell	Wyden
Fitzgerald	Mikulski	
Graham	Miller	

NAYS—5

Boxer	Durbin	Lautenberg
Chafee, L.	Feingold	

NOT VOTING—10

Akaka	Frist	Lieberman
Ashcroft	Gorton	Roth
Burns	Grams	
Feinstein	Helms	

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. ALLARD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President. I rise today to congratulate my colleague from Colorado, Senator BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, on the passage of S. 2508, the Colorado Ute Settlement Act Amendments of 2000. This important Indian water rights settlement would never have gotten as far as it has in the Senate without the hard work and dilligence of Senator CAMPBELL. As chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee and a member of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, I know how difficult it is to reach consensus on Indian water rights settlements. It takes a great deal of knowledge, dedication and downright hard work to get these kinds of bills through committee and onto the Senate floor and while the work can be frustrating, the rewards of a job well done are the appreciation of the Tribe and the water users. Senator CAMPBELL should reap those rewards. This settlement has been a long time coming and I hope the House of Representatives will look favorably on the hard work that has been done here and

pass this bill expeditiously so that it will make it to the White House and be signed into law.

My only regret is that this bill has taken so long to pass the Senate. Fulfilling this commitment to the Colorado Ute Indian Tribes and the Colorado water users never should have taken this long. The settlement agreement was signed in 1986 and now—finally—after 15 years of foot dragging and outright obstruction by outside groups, a bill to implement the agreement passes the Senate. The history of this unfulfilled promise is not a good one. For the past 15 years, numerous, and duplicative studies have been required, each of which resulted in substantial reductions in water to be diverted and stored in the Animas-La Plata project. The tribes, in order to get a project, have agreed to substantial modification of their rights under the 1986 agreement and 1988 Settlement Act to make this proposal work. The cost of the project has been cut by almost two thirds, yet opponents of the project are still unhappy. I wonder what would make them happy—complete and total derogation of the Federal Government's obligation to the tribes? I know Senator CAMPBELL would not let that happen and I would certainly support him in his efforts.

This bill, as passed today, represents the best hope for the United States to do right by the Colorado Ute Indian Tribes at this point and I am pleased to vote for it. I again congratulate Senator CAMPBELL.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution is read the third time.

The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) would each vote ''yea.''

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 283 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Abraham	Feingold	Mikulski
Allard	Fitzgerald	Miller
Bayh	Graham	Moynihan
Bennett	Gramm	Murkowski
Biden	Grassley	Murray
Bingaman	Gregg	Nickles
Bond	Hagel	Reed
Boxer	Harkin	Reid
Breaux	Hatch	Robb
Brownback	Hollings	Roberts
Bryan	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Bunning	Hutchison	Santorum
Byrd	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Campbell	Inouye	Schumer
Chafee, L.	Johnson	Sessions
Cleland	Kennedy	Shelby
Cochran	Kerrey	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kohl	Snowe
Craig	Kyl	Specter
Crapo	Landrieu	Stevens
Daschle	Lautenberg	Thomas
DeWine	Levin	Thompson
Dodd	Lincoln	Thurmond
Domenici	Lott	Torricelli
Dorgan	Lugar	Voinovich
Durbin	Mack	Warner
Edwards	McCain	Wellstone
Enzi	McConnell	Wyden

NAYS—2

Baucus	Leahy

NOT VOTING—11

Akaka	Frist	Jeffords
Ashcroft	Gorton	Lieberman
Burns	Grams	Roth
Feinstein	Helms	

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115) was passed.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now be in a period of morning business with Senators speaking for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of the affected members of the Senate, I would like to state for the record that if a Member who is precluded from travel by the provisions of rule 39 is appointed as a delegate to an official conference to be attended by Members of the Senate, then the appointment of that individual constitutes an authorization by the Senate and the Member will not be deemed in violation of rule 39.

ACKNOWLEGMENT OF SENATOR JEFF SESSIONS' 100TH PRESIDING HOUR

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today, I have the pleasure to announce that Senator JEFF SESSIONS has achieved the 100 hour mark as presiding officer. In doing so, Senator SESSIONS has earned his second Golden Gavel Award.

Since the 1960's, the Senate has recognized those dedicated Members who preside over the Senate for 100 hours with the golden gavel. This award continues to represent our appreciation for the time these dedicated Senators contribute to presiding over the U.S. Senate—a privileged and important duty.

On behalf of the Senate, I extend our sincere appreciation to Senator SESSIONS and his staff for their efforts and commitment to presiding duties during the 106th Congress.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read the names of some of those who have lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

October 25, 1999:

Haeng Eom, 57, Seattle, WA;

Jeong Eom, 60, Seattle, WA;

Jamal Johnson, 18, New Orleans, LA;

Joe Leavitt, 65, Kansas City, MO;

Lanette Macias, 34, Kansas City, MO;

Solomon McGruder, 30, New Orleans, LA;

Irving E. Varon, 51, Seattle, WA;

Alfonso Vilmil, 53, El Paso, TX;

Walter Williams, 35, Nashville, TN; and

Unidentified Male, 16, Chicago, IL.

We cannot sit back and allow such senseless gun violence to continue. The deaths of these people are a reminder to all of us that we need to enact sensible gun legislation now.

STATUS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW AND THE INTERNET

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the impact the Internet is having on database producers and the lack of Intellectual Property protection we provide to creators of databases, in particular. This is an issue that deserves the Senate's attention, and I will be encouraging the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH, to hold hearings early next year to examine this issue in detail.

Intellectual Property laws are about striking a balance between our need to encourage invention and creativity with a public policy that discourages the use of monopoly power. Our founding fathers recognized the importance of national patent and copyright laws in Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution. Similarly, we have a long tradition of protecting the public from monopolistic abuses through our Antitrust laws, starting with the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890.

Through our copyright and patent laws, we allow artists and inventors to have monopolies of limited duration on their creations and inventions, which can have the short-term effect of limiting access by consumers. However, these exclusive rights give artists and inventors incentive to create more—ultimately to the benefit of the public at large. Our thriving economy and the success of our country's technology sector is evidence that we have reached an appropriate balance between exclusive rights and consumer access.

However, the balance has shifted with the emergence of new technology. Digital technology, for example, allows an individual to copy huge volumes of data from anonymous sources and then distribute it almost immediately all over the world through the Internet.

I am very concerned about the utter lack of protection for individuals and companies who invest substantial resources in gathering and organizing large volumes of data or information. These databases were, at one time, protected by our copyright laws under a legal theory known as ''sweat-of-the-brow.'' This policy protected collections of information from theft and recognized that significant resources often were spent in collecting and organizing information. In 1991, the Supreme Court overturned the sweat-of-the-brow protection and said that only ''original'' works are covered by copyright law. This ruling, coupled with the ease of copying and distributing databases over the Internet, have created a significant problem with theft or ''piracy'' of databases. The creators of stolen databases are usually left with only piece-meal protections and often have no recourse whatsoever.

I share the concerns of those who believe that database protection legislation could limit the access of consumers to information, and I certainly will not support legislation that harms consumers. However, Mr. President, I believe that this is a case where our policies are out of balance.

Information is a resource that becomes much more valuable when it is organized in a coherent way. Database companies devote substantial resources to collecting, organizing, and maintaining information for users. Without such investments, vast quantities of data would be incomprehensible and almost unusable. We must give the companies that create these databases some sort of exclusive right to enjoy the benefits of their hard work and investment.

Without granting some exclusive right to database producers, investment in databases will diminish over time, as more and more databases are copied and distributed by pirates. Ultimately, the reliability of information available to consumers over the Internet would be undermined.

This potential for unreliability has serious real-life implications. For example, emergency room staff and parents use databases to identify poisons and their remedies; doctors use them to find specifics about a medical procedure; farmers use them for weather and soil information; lawyers use them to find cases and precedents; pharmacists use them to detect dangerous drug interactions; chemists use them to test new compounds; workers use them to find new jobs; and home buyers use them to find the right house. If these databases are not available or are inaccurate, it is the consumer who loses. As with all of our intellectual property rights, some small limitations on consumer access in the short-term will produce significant long-term advantages and increased access to accurate information.

This is not a new issue for the Senate. Two years ago, in the 105th Congress, a serious effort was made to pass legislation that would limit database piracy. Judiciary Committee Chairman HATCH hosted extensive negotiations between all interested parties. Unfortunately, a compromise on database protection could not be reached. At the last minute, the database provisions were dropped from the conference report for the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA).

When we passed the DMCA, I came to the Floor and expressed my disappointment that we could not reach a consensus on a database provision. Judiciary Committee Chairman HATCH and the Ranking Member LEAHY also expressed their disappointment. I asked, and Senator HATCH agreed, that the Judiciary Committee address the database bill early in the 106th Congress. Unfortunately, despite efforts particularly in the House of Representatives to reach an agreement, conflicts in the industry remain. We have not been able to consider such a bill during this Congress. Now, with only a few days left, it appears that we will not consider database protection at all this year.

I believe that we should start fresh on database legislation early next year. I ask Chairman HATCH for his commitment that the Judiciary Committee will hold a hearing on this important matter in the Spring. For my part, I will do everything I can to draw attention to this matter. I will continue working toward a solution that protects databases from piracy while protecting the rights of consumers.

INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING EMPLOYEES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join my colleague, Senator HELMS, in expressing my strong support for this legislation to benefit international broadcasting employees.

The bill is important for several reasons. A new special immigrant visa class will be established to cover individuals working in the United States for the International Broadcasting Bureau or one of the grantee organizations affiliated with the Broadcasting Board of Governors. Included among the grantee organizations are the well-respected Radio Free Asia, the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe.

In creating a special immigrant visa category, we are making a concerted effort to address the recruitment shortages plaguing these worthwhile broadcasting organizations. This legislation will help to attract qualified foreign employees for available positions with the international broadcasting industry here in the United States.

The mission of the United States with respect to international broadcasting makes it important for us to be able to attract and retain a large number of foreign language broadcasters. They must have a unique combination of journalistic skills, including fluency in various languages and an in-depth knowledge of the people, history and cultures of other nations. To carry out its mission, the Broadcasting Board of Governors and its grantees must employ a minimum of 3,400 broadcasters and support staff, such as reporters, writers, translators, editors, producers, announcers, and news analysts.

Historically, the Broadcasting Board of Governors has been unable to obtain sufficient numbers of U.S. workers with the rare combination of skills needed for this mission. As a result, we have had to look to other nations to attract the necessary talent.

No current visa category exists which properly suits the needs of the international broadcasting industry. Neither the H–1B nor J–1 non-immigrant visas are appropriate for the Broadcasting Board of Governors to use as a means to recruit foreign broadcasters and support personnel. Each of these categories has restrictions which make it difficult to recruit qualified applicants.

This legislation overcomes these problems by adding a special immigrant category under the Immigration and Nationality Act. Up to one hundred immigrant visas will be available each fiscal year for foreign nationals employed by the Broadcasting Board of Governors. Spouses and dependent children will also be able to benefit from this legislation.

This proposal will provide significant assistance for the international broadcasting industry in meeting its goals and recruitment needs in providing essential news coverage for many of the most dangerous regions of the world. The people employed by organizations

like Radio Free Asia, the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe are exceptionally talented and courageous. They and their families make substantial sacrifices, and they put themselves at great personal risk to carry out their important responsibilities. These dedicated men and women deserve our full support. I strongly urge my colleagues to pass this needed legislation.

GUN VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the 106th Congress is about to adjourn without passing critical legislation to reduce the level of gun violence in this country.

Over the last years, the American people have been demanding that their schools, places of worship, and other public places be better protected from gun violence. Congress had an opportunity to address the gun violence problem in our country by passing sensible gun laws that would help ensure that young people or those with criminal backgrounds do not illegally gain access to firearms. In the end, Congress failed the American people.

It is very disappointing that Congress refused to act on the issue of gun violence. Too many senseless shootings have put our sense of safety in jeopardy. Here are just some of the high profile shootings that took place during this session of Congress, and the casualties that occurred as a result.

In the year 1999:

January 14, an office building, Salt Lake City, Utah, one dead, one injured;

March 18, a law office, Johnson City, Tennessee, two dead;

April 15, a library, Salt Lake City, Utah, three dead, four injured;

April 20, a high school, Littleton, Colorado, 15 dead, 23 injured;

May 20, a high school, Conyers, Georgia, six injured;

June 3, a grocery store, Las Vegas, Nevada, four dead;

June 11, a psychiatrist's office, Southfield, Michigan, three dead, four injured;

July 4, multiple locations, Illinois and Indiana, three dead, nine injured;

July 29, two day trading firms, Atlanta, Georgia, 13 dead, 13 injured;

August 5, two office buildings, Pelham, Alabama, three dead;

August 10, a Jewish Community Center, Los Angeles, California, five injured, and later in the same day, one dead;

September 14, a hospital, Anaheim, California, three dead;

September 15, a church, Fort Worth, Texas, eight dead, seven injured;

November 2 an office building, Honolulu, Hawaii, seven dead;

November 3, a shipyard, Seattle, Washington, two dead, two injured;

December 6, a middle school, Fort Gibson, Oklahoma, four injured; and

December 30, a hotel, Tampa, Florida, five killed, three injured.

In the year 2000:

January 23, a Sikh temple, El Sobrante, California, one dead, one injured;

February 14, a sandwich shop, Littleton, Colorado, two dead;

February 29, an elementary school, Flint, Michigan, one dead;

March 1, several locations, Wilkinsburg, Pennsylvania, three dead, two injured;

March 8, the scene of a fire, Memphis, Tennessee, four dead, two injured;

March 10, a high school dance, Savannah, Georgia, two dead, one injured;

March 24, a State office building, Effingham, Illinois, two dead;

April 18, a seniors home, Lincoln Park, Michigan, two dead, one injured;

April 24, a zoo, Washington, D.C., seven injured;

April 28, several locations, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, five killed, one injured;

April 28, a restaurant and hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah, two dead, three injured;

May 11, a middle school, Prairie Grove, Arkansas, two injured;

May 17, a ball park, Ozark, Alabama, two dead, one injured;

May 26, a middle school, Lake Worth, Florida, one dead;

June 25, a basketball court, Chicago, Illinois, seven injured;

August 28, a professor's office, Fayetteville, Arkansas, two dead;

September 7, a sewage lagoon, Bunker, Missouri, two dead, two injured;

September 24, a high school, outside Seattle, Washington, one injured;

September 26, a middle school, New Orleans Louisiana, two injured;

October 20, a courthouse, Yreka, California, one dead, two injured; and

October 23, a pizzeria in New Baltimore, Michigan, one dead.

Gun violence is a critical issue that the majority of Americans care about deeply. The will of the majority can be frustrated in the short run, but not in the long run. This issue will not go away. If this Congress will not pass legislation addressing gun violence in America, I am confident that another Congress will, and I will continue to work toward that objective.

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARDS YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the volatile situation in Yugoslavia. Slobodan Milosevic as Yugoslav dictator is history. The long nightmare is over. The Serbian people have spoken and, although Milosevic's ultimate fate is still uncertain, Kostunica's victory marks a sea change in Serbia's current history, a clear choice for democratic change over a stagnant and morally bankrupt dictatorship.

As Kostunica works hard to secure and stabilize his fledgling government, the final outcome is not yet certain. The United States must not fumble the opportunity to support the new Serbian government as it navigates a potentially treacherous transition. With Milosevic's party still controlling the Serb parliament and Milosevic himself still lurking in the political shadows, we must engage in an open and constructive dialogue with Kostunica and his allies.

To this end, I welcome the recent move by the administration to lift some of the sanctions that specifically targeted the Milosevic regime, namely the flight ban and the oil embargo, while retaining the so-called ''outer wall'' of sanctions. I also commend the State Department's decision to send a delegation to Belgrade to discuss the Kostunica government's assistance needs.

Mr. President, extending a helping hand does not, however, mean giving Kostunica and his new government a free pass when it comes to accounting for the terrible crimes of the Milosevic regime. To unilaterally lift all sanctions, or to open up the aid spigot fully would be both premature and naive. Instead, the United States should adopt a more measured response, recognizing as well the fact that a too forward-leaning or heavy handed policy could risk undermining Kostunica before he is able to consolidate power. The following immediate steps would, I believe, help lay the correct groundwork for future cooperation.

First, the United States must maintain its insistence that Milosevic be delivered to the Hague to stand trial for war crimes. Anything less would fatally undermine the International Tribunal.

Second, even as we congratulate Mr. Kostunica and recognize him as an inestimable improvement over his predecessor, we must emphasize to him that his democratic credentials alone will not be a sufficient qualification for Serbia to reenter the international community. A Kostunica government must fully respect the independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina and not undermine the Dayton Accords. Kostunica's recent meeting in Sarajevo with the three members of Bosnia's collective presidency gives some grounds for optimism. Serbia must also unequivocally renounce the use of force in Kosovo and take steps to implement policies that reflect a respect for minorities and rule of law.

The foreign operations bill for fiscal year 2001 will, in fact, condition U.S. assistance to Serbia on meeting the above benchmarks. I support this section of the bill because it is the right thing to do and the right message to send. But while we should remain firm in our policy, we must also be flexible in our evaluation, recognizing what Kostunica is able to do and what he is unable to do while pro-Milosevic forces still wield considerable power in the Serbian government.

Third, the Stability Pact for Southeast Europe must be given a jolt. Too much time has been wasted on conferences and working groups. Assistance must begin to flow in the next few months. A long-needed measure to help the front-line states would be a crash-effort to clear the Danube River of

bombed-out bridges, thereby reopening vital trade links from Bulgaria and Romania to Western Europe.

Finally, we should strongly encourage the European Union to make good on this commitment to expand its membership to candidates as soon as they meet the qualifications. In Southeastern Europe this means Hungary and Slovenia. Brussels must not squander a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity.

Mr. President, there is another reason I wanted to take the floor today, one that touches on the future of our commitment to the Balkans and, indeed, to a stable and secure Europe.

As we continue to work towards a Serbia that will meet the necessary criteria to rejoin the community of western democracies, it is just as important to remember why we are engaged in the Balkans in the first place. This is, after all, an election year, a time when Americans should rightly question the policies and decisions of the current administration when making their decision about the next.

U.S. military engagement on the European continent since the end of World War II has provided the security umbrella under which democracy and free-market capitalism have been able to develop and flourish. The Balkans, however, are a world away from that reality, the last remaining area of instability in Europe. During the last decade several hundred thousand people have been killed in three bloody wars there. The NATO-led peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and Kosovo are designed to provide the same kind of umbrella as in post-war Western Europe to allow democracy, civil society, and capitalism to take root and develop.

Without American leadership, this region would most likely still be mired in civil war, ethnic cleansing, and ultra-nationalist aggression, with Milosevic firmly ensconced at the center of it all.

I remember well when in September 1992, reacting to the mass murders an ethnic cleansing that Milosevic directed in Croatia and Bosnia, I called for lifting the arms embargo against Bosnia and, six months later, for hitting the Bosnian Serbs with air strikes. I was joined by Bob Dole and JOE LIEBERMAN, but for three years ours was a lonely fight. Finally, after hundreds of thousands killed and massacres in Srebrenica and Sarajevo that galvanized public opinion, our government undertook a bombing campaign that led to the Dayton Accords.

Just as that American military action in 1995 served as the catalyst for change in Bosnia, so did Operation Allied Force in 1999 dash the myth in Serbia of Milosevic's invincibility. If he had gotten away with purging Kosovo of most of its ethnic Albanians, those in Serbia who found Milosevic to be odious would have had no reason to believe that anything could be done to stop his immoral and ruinous policies.

American leadership has been indispensable for successful military action in the Balkans. The bombing campaign our government undertook in 1995 led to the Dayton Accords for Bosnia. Operation Allied Force in 1999 forced Milosevic to withdraw his military and paramilitary units from Serbia, destroying the myth in Serbia of his invincibility. This leadership goes beyond the purely technical military assets that only the U.S. can deploy; it also involves intangibles. SFOR in Bosnia and KFOR in Kosovo contain thousands of highly qualified soldiers from many countries, but the American troop presence on the ground gave the mission its ultimate credibility with the Balkan peoples. This fact I have witnessed firsthand from my many trips to the region.

I am, therefore, alarmed by the recent calls for a unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces from the Balkans. Such a radical shift in our policy, I believe, would have a catastrophic effect not only on the very real progress we have made in stabilizing both Bosnia and Kosovo, but on U.S. leadership in Europe and on the Atlantic Alliance as a whole. U.S. participation on the ground in the Balkans is essential to our overall leadership in NATO, which is an alliance not only of shared values, but also of shared risk and responsibility. To begin a disengagement from the Balkans would not only guarantee the loss of American leadership in NATO, but also, I fear, lead to the premature end of Western Europe's commitment to stabilizing the Balkans.

As my colleagues surely know, the vast majority of the troops in SFOR and KFOR—approximately eighty percent—are European. Yet despite this minority participation, the United States retains the command of both Balkan operations in the person of U.S. General Joseph Ralston, the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR).

Let me be blunt: it is naive to believe that we could retain command of these operations—or, more importantly, leadership of NATO itself—if we would cavalierly inform our allies that we were unilaterally pulling out of the Balkans. It just won't work.

If the U.S. withdrew, like it or not, the future of SFOR and KFOR would be in jeopardy, and the likelihood of renewed hostilities and instability beyond the borders of Bosnia and Kosovo would greatly increase.

We are entering into a very sensitive period for the Balkans, one that could either strengthen or tear apart the fragile peace that KFOR and SFOR have helped secure. Local elections will take place in Kosovo later this month, in Bosnia in November, and in Serbia in December. The anti-democratic, ultra nationalist forces in the region are now no doubt biding their time and hoping for a new administration that has already laid its withdrawal cards on the table.

The assertion that our Balkan operations are a heavy drain on our resources is also completely off base. Our Bosnia and Kosovo operations together amount to little more than one percent of our total defense budget. This hardly constitutes a ''hollowing out'' of the military.

The argument that our commitment to the Balkans is open-ended is equally misleading. There are detailed military, political, economic, and social benchmarks set in place. Our ''exit strategy'' is crystal clear: a secure, stable, democratic Balkans with a free-market economy that can join the rest of the continent, a Europe ''whole and free.'' These are the ideals for which the greatest generation fought and died. We dare not embark upon a policy that fails to recognize the most important international lesson of the twentieth century: America's national security is inextricably linked to the maintenance of a stable and peaceful Europe.

To pull the plug on a Balkans policy that has finally begun to yield real dividends and at the same time to put NATO, the most successful alliance in history, at risk would jeopardize America's national security.

It would also betray the brave crowds in Serbia, who have struggled to open up great possibilities for their country, the Balkans, and all of Europe. This is no time for Americans to retreat from the struggle out of ill-conceived, artificially narrow definitions of national security. The American people have shown time and again that they lack neither vision nor patience when they are convinced of the importance of a cause. A Europe unified by democracy is such a cause.

S. 1854, THE 21ST CENTURY ACQUISITION REFORM AND IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2000

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was pleased that last Thursday the Senate unanimously passed S. 1854, the ''21st Century Acquisition Reform and Improvements Act of 2000.'' I originally introduced the bill last year with Senators DEWINE and KOHL, and we are hopeful that it will be enacted into law this year. I want to express my thanks to Senator LEAHY, the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee, and to Senators DEWINE and KOHL, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Antitrust Subcommittee, respectively, for their hard work and cooperation in developing and passing the bipartisan proposal that the Senate approved. The reforms that will be put in place upon enactment of this legislation are long overdue. Businesses, both small and large, as well as the antitrust enforcement agencies, have much to gain by its enactment.

As my colleagues know, the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 requires companies contemplating a merger or acquisition to file a pre-merger notification with the Antitrust Division or the Federal Trade Commission if the size of the companies and the size of the proposed transaction are greater than certain

monetary thresholds. These monetary thresholds, however, are seriously outdated. They have not been changed—even for inflation—since the legislation was enacted more than two decades ago.

Because these monetary thresholds are obsolete, businesses today often are required to notify the Antitrust Division and the FTC of proposed transactions that simply do not raise competitive issues. As a result, the agencies are required to expend valuable resources performing needless reviews of transactions that were never intended to be reviewed. In short, current law senselessly imposes a costly regulatory and financial burden upon companies, particularly small businesses, and needlessly drains the resources of the agencies. Because of the unnecessarily low monetary thresholds, current law fails to reflect the true economic impact of mergers and acquisitions in today's economy.

In addition, after a pre-merger notification is filed, the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act imposes a 30-day waiting period, during which the proposed transaction may not close and the Antitrust Division or the FTC conducts an antitrust investigation. Prior to the expiration of this waiting period, the agency investigating the transaction may make a ''second request''—a demand for additional information or documentary material that is relevant to the proposed transaction. Unfortunately, many second requests require the production of an enormous volume of materials, many of which are unnecessary for even the most comprehensive merger review. Complying with such second requests has become extraordinarily burdensome, often costing companies in excess of $1 million. Second requests also extend the waiting period for an additional 20 days, a period of time that does not begin to run until the agencies have determined that the transacting companies have ''substantially complied'' with the second request. This procedure results in many lawful transactions being unnecessarily delayed for extended periods of time, causing an enormous strain on the businesses, their employees, and their shareholders.

I am pleased that this legislation will rectify many of the problems with the 1976 Hart-Scott-Rodino Act. First, the legislation increases the size-of-transaction threshold from $15 million to $50 million, effectively exempting mergers and acquisitions that would not pose any competitive concerns from the Act's notification requirement. Such mergers make up over half of all transactions reported in 1999. Therefore, this legislation provides significant regulatory and financial relief for all businesses, particularly small and medium-sized ones. In addition, the legislation indexes the threshold for inflation, so that the problem of an expanding economy outgrowing the statute's monetary threshold will not recur.

In addition to providing regulatory and financial relief for companies, another purpose of this legislation is to ensure that the Antitrust Division and the FTC efficiently allocate their finite resources to those transactions that truly warrant antitrust scrutiny. To that end, one of its main objectives is to achieve a more effective and efficient merger review process by eliminating unnecessary burden, costly duplication and undue delay. In order to accomplish this objective, this legislation directs the Assistant Attorney General and the FTC to conduct an internal review and implement reforms of the merger review process, including the designation of a senior official for expedited review of appeals regarding the scope of and compliance with second requests. Fortunately, these reforms will be implemented quickly because, under this legislation, the Assistant Attorney General and the FTC will have 120 days to issue the guidelines and make the necessary changes to their regulations and policy documents to implement the reforms, and they must report back to Congress within 180 days.

This legislation sets forth reforms to the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act that are long overdue. It provides significant regulatory and financial relief for businesses, while ensuring that transactions that truly deserve antitrust scrutiny will continue to undergo review. Again, I thank my colleagues who joined me in supporting passage of this legislation. In the waning hours of this Congressional Session, it is my intention to see this non-controversial consensus legislation enacted into law this year, and I will seek its attachment to one of the remaining ''must-pass'' vehicles.

Finally, I would like to recognize the hard work and efforts of several staff members of the Judiciary Committee who were instrumental in the successful passage of this legislation. On my staff, I particularly would like to thank the Committee's Chief Counsel and Staff Director, Manus Cooney, the lead counsels who worked on this measure, Makan Delrahim, Rene Augustine, and Kyle Sampson, and legal fellow Thadd Prisco. On Senator LEAHY's staff, I would like to recognize the professional skills and input of the Minority Chief Counsel, Bruce Cohen, and the Minority General Counsel, Beryl Howell. On the Antitrust Subcommittee, I would like to thank Peter Levitas and Mark Grundvig, who are Senator DEWINE's able counsels, as well as Jon Leibowitz and Seth Bloom, counsels to Senator KOHL, for their tireless efforts and input. Without the assistance and hard work of these loyal public servants, the important reforms in this legislation would not have been possible. Thank you.

THE BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT ACT OF 2000

Mr. LEAHY. I am pleased that the House of Representatives tonight approved the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000, S. 2413, and sent it to the president for his signature. President Clinton has already endorsed this legislation to support our nation's law enforcement officers and is eager to sign it into law.

Senator CAMPBELL and I introduced this bipartisan bill on April 12, 2000. The Senate Judiciary Committee passed our bill unanimously on June 29. For the past four months, we have been urging passage of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000. The Senate finally passed our bipartisan bill on October 11, 2000 by unanimous consent.

I want to thank Senators HATCH, SCHUMER, KOHL, THURMOND, REED, JEFFORDS, ROBB, REID, SARBANES, BINGAMAN, ASHCROFT, EDWARDS, BUNNING, CLELAND, HUTCHISON, ABRAHAM and GRAMS for cosponsoring and supporting our bipartisan bill.

To better protect our Nation's law enforcement officers, Senator CAMPBELL and I introduced the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 1998. President Clinton signed our legislation into law on June 16, 1998, pubic law 105–181. That law created a $25 million, 50 percent matching grant program within the Department of Justice to help state and local law enforcement agencies purchase body armor for fiscal years 1999–2001.

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, more than 40 percent of the 1,182 officers killed by a firearm in the line of duty since 1980 could have been saved if they had been wearing body armor. Indeed, the FBI estimates that the risk of fatality to officers while not wearing body armor is 14 times higher than for officers wearing it.

In its two years of operation, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program funded more than 325,000 new bulletproof vests for our nation's police officers, including more than 536 vests for Vermont police officers with federal grant funds of $140,253 for Vermont law enforcement agencies. More information about the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program is available at the program's web site at http://vests.ojp.gov/. The entire process of submitting applications and obtaining federal funds is completed through this web site.

The Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000 builds on the success of this program by doubling its annual funding to $50 million for fiscal years 2002–2004. It also improves the program by guaranteeing jurisdictions with fewer than 100,000 residents receive the full 50–50 matching funds because of the tight budgets of these smaller communities. In addition, under the Leahy-Campbell floor amendment to this bill, the purchase of stab-proof vests will be eligible for grant awards to protect corrections officers and sheriffs who face violent criminals in close quarters in local and county jails.

More than ever before, police officers in Vermont and around the country

face deadly threats that can strike at any time, even during routine traffic stops. Bulletproof vests save lives. It is essential the we update this law so that many more of our officers who are risking their lives everyday are able to protect themselves.

In the last Congress, we created the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program in part in response to the tragic Drega incident along the Vermont and New Hampshire border. On August 19, 1997, Federal, State and local law enforcement authorities in Vermont and New Hampshire had cornered Carl Drega, after hours of hot pursuit. This madman had just shot to death two New Hampshire state troopers and two other victims earlier in the day. In a massive exchange of gunfire with the authorities, Drega lost his life.

During that shootout, all federal law enforcement officers wore bulletproof vests, while some state and local officers did not. For example, Federal Border Patrol Officer John Pfeifer, a Vermonter, who was seriously wounded in the incident. If it was not for his bulletproof vest, I would have been attending Officer Pfeifer's wake instead of visiting him, and meeting his wife and young daughter in the hospital a few days later. I am relieved that Officer John Pfeifer is doing well and is back on duty today.

The two New Hampshire state troopers who were killed by Carl Drega were not so lucky. They were not wearing bulletproof vests. Protective vests might not have been able to save the lives of those courageous officers because of the high-powered assault weapons used by this madman. We all grieve for the two New Hampshire officers who were killed. Their tragedy underscore the point that all of our law enforcement officers, whether federal, state or local, deserve the protection of a bulletproof vest. With that and lesser-known incidents as constant reminders, I will continue to do all I can to help prevent loss of life among our law enforcement officers.

The Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000 will provide state and local law enforcement agencies with more of the assistance they need to protect their officers. Our bipartisan legislation enjoys the endorsement of many law enforcement organizations, including the Fraternal Order of Police and the National Sheriffs' Association. In my home State of Vermont, the bill enjoys the strong support of the Vermont State Police, the Vermont Police Chiefs Association and many Vermont sheriffs, troopers, game wardens and other local and state law enforcement officials.

Since my time as a State prosecutor, I have always taken a keen interest in law enforcement in Vermont and around the country. Vermont has the reputation of being one of the safest states in which to live, work and visit, and rightly so. In no small part, this is due to the hard work of those who have sworn to serve and protect us. And we should do what we can to protect them, when a need like this one comes to our attention.

Our Nation's law enforcement officers put their lives at risk in the line of duty everyday. No one knows when danger will appear. Unfortunately, in today's violent world, even a traffic stop may not necessarily be ''routine.'' Each and every law enforcement officer across the nation deserves the protection of a bulletproof vest.

Mr. President, I look forward to President Clinton signing this life-saving legislation into law.

FAILURE TO PASS AN INTERSTATE WASTE BILL

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, one of the many items that the Senate failed to address during this Congress is legislation that would allow the states to protect themselves from unwanted out-of-state garbage. Three separate bills were offered in the Senate on this issue and each had merit, at least as a point of departure. In fact two of the bills incorporated elements that easily passed the Senate a few years ago.

The Environment and Public Works Committee held a hearing on these bills but failed to move any of the bills forward. This is more than disappointing. For a state like Virginia that is now importing over 7 million tons of municipal solid waste each year, with no way to limit the growth of this unwanted import, it is important that the committee and the full Senate act on legislation.

Seven million tons of imported solid waste represents 280,000 truck loads of waste moving into the Commonwealth of Virginia each year. The traffic this generates is reason alone to authorize additional state controls. But there are other reasons. Cheap landfill disposal due to an over abundance of capacity, has made us less vigilant about recycling. And although new federal landfill standards protect our environment better than the old standards, today's landfills are much larger than yesterdays, and we are not yet certain that all the engineering improvements we have made are enough. We may not know if these new landfills leak for a few more years.

Transporting waste hundreds of miles for disposal is also a senseless use of diesel fuel, and when we are already facing a shortage we should seek to conserve our fuel resources. We are misallocating fuel that could be used to heat homes this winter and using it to hall trash up and down the east coast. I understand from the Federal Highway Administration that the large trucks used to transport waste get about 6.1 miles per gallon. An out of state delivery of trash to Virginia landfills can amount to 680 miles round trip and 68 gallons of gas. If only half the trips to Virginia are that long, over 500,000 gallons of diesel fuel will be used to ship waste several hundred miles. This is a waste.

During this Congress, I introduced one interstate waste bill and co-sponsored two others, and if members of the Senate propose other ways to deal with this problem, I am more than willing to work with them to develop something that is workable for all parties. But at this time unless a state chooses, as some have, to simply stop siting land disposal capacity, they lose all control in terms of how long that capacity will last and what kind of traffic it will receive.

When we come back next year I will try again to move legislation. I will meet with the exporting States and I will continue to work toward a goal of wiser use of our resources, and that includes recycling, minimizing waste in the first place and certainly finding a way to dispose of it without moving half way across the country.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF SOLID WASTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, it is outrageous that another Congress has passed without the enactment of legislation which would resolve the problem of the interstate transportation of solid waste. The people should not be dumped on any longer. They should have some control over their own jurisdictions and over their own land. It is up to us to give them that authority. I just heard that Toronto Canada is thinking about sending its waste to Michigan and the people of Michigan have nothing to say about it.

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that, under the Commerce Clause of the Constitution, unless Congress acts, states and municipalities are powerless to stop trash from being brought into their jurisdictions—powerless to protect their citizens' safety, the environment and their quality of life. So our states and municipalities rely on us to pass this protective legislation, and we let them down—again. The Senate has expressed its will on this issue over and over again—A majority of Senators support this legislation. We passed it by an overwhelming vote of 94–6. But the House has not acted. There are a few people over there who oppose it who have managed to displace the will of what appears to be a clear majority of House Members.

What will it take? The problem is getting worse. Total interstate waste shipments continue to rise and there is a finite amount of landfill capacity available. Michigan, my State, imports over 12 percent of all of the solid waste it disposes of in landfills. Michigan counties and townships have plans for waste disposal. They have invested in it. They have made significant commitments to waste reduction and recycling. They have spent a lot of money on these investments to dispose of their waste locally. Those plans and those good faith investments are totally undermined when contracts to bring in waste from other states and countries are entered into without consideration by State, county, or local

governments of the impact of those contracts for importing waste into those areas. When you import waste in that way, without consideration of plans, and without consideration of the efforts that local governments have made to dispose of their own waste, it totally disrupts those efforts and those expenditures. It is not right. States and local governments have a right to do that planning and to make those investments in order to dispose of their own waste and, should they see fit, not to see their own plans displaced by the import of waste from other places.

I want to commend all the Senators who have been involved in this effort for so many years. Our previous vote of 96 to 4 shows that this truly is a bipartisan effort and it will continue to be.

Our States are counting on us to give them the authority to protect their citizens and the environment. I can assure you that, when Congress returns in January, I will be ready to fight this battle again until we pass legislation to prevent our states from being dumping grounds.

RELIGIOUS LAND USE AND INSTITUTIONALIZED PERSONS ACT OF 2000

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, just before the August recess, the Senate passed the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000, S. 2869. I had some serious concerns about this bill as originally introduced. As my colleagues know, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH and my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, came up with a bipartisan compromise that addressed many of the concerns I had about the initial bill. Specifically, I was concerned that the bill would have unintentionally impeded the ability of states and localities to protect the health and safety of children in a variety of ways. I am relieved that the new Senate version has a much more limited scope. Because the bill that was passed applies only to zoning decisions, landmark designations and institutionalized persons, it will not have any impact on child welfare systems, including the ability of states and localities to protect the health and safety of children. I see the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts on the floor and I would ask my colleague, as one of the authors of this new legislation, if my understanding of this legislation correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Ohio is correct.

Mr. DEWINE. Since the definition of ''land use regulation'' is limited to ''a zoning or landmarking law, or the application of such a law,'' am I also correct in understanding that this legislation will not affect the ability of states and localities to enforce fire codes, building codes, and other measures to protect the health and safety of people using the land or buildings, such as children in childcare centers, schools, or camps run by religious organizations?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, the Senator from Ohio is correct.

Mr. DEWINE. Am I also correct that the legislation will not affect civil rights laws that protect young people?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DEWINE. I thank my friend and colleague from Massachusetts for clarifying these points, and for working to pass legislation that does not compromise the health and safety of children and their families.

RECORD THIRD QUARTER NET PROFITS FOR BIG OIL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor once again to announce that Big Oil is beginning to release its third quarter profit reports and while the news is great for investors, it's not so great for American consumers. As American families have been paying sky-high prices at the gas pump and are bracing for record-high home heating costs this winter, the oil industry has been savoring phenomenal profits. Something is wrong when working families are struggling to pay for basic transportation and home heat while Big Oil rakes in obscene amounts of cash by the barrel.

The overall net income for major petroleum companies more than doubled in the third quarter of 2000 relative to the third quarter of 1999. Let me illustrate the phenomenal profits of the oil industry for the past year when gasoline prices soared and heating oil stocks fell.

In the third quarter of 2000, Chevron Corporation reported net profits of $1.53 billion, Exxon Mobil Corporation reported net profits of $4.29 billion, and Texaco reported net profits of $798 million. Compared to the third quarter of 1999, the profits in the third quarter of 2000 increased 163 percent for Chevron, 96 percent for Exxon Mobil, and 106 percent for Texaco. I ask unanimous consent that a chart of these statistics be printed in the RECORD.

Not surprisingly, these multi-million and even multi-billion dollar profits are making record profits. Exxon Mobil executive Peter Townsend is quoted as saying: ''We've got a lot of cash around here. It's coming in pretty fast, flying through the door.'' And according to Fadel Gheit, an analyst with Fahnestock & Company: ''The fourth quarter could beat the third.''

There is no doubt that Big Oil reaped record profits while American consumers and small business owners dug deeper into their pockets to pay for soaring gasoline prices. And more record profits for Big Oil at the expense of consumers and small business owners are expected this winter when heating costs go through the roof. Mr. President, that is outrageous.

Even more disturbing are the recent press reports that the major oil companies are not using their record profits to boost production and lower future prices, but are instead cutting back on exploration and production. Listen to this from a report in the Wall Street Journal: ''Exploration and production expenditures at the so-called super majors—Exxon Mobil Corp., BP Amoco PLC, and Royal Dutch/Shell Group—fell 20 percent to $6.91 billion in the first six months of the year from a year earlier. . . .''

The investment firm UBS Warburg in London estimated this month that the surplus cash of the top 10 global energy companies will total $40 billion this year and grow to $130 billion by the end of 2004. The companies, Warburg predicts, will use about two-thirds of the surplus to repurchase stock to bolster market price, and one-third to reduce debt. Indeed, last week Texaco and Chevron agreed to merge with Chevron paying $35.1 billion to acquire Texaco.

Well I for one have had enough of Big Oil making record profits at the expense of the working families and the small business owners who pay the oil bills, live by the rules and struggle mightily when fuel and heating costs skyrocket.

On September 27, 2000, I introduced S. 3118, the Windfall Oil Profits For Heating Assistance Act of 2000. My legislation imposes a windfall profits assessment on the oil industry to fund heating help for consumers and small business owners across America.

In true arrogance to the needs of Americans struggling to heat their homes, John Felmy of the American Petroleum Institute has publicly stated: ''The profits aren't owned by consumers, they're owned by the shareholders. The companies have to do what's appropriate for owners of the enterprise.''

The oil industry is made up of corporations formed under the laws of the United States. These oil industry corporations have a responsibility to the public good as well as their shareholders. To reap record windfall profits and then cut back on exploration and production to further increase future profits is poor corporate citizenship and an abuse of the public trust by these oil industry corporations and their executives.

In response to the energy crisis of the 1980s, Congress enacted the Crude Oil Windfall Profit Tax Act of 1980. This windfall profits tax, which was repealed in 1988, funded low-income fuel assistance and energy and transportation programs.

Similar to the early 1980s, American families again face an energy crisis of high prices and record oil company profits. This past June, gasoline prices hit all-time highs across the United States, with a national average of $1.68 a gallon, according to the Energy Information Administration. This winter, the Department of Energy estimates that heating oil inventories are 36 percent lower than last year with heating oil inventories in New England estimated to be 65 percent lower than last

year. In my home state of Vermont, energy officials estimate heating oil costs will jump to $1.31 per gallon, up from $1.19 last winter and 80 cents in 1998.

Given the oil industry's record windfall profits in the face of this energy crisis, it is time for Congress to act and again limit the windfall profits of Big Oil. My bill would do just that and dedicate the revenue generated from this windfall profits adjustment to help working families and small business owners with their heating oil costs this winter.

Specifically, the Windfall Oil Profits For Heating Assistance Act of 2000 would impose a 100 percent assessment on windfall profits from the sale of crude oil. My legislation builds on the current investigation by the Federal Trade Commission into the pricing and profits of the oil industry. The bill requires the Federal Trade Commission to expand this investigation to determine if the oil industry is reaping windfall profits.

The revenue collected from windfall oil industry profits, under my legislation, would be dedicated to two separate accounts in the Treasury for the following: 75 percent of the revenues to fund heating assistance programs for consumers such as the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), weatherization and other energy efficiency programs; and 25 percent of the revenues to fund heating assistance programs for small business owners.

American consumers and small business owners continue to pay sky-high gasoline prices and home heating oil costs are expected to hit an all-time high this winter while U.S. oil corporations reap more record profits. It is time for Congress to restore some basic fairness to the marketplace. It is time for Congress to transfer the windfall profits from Big Oil to fund heating oil assistance for working families.

I urge my colleagues to support the Windfall Oil Profits For Heating Assistance Act of 2000.

Mr. President, I ask that the chart to which I referred, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORD PROFITS FOR BIG OIL—THIRD QUARTER PROFITS

Company	3rd quarter		change (in percent)
	1999	2000	
Chevron	$582 million	$1.52 billion	163
Exxon Mobil	2.19 billion	4.29 billion	96
Texaco	387 million	798 million	106

RETIREMENT OF TINKER ST. CLAIR

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Tinker St. Clair, who is retiring at the end of this year after 21 years of outstanding service to the Senate as doorkeeper.

Tinker goes back many many years with the Kennedy family. In a sense, I inherited Tinker from my brothers. At the time of the 1960 Presidential campaign, Tinker was active in Democratic Party politics in McDowell County in the heart of coal country in West Virginia. Tinker supported Jack in the key West Virginia Presidential Primary that year, and he campaigned effectively for my brother throughout southern West Virginia. Jack won a dramatic victory in that primary, and it put him solidly on the road to the White House. So it's fair to say that the New Frontier was born right there in West Virginia, and Tinker St. Clair was very much a part of that victory.

Tinker was also there for my brother Robert Kennedy in his Presidential campaign in 1968.

For the past 21 years in the Senate, Tinker has been a great friend of mine as well, and a great friend of many other Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Day in and day out on the Senate floor, Tinker's welcoming smile and wonderful personality have warmed our hearts and minds. He is often here with us, sitting in the back of the Chamber, listening intently to our debates, offering an encouraging word when we arrive and when we finish speaking, reminiscing about past days in the Senate and past campaigns in West Virginia, telling us with pride about his children, his grandchildren, and in recent years, his great-grandchildren.

When Tinker leaves us this year, he will leave a place in our hearts that will be impossible to fill. But as he said the other day, he feels it is time, as the West Virginia mountaineer he's always been, to sit on the porch and enjoy his family.

As this session of Congress comes to an end, I express my warmest wishes to Tinker for a long and happy and healthy retirement. He has surely earned it. He has served West Virginia well, he has served the Senate well, and he has served the Nation well, and we will miss him very very much.

PRESIDENT KIM DAE JUNG AND THE NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the President of South Korea, Kim Dae Jung, for winning the Nobel Peace Prize. This is a man who truly deserves this honor, as there are few men in the world today who have worked so tirelessly for democracy and peace in East Asia. Like so many of the outstanding men of our time, President Kim's life reads something like a novel, from his early childhood as a farmer's son on a small Korean island, to his criticism of the Japanese colonial rule, to his constant fight against dictatorship in South Korea, to his relentless pursuit of a constructive engagement policy with North Korea. No part of his path to the present has been easy, and, he came perilously close to losing his life on several occasions. The stories that are told about his near death experiences at the hands of the military regime in South Korea, and the intervention by the United States to save his life, are legendary in his country. He has been accused of nearly every possible political crime, from subversion to treason. But he has persisted and has succeeded, this in spite of the formidable odds against him. Significantly, South Korea has achieved its status as one of the world's most stable democratic countries because of his efforts, and it is appropriate he should be recognized by the Norwegian Nobel Committee for the impact he has made over the years.

As my colleagues know, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright arrived in North Korea earlier this week, her stated goal being to improve relations with that country. This follows the trip to North Korea by President Kim, the trip to this country by North Korean Vice Marshal Jo Myong Rok, and the normalization of relations between North Korea and both Great Britain and Germany—all of which occurred in the last six months and are a direct result of the ''sunshine policy'' that President Kim introduced when he entered office. Needless to say, since the initiation of the policy he has been roundly condemned by government officials and analysts alike as an idealist who did not entirely understand what was at stake in the region. Recall it was only in June of 1999 that North and South Korea fought a battle off the South Korean coast. But President Kim has persevered and, as a result, has brought the region closer to peace and stability than any time in the last fifty years. This is no small accomplishment.

There is no doubt that South Korea has some serious challenges to face in the immediate future. Looking at the South Korean economy, although it has recovered substantially from the 1997 financial crisis, it is again showing signs of instability. The reforms that were considered necessary by President Kim for a sustained transformation—financial, corporate, and governmental—have not yet fully occurred, raising the possibility of another crisis down the road. It is also true that most of the rapprochement that has taken place between South Korea and North Korea is symbolic in nature, leading to hard questions concerning what concrete actions will be undertaken to increase cooperation and decrease tensions in the region.

But hopefully the Nobel Peace Prize will provide President Kim with additional leverage for the policies his country has been pursuing, and through greater national and international consensus, he will find a path to the desired end of peace and prosperity in the region. There is no doubt that remarkable steps forward have been taken by all those involved, and I remain optimistic that change can occur. Before she left North Korea, Secretary Albright stated that there

were ''many towering peaks ahead'' in the process. This is, no doubt, true. Pragmatic and reciprocal confidence-building mechanisms will be required to convince all the parties involved that the peace process should move forward. But it is also true that the prospects for cooperation are brighter than ever before. And much of this progress can be directly attributed to President Kim.

So, Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate President Kim for his selection by the Nobel Committee, to celebrate those things that he has accomplished in his life, and to wish him much success in the days, months, and years that follow.

THE LEGACY OF GUNN MCKAY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, all of us who knew him during his decade of service in Congress, and others who knew him only by reputation, mourn the recent passing of Gunn McKay.

Gunn McKay was a leading member of the Committee on Appropriations in the other body and chaired the Subcommittee on Military Construction. He was effective. He knew how to lead and how to legislate. His voice was an influential voice on energy issues and military readiness and Federal land policy. And he knew how to bring people together to get things done.

It was not politics that motivated Gunn McKay in his public service; it was people. He thrived in being able to help people get and keep good-paying jobs. He deeply, unequivocally believed that there is a role for government, through programs like Medicare and Social Security and in other ways, in helping those who struggle.

Gunn achieved all of the good he accomplished in life through a deep-down and infectious optimism about people and about the future. More than being a great public servant, he was a good man. Those who worked with him will tell you that Gunn did not have a mean bone in his body. When he left public life Gunn and his wife, Donna, devoted much of their time to church service abroad.

The Nation and its Congress are better for the fact that Gunn McKay served here. And so, certainly, are the people of his beloved State of Utah.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Salt Lake Tribune about Gunn McKay be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune]

UTAH DEMO GUNN MCKAY DIES AT 75

(By Judy Fahys)

K. Gunn McKay, the Weber County farmer's son and Democrat who served five terms in Congress in the 1970s and earned bipartisan praise for his down-home warmth and political skill, died Friday night from cancer. He was 75.

''Tell the facts and leave the right impression,'' McKay used to tell his young congressional aides, and that credo served the former teacher through a career in state and national politics and on Mormon mission assignments in Europe, Africa and Asia.

''Unassuming'' and ''determined'' are the words Barry McKay, a Salt Lake City lawyer, used to describe his eldest brother. He recalled Friday how Gunn McKay spent most of one Christmas, the day he returned home from a church mission in England, helping neighbors start their frozen cars.

Political scientist J.D. Williams called McKay ''the personification of Huntsville,'' McKay's hometown in the Ogden Valley.

''He talked with a rural Utah slang when he wanted to,'' said Williams. ''He had a beautiful smile and demeanor, and he was everybody's friend.''

''You didn't have to guess what he meant,''said former Sen. Jake Garn, a Republican who served with the Democrat in Congress and lived near him outside the nation's capital.

''He was extremely well-liked,'' said Garn, whose U.S. Senate service overlapped with six years of McKay's time in Washington. ''Whether you agreed with him or not, you could trust him. He would always follow through.''

McKay even converted David L. Bigler, a Utah historian and former public-relations director for Geneva Steel, then known as U.S. Steel. Bigler switched political parties to raise money for McKay's first campaign.

''He really did care for people,'' said Bigler, who was struck at once by McKay's integrity. ''All politicians say that, but few of them do. He did.''

Politics may have been in McKay's blood. His grandfather, Angus, was House Speaker in Utah's first Legislature. And his father, James, had run for the 1st Congressional District seat that McKay would win 35 years later, in 1970.

And unlike most emerging politicians, name recognition was never a problem for McKay, whose father was a cousin to one of the most beloved presidents of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Huntsville-born David O. McKay. The church leader died just a year before his relative took the oath for his first term in Congress.

The eldest of eight children, McKay was a three-sport star at Weber High School before serving in the U.S. Coast Guard during World War II and on an LDS mission to England the following three years. He later graduated from Utah State University with a degree in education.

He was teaching history in Ogden City Schools and running a deli when he was appointed to the first of two terms in the Utah Legislature.

From there, he was tapped to be chief of staff to Democratic Gov. Calvin L. Rampton.

During his five terms in Washington from 1971 to 1981, McKay built a reputation for being one of the half-dozen most conservative Democrats in a Congress long controlled by Democrats.

He fought federally funded abortions and backed the U.S. Supreme Court's decision to outlaw prayer in schools. He pushed the Central Utah Project, military appropriations that bolstered Hill Air Force Base and other Utah installations, ''gasohol'' and a balanced-budget law. He also fought higher fees for ranchers who leased federal range.

McKay's powers of persuasion helped land him a seat on the coveted Appropriations Committee upon entering Congress—the first ever for a Utahn.

''Most people have to wait [10 years] to be considered,'' said Jim McConkie, a Salt Lake City lawyer who served on McKay's congressional staff for five years.

McConkie recalled how McKay used his influential role as chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee to become close to President Carter, who invited McKay to Camp David a few times.

''But he never lost his roots,'' said McConkie. ''He could see to the heart of an issue.''

Nothwithstanding his Washington successes, McKay lost his seat to Republican Rep. Jim Hansen in the Ronald Reagan landslide of 1980.

In 1986, when McKay unsuccessfully challenged Hansen for his old seat he shared his view of Utah voters, one that contemporary Utah Democrats have taken to heart.

''Utah voters are independent thinkers,'' McKay told The Salt Lake Tribune. ''They are concerned with ineffective federal policies and lack of congressional action on issues which are increasingly having a negative impact on their lives.''

The year after he left Congress, McKay went on an LDS mission to Scotland with his wife Donna. Later, the couple was called to serve in Kenya, where McKay found himself a block away from the embassy bombing in 1998.

They also served in Singapore and Malaysia. McKay took ill while serving in Pakistan.

The McKays, who married in 1950, had 10 children, 40 grandchildren and one great-grandchild.

Said former Utah First Lady Norma Matheson: ''He loved being in public service, and it showed.''

CONGRESSMAN MEEHAN'S ELOQUENT TRIBUTE TO HIS FATHER

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, all of us who know and admire our distinguished colleague in the House of Representatives, Congressman MARTY MEEHAN, were saddened to learn of his father's death earlier this month.

At the funeral service for his father on October 14 in Lowell, Massachusetts, Congressman MEEHAN delivered an eloquent tribute to his father that deeply touched all of those who were present. He described in vivid terms and in many wonderful stories the lifelong love and support that Mr. Meehan gave to his family.

I believe that Congressman MEEHAN'S moving eulogy to his father will be of interest to all of us in Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY OF MARTIN T. MEEHAN

(By U.S. Rep. Martin T. Meehan, October 14, 2000)

On behalf of my mother, brothers and sisters, my Aunt Katherine and Uncle John, my cousins, and my entire family, I want to thank all of you for joining us today to help celebrate our father's life. We are all honored by your presence and are grateful for your support and affection over the last few days.

I can imagine my father looking out at the long lines forming outside the McCabe's funeral Home yesterday. He would have said, ''Frankie McCabe must be giving something out for Free!''

Frank isn't, Dad, believe me.

My father was born in Lowell on July 16, 1927 to Martin H. Meehan and Josephine Ashe Meehan. His father immigrated to the United States from County Clare, Ireland in 1912. His mother, immigrated from County

Kerry the year before, was a cousin of the great Irish patriot Thomas Ashe, who died during one of the first hungers strikes—in Ireland's fight for freedom in Mount Joy Jail in 1916.

Thomas Ashe's picture was hung on the wall of his family home on Batchelder Street in the Acre Section of Lowell. In 1963, a portrait of President Kennedy was added.

The Acre was where the Greek and Irish immigrants settled in Lowell. My father grew up there and he loved it. Swimming in the canals, playing baseball for St. Patrick's and Lowell High School, and building lifetime bonds. It was a neighborhood where the kids were tough and strong, and everyone had a nick name—hence ''Buster.'' The Acre was where thousands of new immigrant families were becoming part of the great American Dream.

In 1946, Dad met my mother at a party her cousin Maureen Gay had. Dad was not invited, he crashed. And my mother was glad he did. There were married three years later.

My father had a saying for everything in life. Some of them really bugged me at times. But they all had a purpose and wisdom for how to lead a good life.

''One God, One County, One Woman'' he used to say. That—one woman—was my mother. He was passionately in love with her through 51 years of marriage. Their love for each other intensified and grew. I believe the love our father and mother shared for one another was extended to every person who was a part of their lives.

I can remember as a very small boy first learning the concept of love. ''I love you kids with all my heart'' he'd say. ''But I love your mother even more''. ''But Dad'', I once replied, ''Who am I supposed to love more? You or Ma? ''You kids should love your mother the most'', he'd say. ''She gave birth to you.''

First they lived in a three tenement on Lincoln Street where Colleen and Kathy and I were born. Later they bought an eight-room house the next street over at 22 London Street where they raised seven children in a home that was filled with love, laughter, energy . . . action 24 hour a day . . . a strong commitment to the Catholic Church and to family.

It was a great neighborhood—and my father helped us spread our family's love all over it. And there isn't a better testament to that love—than our relationship with the Durkin family who had seven children of their own, just down the street. So many memories, so many stories.

Visiting the ice cream stand with Dad was unforgettable. He would load all of us into the car with as many of our friends as would fit. He would ask us what we wanted. ''I'll have a banana split,'' I'd shout. My sisters would say, ''I'll have a hot fudge Sunday.'' Our friends couldn't believe it—they would order a shake or double ice cream scoop with extra nuts, extra whipped cream!

He'd take everyone's order and then go up to the line. Don't worry, he'd say, ''I'll carry it back''.

Ten minutes later he'd return with 13 single cups of chocolate ice cream. ''That's all they'd had,'' he'd shrug?

Dad was also a very successful little league coach. On Dad's White Sox team everyone played—at least three innings. I remember how embarrassed I was when Dad's White Sox lost every game—0–18. Some games we were winning after three winnings, 8 to 4 or even 7 to 2. But in the fourth inning Dad put all of the subs in—no matter what. ''Everyone plays!'' he'd say. The other teams kept the best players in for the whole game. Naturally, they would win.

Today I am so proud of the way my Dad coached the kids on that 0 and 18 team. Today, I am so proud of how my father lived his life.

As children, we shared so many happy times together each summer with family and friends at Seabrook Beach. Later as adults, with his grandchildren, we spent weekends at dad and Mom's beach house. After a few morning hours together on the beach, Mom and Dad would head back to the house to begin the daylong cooking ritual so that we could have a dinner together. Many times in the evenings, we would sing songs around a bonfire on the beach. We enjoyed lobster bakes and thankfully Mom and Dad got to enjoy an occasional sunrise together. And many times, after a long day, many of us would sit together and watch the sun go down and our father would say to us all, ''It's a great life and it's a great country''.

Dad worked at the Lowell Sun Publishing Company for 43 years. He started as a truck driver . . . became a linotype operator . . . Then became Assistant Foreman in the Composing Room. He loved the Sun and the newspaper business, and he knew it from soup to nuts. There were a lot of great reporters that came through the Sun over the years, but my father never hesitated to tell them when he felt they just didn't get it right—especially on a political story.

Frank Phillips, Chris Black, Brian Mooney and others all heard from Dad on more than one occasion. When he was finished he had earned their respect and they appreciated his wisdom and experience. And they all affectionately repeat those stories—even today.

Dad was an active lifetime member of the Typographical Union—serving in a leadership position. He always stressed the importance of workers being able to organize for fair wages and benefits. It's not surprising that my sisters Colleen and Kathy are members of the teachers union and Mark and Paul are active members of their respective unions as well.

But as strong a union person as he was—he loved the Lowell Sun and the company's ownership, the Costello Family. He followed the Costello kids' lives as if they were his own—always loyal to the company and the Costello family.

Supporting Mom and seven young children was not always easy. For seven years he got a second job working nights as a Corrections Officer. On Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays he would get up at 5:30 to be at the Sun to punch in at 7 o'clock. His shift was over at 3:30. He'd put on his uniform at the Paper, punch in at the Jail at 4 o'clock and work until midnight. He got home by 12:30 in the morning, and went to bed for five hours so he could be back at the paper by 7 am.

I'm sure it wasn't easy—but he wanted the best for his children and he wanted my mother to be able to be home with us.

My father didn't care what we did for work—but he wanted us to get an education. And we all did. He was especially proud of the fact that my sisters Colleen, Kathy, and Mary all became school teachers. He thought it was the most important job of all. ''Teaching is not a job''—Dad would say—''it's a vocation''. He loved the idea that his daughters were helping to shape the minds of 25 kids in a classroom each day.

He was so proud of all his children, in a unique and special way. My brother Mark, a master electrician, ''has the biggest and best heart of all my kids'', he'd say. And Mark gave Dad his newest precious grandchild ''Sarah'' just two weeks ago. He was so proud that Paul followed him to the Sheriff's Department. Paul is a model for overcoming obstacles and winning. He recently went back to school for his degree, got married and was promoted to Captain as well.

When I ran for Congress in 1992 my sister Maureen answered the call and put her work—and life—on hold to take the most important job in the campaign—raising the money to win. My Dad just loved the fact that I turned to my sister. And when we won he knew it was Maureen who was the rock behind us. ''Politics is a tough business,'' he'd say—''you need people you can really trust—and that means family''. That's why President Kennedy had Bobby. 'Course after the election, I remember Maureen was sick and I asked, ''What's wrong with her now?''—Dad's split second response—''Working for you!''

Dad was so well read, a voracious reader . . . A lover of poetry and words, and boy did he love to sing!

So much love in his heart, and this extension of love was felt by his grandchildren and in-laws. The term ''in-laws'' didn't mean much to Dad—he welcomed them and loved them like they were his own. And they loved him back.

All fifteen of his grandchildren are loved as individuals and each of them realizes the power of love and family through their papa and munama. One of my young nieces asked during the last couple of days, ''How did Papa have so much love to give to so many people?'' Well, I really don't know the answer to that for sure. I just know he did. Every time our father gave us a hug—or as he would say a hug-a-deen—he would accompany it with an ''I love you''. ''Aren't they wonderful'', Dad would say. ''Your mother and I will live in them in the next generation through these beautiful kids . . . and as I've told you'', he'd say, ''that's the sweet mystery of life''.

So happy, so content, there was nothing more in life that he wanted—than that which he already had—His Family.

And he thanked God for our happiness every single day.

Joseph P. Kennedy, Sr., once said that the measure of a man's success in life was not the money he had made, but rather the family he had raised. That quote has been framed in my parents' home over 15 years. My father believed it and devoted himself to family every day of his life for 73 years. He was an immensely successful man.

We love you Dad and will miss you.

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM TAX FAIRNESS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to retain the important ag tax provisions contained in the Senate version of the upcoming tax package that will soon be before us. I have not seen the final tax bill as of yet, but word is that most if not all of the agricultural tax provisions are being stripped from the bill at the will of the House. I hope this is not true. I cannot imagine why we would choose to leave out farmers from important tax relief at a time when this Congress has clearly recognized the economic hardships in farm country today.

I plead with my colleagues to include these necessary provisions in any final tax package.

Specifically, I am talking about a provision that came from a bill Senator DASCHLE and I introduced—along with 31 co-sponsors—to clarify that Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) payments made to farmers for taking agricultural land out of production for environmental improvement—are not

subject to self employment social security taxes—a rate of up to 15 percent of the payment amount.

The CRP has been a great success for this nation. The program provides financial incentives for improving and preserving environmentally sensitive land—taking it out of production and enhancing its environmental benefit. The CRP program increases water quality, wildlife habitat and prevents soil erosion—all factors which have become even more important in light of recent concerns about nonpoint source pollution in our nation's waterways.

The Senate has strongly supported this measure—passing it by unanimous consent earlier this year on the death tax debate—and our Senate leadership has held firm in fighting for this needed provision, but for some reason, our fine colleagues in the House have decided to make an issue of this provision and are trying to strike it from the tax package.

It makes no sense to yield to the House on this matter. The provision, as currently contained in the Senate tax package—will only cost $292 million over 5 years—but that money and the clarity it brings to our nation's farmers is worth far more than can be said in this time of farm economic stress. This provision allows farmers to plan and better use their resources next year because they will no longer have to wonder or worry about whether the IRS is going to come after them for a conservation tax they didn't know they owed.

Currently, there is confusion over whether CRP income should be taxed owing to a recent court case in the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals which overturned a 1998 Tax Court ruling that CRP income is not subject to social security taxes. The Tax Court found and I concur, that because it is a rental payment the government makes in exchange for farmers taking environmentally sensitive land out of production, CRP payments should be treated the same as other contractual agreements made by farmers for land use—and be exempt from self-employment taxes.

The new court ruling creates a discrepancy between active farmers who take part in CRP—which are now subject to the tax—and landowners who do not farm but take part in CRP and are exempt from the tax.

This tax correction is just common sense. Now more than ever we should appreciate the need for conservation and the co-benefits of wildlife, air and water quality it provides. We should not allow a tax to create confusion and a disincentive for farmers to trust and work with government for the good of the environment.

Numerous ag groups support this bill including the National Corn Growers, National Wheat Growers, American Soybean and Cattlemen's Beef Associations—along with the National Farmer's Union and the American Farm Bureau. This is our only opportunity to address this important issue.

In my state of Kansas alone, $102.7 million in CRP payments were issued in 1999. Are we really going to tell farmers that this money—promised them for conservation purposes—will now be additionally taxed? This would amount to a disincentive for farmers to participate in environmental and conservation programs. Is that the message this Congress really wants to send?

Again, I urge my colleagues to include this important provision—and all the ag tax provisions that have been so carefully worked out and included in the Community Renewal and New Markets Act. We cannot afford to leave this important work undone.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

DISABILITY MENTORING DAY

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, Iowa Governor Tom Vilsack has proclaimed October 25 ''Iowa Disability Mentoring Day.'' Today, Iowans around the state will work to raise awareness of the benefits for all of us of increasing employment opportunities for young people with disabilities. And young people with disabilities will learn about job opportunities through on-site work experiences, job shadowing, and other forms of job mentoring.

Many of the mentors will themselves be people with disabilities. All children need role models, and I'm thrilled that through mentoring, children with disabilities will see tangible evidence that their disability does not diminish their ability to participate in the cultural, economic, educational, political, and social mainstream.

It's no surprise that Iowa is celebrating disability mentoring, because we are a leader in the field. This week, Iowa received a Federal grant under the Work Incentives Improvement Act for the Working Together So All Can Work program. This grant will enable more people with disabilities to participate in the workforce.

And Iowa Creative Employment Options, along with the University of Iowa Hospital School, has started up the Healthy and Ready to Work Mentoring Project. The project is run by a mentoring group of young adults with disabilities who have achieved their career goals or are pursuing the education and training they need to reach their goals.

These young men and women are college students, computer programmers, teachers, television directors, social workers, and businesspeople. On top of their studies and jobs, they are working with high school guidance counselors, meeting with students with disabilities, and developing a resource book to help students with disabilities and other students prepare for their careers. And they're planning to do even more in the future.

Mr. President, ten years ago, we passed the Americans with Disabilities Act. We said no to exclusion, dependence, and paternalism for people with disabilities, and we said yes to inclusion, independence, and empowerment. Iowa Disability Mentoring Day and projects like the Healthy and Ready to Work Mentoring Project and the Working Together So All Can Work Program bring the ADA to life every day by increasing the independence and self-sufficiency of people with disabilities. I thank everyone who is a part of these efforts.●

IN RECOGNITION OF BERKELEY COLLEGE

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I stand today to congratulate Berkeley College for being named the Woodbridge Metro Chamber of Commerce Corporate Citizen of the Year. Berkeley College has become a vital link in the Township of Woodbridge and throughout Middlesex County among students, business leaders, and government officials. Cooperation among all three elements has allowed them to form stronger relationships, institutions, and alliances throughout the community.

Berkeley College has fostered this collaborative spirit by hosting a number of informational forums such as the Education Foundation's Educator Institute, Tech Academy 2000, and other useful job training programs. Berkeley College has also sponsored a number of annual public service events like the Mayor's Fun Run, the Mayor's Holiday Stroll in the Park, and Making Strides in Breast Cancer. Most importantly, Berkeley offers a high quality business education to more than 600 students who receive valuable hands on knowledge of the current business culture through the College's association with various business and government leaders.

It is an honor to be able to recognize the achievements of Berkeley College.●

IN RECOGNITION OF BERNADETTE M. SOHLER

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Bernadette M. Sohler as the 2000 recipient of the Woodbridge Metro Chamber of Commerce Member of the Year for her exemplary service to the Chamber and the community at large.

Bernadette has served as a strong advocate and avid supporter of the Woodbridge Chamber since 1994. She served as its President from 1998–1999 and has volunteered for numerous committees including the Annual Chamber Golf Classic, Tour of Woodbrigde, Holiday Luncheon and Parade, Chairman's Award, and Staff Appreciation Day.

As the External Affairs Manager at the Middlesex Water Company, Bernadette is responsible for all community and media relations; employee, customer, financial communications; corporate contributions; and public education. Her numerous board positions

include Chair of the Public Information Committee of the American Water Works Association, the Central Jersey National Council of Community and Justice, the Charity Committee of the Diocese of Metuchen, Raritan Bay Healthcare Foundation, and the Perth Amboy Neighborhood Empowerment Council Economic Development Task Force. Bernadette's strong record in the business community at the Middlesex Water Company and her commitment to public service demonstrate her outstanding achievements in the public and private sectors.

It is an honor to recognize Bernadette M. Sohler's efforts and congratulate her on receiving the 2000 Chamber of Commerce Member of the Year Award from the Woodbrigde Metro Chamber of Commerce.●

IN RECOGNITION OF ELIZABETH JONASKY

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Elizabeth Jonasky of Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey on the momentous occasion of her 105th birthday. Mrs Jonasky will reach this wonderful milestone on November 5th of this year, and I feel it fitting that we acknowledge this special moment.

As I ponder all of the marvels and tragedies of our world that Elizabeth Jonasky has witnessed, I am reminded of the profound words of the Greek philosopher Plato, who once said, ''It gives me great pleasure to converse with the aged. They have been over the road that all of us must travel, and know where it is rough and difficult and where it is level and easy.''

It is a honor to wish Mrs. Jonasky the best of happiness on her birthday. It is my sincere hope that we will be able to continue to learn about life's rough and easy spots from her for sometime to come.●

IN RECOGNITION OF FATHER ROBERT COUNSELMAN

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to honor Father Robert Counselman, who received the 2000 William E. Short Award from the Woodbridge Metro Chamber of Commerce. Through his exemplary service to the community, Father Counselman has shown his dedication and commitment to numerous civic institutions within and outside of the church.

Father Counselman serves as Chaplain to the Woodbridge Township Police Department and the Woodbridge Chamber of Commerce. He is an active participant in several civic and private institutions such as Habitat for Humanity, the Woodbridge Historical League, the Community Advisory Panel, and the Woodbridge Historic Preservation Commission. He was also instrumental in setting up a ''Soup Kitchen'' at Trinity Church, which provides free meals on Fridays. In addition, he helped establish a community playground, and is always available to assist people in their times of need.

It is an honor to recognize Father Robert Counselman's work and congratulate him on receiving the William E. Short Award from the Woodbridge Metro Chamber of Commerce.●

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHN A. HOFFMAN ESQ.

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to rise today to recognize John A. Hoffman Esq., a lifelong resident of central New Jersey, as the Woodbridge Metro Chamber of Commerce Citizen of the Year. John has participated in numerous business, legal, and community affairs for more than 35 years and has established a remarkable record of success.

Mr. Hoffman joined the firm of Wilentz, Goldman & Spitzer in 1963, and is currently a managing partner. He represents major corporate and government clients such as PSE&G, Verizon New Jersey, Inc., Elizabeth Town Water Company, the Middlesex County Utilities Authority, and the New Jersey Performing Arts Center. John also serves as a member on several boards such as the Middlesex County College Foundation, Robert Wood Johnson University Hospital Foundation, Sister Cities Program of New Brunswick, and the New Jersey Client Security Fund. John has devoted his life to the practice of law and has used his experience and vision to lead and advise several other institutions in New Jersey. It is his extensive service to these institutions and their continued success that our State of New Jersey owes a great debt of gratitude.

It is an honor to recognize Mr. Hoffman's work and extend my congratulations to him on receiving the 2000 Citizen of the Year Award from the Woodbridge Metro Chamber of Commerce.●

IN RECOGNITION OF LEE VETLAND

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize Lee Vetland, the Woodbridge Chamber of Commerce Small Business Person of the Year. As owner of Lee's Auto Body, Inc. in Avenel, New Jersey, Mr. Vetland has turned his business into a highly respected and successful enterprise.

Lee's Auto Body opened for business in 1975 with three employees. Since that time, through his own industry, hard work, and a strong work ethic, Lee has seen his business grow to 21 employees. His efforts and commitment extend to other areas besides his entrepreneurship. Lee is the Chairman of the Board for Auto Body Distributing Company, Vice President of the Auto Body Shop Association in New Jersey (A.A.S.P.N.J.), a member of the Advisory Board for the Amoco Dealer Panel, and the Governor's Task Force on insurance fraud. While Lee has excelled in the auto body business, his expertise and knowledge have benefitted numerous organizations and associations throughout New Jersey as well.

It is an honor to recognize Mr. Vetland's achievements and extend my congratulations to him for receiving the 2000 Small Business Person of the Year Award from the Woodbridge Metro Chamber of Commerce.●

IN RECOGNITION OF THE MIDDLESEX COUNTY DIVISION OF THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I stand today to congratulate the Middlesex County Division of the American Cancer Society for being honored with the Community Service Award by the Woodbridge Metro Chamber of Commerce. The Middlesex Unit offers a wide array of programs and resources to help people learn about new treatments for cancer, arrange for home care, locate medical supplies and uplift patients with cancer and their families.

The Middlesex Unit is dedicated to eliminating cancer as a major health problem by taking pro-active measures to save lives and diminish the suffering of cancer patients through research, education, advocacy, and service. The Middlesex County Division's commitment to reducing the effects of cancer through medical means as well as its commitment to helping patients through financial assistance illustrates the Division's unique and humane approach to aiding patients with cancer. Their services have been of great benefit to countless individuals in Middlesex County.

It is an honor to recognize the work of the Middlesex County Division of the American Cancer Society and congratulate them on receiving the Woodbridge Metro Chamber of Commerce's 2000 Community Service Award.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:08 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3646) for the relief of certain Persian Gulf evacuees.

The messages also announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 468) to establish the Saint Helena Island National Scenic Area.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2442) to provide for the preparation of a Government report detailing injustices suffered by Italian Americans during World War II, and a formal acknowledgment of such injustices by the President.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2884) to extend energy conservation programs under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act through fiscal year 2003.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 484. An act to provide for the granting of refugee status in the United States to nationals of certain foreign countries in which American Vietnam War POW/MIAs or American Korean War POW/MIAs may be present, if those nationals assist in the return to the United States of those POW/MIAs alive.

S. 698. An act to review the suitability and feasibility of recovering costs of high altitude rescues at Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 700. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Ala Kahakai Trail as a National Historic Trail.

S. 893. An act to amend title 46, United States Code, to provide equitable treatment with respect to State and local income taxes for certain individuals who perform duties on vessels.

S. 938. An act to eliminate restrictions on the acquisition of certain land contiguous to Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, and for other purposes.

S. 1438. An act to establish the National Law Enforcement Museum on Federal land in the District of Columbia.

S. 1474. An act providing conveyance of the Palmetto Bend project to the State of Texas.

S. 1482. An act to amend the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1752. An act to reauthorize and amend the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.

S. 1865. An act to provide grants to establish demonstration mental health courts.

S. 2345. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study concerning the preservation and public use of sites associated with Harriet Tubman located in Auburn, New York, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1161. An act to revise the banking and bankruptcy insolvency laws with respect to the termination and netting of financial contracts, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1804. An act to authorize the Pyramid of Remembrance Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to soldiers who have lost their lives during peacekeeping operations, humanitarian efforts, training, terrorist attacks, or covert operations.

H.R. 2413. An act to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to enhance the ability of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to improve computer security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3312. An act to clarify the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act of 1996 to authorize the Merit Systems Protection Board to establish under such Act a 3-year pilot program that will provide a voluntary early intervention alternative dispute resolution process to assist Federal agencies and employees in resolving certain personnel actions.

H.R. 3514. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a system of sanctuaries for chimpanzees that have been designated as being no longer needed in research conducted or supported by the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4656. An act to authorize the Forest Service to convey certain lands in the Lake Tahoe Basin to the Washoe County School District for use as an elementary school site.

H.R. 4940. An act to designate the museum operated by the Secretary of Energy in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, as the ''American Museum of Science and Energy,'' and for other purposes.

H.R. 5068. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5927 Southwest 70th Street in Miami, Florida, as the ''Marjory Williams Scrivens Post Office.''

H.R. 5143. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3160 Irvin Cobb Drive, in Paducah, Kentucky, as the ''Morgan Station.''

H.R. 5144. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 203 West Paige Street, in Tompkinsville, Kentucky, as the ''Tim Lee Carter Post Office Building.''

H.R. 5388. An act to designate a building proposed to be located within the boundaries of the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge, as the ''Herbert H. Bateman Educational and Administrative Center.''

H.R. 5478. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by donation suitable land to serve as the new location for the home of Alexander Hamilton, commonly known as the Hamilton Grange, and to authorize the relocation of the Hamilton Grange to the acquired land.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution recognizing the Liberty Memorial in Kansas City, Missouri, as a national World War I symbol honoring those who defend liberty and our country through service in World War I.

S. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution establishing a special task force to recommend an appropriate recognition for the slave laborers who worked on the construction of the United States Capitol.

S. Con. Res. 141. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of copies of the publication entitled ''The United States Capitol'' as a Senate document.

S. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution condemning the assassination of Father John Kaiser and others in Kenya, and calling for a thorough investigation to be conducted in those cases, a report on the progress made in such as investigation to be submitted to Congress by December 15, 2000, and a final report on such an investigation to be made public, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 414. Concurrent resolution relating to the reestablishment of representative government in Afghanistan.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the resolution (H. Res. 645) returning to the Senate the bill (S. 1109) entitled the ''Bear Protection Act of 1999'' in which is conveys that in the opinion of the House, the bill contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States and is an infringement of the privileges of the House and that such bill be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating the resolution.

The message also announced that the House has passed the bill (S. 1453) to facilitate famine relief efforts and a comprehensive solution to the war in Sudan, with amendment.

The message further announced that the House has passed the bill (S. 1452) to modernize the requirements under the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards of 1974 and to establish a balanced consensus process for the development, revision, and interpretation of Federal construction and safety standards for manufactured homes, with amendments.

The message also announced that the House has passed the bill (S. 1694) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the reclamation and reuse of water and wastewater in the State of Hawaii, with amendments.

The message further announced that the House has passed the bill (S. 2749) to establish the California Trail Interpretive Center in Elko, Nevada, to facilitate the interpretation of the history of development and use of trails in the setting of the western portion of the United States, with amendments.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4868) to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, to make other technical amendments to the trade laws, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

At 11:08 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed 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) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

At 3:34 p.m. a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 782. An act 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.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 426. Concurrent resolution concerning the violence in the Middle East.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 2547. An act to provide for the establishment of the Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve and the Baca National Wildlife Refuge in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes.

At 5:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

At 6:18 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to 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.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 7:24 p.m. a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–630. A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, Cuyahoga County, Ohio relative to the Ryan White CARE Act programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted.

By Mr. STEVENS, from the Committee on Appropriations: Special Report entitled ''Further Revised Allocation To Subcommittees Of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2001'' (Rept. No. 106–508).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of committee was submitted:

By Mr. ROTH for the Committee on Finance.

Lisa Gayle Ross, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of the Treasury.

(The above nomination was reported with the recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 3232. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize certain projects in California for the use or reuse of reclaimed water and for the design and construction of demonstration and permanent facilities for that purpose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WELLSTONE:

S. 3233. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for medicare beneficiary copayments for outpatient mental health services that are the same as beneficiary copayments for other part B services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON):

S. 3234. A bill to protect the public's ability to fish for sport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. BURNS):

S. 3235. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a deferral of tax on gain from the sale of telecommunications businesses in specific circumstances or a tax credit and other incentives to promote diversity of ownership in telecommunications businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOND:

S. 3236. A bill to provide for reauthorization of small business loan and other programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 3237. A bill to provide for an international scientific commission to assess changes in global climate patterns, to conduct scientific studies and analyses on behalf of nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 3238. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections for individuals who need mental health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LOTT (for Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY)):

S. 3239. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide special immigrant status for certain United States international broadcasting employees; considered and passed.

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. 3240. A bill to avoid a pay-go sequestration for fiscal year 2001; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Governmental Affairs, jointly.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. KERREY, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. CLELAND):

S. 3241. A bill to carry out an international fellowship program between the United States and Vietnam to enable Vietnamese nationals to pursue advanced studies in science, mathematics, medicine, and technology; to enable United States citizens to teach in those fields in Vietnam; and to promote reconciliation between the two countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 3242. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to encourage equity investment in rural cooperatives and other rural businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mrs. BOXER:

S. 3232. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize certain projects in California for the use or reuse of reclaimed water and for the design and construction of demonstration and permanent facilities for that purpose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

CALIFORNIA RECLAIMED WATER ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the California Reclaimed Water Act for the 21st century. As California takes its first steps into the 21st century, it is undeniable that the quality of water, the quantity of water, and the availability of water are among the most formidable challenges to our 34 million citizens and the many diverse regions of our fast growing state. Our farmers, urban dwellers, sport and commercial fishing interests, tribes, mountain communities and environmentalists all seek a more reliable and a more certain water future. Recycled water plays an important part in meeting California's water needs today and will play an even more important role in the next several decades.

California is making significant progress in its effort to put its water house in order. Between March and June of this year, two major water policy initiatives occurred in California. On March 7, 2000, California voters overwhelmingly approved a $2 billion water bond. Further, on August 28, 2000, Governor Gray Davis and Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt signed the landmark CALFED water agreement which broadly sets a course for California's water future. Water recycling and reuse is a major element of both these new actions and policies.

The existing federal program to support water recycling is found in title XVI, Public Law 102–575 and was enacted in 1992. The law authorized recycling projects and studies throughout California, including in Los Angeles, San Diego, San Jose, and San Francisco. The law also authorized projects in Colorado and Arizona. The 1992 law also called for a special Southern California Comprehensive Water Reclamation and Reuse study to investigate

how the use of recycled water could relieve water supply pressure in California. That study is being prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, State of California's Department of Water Resources, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Central Basin and West Basin Municipal Water Districts, City of Los Angeles, City of San Diego, San Diego Water Authority, Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority and the South Orange County Reclamation Authority. It should soon be completed.

Expressing continued support for the title XVI program, in 1996 Congress authorized a second group of water recycling projects in California, from Watsonville to Ventura County, and from Pasadena to Orange County, plus individual projects in Utah, New Mexico, Texas and Nevada. The legislation I introduce today builds upon these congressional efforts, voter ballot initiatives and agency studies. The bill authorizes a series of title XVI water recycling projects and directs the Secretary of the Interior to work with various water districts throughout the State including: Castaic Lake Water Agency Reclaimed Water Project Lake County, Clear Lake Basin Water Reuse Project East Bay Municipal Utility District and the San Ramon Serves District Recycled Water Project Inland Empire Utilities Agency, Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Project in San Bernardino County San Pablo Baylands Water Reuse Project in Sonoma, Napa, Marin and Solano Counties State of California Water Recycling Program Regional Brine Lines (salt removal) in Southern California, the San Francisco Bay and the Santa Clara Valley areas Chino Basin Watermaster, Inland Empire Utilities Agency, Western Municipal Water District and the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority for the Lower Chino Dairy Area Desalination Demonstration and Reclamation Project.

Additional research, in cooperation with the WateReuse Foundation, is mandated and two previously authorized projects, one in Los Angeles and the other in the San Gabriel Basin, are modified. Finally, my bill mandates that the proposed projects be coordinated with the CALFED Program. Taken together, these projects will have the capacity to produce hundreds of thousands of acre feet of water. The Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Project, for example, is designed to yield up to 66,000 acre feet of recycled water annually. Each acre foot of recycled water reduces the demand for imported water from the Bay-Delta and the Colorado River. Inland proposed to ''drought proof'' its region with these and related investments.

Beneficiaries of these projects and these investments include the immediate service areas, downstream neighbors, and towns and communities throughout California. Water recycling projects in California also reduce the demand for imported water, be it from the San Francisco Bay-Delta or the Colorado River. Recycling and reuse investments in Southern California have the effect of helping the Bay-Delta by reducing demand for additional imported Bay-Delta water. These same investments benefit California's neighboring states up and down the Colorado River. As more water is developed locally, pressure is reduced for imports.

Presently, negotiations are underway between California and the other six states of the Colorado River Basin. California is being asked to reduce the amount of water it takes from the Colorado River. In fact, as a result of these talks, California faces a reduction of some 800,000 acre feet. The water recycling projects proposed in this legislation can help California meet this challenge. As a result, Utah, Colorado, Nevada and Arizona also benefit from these programs. Unlike traditional Bureau of Reclamation water projects, these water recycling projects require a majority of funds to be locally provided. Consistent with title XVI limitations on recycling projects as authorized in 1992 and 1996, the projects proposed in my bill require 75 percent local funding. Federal cost sharing is limited to 25 percent. Moreover, this bill specifies that none of the funds can be used for annual operation and maintenance costs. Those annual expenses are the responsibility of the local water districts or management agency.

The water recycling projects authorized by my bill are part of a long-term solution to some of California's most difficult challenges. Water recycling is not the only solution. But, water recycling and water reuse can play a significant part as these projects can be designed, built, and placed on line within a short time. This bill helps communities throughout California. This bill helps communities in Southern California, reducing pressure on the Bay-Delta water supplies. And, this bill respects our neighboring states up and down the Colorado River. I ask unanimous consent that this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3232

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 ''California Reclaimed Water Act for the 21st Century''.

SEC. 2. COORDINATION OF PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS.

Section 1602 of the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (43 U.S.C. 390h) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) COORDINATION WITH CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall coordinate projects under this title with projects and programs under the CALFED Bay-Delta Program referred to in the California Bay-Delta Environmental Enhancement and Water Security Act (division E of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–748).

''(2) FEDERAL EXPENDITURES.—The Secretary shall take into account Federal expenditures under this title in making determinations under the CALFED Bay-Delta Program relating to the equitable implementation of ecosystem restoration and water management.

''(f) COMPLIANCE WITH NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.—Each project under this title shall be carried out in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).''.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATIONS.

The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is amended—

(1) by inserting after section 1601 the following:

"Subtitle A—Specific Projects";

(2) by redesignating sections 1631, 1632, 1633, and 1634 (43 U.S.C. 390h–13, 390h–14, 390h–15, 390h–16) as sections 1640, 1671, 1672, and 1631, respectively;

(3) by moving section 1631 (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) to follow section 1630;

(4) by inserting before section 1671 (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

"Subtitle B—Studies and Research";

(5) by inserting after section 1631 (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

"SEC. 1632. CASTAIC LAKE WATER AGENCY RECLAIMED WATER PROJECT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Castaic Lake Water Agency, California, may participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Castaic Lake Water Agency reclaimed water project, California, to reclaim and reuse wastewater within and outside the service area of the Castaic Lake Water Agency for ecosystem restoration, irrigation, recreational, industrial, and other public purposes.

''(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation or maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000.

"SEC. 1633. CLEAR LAKE BASIN WATER REUSE PROJECT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with Lake County, California, may participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Clear Lake Basin water reuse project to obtain, store, and use reclaimed wastewater in Lake County for ecosystem restoration, irrigation, recreational, industrial, and other public purposes.

''(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation or maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $9,000,000.

"SEC. 1634. SAN RAMON VALLEY RECYCLED WATER PROJECT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may provide design and construction assistance for the East Bay Municipal Utility District/Dublin San Ramon Services District advanced wastewater reuse treatment project, California, for use for ecosystem restoration, irrigation, recreational, industrial, and other public purposes.

''(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation or maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000.

''SEC. 1635. INLAND EMPIRE REGIONAL WATER RECYCLING PROJECT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Inland Empire Utilities Agency, may participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Inland Empire regional project described in the report submitted under section 1606 to recycle water for ecosystem restoration, irrigation, recreational, industrial, and other public purposes.

''(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation or maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000.

''SEC. 1636. SAN PABLO BAYLANDS WATER REUSE PROJECTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with Sonoma, Napa, Marin, and Solano Counties, California, may participate in the design, planning, and construction of water reuse projects, to be known collectively as the 'San Pablo Baylands water reuse projects', to obtain, store, and use reclaimed wastewater for ecosystem restoration, irrigation, recreational, industrial, and other public purposes.

''(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of a project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation or maintenance of any project described in subsection (a).

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000.

''SEC. 1637. CALIFORNIA WATER RECYCLING PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may provide assistance to the State of California in carrying out projects that receive funding under chapter 7, article 4, of the Safe Drinking Water, Clean Water, Watershed Protection, and Flood Protection Act of the State of California to recycle water for ecosystem restoration, irrigation, recreational, industrial, and other public purposes.

''(b) AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into such agreements as are necessary to carry out this section.

''(c) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of a project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

''(d) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation or maintenance of any project described in subsection (a).

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Upon approval of the Act referred to in subsection (a), there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $50,000,000.

''SEC. 1638. REGIONAL BRINE LINES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary, in cooperation with units of local government, may carry out a program under the Federal reclamation laws to assist agencies in projects to construct regional brine lines to export the salinity imported from the Colorado River to the Pacific Ocean as identified in—

''(A) the Salinity Management Study prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation; and

''(B) the Southern California Comprehensive Water Reclamation and Reuse Study prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation.

''(2) SAN FRANCISCO BAY AND SANTA CLARA VALLEY.—The Secretary may carry out a study of, and a program under the Federal reclamation laws to assist water agencies in, projects to construct regional brine lines in the San Francisco Bay area and the Santa Clara Valley area, California.

''(b) AGREEMENTS AND REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may enter into such agreements and promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

''(c) COST SHARING.—

''(1) PROJECTS.—The Federal share of the cost of a project to construct regional brine lines described in subsection (a) shall not exceed—

''(A) 25 percent of the total cost of the project; or

''(B) $50,000,000.

''(2) STUDY.—The Federal share of the cost of the study described in subsection (a)(2) shall be 50 percent.

''(d) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation or maintenance of any project described in subsection (a).

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

''SEC. 1639. LOWER CHINO DAIRY AREA DESALINATION DEMONSTRATION AND RECLAMATION PROJECT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Chino Basin Watermaster, the Inland Empire Utilities Agency, the Western Municipal Water District, and the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority and acting under the Federal reclamation laws, shall participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Lower Chino Dairy Area desalination demonstration and reclamation project.

''(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed—

''(1) 25 percent of the total cost of the project; or

''(2) $50,000,000.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation or maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.''; and

(6) by inserting after section 1672 (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

''SEC. 1673. RESEARCH CONCERNING WATER REUSE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the WateReuse Foundation, shall develop and carry out a program to conduct research concerning water reuse in relation to—

''(1) public health;

''(2) water quality;

''(3) new technology and techniques;

''(4) salt management;

''(5) economics;

''(6) ecosystem restoration; and

''(7) other important matters.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $2,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005, to remain available until expended.''.

SEC. 4. WEST BASIN COMPREHENSIVE DESALINATION DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 1605 of the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (43 U.S.C. 390h–3) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) WEST BASIN COMPREHENSIVE DESALINATION DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the West Basin Municipal Water District, shall participate in the planning, design, and construction of the components of the West Basin Comprehensive Desalination Demonstration Program in Los Angeles County, California.

''(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in paragraph (1) shall not exceed 50 percent of the total.

''(3) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not provide funds for the operation or maintenance of the components described in paragraph (1).''.

SEC. 5. PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.

(a) LOS ANGELES AREA.—Section 1613 of the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (43 U.S.C. 390h–11) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) WATER RECYCLING PROJECT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may participate in the design, planning, and construction of a water recycling project, to be known as the 'City of Los Angeles Water Recycling Program', to reclaim and reuse wastewater within the city of Los Angeles and surrounding area for ecosystem restoration, irrigation, recreational, industrial, and other public purposes.

''(2) COMPONENTS.—The water recycling project shall consist of—

''(A) the central city project, a multiphase project that may provide up to 4,000 acre-feet per year of recycled water for ecosystem restoration and for industrial, commercial, and irrigation customers near downtown Los Angeles; and

''(B) the harbor water recycling project, a multiphase project that may provide up to 25,000 acre-feet per year of recycled water to the Los Angeles Harbor area.

''(c) COST SHARING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of the projects described in subsections (a) and (b) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the projects.

''(2) MAXIMUM FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share with respect to the water recycling project described in subsection (b) shall not exceed $12,000,000.

''(d) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation or maintenance of any project described in subsection (a) or (b).''.

(b) SAN GABRIEL BASIN.—Section 1640(d) of the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (43 U.S.C. 390h–13(d)) (as redesignated by section 3(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2) and (3)'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''(other than section 1614)'' after ''this title''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) SAN GABRIEL BASIN.—In the case of the project authorized by section 1614, the Federal share of the cost of the project shall not exceed $50,500,000.''.

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act is amended—

(1) in section 1640 (43 U.S.C. 390h–13) (as redesignated by section 3(a)(2))—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''1630'' and inserting ''1632''; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1), by inserting ''(other than sections 1634, 1636, 1637, 1638, and 1639)'' after ''authorized by this title'';

(2) in section 1671(c) (43 U.S.C. 390h–14(c)) (as redesignated by section 3(a)(2)), by striking ''section 1633'' and inserting ''section 1672''; and

(3) in section 1672 (43 U.S.C. 390h–15) (as redesignated by section 3(a)(2))—

(A) in the section heading, by inserting ''**FOR GROUNDWATER STUDY**'' before the period; and

(B) by striking ''section 1632'' and inserting ''section 1671''.

(b) The table of contents in section 2 of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. prec. 371; Public Law 102–575) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the item relating to section 1601 the following:

''Subtitle A—Specific Projects''; and

(2) by striking the items relating to sections 1631 through 1634 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 1631. Willow Lake Natural Treatment System Project.
''Sec. 1632. Castaic Lake Water Agency reclaimed water project.
''Sec. 1633. Clear Lake Basin water reuse project.
''Sec. 1634. San Ramon Valley recycled water project.
''Sec. 1635. Inland Empire regional water recycling project.
''Sec. 1636. San Pablo Baylands water reuse projects.
''Sec. 1637. California water recycling program.
''Sec. 1638. Regional brine lines.
''Sec. 1639. Lower Chino Dairy Area desalination demonstration and reclamation project.
''Sec. 1640. Authorization of appropriations.

''Subtitle B—Studies and Research

''Sec. 1671. Groundwater study.
''Sec. 1672. Authorization of appropriations for groundwater study.
''Sec. 1673. Research concerning water reuse.''.

Mr. WELLSTONE.

S. 3233. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare beneficiary copayments for outpatient mental health services that are the same as beneficiary copayments for other part B services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

MEDICARE MENTAL HEALTH MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Medicare Mental Health Modernization Act, a bill to improve the delivery of mental health services through the Medicare health care system. This improvement and modernization of mental health services in the Medicare system is long overdue, as it has remained virtually unchanged since it was enacted by Congress in 1965. In the 35 years since then, the scientific breakthroughs in our understanding of mental illnesses and the enormous improvements in medications and other effective treatments have dramatically changed our understanding and treatment of mental illness. Yet, the health care systems, both public and private, lag behind in its treatment of this potentially life-threatening disease, one that affects the young and the old. As we work to improve health care for all Americans, in all health care systems, the ever-growing population of older Americans make it all the more urgent that we bring the Medicare system into the 21st century, and bring mental health care to those in need.

Though they are so often not recognized, mental health problems among the elderly are widespread and life-threatening. Americans aged 65 years and older have the highest rate of suicide of any population in the United States, and suicide rates increase with age. While this age group accounts for only 13 percent of the U.S. population, Americans 65 and older account for 20 percent of all suicide deaths. All too often, depression among the elderly is untreated or inappropriately treated, and this disease and other illnesses such as Alzheimer's disease, anxiety, late-life schizophrenia, can lead to severe impairment or death.

Major depression is strikingly prevalent among older people, with between 8 and 20 percent of older people in community studies showing symptoms of depression. Studies of patients in primary care settings show that up to 37 percent are experiencing such symptoms, although they often go untreated. Depression is not a normal part of aging, but a serious debilitating disease. Almost 20 percent of the population of individuals age 55 and older experience a serious mental disorder. What is most alarming is that most elderly suicide victims—70 percent—have visited their primary care doctor in the month prior to their completed suicide. It is critical that the mental health expertise that is needed be provided within the Medicare system, and that screening, diagnosis, and treatment be provided in a timely manner.

Medicare coverage for mental health services is markedly different from other outpatient services. In order to receive mental health care, seniors must pay, out of their own pockets, half the cost of a visit to their mental health specialist, an extremely unfair burden to place on the elderly, who are so often facing other health or life difficulties as well.

We know too that substance abuse, particularly of alcohol and prescription drugs, among adults 65 and older is one of the fastest growing health problems in the United States, with 17 percent of this age group suffering from addiction or substance abuse. While addiction often goes undetected and untreated among older adults, aging and disability only makes the body more vulnerable to the effects of these drugs, further exacerbating underlying health problems, and creating a serious need for treatment that recognizes these vulnerabilities.

Medicare also provides health care coverage for non-elderly individuals who are disabled, through Social Security Disability Insurance, SSDI. According to the Health Care Financing Agency, HCFA, Medicare is the primary health care coverage for the 5 million non-elderly, disabled people on SSDI. Up to 40 percent of these individuals have a diagnosis of mental illness and/or addiction, and also face severe discrimination in their mental health coverage.

What will my bill do? The Medicare Mental Health Modernization Act has several important components. First, the bill reduces this discriminatory 50 percent copayment for mental health care to 20 percent, which is equal to the level that applies to every other outpatient service in Medicare. This is straightforward, fair, and the right thing to do. By doing so, this provision will increase access to mental health care overall, especially for those who currently forego seeking treatment, and instead, find themselves suffering from worsening mental health conditions. Secondly, the bill adds intensive residential services to the Medicare mental health benefit package. This provision will give people suffering from mental illnesses such as Alzheimer's disease or late-life schizophrenia an alternative to going to nursing homes. Instead, they will be able to be cared for in their homes or in more appropriate residential settings. I also ask the Secretary for Health and Human Services to conduct a study of the current Medicare coverage criteria to determine the extent to which people with these forms of illnesses are receiving the appropriate care that is needed.

Finally, my bill expands the number of mental health professionals eligible to provide services through Medicare to include clinical social workers and licensed professional mental health counselors. Provision of adequate mental health services provided through Medicare requires more trained and experienced providers for the aging and growing population and should include those who are appropriately licensed and qualified to deliver such care.

These changes are needed now. The mental health groups most concerned with medicare improvement are strongly supportive of this bill, including, among others, the American Counseling Association, the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill, the National Mental Health Association, the American Psychological Association, the Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, and the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors. The U.S. Surgeon General David Satcher recognized the urgency in his recent reports on mental health: ''Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General'' and ''The Surgeon General's Call to Action to Prevent Suicide''. Dr. Satcher stated, ''Disability due to mental illness in individuals over 65 years old will become a major public health problem in the near future because of demographic changes. In particular, dementia, depression, and schizophrenia, among other conditions, will all present special problems for this age group.''

For too long we have continued to neglect those with mental illness in

our society, and the Medicare system is no exception. I urge your cosponsorship of this bill as we begin our work in this new century. It is time to treat the elderly in our society, particularly those with serious, debilitating diseases, with the care, respect, and fairness they deserve.

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself, and Mrs. HUTCHISON):

S. 3234. A bill to protect the public's ability to fish for sport, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE FREEDOM TO FISH ACT

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I rise today to send to the desk a bill that is called the Freedom to Fish Act. The legislation cosponsored by Senator HUTCHISON addresses an unsettling situation arising over access to our nation's public coastal resources. I understand that it is very late in the session to be introducing new legislation, but I believe this matter is significantly important to require immediate recognition. There is a growing movement to limit the use and enjoyment of America's coastal and ocean waters. This restriction of public access is occurring under the guise of the establishment of marine protected areas. Many in the environmental community are lauding the creation of these undersea national parks as the silver bullet solution to our over-exploited fisheries and degraded habitat. The bill I am introducing today aims to correct a system that would unfairly penalize our nation's approximately ten million marine recreational anglers. For while I support the goal of healthy marine fisheries, I disagree strongly with any method that unnecessarily limits our citizens' access to public waters.

I believe that my record clearly indicates my dedication to protecting and improving the health of our oceans and coasts. However, I believe that restricting public access to those waters is not the appropriate vehicle for accomplishing that goal in most cases. The notion of a marine park is certainly not new, having its origins in successful land management practices. The establishment of wildlife refuges, national parks and forests has shown clear benefits to the natural species living on those lands and fresh waters. However, in the transfer from the land to the marine waters one very important aspect of the protected area has been neglected. While sport fishing is nearly universally accepted throughout this nation's terrestrial parks, and wilderness areas, those advocating the use of marine parks take pains to specifically restrict the access of recreational anglers. This seems ironic to me, as an increasing number of recreational anglers practice catch and release fishing and all contribute money to their state's fish and game departments through the payment of license fees and taxes. I believe these anglers to be among this nation's first conservationists and their contributions to the resource need to be recognized.

In response to criticism and attacks against our Nation's sportsmen and women, I introduce the Freedom to Fish Act. The act establishes guidelines and safeguards by which the public's right to use and enjoy these resources is preserved in all but the most serious cases. It provides assurances that the angling public will have a place at the table when decisions are made regarding their use of the resource. Second, the Freedom to Fish Act will ensure that recreational anglers will be prohibited from an area only when they have been shown to be causing significant adverse effects on that fishery resource. Further, should prohibitions be justified, this bill prevents areas larger than scientifically necessary from being closed. In those cases, criteria will be established so that once certain goals have been reached, the area will reopen to the public immediately. Restricting public admission to our coastal waters should not be our first course of action, but rather our last resort. Open access to fishing is the single most important element of recreational fishing. We must defend public access against those that would try to restrict it under the cloak of marine resource protection. With that, I submit the Freedom to Fish Act for your review and discussion.

Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. BURNS):

S. 3235. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a deferral of tax on gain from the sale of telecommunications businesses in specific circumstances or a tax credit and other incentives to promote diversity of ownership in telecommunications businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS OWNERSHIP DIVERSITY ACT OF 2000

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce revised legislation that will make sure that new entrants and small businesses will have the chance to enter and grow in today's megacorporation-dominated telecommunications marketplace. Together with my good friend and colleague, Communications Subcommittee Chairman CONRAD BURNS, I am pleased to bring forward for the Senate's consideration The Telecommunications Ownership Diversity Act of 2000.

Mr. President, no one needs to be told that any small business faces significant barriers in trying to enter the telecommunications industry. These barriers are even more formidable when the entrepreneur happens to be a woman or a member of a minority group, due to their historically more difficult job of obtaining needed financing. Therefore, in this current telecom industry mixer, small businesses, especially those owned by minorities or women, are often left without partners, watching as bigger, more established companies, get to dance.

That's not right, but there is an answer. The answer isn't to forbid mergers out-of-hand, or to retain hopelessly outdated FCC ownership restrictions, or to pursue constitutionally or economically doomed set-aside programs. The answer is to give established industry players economic incentives to deal with new entrants and small businesses that counterbalance the incentives they have to deal with larger companies.

And that's what this bill does. The Telecommunications Ownership Diversity Act of 2000 will promote entry into the telecommunications industry during this period of unprecedented restructuring by providing carefully-limited changes to the tax law. These changes to the tax law are an indispensable component of the solution. Under current law, smaller companies typically must purchase properties for cash, and cash transactions are fully taxable to the seller. So naturally sellers of telecommunications businesses prefer to sell for stock, which is tax-deferred, and which large companies have to offer.

The Act will level the playing field for new entrants and small businesses by giving telecommunications business sellers a tax deferral when the property is bought for cash by a small business telecommunications company. The Act will also encourage the entry of new players and the growth of existing small businesses by enabling the seller of a telecommunications business to claim the tax deferral on capital gains if it invests the proceeds of any sale of its business in purchasing an interest in an eligible small business.

In recognition of the convergence of telecommunications services and the growing importance of wireless and other services as an essential component of the telecommunications market, the telecommunications businesses eligible for this capital gains tax deferral are broadly defined to include not only broadcast and cable TV-type businesses, but also wireline and wireless telephone service providers and resellers. To eliminate the potential for abuse, the Act would require the eligible purchaser to hold any property acquired for three years, during which time it could only be sold to an unrelated eligible purchaser. The General Accounting Office is required to thoroughly audit and report on the administration and effect of the Act every two years.

Mr. President, this legislation represents a significant step toward helping to ensure that small companies share a portion of the investment benefits our tax laws give to major telecommunications companies. Over the next several months, we look forward to working with interested organizations to further refine this legislation. Specifically, we would welcome comments on how to further refine the concepts of qualified telecommunications business and eligible purchaser so as to ensure that this legislation meets its

goals in the most fair and effective manner. Moreover, we note that this legislation contains a ''control'' test that is intended to ensure that this legislation is not subject to abuse—and actually benefits those that it is intended to help. We recognize, however, that this control test may also need to be refined as we go forward.

Mr. President, hallmark developments in the telecommunications industry have been made by gifted individuals with small companies and unlimited vision. In this sense the telecommunications industry is a true microcosm of the American free-market system, in which the benefits produced by its entrepreneurs generate benefits that extend to all of us. It is therefore critically important that new entrants and small businesses have a chance to participate across the broad spectrum of industries that will make up the telecommunications industry in the Information Age. The Act will help them do that, and Senator BURNS and I are proud to sponsor it and to work for its enactment.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 3237. A bill to provide for an international scientific commission to assess changes in global climate patterns, to conduct scientific studies and analyses on behalf of nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTERNATIONAL CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE COMMISSION ACT

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this bill provides for the creation of an international scientific commission to assess changes in global climate patterns and to conduct scientific studies and analysis on behalf of the nations of the world.

The Commerce Committee held three hearings on the subject of climate change this year. We heard from several witnesses on the science of global warming, the impacts of climate change on the United States, and solutions to climate change.

One of the most salient points of the three hearings was the importance of good science to the policymaking process. Most importantly, any action the United States takes in response to claims of global warming must be based on the best science available and not on rhetoric or political expedience. We must continue to invest in our research capabilities to fully understand the scientific interactions between humans, the land, the ocean, and the atmosphere.

Based upon testimonies received by the Commerce Committee, the knowledge base in some countries is far greater than in others. To solve this global problem of climate change, we must rely upon all the resources and knowledge available to us. We must ensure that the United States research program is providing the maximum returns on our investment dollars. It was both surprising and disappointing to see that for a recent assessment of the United States, we had to rely upon two foreign computer models. We must do better.

Mr. President, I feel it is of vital importance that we allow scientists the opportunity to pursue knowledge as opposed to being constrained by politics. In introducing this bill entitled, International Climate Change Science Commission Act, it is my hope and intention that the membership of the Commission will be filled by those who are scientists and fully appreciate the pursuit of truth and knowledge. I hope this commission will provide them with an opportunity to freely research, discuss, and document their scientific findings.

Mr. President, I realize this bill will not pass this session. However, it is my hope that by introducing this bill a discussion will begin in the scientific community of how to better structure this piece of legislation and to ensure that the best available science is used for policy decisions. After discussions with the scientific community, I intend to re-introduce this bill or a new version of the measure next session and hopefully then move towards its enactment.

I also plan to offer other pieces of legislation next year in this area. There are several types of actions that may be taken to address this situation as indicated in the Commerce Committee's hearing, ''Solutions to Climate Change,'' held on September 21, 2000.

Mr. DURBIN:

S. 3238. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections for individuals who need mental health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

THE MENTAL HEALTH ACCESS ACT OF 2000

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation on behalf of the more than 50 million Americans each year who suffer from mental illness. This bill, the Mental Health Access Act, removes one of the many barriers to health care faced by those who have been treated for a mental condition.

The Mental Health Access Act limits the ability of health plans to redline individuals with a preexisting mental health conditions. I undertook this initiative when I learned that some of my constituents were being turned away from health plans in the private non-group market due solely to a past history of treatment for mental conditions. Unfortunately, under the current system of care in the United States, individuals who are undergoing treatment or have a history of treatment for mental illness may find it difficult to obtain private health insurance, especially if they must purchase it on their own and do not have an employer-sponsored group plan available to them. In part this is because while the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPAA) protects millions of Americans in the group health insurance market, it affords few protections for individuals who apply for private non-group insurance.

The Mental Health Access Act closes this loophole by limiting any preexisting condition exclusion relating to a mental health condition to not more than 12 months and reducing this exclusion period by the total amount of previous creditable coverage. It prohibits any health insurer that offers health coverage in the individual insurance market from imposing a preexisting condition exclusion relating to a mental health condition unless a diagnosis, medical advice or treatment was recommended or received within the 6 months period to the enrollment date. And it prohibits health plans in the individual market from charging higher premiums to individuals based solely on the determination that the such individual has had a preexisting mental health condition. These provisions apply to all health plans in the individual market, regardless of whether a state has enacted an alternative mechanism (such as a risk pool) to cover individuals with preexisting health conditions.

The Mental Health Access Act complements ongoing efforts to enhance parity between mental health services and other health benefits. This is because parity alone will not help individuals who do not have access to any affordable health insurance due to preexisting mental illness discrimination. The Access Act does not mandate that insurers provide mental health services if they are not already offering such coverage. It simply prohibits plans in the private non-group market from redlining individuals who apply for general health insurance based solely on a past history of treatment for a mental condition.

Recognizing that we are nearing the close of this year's legislative session. I plan to reintroduced this bill when Congress returns and it is my hope that many of my colleagues will join me. In the meantime, I have asked the General Accounting Office (GAO)to examine the extent to which private health insurers medically underwrite for mental health conditions by either denying coverage or raising premiums, often to a level that is unaffordable for many individuals. Specifically, I have asked the GAO to examine: the types of mental health conditions for which individual health insurers typically underwrite; the degree to which there is an actuarial basis for these carrier practices; the prevalence of medical underwriting for mental health conditions that result in denying coverage or raising premiums; and the extent of state laws that prevent or constrain insurers from denying coverage or raising premiums due to a history of mental health conditions, including consumer protections such as appeals procedures and access to information.

It simply does not make sense that just because a person seeks treatment

for mental illness he or she is rendered uninsurable. I invite my colleagues to enlist in this important initiative to ensure that such individuals are not discriminated against when applying for health insurance coverage.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 3242. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to encourage equity investment in rural cooperatives and other rural businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

NATIONAL RURAL COOPERATIVE AND BUSINESS EQUITY FUND ACT

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today, Senator CRAIG and I are introducing the National Rural Cooperative and Business Equity Fund Act to create a new public/private partnership designed to attract equity investment in cooperatives and other businesses in rural America. Senators DASCHLE, JEFFORDS, and JOHNSON are cosponsoring this bipartisan measure.

The Iowa 2010 Strategic Planning Council was commissioned by Governor Vilsack to identify barriers to Iowa's economic development progress over the next ten years. The council found that two very significant hurdles were lack of venture funding and access to capital.

The situation is no different in many other rural areas. Many new rural businesses, particularly cooperatives and farmer-owned businesses, have tremendous difficulty acquiring equity capital—especially those involving value-added agricultural processing.

In Iowa alone, I have seen many cases where equity capital would have made a big difference in the future of a rural business. And every time we lose an opportunity to help a business, it means fewer jobs, fewer well-paying jobs, and less income for rural and small town America.

In fact, just recently, in eastern Iowa, a group of turkey producers joined together to purchase the soon-to-be-closed West Liberty packing plant from Louis Rich. Ultimately—with the assistance of a USDA loan guarantee and state and private support—the co-op successfully purchased the plant. However, they almost went under because of limited equity. Only by the skin of our teeth are those jobs still in Iowa and those farmers still enjoying the benefits of cooperative ownership of that plant. In too many other cases, good ideas have been shattered because of a lack of equity.

My state has made some progress through the Iowa Department of Economic Development's ''Community Economic Betterment Account'' or CEBA, which recently set aside some funding for venture capital. But far more resources are needed in Iowa and across Rural America.

That's why this legislation is so important. If we pass the National Rural Cooperative and Business Equity Fund Act, we will help quality rural cooperatives and businesses succeed and expand, and we will create jobs and raise the incomes of employees and farmers.

We're opening this bill up to discussion today with the hope of passing it in the next Congress. I believe this legislation has a strong start in the support of Senators CRAIG, DASCHLE, JEFFORDS, and JOHNSON. We also have the support of a number of national organizations that are key players in rural economic development including: Agribank, the American Bankers Association, CoBank, the Farm Credit Council, the Independent Community Bankers Association, the National Cooperative Business Association, the National Cooperative Bank, National Farmers Union, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and the National Rural Utilities Cooperative Finance Cooperation.

The equity fund created by this legislation will have a 12-person Board of Directors that would decide which proposals to fund. This board would include the Secretary of Agriculture and two of his or her appointees, and the remainder of the Board would be made up of private investors in the fund. The first $150 million in private sector investments will be matched dollar for dollar by the U.S. Department of Agriculture over a three year period. As a compensation for the lower rate of return in the equity fund relative to other investments, the Department of Agriculture will guarantee up to 50 percent of an investment. Debentures, which would be guaranteed, could also be issued.

Businesses applying for equity from the fund must be sponsored by a local entity, such as a bank, a regional or local development council, or a cooperative or economic development group. The businesses must be based in rural areas, and they cannot be primarily retail businesses. Cooperatives and other businesses receiving an equity investment from the fund will be required to invest a substantial amount of their own capital.

The Fund is intended to support projects that will provide off-farm income, additional markets for agricultural products, and new business opportunities in rural communities. A diverse range of viable projects, representing a variety of business structures, operating in rural communities of various sizes would be encouraged.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues and those concerned about rural economic development to examine this measure between Congresses and at the beginning of the coming Congress. I am hopeful that we will be able to make the National Rural Cooperative and Business Equity Fund a reality.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 922

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 922, a bill to prohibit the use of the ''Made in the USA'' label on products of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and to deny such products duty-free and quota-free treatment.

S. 1760

At the request of Mr. MILLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1760, a bill to provide reliable officers, technology, education, community prosecutors, and training in our neighborhoods.

S. 2435

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2435, a bill to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to create a grant program to promote joint activities among Federal, State, and local public child welfare and alcohol and drug abuse prevention and treatment agencies.

S. 2718

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2718, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives to introduce new technologies to reduce energy consumption in buildings.

S. 3020

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3020, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to revise its regulations authorizing the operation of new, low-power FM radio stations.

S. 3045

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3045, a bill to improve the quality, timeliness, and credibility of forensic science services for criminal justice purposes.

S. 3089

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) were added as cosponsors of S. 3089, a bill to authorize the design and construction of a temporary education center at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial

S. 3152

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3152, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for distressed areas, and for other purposes.

S. 3156

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3156, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to ensure the recovery of the declining biological diversity of the United States, to reaffirm and strengthen the commitment

of the United States to protect wildlife, to safeguard the economic and ecological future of children of the United States, and to provide certainty to local governments, communities, and individuals in their planning and economic development efforts.

S. 3157

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3157, a bill to require the Food and Drug Administration to establish restrictions regarding the qualifications of physicians to prescribe the abortion drug commonly known as RU–486.

S. 3169

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3169, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the International Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to drugs for minor animal species, and for other purposes.

S. 3181

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 3181, a bill to establish the White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance, and for other purposes.

S. 3216

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3216, a bill to provide for review in the Court of International Trade of certain determinations of binational panels under the North American Free Trade Agreement.

S. 3222

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3222, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to provide assistance through States to eligible weed management entities to control or eradicate harmful, nonnative weeds on public and private land.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

DAIRY MARKET ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2000

CRAIG AMENDMENT NO. 4340

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. CRAIG) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 2773) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to enhance dairy markets through dairy product mandatory reporting, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

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.''.

NATIONAL RECORDING PRESERVATION ACT OF 2000

DASCHLE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 4341

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DASCHLE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. WYDEN)) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 4846) to establish the National Recording Registry in the Library of Congress to maintain and preserve recordings that are culturally, historically, or aesthetically significant, and for other purposes; as follows:

In section 101, insert ''and collections of sound recordings'' after ''recordings''.

In section 102(a)(1), insert ''and collections of sound recordings'' after ''recordings''.

In section 102(a)(1), strike ''10 years'' and insert ''25 years''.

In section 102(a)(3), insert ''and collections of sound recordings'' after ''recordings''.

In section 102(b), insert ''or collection of sound recordings'' after ''recording''.

In section 103(a), insert ''or collection of sound recordings'' after ''recording'' each place it appears.

In section 103(b)(1), insert ''or collection of sound recordings'' after ''sound recording''.

In section 103(b)(4), insert ''or collection of sound recordings'' after ''sound recording'' the first place it appears.

In section 103(c), insert ''or collection of sound recordings'' after ''sound recording''.

In section 103(c), strike ''recording,'' and insert ''recording or collection,''.

In section 104(a), insert ''(including electronic access)'' after ''reasonable access''.

In the heading for section 122(d)(2), insert ''OR ORGANIZATION'' after ''ORGANIZATION''.

In section 124(a)(1), insert ''and collections of sound recordings'' after ''recordings'' the first place it appears.

Add at the end of section 124 the following new subsection:

(c) ENCOURAGING ACCESSIBILITY TO REGISTRY AND OUT OF PRINT RECORDINGS.—The Board shall encourage the owners of recordings and collections of recordings included in the National Recording Registry and the owners of out of print recordings to permit digital access to such recordings through the National Audio-Visual Conservation Center at Culpeper, Virginia, in order to reduce the portion of the Nation's recorded cultural legacy which is inaccessible to students, educators, and others, and may suggest such other measures as it considers reasonable and appropriate to increase public accessibility to such recordings.

Insert after section 125 the following new section:

SEC. 126. ESTABLISHMENT OF BYLAWS BY LIBRARIAN.

The Librarian may establish such bylaws (consistent with this subtitle) as the Librarian considers appropriate to govern the organization and operation of the Board, including bylaws relating to appointments and removals of members or organizations described in section 122(a)(2) which may be required as a result of changes in the title, membership, or nature of such organizations occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Redesignate section 133 as section 134 and insert after section 132 the following new section:

SEC. 133. ENCOURAGING ACTIVITIES TO FOCUS ON RARE AND ENDANGERED RECORDINGS.

Congress encourages the Librarian and the Board, in carrying out their duties under this Act, to undertake activities designed to preserve and bring attention to sound recordings which are rare and sound recordings and collections of recordings which are in danger of becoming lost due to deterioration.

DASCHLE AMENDMENT NO. 4342

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DASCHLE) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 4846) supra; as follows:

Amend the title to read as follows: ''A Bill to establish the National Recording Registry in the Library of Congress to maintain and preserve sound recordings and collections of sound recordings that are culturally, historically, or aesthetically significant, and for other purposes.''.

HONORING SCULPTOR KORCZAK ZIOLKOWSKI

On October 24, 2000, the Senate amended and passed S. Res. 371, as follows:

S. RES. 371

Whereas Korczak Ziolkowski was born in Boston, Massachusetts on September 6, 1908, the 31st anniversary of the death of Lakota Sioux leader Crazy Horse;

Whereas, although never trained in art or sculpture, Korczak Ziolkowski began a successful studio career in New England as a commissioned sculptor at age 24;

Whereas Korczak Ziolkowski's marble sculpture of composer and Polish leader Ignace Jan Paderewski won first prize at the 1939 New York World's Fair and prompted Lakota Indian Chiefs to invite Ziolkowski to carve a memorial for Native Americans;

Whereas in his invitation letter to Korczak Ziolkowski, Chief Henry Standing Bear wrote: ''My fellow chiefs and I would like the white man to know that the red man has great heroes, too.'';

Whereas in 1939, Korczak Ziolkowski assisted Gutzon Borglum in carving Mount Rushmore;

Whereas in 1941, Korczak Ziolkowski met with Chief Henry Standing Bear who taught Korczak more about the life of the brave Sioux leader Crazy Horse;

Whereas at the age of 34, Korczak Ziolkowski temporarily put his sculpting career aside when he volunteered for service in World War II, later landing on Omaha Beach;

Whereas after the war, Korczak Ziolkowski turned down other sculpting opportunities in order to accept the invitation of Chief Henry Standing Bear and dedicate the rest of his life to carving the Crazy Horse Memorial in the Black Hills of South Dakota;

Whereas on June 3, 1948, when work was begun on the Crazy Horse Memorial, Korczak Ziolkowski vowed that the memorial would be a nonprofit educational and cultural project, financed solely through private, nongovernmental sources, to honor the Native Americans of North America;

Whereas the Crazy Horse Memorial is a mountain carving-in-progress, and once completed it will be the largest sculpture in the world;

Whereas since his death on October 20, 1982, Korczak's wife Ruth, the Ziolkowski family, and the Crazy Horse Memorial Foundation have continued to work on the Memorial and to continue the dream of Korczak Ziolkowski and Chief Henry Standing Bear; and

Whereas on June 3, 1998, the Memorial entered its second half century of progress and heralded a new era of work on the mountain with the completion and dedication of the face of Crazy Horse: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That

(1) the Senate recognizes—

(A) the admirable efforts of the late Korczak Ziolkowski in designing and creating the Crazy Horse Memorial;

(B) that the Crazy Horse Memorial represents all North American Indian tribes, and the noble goal of reconciliation between peoples; and

(C) that the creation of the Crazy Horse Memorial, from its inception, has been accomplished through private sources and without any Federal funding; and

(2) it is the sense of the Senate that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that a commemorative postage stamp be issued in honor of sculptor Korczak Ziolkowski and the Crazy Horse Memorial for the 20th anniversary of his death, October 20, 2002.

AIRPORT SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2000

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on the bill (S. 2440).

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 2440) entitled ''An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to improve airport security'', do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Airport Security Improvement Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECKS.

(a) EXPANSION OF FAA ELECTRONIC PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall develop, in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the pilot program for individual criminal history record checks (known as the electronic fingerprint transmission pilot project) into an aviation industry-wide program.

(2) LIMITATION.—The Administrator shall not require any airport, air carrier, or screening company to participate in the program described in subsection (a) if the airport, air carrier, or screening company determines that it would not be cost effective for it to participate in the program and notifies the Administrator of that determination.

(b) APPLICATION OF EXPANDED PROGRAM.—

(1) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall transmit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report describing the status of the Administrator's efforts to utilize the program described in subsection (a).

(2) NOTIFICATION CONCERNING SUFFICIENCY OF OPERATION.—If the Administrator determines

that the program described in subsection (a) is not sufficiently operational 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act to permit its utilization in accordance with subsection (a), the Administrator shall notify the committees referred to in paragraph (1) of that determination.

(c) CHANGES IN EXISTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 44936(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking '', as the Administrator decides is necessary to ensure air transportation security,'';

(2) in subparagraph (D) by striking ''as a screener'' and inserting ''in the position for which the individual applied''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECKS FOR SCREENERS AND OTHERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A criminal history record check shall be conducted for each individual who applies for a position described in subparagraph (A), (B)(i), or (B)(ii).

''(ii) SPECIAL TRANSITION RULE.—During the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this subparagraph, an individual described in clause (i) may be employed in a position described in clause (i)—

''(I) in the first 2 years of such 3-year period, for a period of not to exceed 45 days before a criminal history record check is completed; and

''(II) in the third year of such 3-year period, for a period of not to exceed 30 days before a criminal history record check is completed,

if the request for the check has been submitted to the appropriate Federal agency and the employment investigation has been successfully completed.

''(iii) EMPLOYMENT INVESTIGATION NOT REQUIRED FOR INDIVIDUALS SUBJECT TO CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK.—An employment investigation shall not be required for an individual who applies for a position described in subparagraph (A), (B)(i), or (B)(ii), if a criminal history record check of the individual is completed before the individual begins employment in such position.

''(iv) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subparagraph shall take effect—

''(I) 30 days after the date of enactment of this subparagraph with respect to individuals applying for a position at an airport that is defined as a Category X airport in the Federal Aviation Administration approved air carrier security programs required under part 108 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations; and

''(II) 3 years after such date of enactment with respect to individuals applying for a position at any other airport that is subject to the requirements of part 107 of such title.

''(F) EXEMPTION.—An employment investigation, including a criminal history record check, shall not be required under this subsection for an individual who is exempted under section 107.31(m) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this subparagraph.''.

(d) LIST OF OFFENSES BARRING EMPLOYMENT.—Section 44936(b)(1)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(or found not guilty by reason of insanity)'' after ''convicted'';

(2) in clause (xi) by inserting ''or felony unarmed'' after ''armed'';

(3) by striking ''or'' at the end of clause (xii);

(4) by redesignating clause (xiii) as clause (xv) and inserting after clause (xii) the following:

''(xiii) a felony involving a threat;

''(xiv) a felony involving—

''(I) willful destruction of property;

''(II) importation or manufacture of a controlled substance;

''(III) burglary;

''(IV) theft;

''(V) dishonesty, fraud, or misrepresentation;

''(VI) possession or distribution of stolen property;

''(VII) aggravated assault;

''(VIII) bribery; and

''(IX) illegal possession of a controlled substance punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of more than 1 year, or any other crime classified as a felony that the Administrator determines indicates a propensity for placing contraband aboard an aircraft in return for money; or''; and

(5) in clause (xv) (as so redesignated) by striking ''clauses (i)–(xii) of this paragraph'' and inserting ''clauses (i) through (xiv)''.

SEC. 3. IMPROVED TRAINING.

(a) TRAINING STANDARDS FOR SCREENERS.—Section 44935 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) TRAINING STANDARDS FOR SCREENERS.—

''(1) ISSUANCE OF FINAL RULE.—Not later than May 31, 2001, and after considering comments on the notice published in the Federal Register for January 5, 2000 (65 Fed. Reg. 559 et seq.), the Administrator shall issue a final rule on the certification of screening companies.

''(2) CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—As part of the final rule, the Administrator shall prescribe minimum standards for training security screeners that include at least 40 hours of classroom instruction before an individual is qualified to provide security screening services under section 44901.

''(B) CLASSROOM EQUIVALENCY.—Instead of the 40 hours of classroom instruction required under subparagraph (A), the final rule may allow an individual to qualify to provide security screening services if that individual has successfully completed a program that the Administrator determines will train individuals to a level of proficiency equivalent to the level that would be achieved by the classroom instruction under subparagraph (A).

''(3) ON-THE-JOB TRAINING.—In addition to the requirements of paragraph (2), as part of the final rule, the Administrator shall require that before an individual may exercise independent judgment as a security screener under section 44901, the individual shall—

''(A) complete 40 hours of on-the-job training as a security screener; and

''(B) successfully complete an on-the-job training examination prescribed by the Administrator.''.

(b) COMPUTER-BASED TRAINING FACILITIES.—Section 44935 of title 49, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) ACCESSIBILITY OF COMPUTER-BASED TRAINING FACILITIES.—The Administrator shall work with air carriers and airports to ensure that computer-based training facilities intended for use by security screeners at an airport regularly serving an air carrier holding a certificate issued by the Secretary of Transportation are conveniently located for that airport and easily accessible.''.

SEC. 4. IMPROVING SECURED-AREA ACCESS CONTROL.

Section 44903 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) IMPROVEMENT OF SECURED-AREA ACCESS CONTROL.—

''(1) ENFORCEMENT.—

''(A) ADMINISTRATOR TO PUBLISH SANCTIONS.—The Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register a list of sanctions for use as guidelines in the discipline of employees for infractions of airport access control requirements. The guidelines shall incorporate a progressive disciplinary approach that relates proposed sanctions to the severity or recurring nature of the infraction and shall include measures such as remedial training, suspension from security-related duties, suspension from all duties without pay, and termination of employment.

''(B) USE OF SANCTIONS.—Each airport operator, air carrier, and security screening company shall include the list of sanctions published by the Administrator in its security program. The security program shall include a process for taking prompt disciplinary action against an employee who commits an infraction of airport access control requirements.

''(2) IMPROVEMENTS.—The Administrator shall—

''(A) work with airport operators and air carriers to implement and strengthen existing controls to eliminate airport access control weaknesses by January 31, 2001;

''(B) require airport operators and air carriers to develop and implement comprehensive and recurring training programs that teach employees their roles in airport security, the importance of their participation, how their performance will be evaluated, and what action will be taken if they fail to perform;

''(C) require airport operators and air carriers to develop and implement programs that foster and reward compliance with airport access control requirements and discourage and penalize noncompliance in accordance with guidelines issued by the Administrator to measure employee compliance;

''(D) assess and test for compliance with access control requirements, report findings, and assess penalties or take other appropriate enforcement actions when noncompliance is found;

''(E) improve and better administer the Administrator's security database to ensure its efficiency, reliability, and usefulness for identification of systemic problems and allocation of resources;

''(F) improve the execution of the Administrator's quality control program by January 31, 2001; and

''(G) require airport operators and air carriers to strengthen access control points in secured areas (including air traffic control operations areas) to ensure the security of passengers and aircraft by January 31, 2001.''.

SEC. 5. PHYSICAL SECURITY FOR ATC FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to ensure physical security at Federal Aviation Administration staffed facilities that house air traffic control systems, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall act immediately to—

(1) correct physical security weaknesses at air traffic control facilities so the facilities can be granted physical security accreditation not later than April 30, 2004; and

(2) ensure that follow-up inspections are conducted, deficiencies are promptly corrected, and accreditation is kept current for all air traffic control facilities.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than April 30, 2001, and annually thereafter through April 30, 2004, the Administrator shall transmit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the progress being made in improving the physical security of air traffic control facilities, including the percentage of such facilities that have been granted physical security accreditation.

SEC. 6. EXPLOSIVES DETECTION EQUIPMENT.

Section 44903(c)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) MANUAL PROCESS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall issue an amendment to air carrier security programs to require a manual process, at explosive detection system screen locations in airports where explosive detection equipment is underutilized, which will augment the Computer Assisted Passenger Prescreening System by randomly selecting additional checked bags for screening so that a minimum number of bags, as prescribed by the Administrator, are examined.

''(ii) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Clause (i) shall not be construed to limit the ability of the Administrator to impose additional security measures on an air carrier or a foreign air carrier when a specific threat warrants such additional measures.

''(iii) MAXIMUM USE OF EXPLOSIVE DETECTION EQUIPMENT.—In prescribing the minimum number of bags to be examined under clause (i), the Administrator shall seek to maximize the use of the explosive detection equipment.''.

SEC. 7. AIRPORT NOISE STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 745 of the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (49 U.S.C. 47501 note; 114 Stat. 178) is amended—

*(1) in the section heading by striking ''**GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE**'';*

(2) in subsection (a) by striking ''Comptroller General of the United States shall'' and inserting ''Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to'';

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''Comptroller General'' and inserting ''National Academy of Sciences'';

(B) by striking paragraph (1);

(C) by adding ''and'' at the end of paragraph (4);

(D) by striking ''; and'' at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting a period;

(E) by striking paragraph (6); and

(F) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4), respectively;

(4) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the agreement entered into under subsection (a), the National Academy of Sciences shall transmit to the Secretary a report on the results of the study. Upon receipt of the report, the Secretary shall transmit a copy of the report to the appropriate committees of Congress.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act (114 Stat. 61 et seq.) is amended by striking item relating to section 745 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 745. Airport noise study.''.

SEC. 8. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) FEDERAL AVIATION MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL.—Section 106(p)(2) is amended by striking ''15'' and inserting ''18''.

(b) NATIONAL PARKS AIR TOUR MANAGEMENT.—Title VIII of the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (49 U.S.C. 40128 note; 114 Stat. 185 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 803(c) by striking ''40126'' each place it appears and inserting ''40128'';

(2) in section 804(b) by striking ''40126(e)(4)'' and inserting ''40128(f)''; and

(3) in section 806 by striking ''40126'' and inserting ''40128''.

(c) RESTATEMENT OF PROVISION WITHOUT SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE.—Section 41104(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), an air carrier, including an indirect air carrier, may not provide, in aircraft designed for more than 9 passenger seats, regularly scheduled charter air transportation for which the public is provided in advance a schedule containing the departure location, departure time, and arrival location of the flight unless such air transportation is to and from an airport that has an airport operating certificate issued under part 139 of title 14, Code or Federal Regulations (or any subsequent similar regulation).''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) EXCEPTION.—This subsection does not apply to any airport in the State of Alaska or to any airport outside the United States.''.

SEC. 9. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I ask unanimous consent the Senate agree to the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, we have just passed the Aviation Security Improvement Act of 2000. I am very pleased that we have been able, in a very bipartisan way, to pass this bill. I would like to just talk a little bit about how we came to pass the Aviation Security Act of 2000.

Thanks to Senator SLADE GORTON, the chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, I was able to chair a hearing in which we heard from the FAA, particularly Admiral Flynn, about the state of our airport security. ''What is the state of our airport security?'' we asked. We wanted to know if we were doing everything we could to give our traveling public the most security possible.

Admiral Flynn did a report and shared that with the Members of the Senate who came to the hearing. Every single Senator who attended the hearing became a cosponsor of the bill that we have just passed because there were some areas that we could clearly see needed to be made more strict, more stringent, just to make sure that we take every single measure we can to make our airports totally secure. Not that they are not, but there were some areas in which we could do better.

So after the hearing and because of the outstanding testimony of Admiral Flynn of the FAA, we did put together a bill that was quite bipartisan. Chairman JOHN MCCAIN of the Commerce Committee came together with Chairman SLADE GORTON of the Aviation Subcommittee. Senators HOLLINGS, INOUYE, BRYAN, and ROCKEFELLER all became immediate cosponsors of the bill. With that bipartisan group, we were able to make the changes that have been passed by the House and now will go to the President.

Six hundred million travelers will pass through U.S. airports. Their safety depends on the soundness of the inspection points and the checkpoints, and we all have been through those monitors and we know how important it is that we have the best equipment and the best trained technicians to make sure we do not have any kind of firearms or explosives of any kind going into our airplanes.

So we were able to pass this bill. I just want to make a couple of the points that are important in the bill.

First, today, a person who has a lapse in employment history—whether it would be a year, 18 months, 2 years—would have a criminal background check done before they could be hired to be an airport baggage screener.

Under the bill that we are passing today, there will be a criminal history record check on every person who becomes a baggage screener.

Secondly, we looked at the airport training requirements for airport baggage screeners. We found that in the most industrialized countries there is a minimum of 40 hours of required training before a person can become a baggage screener, but in America the standard is 8 hours.

The committee and the Congress believe we need to have more hours of required training and a test for baggage screeners. That will happen because of the bill we have just passed.

Third, the security procedures in sensitive areas, such as the air traffic control towers, will be beefed up. And there will be prescribed security protocols and sanctions for people who violate those protocols.

And fourth, the new generation of explosive detection systems will be utilized at a higher rate because of the bill we have passed today.

I think we have done a very good job. I am very pleased that we had such a bipartisan effort on this piece of legislation. It could not have happened without the House and the Senate working together and so many people who did come into the negotiations on this bill. The leadership of our chairman, JOHN MCCAIN, and our subcommittee chairman, SLADE GORTON, were essential, along with Senators HOLLINGS, INOUYE, BRYAN, and ROCKEFELLER.

I also thank the staff who worked so hard. As you know, many times Senators have 10 things that are being asked of them at any one time. Without very good staff work, this would not have passed. So I especially thank my Commerce Committee staff legislative aid, Joe Mondello, who did yeoman service in making sure the bill got through committee and worked out all the little things that came up that could have unraveled the bill and did not. On Senator MCCAIN's staff, Mike Reynolds, and Rob Chamberlin, who also did terrific work in making sure we got this expeditiously through the committee in the last hours of the session, because we did not want to wait 60 days before we could bring this back next year. It is too important.

The air traveling public deserve to have the very best airport security. That is what this bill will allow. I believe the President will sign the bill. I urge him to do so.

Thank you, Mr. President.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 106–173, announces the following appointments to the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission: The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), and Dr. Gabor S. Boritt, of Pennsylvania.

JAMES MADISON COMMEMORATION COMMISSION ACT

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. 3137.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3137) to establish a commission to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the birth of James Madison.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is passing S. 3137, the James Madison Commemoration Commission Act. I was an original cosponsor of this legislation, which will establish a bipartisan commission to recognize the life and accomplishments of James Madison on the 250th anniversary of his birth, March 16, 2001.

Among his many accomplishments, James Madison was the primary author of the U.S. Constitution, a document so brilliantly constructed that it has been amended only 27 times in our Nation's history. The first 10 amendments were ratified as our Bill of Rights in 1791, over two centuries ago. There have been just 17 additional amendments.

Our tribute to the Father of the Constitution comes in the same year that the Senate defeated no less than three ill-conceived proposals to amend his handiwork. I am proud that we were good stewards of the Constitution, and that the anniversary of Madison's birth will truly be a cause for celebration.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a second and third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 3137) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 3137

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''James Madison Commemoration Commission Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Congressional findings.
Sec. 3. Establishment.
Sec. 4. Duties.
Sec. 5. Membership.
Sec. 6. Powers.
Sec. 7. Staffing and support.
Sec. 8. Contributions.
Sec. 9. Reports.
Sec. 10. Audit of financial transactions.
Sec. 11. Termination.
Sec. 12. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) March 16, 2001, marks the 250th anniversary of the birth of James Madison;

(2) as a delegate to the Continental Congress, and to the Annapolis Convention of 1786, James Madison foresaw the need for a more effective national government and was a persuasive advocate for such a government at the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention of 1787;

(3) James Madison worked tirelessly and successfully at the Constitutional Convention to mold a national charter, the United States Constitution, that combined both energy and restraint, empowering the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary, within a framework of limited government, separated powers, and a system of federalism;

(4) James Madison was an eloquent proponent of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights;

(5) James Madison faithfully served his country as a Representative in Congress from 1789 to 1797, as Secretary of State from 1801 to 1809, and as President of the United States from 1809 to 1817;

(6) as President, James Madison showed courage and resolute will in leading the United States to victory over Great Britain in the War of 1812;

(7) James Madison's political writings, as exemplified by his Notes on the Federal Convention and his contributions to The Federalist Papers, are among the most distinguished of American state papers;

(8) by his learning, his devotion to ordered liberty, and by the force of his intellect, James Madison made an indispensable contribution to the American tradition of democratic constitutional republicanism embodied in the Constitution of the United States, and is justifiably acclaimed as father of the Constitution;

(9) it is appropriate to remember, honor, and renew the legacy of James Madison for the American people and, indeed for all mankind; and

(10) as the Nation approaches March 16, 2001, marking the anniversary of the birth of James Madison, it is appropriate to establish a commission for the commemoration of that anniversary.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT.

A commission to be known as the James Madison Commemoration Commission (in this Act referred to as the ''Commission'') and a committee to be known as the James Madison Commemoration Advisory Committee (in this Act referred to as the ''Advisory Committee'') are established.

SEC. 4. DUTIES.

(a) COMMISSION.—The Commission shall—

(1) in cooperation with the Advisory Committee and the Library of Congress, direct the Government Printing Office to compile and publish a substantial number of copies of a book (as directed by the Commission) containing a selection of the most important writings of James Madison and tributes to him by members of the Commission and other persons that the Commission deems appropriate;

(2) in cooperation with the Advisory Committee and the Library of Congress, plan and coordinate 1 or more symposia, at least 1 of which will be held on March 16, 2001, and all of which will be devoted to providing a better understanding of James Madison's contribution to American political culture;

(3) in cooperation with the Advisory Committee recognize such other events celebrating James Madison's birth and life as official events of the Commission;

(4) develop and coordinate any other activities relating to the anniversary of the birth of James Madison as may be appropriate;

(5) accept essay papers (via the Internet or otherwise) from students attending public and private institutions of elementary and secondary education in any State regarding James Madison's life and contributions to America and award certificates to students who author exceptional papers on this subject; and

(6) bestow honorary memberships to the Commission or to the Advisory Committee upon such persons as it deems appropriate.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Advisory Committee shall—

(1) submit a suggested selection of James Madison's most important writings to the Commission for the Commission to consider for inclusion in the book printed as provided in subsection (a)(1);

(2) submit a list and description of events concerning the birth and life of James Madison to the Commission for the Commission's consideration in recognizing such events as official ''Commission Events''; and

(3) make such other recommendations to the Commission as a majority of its members deem appropriate.

SEC. 5. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION.—

(1) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of 19 members, as follows:

(A) The Chief Justice of the United States or such individual's delegate who is an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

(B) The Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate or each such individual's delegate who is a Member of the Senate.

(C) The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives or each such individual's delegate who is a Member of the House of Representatives.

(D) The Chairman and the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate or each such individual's delegate who is a member of such committee.

(E) The Chairman and the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives or each such individual's delegate who is a member of such committee.

(F) Two Members of the Senate selected by the Majority Leader of the Senate and 2 Members of the Senate selected by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(G) Two members of the House of Representatives selected by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and 2 Members of the House of Representatives selected by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(H) Two members of the executive branch selected by the President of the United States.

(2) CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN.—The Chief Justice of the United States shall serve as Chairman of the Commission and the members of the Commission shall select a vice chairman from its members, unless the Chief Justice appoints a delegate to serve in his stead, in which circumstance, the members of the Commission shall select a chairman and vice chairman from its members.

(b) MEMBERSHIP OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

(1) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Advisory Committee shall be composed of 14 members, as follows:

(A) The Archivist of the United States or such individual's delegate.

(B) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution or such individual's delegate.

(C) The Executive Director of Montpelier, the home of James Madison, and the 2001 Planning Committee of Montpelier or such individual's delegate.

(D) The President of James Madison University in Harrisonburg, Virginia or such individual's delegate.

(E) The Director of the James Madison Center, James Madison University in Harrisonburg, Virginia or such individual's delegate.

(F) The President of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation or such individual's delegate.

(G) Two members, who are not Members of Congress but have expertise on the legal and

historical significance of James Madison, selected by the Majority Leader of the Senate, and 2 members, who are not Members of Congress but have expertise on the legal and historical significance of James Madison, selected by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(H) Two members, who are not Members of Congress but who have expertise on the legal and historical significance of James Madison, selected by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and 2 members, who are not Members of Congress but who have expertise on the legal and historical significance of James Madison, selected by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(2) CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN.—The members of the Advisory Committee shall select a chairman and vice chairman from its members.

(c) TERMS.—Each member of the Commission shall be selected and each member of the Advisory Committee shall be selected not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act and shall serve for the life of the Commission and the Advisory Committee, respectively.

(d) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made in subsection (a). A vacancy in the Advisory Committee shall be filled by the person holding the office named in subsection (b) or his designate.

(e) COMPENSATION.—

(1) RATES OF PAY.—Members of the Commission and the Advisory Committee shall serve without pay.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member of the Commission and the Advisory Committee may receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of its chairman or a majority of its members. The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the chairman or a majority of its members.

(g) APPROVAL OF ACTIONS.—All official actions of the Commission under this Act shall be approved by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the members. All official actions of the Advisory Committee under this Act shall be approved by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the members.

SEC. 6. POWERS.

(a) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—Any member or staff person of the Commission may, if authorized by the Commission, take any action that the Commission is authorized to take by this Act.

(b) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may procure services and property, and make or enter into contracts, leases, or other legal agreements, in order to carry out this Act.

(2) RESTRICTION.—The contracts, leases, or other legal agreements made or entered into by the Commission shall not extend beyond the date of termination of the Commission.

(3) TERMINATION.—All supplies and property acquired by the Commission under this Act that remain in the possession of the Commission on the date of termination of the Commission shall become the property of the General Services Administration upon the date of the termination.

(c) INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal agency information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the chairperson of the Commission, the head of the Federal agency shall furnish the information to the Commission.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any information that the Commission is prohibited to secure or request by another law.

(d) RULES AND REGULATIONS.—The Commission may adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary to conduct meetings and carry out its duties under this Act. The Commission may also adopt such rules for the Advisory Committee.

(e) MAILS.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other Federal agencies, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate may mail items on behalf of the Commission.

(f) NECESSARY AND PROPER POWERS.—The Commission may exercise such other powers as are necessary and proper in carrying out and effecting the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 7. STAFFING AND SUPPORT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Librarian of Congress shall provide the Commission and the Advisory Committee with such assistance, including staff support, facilities, and supplies at no charge, as may be necessary to carry out its duties.

SEC. 8. CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) DONATIONS.—The Commission may accept donations of money, personal services, and property, both real and personal, including books, manuscripts, miscellaneous printed matter, memorabilia, relics, and other materials related to James Madison.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any funds donated to the Commission may be used by the Commission to carry out this Act. The source and amount of such funds shall be listed in the interim and final reports required under section 9.

(2) PROCUREMENT REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any procurement requirement otherwise applicable to the Commission, the Commission shall conduct procurements of property or services involving donated funds pursuant to the small purchase procedures required by section 303(g) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(g)). Section 15(j) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(j)) shall not apply to such procurements.

(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ''donated funds'' means any funds of which 50 percent or more derive from funds donated to the Commission.

(c) VOLUNTEER SERVICES.—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, United States Code, the Commission may accept and use voluntary and uncompensated services as the Commission determines necessary.

(d) REMAINING FUNDS.—Funds remaining upon the date of termination of the Commission shall be used to ensure the proper disposition of property donated to the Commission as specified in the final report required by section 9.

SEC. 9. REPORTS.

(a) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than February 15, 2001, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the President and Congress an interim report detailing the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of funds received and expended by the Commission, during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2000.

(b) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than February 15, 2002, the Commission shall submit to the President and to Congress a final report containing—

(1) a summary of the activities of the Commission;

(2) a final accounting of funds received and expended by the Commission;

(3) the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Commission;

(4) specific recommendations concerning the final disposition of historically significant items donated to the Commission under section 8(a), if any; and

(5) any additional views of any member of the Commission concerning the Commission's recommendations that such member requests to be included in the final report.

SEC. 10. AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the General Services Administration shall audit financial transactions of the Commission, including financial transactions involving donated funds, in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. In conducting an audit pursuant to this section, the Inspector General shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and other papers, items, or property in use by the Commission, as necessary to facilitate the audit, and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians.

(b) AUDIT REPORTS.—Not later than March 15, 2001, the Inspector General of the General Services Administration shall submit to the President and to Congress a report detailing the results of any audit of the financial transactions of the Commission conducted before January 1, 2001. Not later than March 15, 2002, such Inspector General shall submit to the President and to Congress a report detailing the results of any audit of the financial transactions of the Commission conducted during the period beginning on January 1, 2001, and ending on December 31, 2001.

SEC. 11. TERMINATION.

The Commission and the Advisory Committee shall terminate not later than 60 days following submission of the final report required by section 9.

SEC. 12. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $250,000 for fiscal year 2001.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF DANGEROUS CRIMINALS ACT OF 1999

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 859, S. 1898.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1898) to provide protection against the risks to the public that are inherent in the interstate transportation of violent prisoners.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Juidiciary, with an amendment; as follows:

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic.]

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Interstate Transportation of Dangerous Criminals Act of 2000'' or ''Jeanna's Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Increasingly, States are turning to private prisoner transport companies as an alternative to their own personnel or the United States Marshals Service when transporting violent prisoners.

(2) The transport process can last for days if not weeks, as violent prisoners are dropped off and picked up at a network of hubs across the country.

(3) Escapes by violent prisoners during transport by private prisoner transport companies have occurred.

(4) Oversight by the Attorney General is required to address these problems.

(5) While most governmental entities may prefer to use, and will continue to use, fully trained and sworn law enforcement officers when transporting violent prisoners, fiscal or logistical concerns may make the use of highly specialized private prisoner transport companies an option. Nothing in this Act should be construed to mean that governmental entities should contract with private prisoner transport companies to move violent prisoners; however when a government entity opts to use a private prisoner transport company to move violent prisoners, then the company should be subject to regulation in order to enhance public safety.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CRIME OF VIOLENCE.—The term ''crime of violence'' has the same meaning as in section 924(c)(3) of title 18, United States Code.

(2) PRIVATE PRISONER TRANSPORT COMPANY.—The term ''private prisoner transport company'' means any entity, other than the United States, a State, or an inferior political subdivision of a State, which engages in the business of the transporting for compensation, individuals committed to the custody of any State or of an inferior political subdivision of a State, or any attempt thereof.

(3) VIOLENT PRISONER.—The term ''violent prisoner'' means any individual in the custody of a State or an inferior political subdivision of a State who has previously been convicted of or is currently charged with a crime of violence or any similar statute of a State or the inferior political subdivisions of a State, or any attempt thereof.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL REGULATION OF PRISONER TRANSPORT COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the American Correctional Association and the private prisoner transport industry, shall promulgate regulations relating to the transportation of violent prisoners in or affecting interstate commerce.

(b) STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations shall include the following:

(1) Minimum standards for background checks and preemployment drug testing for potential employees, including requiring criminal background checks, to disqualify persons with a felony conviction or domestic violence conviction as defined by section 921 of title 18, United States Code, for eligibility for employment. Preemployment drug testing will be in accordance with applicable State laws.

(2) Minimum standards for the length and type of training that employees must undergo before they can transport prisoners not to exceed 100 hours of preservice training focusing on the transportation of prisoners. Training shall be in the areas of use of restraints, searches, use of force, including use of appropriate weapons and firearms, CPR, map reading, and defensive driving.

(3) Restrictions on the number of hours that employees can be on duty during a given time period. Such restriction shall not be more stringent than current applicable rules and regulations concerning hours of service promulgated under the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Act.

(4) Minimum standards for the number of personnel that must supervise violent prisoners. Such standards shall provide the transport entity with appropriate discretion, and, absent more restrictive requirements contracted for by the procuring government entity, shall not exceed a requirement of 1 agent for every 6 violent prisoners.

(5) Minimum standards for employee uniforms and identification that require wearing of a uniform with a badge or insignia identifying the employee as a transportation officer.

(6) Standards establishing categories of violent prisoners required to wear brightly colored clothing clearly identifying them as prisoners, when appropriate.

(7) Minimum requirements for the restraints that must be used when transporting violent prisoners, to include leg shackles and double-locked handcuffs, when appropriate.

(8) A requirement that when transporting violent prisoners, private prisoner transport companies notify local law enforcement officials 24 hours in advance of any scheduled stops in their jurisdiction.

(9) A requirement that in the event of an escape by a violent prisoner, private prisoner transport company officials shall immediately notify appropriate law enforcement officials in the jurisdiction where the escape occurs, and the governmental entity that contracted with the private prisoner transport company for the transport of the escaped violent prisoner.

(10) Minimum standards for the safety of violent prisoners in accordance with applicable Federal and State law.

(c) FEDERAL STANDARDS.—Except for the requirements of subsection (b)(6), the regulations promulgated under this Act shall not provide stricter standards with respect to private prisoner transport companies than are applicable, without exception, to the United States Marshals Service, Federal Bureau of Prisons, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service when transporting violent prisoners under comparable circumstances.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) PENALTY.—Any person who is found in violation of the regulations established by this Act shall—

(1) be liable to the United States for a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed $10,000 for each violation and, in addition, to the United States for the costs of prosecution; and

(2) make restitution to any entity of the United States, of a State, or of an inferior political subdivision of a State, which expends funds for the purpose of apprehending any violent prisoner who escapes from a prisoner transport company as the result, in whole or in part, of a violation of regulations promulgated pursuant to section 4(a).

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for S. 1898, the Interstate Transportation of Dangerous Criminals Act, also known as ''Jeanna's bill.'' I worked with Senator DORGAN in developing this legislation, which passed the Judiciary Committee in September with unanimous bipartisan support. I praise Senator DORGAN's leadership, and am proud to be an original cosponsor.

Kyle Bell was sentenced to life in prison for the brutal murder of 11-year old Jeanna North. On October 13, 1999, Bell escaped, while being transferred interstate by a private prisoner transport company. He picked the locks on his handcuffs and leg irons, and slipped off the bus while it was stopped for gas in New Mexico. He was wearing his own street clothes and shoes. The guards did not notice that Bell was missing until nine hours later, and then delayed in notifying New Mexico authorities.

Kyle Bell's escape is not an isolated case. In recent years, there have been several escapes by violent criminals when vans operated by private prisoner transport companies broke down or guards fell asleep on duty. There have also been an alarming number of traffic accidents in which prisoners were seriously injured or killed because drivers were tired, inattentive or poorly trained.

Privatization of prisons and prisoner transportation services may be cost efficient, but public safety must come first. Jeanna's bill, S.1898, requires the Attorney General to establish some basic, common-sense guidelines for private companies that transport violent criminals across State lines, including:

minimum standards for pre-employment background checks;

minimum standards for training employees;

minimum standards for the identification, restraint, and safety of violent prisoners; and

a requirement that private prisoner transport companies notify local law enforcement in advance of any stops in their jurisdiction.

A violation is punishable by a $10,000 fine, plus restitution for the cost of recapturing any violent prisoner who escapes as the result of such violation. This should create a healthy incentive for companies to abide by the regulations and operate responsibly.

As Senator DORGAN has pointed out, a company hauling hazardous waste, cattle, or even circus animals has to meet certain minimum standards. Yet there are no requirements for hauling violent criminals around the country.

Jeanna's bill has been endorsed by a wide range of law enforcement and victims' rights groups, including the National Sheriff's Association, the National Association of Police Organizations, the Fraternal Order of Police, the California Correctional Peace Officers Association, the New York Correctional Officers and Police Benevolent Association, the National Organization of Parents of Murdered Children, the KlassKids Foundation, and many others. It will go a long way toward preventing more violent criminals from escaping. I am pleased that the Senate is finally passing this important legislation, and urge the House of Representatives to do the same.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute be agreed to, the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1898), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3239, introduced earlier

today by Senators HELMS and KENNEDY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3239) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide special immigrant status for certain United States international broadcasting employees.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 3239) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 3239

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

SECTION 1. SPECIAL IMMIGRANT STATUS FOR CERTAIN UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING EMPLOYEES.

(a) SPECIAL IMMIGRANT CATEGORY.—Section 101(a)(27) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (K);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (L); and

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

''(M) subject to the numerical limitations of section 203(b)(4), an immigrant who seeks to enter the United States to work as a broadcaster in the United States for the International Broadcasting Bureau of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, or for a grantee of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and the immigrant's accompanying spouse and children.''.

(b) NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(4)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and not more than 100 may be made available in any fiscal year to special immigrants, excluding spouses and children, who are described in section 101(a)(27)(M)''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to visas made available in any fiscal year beginning on or after October 1, 2000.

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER CONFIDENTIALITY ACT OF 2000

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of H.R. 3218, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3218) to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit the appearance of Social Security account numbers on or through unopened mailings of checks or other drafts issued on public money in the Treasury.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3218) was read the third time and passed.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS IN BELARUS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. Con. Res. 153 and the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 153) expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the parliamentary elections held in Belarus on October 15, 2000, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 153) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 153

Whereas on October 15, 2000, Aleksandr Lukashenko and his authoritarian regime conducted an illegitimate and undemocratic parliamentary election in an effort to further strengthen the power and control his authoritarian regime exercises over the people of the Republic of Belarus;

Whereas during the time preceding this election the regime of Aleksandr Lukashenko attempted to intimidate the democratic opposition by beating, harassing, arresting, and sentencing its members for supporting a boycott of the October 15 election even though Belarus does not contain a legal ban on efforts to boycott elections;

Whereas the democratic opposition in Belarus was denied fair and equal access to state-controlled television and radio and was instead slandered by the state-controlled media;

Whereas on September 13, 2000, Belarusian police seized 100,000 copies of a special edition of the Belarusian Free Trade Union newspaper, Rabochy, dedicated to the democratic opposition's efforts to promote a boycott of the October 15 election;

Whereas Aleksandr Lukashenko and his regime denied the democratic opposition in Belarus seats on the Central Election Commission, thereby violating his own pledge to provide the democratic opposition a role in this Commission;

Whereas Aleksandr Lukashenko and his regime denied the vast majority of independent candidates opposed to his regime the right to register as candidates in this election;

Whereas Aleksandr Lukashenko and his regime dismissed recommendations presented by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) for making the election law in Belarus consistent with OSCE standards;

Whereas in Grodno, police loyal to Aleksandr Lukashenko summoned voters to participate in this illegitimate election for parliament;

Whereas the last genuinely free and fair parliamentary election in Belarus took place in 1995 and from it emerged the 13th Supreme Soviet whose democratically and constitutionally derived authorities and powers have been undercut by the authoritarian regime of Aleksandr Lukashenko; and

Whereas on October 11, the Lukashenko regime froze the bank accounts and seized the equipment of the independent publishing company, Magic, where most of the independent newspapers in Minsk are published: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BELARUS PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS.

Congress hereby—

(1) declares that—

(A) the period preceding the elections held in Belarus held on October 15, 2000, was plagued by continued human rights abuses and a climate of fear for which the regime of Aleksandr Lukashenko is responsible;

(B) these elections were conducted in the absence of a democratic electoral law;

(C) the Lukashenko regime purposely denied the democratic opposition access to state-controlled media; and

(D) these elections were for seats in a parliament that lacks real constitutional power and democratic legitimacy;

(2) declares its support for the Belarus' democratic opposition, commends the efforts of the opposition to boycott these illegitimate parliamentary elections, and expresses the hopes of Congress that the citizens of Belarus will soon benefit from true freedom and democracy;

(3) reaffirms its recognition of the 13th Supreme Soviet as the sole and democratically and constitutionally legitimate legislative body of Belarus; and

(4) notes that, as the legitimate parliament of Belarus, the 13th Supreme Soviet should continue to represent Belarus in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DISAPPEARANCES OF INDIVIDUALS AND POLITICAL DETENTIONS IN BELARUS.

It is the sense of Congress that the President should call upon Aleksandr Lukashenko and his regime to—

(1) provide a full accounting of the disappearances of individuals in that country, including the disappearance of Viktor Gonchar, Anatoly Krasovsky, Yuri Zakharenka, and Dmitry Zavadsky; and

(2) release Vladimir Kudinov, Andrei Klimov, and all others imprisoned in Belarus for their political views.

SEC. 3. TRANSMITTAL OF RESOLUTION.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President.

JAMES GUELFF BODY ARMOR ACT OF 2000

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 733, S. 783, by Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 783) to limit access to body armor by violent felons and to facilitate the donation of Federal surplus body armor to State and local law enforcement agencies.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, as follows:

(Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic.)

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''James Guelff Body Armor Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) nationally, police officers and ordinary citizens are facing increased danger as criminals use more deadly weaponry, body armor, and other sophisticated assault gear;

(2) crime at the local level is exacerbated by the interstate movement of body armor and other assault gear;

(3) there is a traffic in body armor moving in or otherwise affecting interstate commerce, and existing Federal controls over such traffic do not adequately enable the States to control this traffic within their own borders through the exercise of their police power;

(4) recent incidents, such as the murder of San Francisco Police Officer James Guelff by an assailant wearing 2 layers of body armor and a 1997 bank shoot out in north Hollywood, California, between police and 2 heavily armed suspects outfitted in body armor, demonstrate the serious threat to community safety posed by criminals who wear body armor during the commission of a violent crime;

(5) of the approximately 1,200 officers killed in the line of duty since 1980, more than 30 percent could have been saved by body armor, and the risk of dying from gunfire is 14 times higher for an officer without a bulletproof vest;

(6) the Department of Justice has estimated that 25 percent of State and local police are not issued body armor;

(7) the Federal Government is well-equipped to grant local police departments access to body armor that is no longer needed by Federal agencies; and

(8) Congress has the power, under the interstate commerce clause and other provisions of the Constitution of the United States, to enact legislation to regulate interstate commerce that affects the integrity and safety of our communities.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BODY ARMOR.—The term ''body armor'' means any product sold or offered for sale, in interstate or foreign commerce, as personal protective body covering intended to protect against gunfire, regardless of whether the product is to be worn alone or is sold as a complement to another product or garment.

(2) LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The term ''law enforcement agency'' means an agency of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(3) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term ''law enforcement officer'' means any officer, agent, or employee of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENT OF SENTENCING GUIDELINES WITH RESPECT TO BODY ARMOR.

(a) SENTENCING ENHANCEMENT.—The United States Sentencing Commission shall amend the Federal sentencing guidelines to provide an appropriate sentencing enhancement, increasing the offense level not less than 2 levels, for any offense in which the defendant used body armor.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—No amendment made to the Federal Sentencing Guidelines pursuant to this section shall apply if the Federal offense in which the body armor is used constitutes a violation of, attempted violation of, or conspiracy to violate the civil rights of any person by a law enforcement officer acting under color of the authority of such law enforcement officer.

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION OF PURCHASE, USE, OR POSSESSION OF BODY ARMOR BY VIOLENT FELONS.

(a) DEFINITION OF BODY ARMOR.—Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(35) The term 'body armor' means any product sold or offered for sale, in interstate or foreign commerce, as personal protective body covering intended to protect against gunfire, regardless of whether the product is to be worn alone or is sold as a complement to another product or garment.''.

(b) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 931. Prohibition on purchase, ownership, or possession of body armor by violent felons

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall be unlawful for a person to purchase, own, or possess body armor, if that person has been convicted of a felony that is—

''(1) a crime of violence (as defined in section 16); or

''(2) an offense under State law that would constitute a crime of violence under paragraph (1) if it occurred within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

''(b) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be an affirmative defense under this section that—

''(A) the defendant obtained prior written certification from his or her employer that the defendant's purchase, use, or possession of body armor was necessary for the safe performance of lawful business activity; and

''(B) the use and possession by the defendant were limited to the course of such performance.

''(2) EMPLOYER.—In this subsection, the term 'employer' means any other individual employed by the defendant's business that supervises defendant's activity. If that defendant has no supervisor, prior written certification is acceptable from any other employee of the business.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''931. Prohibition on purchase, ownership, or possession of body armor by violent felons.''.

(c) PENALTIES.—Section 924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) Whoever knowingly violates section 931 shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.''.

SEC. 6. DONATION OF FEDERAL SURPLUS BODY ARMOR TO STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''Federal agency'' and ''surplus property'' have the meanings given such terms under section 3 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 472).

(b) DONATION OF BODY ARMOR.—Notwithstanding section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484), the head of a Federal agency may donate body armor directly to any State or local law enforcement agency, if such body armor is—

(1) in serviceable condition; and

(2) surplus property.

(c) NOTICE TO ADMINISTRATOR.—The head of a Federal agency who donates body armor under this section shall submit to the Administrator of General Services a written notice identifying the amount of body armor donated and each State or local law enforcement agency that received the body armor.

(d) DONATION BY CERTAIN OFFICERS.—

(1) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—In the administration of this section with respect to the Department of Justice, in addition to any other officer of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General, the following officers may act as the head of a Federal agency:

(A) The Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

(B) The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(C) The Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

(D) The Director of the United States Marshals Service.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.—In the administration of this section with respect to the Department of the Treasury, in addition to any other officer of the Department of the Treasury designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, the following officers may act as the head of a Federal agency:

(A) The Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms.

(B) The Commissioner of Customs.

(C) The Director of the United States Secret Service.

(e) NO LIABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States shall not be liable for any harm occurring in connection with the use or misuse of any body armor donated under this section.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be agreed to, the bill be considered read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 783), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

CELEBRATING THE BIRTH OF JAMES MADISON AND HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE NATION

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H. Con. Res. 396.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 396) celebrating the birth of James Madison and his contributions to the Nation.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 396) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING COLLEAGUES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I will take a few minutes this evening to talk about a person who is a colleague in the sense that I have worked with him for 25 years in my office in Connecticut. He has recently retired. I will also discuss three colleagues here in the U.S. Senate who have announced their retirement. As we, hopefully, arrive at the closing of this session, I want to take a couple of moments to share my thoughts about these three colleagues. I will speak about two other colleagues tomorrow or the next day, if I can, so as not to consume too much time this evening because colleagues may want to be heard on other matters.

TRIBUTE TO STANLEY ISRAELITE

Mr. DODD. First, I want to pay tribute to a man that has literally been like a father, brother, and uncle to me, and a close confidant for a quarter of a century. I affectionately call him ''the coach.'' Stanley Israelite has been with me in my office from the very first day in January of 1975 when I was sworn into the House of Representatives, until just months ago when, at age 75, he retired from the service of the U.S. Senate and service to me as a Member of the House and the Senate.

There are many words to describe Stanley Israelite and the many roles in my life and the lives of countless others in Connecticut and the country that he has served as a friend, counselor, trusted advisor, and faithful public servant. While these words can describe what he has been, there are really no words to describe what he has meant, particularly to me and to literally hundreds of others who have been blessed to know him and have been affected by the work he has performed on their behalf. It is equally the case that there are no words to express my true feelings of deep gratitude for Stanley's service and my personal sadness that he is retiring from the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, in a recent edition of the New London Day, a local paper in Connecticut, the headline read ''Israelite Enjoys Retirement for Day, Then Joins NCDC''—the Norwich Community Development Corporation. That one headline fairly well sums up Stanley's remarkable life of service. For almost 75 years, he has led a life of tireless devotion to the things that endure in this life: faith, family, compassion for the less fortunate, integrity, and great humility.

While many think of him as a quintessential public servant, Stanley Israelite's roots actually lie in the world of small business. His first occupation, after serving in the U.S. military, was helping to run his father's jewelry store in Norwich, Connecticut. He would later serve as an officer of the Norwich Chamber of Commerce and then became director of it. In fact, he was director when he joined me as a freshman member of the House. Subsequently, he was elected as a member of the City Council in his beloved hometown of Norwich, Connecticut, and was chosen to serve as commissioner to the Norwich Department of Public Utilities.

In his ''spare time,'' he was corporator of the William W. Backus Hospital in Norwich, the former Norwich Savings Society, and the Norwich Free Academy, one of the oldest, if not the oldest, public high schools in America.

In the 1970s, he served as head of the Norwich Community Development Corporation. In that role, he oversaw the establishment of the Norwich Industrial Park. I know a lot of industrial parks built today are rather commonplace, but this was one of the first and one of the most unique in the State of Connecticut and across the country. This facility embodies Stanley's vision of a thriving economic community in southeastern Connecticut, and he created it while maintaining the wonderful topography and environmental integrity of that part of the city of Norwich.

It represents, in many ways—in stone, metal, glass, and the environment that surrounds it—the deep commitment of this remarkable man to make life better for those around him. As one former State Senator recently said of Stanley's work on the Norwich Industrial Park, ''It's high time we name the park after him.'' I second that thought.

For the past 25 years, I have had the great privilege of knowing Stanley as a member of my staff. He served as my State director and senior advisor for a quarter century. But what truly distinguished Stanley was not the title that he held in my office, but his rock-solid sense of purpose. Stanley was with me on the very first day that I was sworn in as a new Member of Congress. Every single day, 7 days a week, I had at least one conversation with Stanley Israelite. I never made an important decision—very few decisions at all—without discussing them with Stanley and getting his solid advice as to how we ought to proceed. Early in my very first term, I remember being out with Stanley for dinner one night. In talking about the job and how the job ought to be done, he listened to me patiently, as he oftentimes did, go on at some length about the work and the projects we wanted to be involved in, the major issues affecting Electric Boat and all these important institutions in my congressional district. After I went on for some time, I turned to Stanley and asked him what he thought. I can almost hear him exactly. He said, ''I am going to tell you one thing about this job.'' He paused and he just said, ''Never forget the people.''

With those words, Stanley Israelite embarked on a 25-year career with me, on a path and a journey that has been a joy every single day. I am constantly reminded by Stanley and by his words and deeds that our job is to never forget the people. For 25 years, he has been a champion of those who too often are ignored, the underdogs, the ill, the elderly, the frail—those who didn't have anybody to speak for them. For Stanley, every person does count. No matter is too small for his attention. For him, a constituent's problem became his problem. Words like ''I can't help you,'' ''try another office,'' ''later,'' or ''no,'' simply were not in Stanley's vocabulary.

In November of 1995, U.S. News and World Report published what they call their ''Portraits of 12 Indispensable Americans.'' I am proud to tell you today that one of those 12 indispensable Americans was the man I speak about this evening, Stanley Israelite.

I ask unanimous consent that that profile of Stanley Israelite contained in the publication of U.S. News and World Report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATOR'S AIDE—HOUNDING THE BUREAUCRATS

(By James Popkin)

Lots of people's problems with their government aren't ideological, they're logistical. That's why many rely on the congressional aides like Stanley Israelite to help them fight their battles with government agencies.

At 70, Stanley Israelite is fighting a crusade to prove the cynics wrong. Since 1975, when the gravely voiced former Brooklynite first went to work for then Rep. Christopher Dodd (now a senator), Israelite has helped thousands of Connecticut citizens replace lost passports, track down late tax refunds, ship dearly departeds to grieving families overseas and even bail the occasional misbehaving Connecticut teenager out of Mexican jails.

All successful members of Congress have staffers like Israelite who can goose reluctant bureaucrats into action. Although Dodd happens to be a Democrat, effective constituent service is a congressional specialty that cuts across political lines. It's first and foremost a matter of good politics: Good service results in happy voters. But what distinguishes Israelite is his gusto for the job. And his not-so-artful technique. ''When I call an agency because somebody is waiting for her Social Security check or a guy is waiting for an FHA loan and the agency gives me some song and dance, I try to let them know I'm not gonna take any of their crap,'' he

says. ''At times, I tell them I've discussed this problem with the senator. Sometimes, it isn't true.''

A former jewelry store owner and Chamber of Commerce honcho from Norwich, Conn., Israelite is Dodd's pipeline to many of the state's small-business owners. Harry Jackson, a life-long Republican who is the City Council president in Norwich, recalls how difficult it was to get a meeting with officials from the Environmental Protection Agency when the city wanted to build a new firehouse on federal land. ''Stan got us in there after just one phone call,'' says Jackson, who ultimately built the firehouse.

''Things happened.'' Don Daren says Israelite was a life-saver in 1981, when a state-based paper distributor was trying to secure a $900,000 umbrella loan from the Connecticut Development Authority. Daren, who owns the Arrow Paper Supply & Food Co., says it was going to take forever for the CDA to process his loan papers so he could buy a new warehouse. ''Stanley told them [CDA officials] my problem, and things happened right away,'' says Daren, whose business has grown from 36 workers then to nearly 200 today. ''He has his own constituency. People like Stanley.''

Ideally, says veteran Hartford Courant political columnist Don Noel, senators like Dodd would use their clout on Capitol Hill to fix bureaucracies and make them more consumer friendly—eliminating the need for taxpayer-financed ombudsmen like Israelite. But since that goal seems unattainable, Noel figures that Israelite plays a vital role. ''If you have something you need the senator to do for you, if anyone can do it, Stanley can,'' he says.

Israelite admits that he is motivated by a desire to help re-elect Dodd. But he adds: ''Part of what drives me is knowing that there's someplace where somebody can go when they are not getting anyplace.''

One of the great honors of my life has been to have Stanley by my side during very important moments—almost every important moment in the past 25 years. Many times when I received the applause as the elected official, the Congressman or the Senator, I knew the person who truly deserved the applause was Stan Israelite.

No tribute to Stanley would be complete without mentioning his wonderful family: his beloved and recently departed wife Pauline, who was as great and close a friend as Stanley; his son Michael and daughter-in-law Donna; his son John; his daughter Abby and son-in-law Bill Dolliver; his daughter Mindy and son-in-law Bill Wilkie; his siblings; and, not least, six wonderful grandchildren. To them I extend my heartfelt gratitude for sharing this remarkable man with me and so many others for a quarter century.

There are few words to describe Stanley that would adequately describe what he has done. No words will describe what he meant to countless individuals. For me, there is sadness that he has retired from my office in the Senate, but there is great comfort in knowing he will continue to work on behalf of the people of our State and his community, and will continue to be a close friend and incredibly important part of my life. So today, there is no need for goodbyes but only these words: Thank you, Coach.

When he departed, he said, ''I am leaving the Senate, but not CHRIS DODD.'' I can say this to Stanley: You may have left my office, but you will never be very far away when I need you for that sound counsel and good advice you gave me for a quarter century. I thank this wonderful man for his service to me, to our State, and to the country.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING SENATORS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to talk about three colleagues that are retiring. There are five, actually, but I will get to them later. I don't want to do it all at once tonight. I will speak about three of them: Senators RICHARD BRYAN, BOB KERREY, and FRANK LAUTENBERG. Later I will talk about CONNIE MACK and Senator PAT MOYNIHAN, who have also made decisions to retire from the Senate. They will be casting their last votes as Members of the Senate in the next three days. I want to take a few minutes in these remaining hours to pay tribute to these three individuals who will be leaving the Congress at the end of this session.

All three of these individuals have served with great distinction in this body. All have made a mark on our Nation for which this country will be grateful for generations to come. All will be missed by those of us who will remain in this body, not to mention by the people of their respective States and people across this country.

Let me first speak, if I may, about my good friend DICK BRYAN of Nevada. Few, if any, of our colleagues have come to this institution having already achieved as much distinction in public service as DICK BRYAN.

Long before he set foot on the floor of this U.S. Senate, he had accomplished a great deal for the people of his beloved State of Nevada. He is the first person in the history of that State to have served as Attorney General, Governor, and then U.S. Senator.

Senator BRYAN did not come to the Senate to sit on passed laurels and achievements. He did what he has done in every position of public trust he has ever held, even going back to his term as the president of his eighth great class at Park Elementary School; he went to work on behalf of the people he was elected to represent.

He went to work for consumers. As the former chairman of the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee, Senator BRYAN successfully fought to have airbags installed in all automobiles sold in the United States. Some viewed this as a highly risky cause to champion as a politician—promoting airbags. It is thought that a Senator should avoid at all costs having his or her name associated with something like airbags.

But Senator BRYAN was not deterred. And today, thanks to him, hundreds of lives are saved every year by a feature that is now standard issue in American automobiles. Every day, when tens of millions of Americans drive to work, school, or the store, they can thank DICK BRYAN for making sure that their trip will be a safer one than it otherwise would have been.

Senator BRYAN also worked with a large coalition of children's advocates to enact new protections for Internet privacy. He led the fight to strengthen the laws governing the credit reporting industry, which is so crucial to the ability of virtually every American to obtain a home, a car, and a loan for any other modern necessity. And he took the lead in crafting legislation to reduce telemarketing fraud, which preys on so many elderly and other vulnerable citizens.

Aside from his record as a consumer advocate, DICK BRYAN is perhaps best known for his work on behalf of his state and its residents. We are all familiar with the tenacity with which he and his colleague Senator REID have worked to prevent the Nevada Test Site at Yucca Mountain from being designated as an interim storage facility for the nation's nuclear waste. I have myself known the unique pleasure of being visited by Senator BRYAN and Senator REID about this matter.

I have also admired Senator BRYAN's efforts to protect Nevada's lands, particularly in the southern part of the state. Because of his efforts, all proceeds from the sale of lands in that part of the state must be spent within the state. That's a plan that no other state enjoys, and it is a tribute to DICK BRYAN's legislative skills.

I would be remiss if I failed to mention the important work that Senator BRYAN has performed as a member of the Senate Ethics Committee and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

These are important and sensitive committees on which to serve. It is a reflection of the high esteem in which he is held by his colleagues that he served on these committees—and did so, I might add, with discretion and with distinction.

In sum, Mr. President, RICHARD BRYAN has spent his two terms in the Senate working hard and working effectively—for consumers, for his constituents, for a stronger intelligence-gathering function by the United States, and for a stronger United States Senate. He has been an outstanding leader and a good friend. We wish him, his wife Bonnie, their children and grandchildren well as they begin the next phase of their life together.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR KERREY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in a few short days, Senator KERREY will also be among our five colleagues bringing to an end their tenure in here in the Senate. I think all of us understand his decision and respect it, but I think we regret it.

Like Senator BRYAN, Senator KERREY is a former governor of his state. Like him, he has served in the Senate for two terms. And like Senator

BRYAN, Senator KERREY has left a lasting mark on this institution, on his state, and on our country.

The outlines of this remarkable man's resume are known to many of us. BOB KERREY served with distinction in the Navy, and today is the only Member of Congress to have earned a Medal of Honor for his heroism in combat duty during the Vietnam war. He became a successful businessman in Omaha.

He was elected Governor of Nebraska in 1982. It was a time when few Democrats were running for—much less winning—state-wide offices, particularly in his part of the country. And it was a time when our entire country was mired in a recession, particularly in Nebraska and other farm states, which were suffering through the worst economic conditions since the Great Depression.

As Governor, BOB KERREY met the challenge of eliminating a serious budget deficit. In fact, he balanced his state's budget every year, helping to turn that deficit into a surplus. He also initiated innovative reforms in welfare, education, job training, and environmental protection.

In the opinion of his constituents and many others, BOB KERREY was proving himself to be an outstanding public servant. He established himself as someone willing to make tough decisions.

He showed that he has an ability to see ''around the corner'' and think ''outside the box'' by initiating thoughtful, creative, and effective policies for the benefit of the people of his beloved state of Nebraska.

But it can be said that public service has always needed BOB KERREY more than BOB KERREY has needed public service. He has never been one to assume that his gifts of leadership and his curiosity about life's meaning and purpose can only be satisfied by holding elected office. Despite his impressive record as Governor, and despite his strong public approval ratings, he declined to run for re-election and took leave of public life. He headed to southern California, where he taught a course on the Vietnam war to college students—readily admitting that one of the chief reasons for accepting that position was to wait out the worst months of the Nebraska winter on a warm beach.

Two years later, the people of Nebraska sent him to the United States Senate—to the good fortune not only of his constituents, but of his new colleagues and the American people. As a member of the Finance Committee, Agriculture Committee, Appropriations Committee, and Select Committee on Intelligence, he worked diligently to strengthen family farmers, small businesses, and our nation's vital intelligence-gathering agencies.

He also dedicated himself to perhaps the most important and intractable domestic policy question facing our nation: entitlement reform. He chaired the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement and Tax Reform—which has produced what many regard as the definitive analysis of the entitlement system. He served on the National Commission on the Future of Medicare, proposing thoughtful ideas for health care reform. He also co-chaired the National Commission on Restructuring the Internal Revenue Service, where he developed some of the most sweeping reforms of IRS operations ever instituted.

Not all of Senator KERREY's ideas on entitlement reform have been adopted or even embraced. But each and every one of them has merited the careful consideration of our colleagues and of the country as a whole.

That in itself is the great tribute to the work of this fine Senator.

Like a sentry on the watch, his words of caution and warning will reverberate through the Halls of Congress long after his departure. He has persistently shone a light on the looming and inescapable demographic fact that retirees are growing in numbers that will soon overwhelm our present ability to sustain them under the umbrella of Social Security and Medicare.

He has done so not with the shrill self-righteousness that some bring to a cause about which they feel great passion. He has done so with conviction, humor, and humility. For his words of warning, and for the way in which he has uttered them, this body and our nation owe him a debt of gratitude.

Now he prepares to move on to academia, where he will become president of New School University in New York City. I come from a family of educators, and when BOB told me of his decision, my first reaction was: are you sure that you want to do this? If you think sitting through a markup or a hearing can be tedious, just wait until that first faculty meeting. And wait until you get a visit from an orange-haired undergraduate seeking special credit for his graffiti art. That will put your patience and problem-solving skills to the test.

But BOB will not be deterred. And I suspect that, as he has done throughout his career, he will shape his office and place more than it will shape him. He will bring his rare gifts of leadership to the higher education students and faculty with whom he will come in touch. I know I am joined by all of my colleagues in wishing him well, and I look forward to many more years of his friendship and his leadership. I don't believe America is through with BOB KERREY yet.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LAUTENBERG

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to another of our retiring colleagues, Senator LAUTENBERG.

FRANK LAUTENBERG is a remarkable man in a great many respects. He has lived the American dream, and devoted his life in public service to making the American dream alive and available to each and every American—regardless of race, creed, or station in life. He has made a lasting and indelible mark on the laws of our nation—and in the process made our nation a better place for all.

The son of immigrants, FRANK was born in Paterson, New Jersey. His family moved some twelve times during his boyhood in search of work. His father spent most of his time laboring in the silk mills of Paterson.

FRANK served in World War Two in the European theater. He attended Columbia University on the G.I. bill. After graduating from Columbia, he and two boyhood friends began a business. As chairman and CEO, it grew to become one of the largest computer services companies in the world.

FRANK became a very successful man financially. The time came when he decided to give something back to the country that had given him and his family so very much. For the past 18 years in the Senate, that is exactly what FRANK LAUTENBERG has done.

FRANK is one of those rare people who rises to a high place in life and never forgets where he came from. He did not pull up the ladder of opportunity once he had climbed it. He fought to keep it in place and make it stronger for those who came after him. He has always, I think, seen a bit of himself in the faces of the children and working people whom he has served.

It so happens that one of America's finest poets, William Carlos Williams also called Paterson, NJ his home. Williams was a doctor. He made house calls, carrying his black medical bag up and down the stairs of Paterson's tenements. He wrote poems at night, or scratched them out during brief intervals of his busy days tending to the sick and scared. He wrote once that there are ''No ideas but in things''. FRANK LAUTENBERG must intuitively graps the meaning of Williams poetry. For him, the noble ideas that have motivated his public service have taken shape in the things he had done—in the resources he has brought home to the people of his state, and in the laws he has written on behalf of all Americans.

In his eighteen years as a United States Senator, FRANK LAUTENBERG has amassed a remarkable record of public achievement. There are few areas of environmental, transportation, budget, and anti-crime policy that have not benefited from his careful mind and strong hand.

On the environment, FRANK helped write landmark legislation to cleanse our air, provide safer drinking water, and clean up more toxic waste sites. He authored measure to make America's beaches cleaner, and to ban the ocean dumping of sewage.

He has shaped our nation's transportation policy. FRANK understands as few others do that our nation can only grow and prosper to the degree that it is able to move people, goods, and services safely and efficiently. Along with

Senator MOYNIHAN and others, his leadership has been instrumental in ensuring some modicum of balance in our funding for mass transit as opposed to roads and highways. He has been a leader in the ongoing effort to support Amtrak and the important cause of commuter and intercity passenger rail service, which can do so much to reduce traffic congestion and keep our air clean.

And no one has done more to promote transportation safety, on the road as well as in the air. FRANK LAUTENBERG authored the law to establish 21 as the legal drinking age, and to ban smoking on airplanes. And he is responsible more than anyone else for the landmark provision in this year's transportation appropriations bill lowering the legal standard for intoxication to .08 percent blood alcohol content. The drinking age law alone as saved an estimated 12,000 lives since its enactment in 1984. It's estimated that his ''.08'' measure will save an additional 600 lives each year in this country.

FRANK LAUTENBERG also understood that we must do more to protect law-abiding citizens from the scourge of gun violence. He authored the bill to close the gun-show loophole. He has fought for child-proof handguns. And his support for measures like the Brady bill was instrumental in bringing about a nationwide reduction in gun violence over the past 7 years.

Lastly, as ranking member of the Budget Committee, FRANK has played a valuable role in bringing about an end to budget deficits and putting our nation on the path to paying off our national debt. He has also worked to strengthen the solvency of Medicare and Social Security.

I said a while ago that FRANK LAUTENBERG proved to be a very successful businessman. He accumulated great financial wealth. No one would have faulted him if he just retired, having made that achievement and contribution for the private sector.

I think all of us, regardless of party and political persuasion, admire people who want to give something back and who are willing to jump into this arena of public life, running the risks that we all do when we place our name on ballots all cross this country. The fact that FRANK LAUTENBERG decided at the end of his private life to become a public citizen and make a significant contribution to his country stands as a wonderful model for others who have done well to follow and when they want to give something back.

Not everyone runs for public office, nor should they, but there are ways in which people can make contributions every day to improve the quality of life for people. FRANK LAUTENBERG is a living embodiment of that concept and that principle.

The colleagues I have talked about, the wonderful colleagues who have served so admirably and so well, DICK BRYAN, BOB KERREY, FRANK LAUTENBERG, and my friend, Stan Israelite, are examples of public servants who I will miss terribly every day. These are good Americans who have made a difference in the lives of all of us as citizens in this country.

I will find time to talk about my good friends, CONNIE MACK and PAT MOYNIHAN, but I see my colleagues on the floor. I thank them for their indulgence. I talked a little longer than I anticipated. I thank the Senators for their patience.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The Senator from Oklahoma.

CONSULTING ON U.S.S. ''COLE'' ACTION

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, many on the Senate Armed Services Committee have been quite distressed over some of the uncertainties, some of the things that happened in conjunction with the tragedy of the U.S.S. *Cole.* Even though it is a delicate thing to talk about, there are people still around who believe that the President took some actions, such as sending the cruise missiles into Afghanistan and the cruise missiles into Sudan, without consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, without consultation with the Intelligence Committee, the Senate Armed Services Committee, the House Armed Services Committee, something that was done and nobody knew it was going to happen. There are a lot of people who believe that might have been politically motivated.

I think it is very appropriate tonight to urge the President that if something should happen that we would have to take some kind of action in the next few days, in that there are only 13 days until a national election, make sure there are no suspicions out there. I want to get on record urging the President to work closely on any proposed action that could take place as a result of the U.S.S. *Cole* tragedy, to work closely on the matter, in full consultation with all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with the top service commanders in chief, as well as the members of both the Senate Armed Services Committee, the House Armed Services Committee, and the Intelligence Committees. By doing this, we could preclude any types of suspicions, allowing us to participate in what would have to be a major decision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

FISCAL DISCIPLINE

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, one of the main reasons I ran for the Senate was to bring fiscal discipline to Washington. As the 106th Congress winds down this week, I look back with mixed feelings at the actions that have been taken over the last 2 years toward bringing our financial house in order. While for the first time we are not spending the Social Security surplus or the Medicare Part A surplus, I believe we could have done a much better job in reining in Federal spending.

Indeed, one fact that does not seem to draw too much attention is the fact that Washington increased overall nondefense domestic discretionary spending in fiscal year 2000 to $328 billion. That is a 9.3-percent boost over the previous fiscal year, and the largest single-year increase in nondefense discretionary spending since 1980. And I fear we will have another big increase in fiscal year 2001.

However, there is actually some good news to celebrate since the beginning of this Congress. As my colleagues may recall, President Clinton said in his State of the Union Address in 1999 that he wanted to save 62 percent of the surplus and spend the other 38 percent. Well, at the time, the entire surplus was the Social Security surplus.

It was Members on this side of the aisle in both the House and the Senate who exposed the President's plan as just another spending gimmick. We were also the ones who got busy advocating and fighting for a lockbox for Social Security and Medicare. For all intents and purposes, we were successful in fiscal year 2000 in doing so, and we will do the same in fiscal year 2001.

Now the Vice President is out there on the campaign trail bending the truth and taking credit for lockboxing Social Security and Medicare. Everyone should be aware that it was the Clinton-Gore administration that sent a veto threat to the Senate regarding the Social Security lockbox amendment that the Senate considered in April of 1999.

Let me recite the direct quote from the veto threat:

> If the Abraham-Domenici amendment or similar legislation is passed by the Congress, the President's senior advisors will recommend to the President that he will veto this bill.

I suspect that senior advisors would include the Vice President.

Although Congress has agreed by consensus not to use the Social Security and Medicare surplus for more spending, Congress still has not been able to pass lockbox legislation. I am fearful, if things get tight in the future and we have a blip in the economy, Congress will revert to its old ways. So I am hoping next year that on a bipartisan basis we can pass lockbox legislation for the Social Security and Medicare surplus.

Probably the best news from fiscal year 2000 is that despite all the supplemental spending we did this past summer, we still achieved an $87 billion on-budget surplus in fiscal year 2000. That is a lot more than the $1 billion on-budget surplus we had at the end of fiscal year 1999. Without question, though, the American people are responsible for this surplus, and their success continues to generate better than expected revenues. However, Congress would have spent considerably

more money, had it not been for a handful of us in the House and Senate who were willing to take the heat for condemning massive spending increases and budget gimmickry. Because this $87 billion on-budget surplus had not been spent, and not used for tax cuts, it is going to go to reduce the national debt.

In my view and in the view of many experts, using our on-budget surplus to pay down the national debt is the best way to ensure fiscal discipline and continue our economic prosperity. We need to continue that economic prosperity if we are going to deal with the problems of Social Security and Medicare in the future. We cannot be lulled by the booming economy and the fact that we have been able to utilize the $87 billion fiscal year 2000 on-budget surplus for debt reduction.

In addition, the way things are going right now in Washington, we may not even see a fiscal year 2001 on-budget surplus. That is because the projected $102 billion surplus is evaporating very quickly. With all the years of experience that I have had in public service, I have to say that I have never seen anything more fiscally irresponsible than the spending spree I have seen occur in Washington this year—but, in particular, these past weeks. The lack of willingness on the part of Congress to make the hard choices and restrain the urge to bring home the bacon is blowing a hole in the fiscal year 2001 surplus and a gigantic hole in the projected 10-year budget surplus.

I think back to 1997 when Congress passed the Balanced Budget Act, helping to put an end to the era of annual deficits. The Balanced Budget Act set spending targets for each fiscal year and was meant to teach Congress to prioritize its spending choices. Under the Balanced Budget Act, if Congress wanted to spend money, it had to find an offset to cover the additional spending. Fair enough, and it worked. It helped to balance the budget.

Today, with the surplus we have achieved and the surplus that everyone thinks we are going to have in the future, the discipline is gone. It is just an out-of-control feeding frenzy. Add the fact that the normal legislative process has gone out the window, and we are in a free fall. Right now, only a handful of individuals—the President and my colleagues who are on the Appropriations Committee—are making the decisions that will impact how much the Federal Government spends for the coming fiscal year. Once the decisions are made, they are packaged together, sent to the floor of the Senate and the House, and voted on: No debate, no amendments. In some circumstances, Members have not even seen the bills they are voting on.

Basically, it is a take-it-or-leave-it attitude. Since these bills contain the bacon, most Members go along and simply vote for them. For those Members who do, they will run home, bragging about how they got this or that for their districts or for their State, failing to understand that their constituents know there is no such thing as a free lunch. Make no mistake, the American people will fast appreciate the spending spectacle that is going on here in Congress. If you think they were mad in 1998 when Congress went on a similar spree—and I remember that because I was campaigning for the Senate in 1998 and I caught all kinds of flak from people because of what Congress had done—wait until they get wind of what is happening right now. And they will. We will definitely feel their wrath. But more important, we will experience their disappointment in letting them down.

This Senator is not going along with the ''pork-a-thon.'' I have voted against most of the appropriations bills that have come before the Senate, not because I am opposed to the Federal Government spending money on what is necessary, but because Congress has been unwilling to prioritize spending and unwilling to make the hard choices within the framework of the 2001 budget resolution.

In case my colleagues are not aware, let me explain briefly how big the increases are in the various appropriations bills.

The fiscal year 2001 Interior appropriations bill spends $18.8 billion, a 26-percent increase over fiscal year 2000; the Transportation appropriations bill, spends $16.8 billion in discretionary spending, a 23-percent increase over fiscal year 2000; the VA–HUD appropriations bill spends $82.5 billion, a 14-percent increase; the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill spends $15.6 billion, a 13-percent increase; the Energy and Water appropriations bill spends $24 billion, a 12-percent increase; the Agriculture appropriations bill spends $15 billion in discretionary spending, an 8-percent increase, and that is not including agriculture emergency spending.

For fiscal year 1999 to fiscal year 2001, nearly $23.25 billion in agriculture emergency spending has been provided by the Government—$23.25 billion in emergency spending. That is more than double the approximately $10.75 billion in emergency spending for the entire 10 year period before. In other words, in 3 years, we have doubled the emergency spending for agriculture over what we spent in the 10 previous fiscal years.

In April, the Senate spent over 50 hours debating and amending a budget resolution for fiscal year 2001. An agreement was reached on an overall spending amount of $600.3 billion in budget authority. I worked with Senators like PHIL GRAMM to add new points of order to bring more discipline to the process. But in light of recent events, I wonder what was the 50 hours of effort over? I find myself asking, Why should we have a budget resolution if we are just going to ignore it? Why even have a budget process if we are just going to operate as if the rules did not exist? Congress and the White House are spending money like drunken sailors, and we need to get on the wagon before it is too late and we spend it all.

CBO's projections over the next 10 years estimate that Federal spending will grow with the rate of inflation, but this does not reflect reality. In fiscal year 2000 alone, we increased discretionary spending by 8.3 percent, a rate much higher than the actual inflation rate. When you compare that with the spending increases of 14 percent, 23 percent, and 26 percent in just fiscal year 2001 alone, then you can see the kind of trouble we are getting ourselves into.

Add up all the numbers, include the appropriations bills that have passed and those that are anticipated to pass; include as much as $265 billion worth of tax reductions for the next 10 years; and, of course, we cannot forget there are going to be additional interest costs that will be generated by Congress simultaneously increasing spending and lowering taxes. Just add it all up. When you do, you will find that Congress and the Clinton-Gore administration will have reduced the 10-year projected budget surplus by more than $600 billion. In a worst case scenario, the Concord Coalition estimates that Congress' accelerated pace of spending could wipe out up to $1.46 trillion of the non-Social Security surplus projected for the next 10 years—over a trillion dollars is what they project. What a terrible thing we are doing to the next administration and to the citizens of this Nation.

After the 106th Congress' drunken spending spree is over, the American people and the future President will be waking up to a tremendous hangover.

FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE ACT OF 1967 AMENDMENTS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on the bill (H.R. 1651).

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1651) entitled ''An Act to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 to extend the period during which reimbursement may be provided to owners of United States fishing vessels for costs incurred when such a vessel is seized and detained by a foreign country, and for other purposes'', with the following amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike ''**SEC. 401. USE OF AIRCRAFT PROHIBITED.**'' and all that follows through ''**SEC. 402.**'' and insert ''**SEC. 401.**''.

Mr. VOINOVICH. I ask unanimous consent the Senate agree to the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2000

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, October 26. I further ask consent that on Thursday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and it will be the intention of the leader to begin consideration of the Older Americans Act, hopefully under an agreement. I further ask consent that at 11 o'clock there be a period of morning business until 12 noon, with the time equally divided between Senators BRYAN and DOMENICI, and that Senator BRYAN be in control of the first half of that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. VOINOVICH. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will hopefully begin debate on the Older Americans Act at 9:30 a.m. At 11 a.m., the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour and then resume consideration of the Older Americans Act. The House is expected to consider the conference report to accompany the District of Columbia appropriations bill, which also contains the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations language, the Labor-HHS appropriations conference report, and the tax bill during tomorrow morning's session. It is hoped that the Senate can begin consideration of those bills as they are received from the House. Therefore, votes are expected in the afternoon on these bills, as well as a vote on a continuing resolution.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order following the remarks of Senator REID from Nevada, who has been very patient. I thank Senator REID and the Chair very much for their patience this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding we are to begin at 9:30 tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that following the prayer and the Pledge of Allegiance, the Senator from Nevada be recognized for a half-hour tomorrow morning as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. VOINOVICH. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I withdraw the request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn.

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. It is my understanding the Senator from Ohio has completed his work for the night.

The Senator from Ohio has finished for tonight?

Mr. VOINOVICH. Yes.

ISSUES BEFORE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND GOVERNOR BUSH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have an interesting number of issues before this body. We have talked on various occasions, not the least of which has been today, about what we have not done: A real Patients' Bill of Rights; a prescription drug coverage through Medicare; a minimum wage increase; tax-deductibility for college-level education, including lifelong learning; education funds to modernize our schools, to have afterschool programs, to have more teachers; commonsense gun safety legislation; long-term tax credits for families caring for elderly parents; and affordable housing. These issues—any one of them—could have been completed with the intercession of the Governor of Texas who is running for President.

The campaign, that will be completed in 12 or 13 days, is a campaign of ideas. What I would like to do tonight is spread across the RECORD of this Senate some of the ideas of George W. Bush, the Governor of the State of Texas. I say this because I think we should understand there are a number of policies that are being advocated by the Vice President and by the Governor of Texas.

So what I want to do today is quote verbatim, statements that have been made by George W. Bush. I will not be able to complete all of his statements tonight, but I am going to spend some time reading direct quotes of George W. Bush. Maybe I will return tomorrow or the day after to complete the statements of the Governor of the State of Texas.

The first quote comes from October 23, 2000. That was last Monday. Here is the direct quote:

> I don't want nations feeling like that they can bully ourselves and our allies. I want to have a ballistic defense system so that we can make the world more peaceful, and at the same time I want to reduce our own nuclear capacities to the level commiserate with keeping the peace.

October 18, 2000, another direct quote:

> Families is where our nation finds hope, where wings take dream.

He also said, on that same occasion, in LaCrosse, WI:

> If I'm the president, we're going to have emergency-room care, we're going to have gag orders.

He also said, and I quote:

> Drug therapies are replacing a lot of medicines as we used to know it.

Another direct quote:

> It's one thing about insurance, that's a Washington term.

Direct quote:

> I think we ought to raise the age at which juveniles can have a gun.

This is the Governor of the State of Texas, the man running for President of the United States, who has said these things.

The next direct quote:

> Mr. Vice President, in all due respect, it is—I'm not sure 80 percent of the people get the death tax. I know this: 100 percent will get it if I'm the president.

Next direct quote:

> Quotas are bad for America. It's not the way America is all about.

Direct quote.

October 18, in St. Louis, the same day that he said, ''Families is where our nation finds hopes, where wings take dream,'' he said:

> If affirmative action means what I just described, what I'm for, then I'm for it.

In Greensboro, NC, on October 10 of this year, he said:

> Our priorities is our faith.

October 11 of the year 2000:

> I mean, there needs to be a wholesale effort against racial profiling, which is illiterate children.

The direct quote from Gov. George W. Bush: ''I mean, there needs to be a wholesale effort against racial profiling, which is illiterate children.''

Greensboro, NC, the day before—that is, October 10—when he was commenting on the Vice President's tax plan:

> It's going to require numerous IRA agents.

The Governor of the State of Texas said, on October 4, in Reynoldsburg, OH:

> I think if you know what you believe, it makes it a lot easier to answer questions. I can't answer your question.

This was in response to a question about whether he wished he could take back any of his answers in the first debate. The direct quote is: ''I think if you know what you believe, it makes it a lot easier to answer questions. I can't answer your question.''

I do not think that takes any discussion to figure out what he just said, because I do not think he knows what he just said.

In Boston, on October 3 of the year 2000, he said:

> I would have my secretary of treasury be in touch with the financial centers, not only here but at home.

Saginaw, MI, September 29, 2000:

> I know the human being and fish can coexist peacefully.

Quote: ''I know the human being and fish can coexist peacefully.''

Redwood, CA, September 27, 2000:

> I will have a foreign-handed foreign policy.

Again, these are direct quotes from the Governor of the State of Texas, the man who has been nominated to be President of the United States.

Los Angeles, September 27:

> One of the common denominators I have found is that expectations rise above that which is expected.

Beaverton, OR, September 25, this year:

It is clear our nation is reliant upon big foreign oil. More and more of our imports come from overseas.

Direct quote, MSNBC, September 20, 2000:

Well, that's going to be up to the pundits and the people to make up their mind. I'll tell you what is a president for him, for example, talking about my record in the state of Texas. I mean, he's willing to say anything in order to convince people that I haven't had a good record in Texas.

September 9, on the Oprah show:

I am a person who recognizes the fallacy of humans.

Interview with Paula Zahn, September 18, 2000:

A tax cut is really one of the anecdotes to coming out of an economic illness.

I have read these over several times. I still am stunned by what has been said by the man running for President of the United States.

Orange, CA, September 15, 2000:

The woman who knew that I had dyslexia—I never interviewed her.

Westminster, CA, September 13:

The best way to relieve families from time is to let them keep some of their own money.

The same interview:

They have miscalculated me as a leader.

Orlando, FL, September 12, 2000:

I don't think we need to be subliminable about the differences between our views on prescription drugs.

This is a campaign of ideas, Mr. President, a discussion of policies, a discussion of having a vision of what this country needs, someone who can discuss them in a logical manner.

Pittsburgh, PA, September 8:

This is what I'm good at. I like meeting people, my fellow citizens, I like interfacing with them.

Westland, MI, September 8:

That's Washington. That's the place where you find people getting ready to jump out of the foxholes before the first shot is fired.

Detroit, September 7, 2000:

Listen, Al Gore is a very tough opponent. He is the incumbent. He represents the incumbency. And a challenger is somebody who generally comes from the pack and wins, if you're going to win. And that's where I'm coming from.

Houston, TX, September 6:

We'll let our friends be the peacemakers and the great country called America will be the pacemakers.

Scranton, PA, September 6:

We don't believe in planners and deciders making decisions on behalf of Americans.

Allentown, PA, September 5:

I regret that a private comment I made to the vice presidential candidate made it through the public airways.

New York Times, September 2:

The point is, this is a way to help inoculate me about what has come and is coming.

CNN online chat:

As governor of Texas, I have set high standards for our public schools, and I have met these standards.

Same interview:

Well, I think if you say you're going to do something and don't do it, that is trustworthiness.

Des Moines, IA, August 21:

I don't know whether I'm going to win or not. I think I am. I do know I am ready for the job. And, if not, that's just the way it goes.

Same, Des Moines, IA:

This campaign not only hears the voices of entrepreneurs and the farmers and the entrepreneurs, we hear the voices of those struggling to get ahead.

Des Moines, IA, August 21:

We cannot let terrorists and rogue nations hold this nation hostile or hold our allies hostile.

I have a different vision of leadership. A leadership is something who brings people together.

That is from Bartlett, TN, August 18.

August 11, Associated Press:

I think he needs to stand up and say if he thought the president were wrong on policy and issues, he ought to say where.

Salinas, CA, August 10:

I want you to know that farmers are not going to be secondary thoughts to a Bush administration. They will be in the forethought of our thinking.

Today Show interview, August 1:

And if he continues that, I'm going to tell the nation what I think about him as a human being and as a person.

Washington Post, July 15. This was a comment to New Jersey's Secretary of State, the Honorable DeForest Soaries, Jr.:

You might want to comment on that, Honorable.

Seattle Post-Intelligencer, June 23, 2000:

This case has had full analyzation and has been looked at a lot. I understand the emotionality of death penalty cases.

Cleveland, OH, June 29:

States should have the right to enact reasonable laws and restrictions particularly to end the inhuman practice of ending a life that otherwise could live.

This is another Cleveland quote from a different time, July 1:

Unfairly but truthfully, our party has been tagged as being against things. Anti-immigrant, for example. And we're not a party of anti-immigrants. Quite the opposite. We're a party that welcomes people.

Wayne, MI, June 28:

The fundamental question is, Will I be a successful president when it comes to foreign policy? I will be, but until I'm the president, it's going to be hard for me to verify that I think I'll be more effective.

NPR radio, June 16:

The only things that I can tell you is that every case I have reviewed I have been comfortable with the innocence or guilt of the person that I've looked at. I do not believe we've put a guilty . . . I mean innocent person to death in the State of Texas.

Hardball, MSNBC, discussion on abortion, May 31 of this year:

I'm gonna talk about the ideal world, Chris. I've read—I understand reality. If you're asking me as the president, would I understand reality, I do.

June 9, 2000, Wilton, CT:

There's not going to be enough people in the system to take advantage of people like me.

April 3, U.S. News and World Report:

I think anybody who doesn't think I'm smart enough to handle the job is underestimating.

This is interesting. This is also on Hardball. Governor Bush:

First of all, Cinco de Mayo is not the independence day. That's dieciseis de Septiembre, and . . .

Chris Matthews says:

What's that in English?

Governor Bush:

Fifteenth of September.

Mr. President, I took 2 years of high school Spanish, and I know that is not September 15.

From Albuquerque, NM, on May 31:

Actually, I—this may sound a little West Texan to you, but I like it. What I'm talking about—when I'm talking about myself, and when he's talking about myself, all of us are talking about me.

Again, he said:

Actually I—this may sound a little west Texan to you, but I like it. What I'm talking about—when I'm talking about myself, and when he's talking about myself, all of us are talking about me.

Here is another direct quote from the Albuquerque on May 31:

This is a world that is much more uncertain than the past. In the past, we were certain, we were certain it was us versus the Russians in the past. We were certain, and therefore we had huge nuclear arsenals aimed at each other to keep the peace. That's what we were certain of. You see, even though it's an uncertain world, we're certain of some things. We're certain that even though the ''evil empire'' may have passed, evil still remains. We're certain there are people that can't stand what America stands for. We're certain there are madmen in this world, and there's terror and there's missiles, and I'm certain of this, too: I'm certain to maintain the peace, we better have a military of high morale, and I'm certain that under this administration, morale in the military is dangerously low.

He was talking with Paula Zahn on May 18 about Rudy Giuliani, the mayor of New York City:

He has certainly earned a reputation as a fantastic mayor, because the results speak for themselves. I mean, New York is a safer place for him to be.

This was in the New York Times on March 4, 2000:

The fact that he relies on facts—says things that are not factual—are going to undermine his campaign.

On his meeting with JOHN MCCAIN, in the Dallas Morning News on May 10, 2000, he said:

I think we agree, the past is over.

This is from Reuters, May 5, 2000:

It's clearly a budget. It's got a lot of numbers in it.

Here is an interview Governor Bush did with Jim Lehrer on The NewsHour, on April 27, 2000:

Governor BUSH: Because the picture on the newspaper. It just seems so un-American to me, the picture of the guy storming the house with a scared little boy there. I talked to my little brother, Jeb—I haven't told this to many people. But he's the Governor of—I shouldn't call him my little brother—my brother, Jeb, the great Governor of Texas.

JIM LEHRER: Florida.

Governor BUSH: Florida. The State of Florida.

On April 26, 2000, he said:

I hope we get to the bottom of the answer. It's what I'm interested to know.

On Meet The Press on April 15, he said:

Laura and I really don't realize how bright our children is sometimes until we get an objective analysis.

On April 6, 2000, the Associated Press reports this quote:

You subscribe politics to it. I subscribe freedom to it.

That was a question about whether he and AL GORE were making the Elian Gonzalez case a political issue.

This appeared in The Los Angeles Times on April 8, 2000:

I was raised in the West. The west of Texas. It's pretty close to California. In more ways than Washington, DC, is close to California.

On March 28, 2000 in Reston, Virginia, he said:

Reading is the basics for all learning.

This was at Fritsche Middle School in Milwaukee on March 30, 2000:

We want our teachers to be trained so they can meet the obligations, their obligations as teachers. We want them to know how to teach the science of reading. In order to make sure there's not this kind of Federal—Federal cufflink.

Mr. President, I will make my final quote for tonight. We have several pages more we will do at a subsequent time.

In the Washington Post of March 24, 2000, this is his quote:

Other Republican candidates may retort to personal attacks and negative ads.

Mr. President, I read these direct quotes. It would have been very easy to editorialize on every one of them. I chose not to do that. I chose, though, to spread across the record of this Senate statements made by Governor George W. Bush which should lead some to believe that if this man is going to be heavily involved in policy not only of this Nation, but this world, that they should be aware of some of the statements he has made. We want this to be a Government where people are clear on the issues, understand the issues. We have difficult, very complex problems not only domestically, but internationally. I think these quotes speak for themselves.

Mr. President, it is my understanding the Senator from Iowa is here and wishes to speak.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask the Senator to yield to me for a second.

Mr. REID. How much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator was given as much time as he may consume.

Mr. REID. I will yield the Senator some time.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for mentioning some of those quotes. I didn't hear them all because I was on my way to the floor from my office.

Mr. REID. I was only able to get to a few of them. I only spent about 40 minutes talking on the direct quotes from the Governor of Texas. There will be more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada can only yield for a question at this point in time.

Mr. REID. It is my understanding he was asking me a question.

Mr. HARKIN. Yes. I appreciate the Senator's comments and reading those quotes. I wonder, did the Senator listen to the third and final debate?

Mr. REID. I didn't miss a single word of that debate.

Mr. HARKIN. I want to ask the Senator, did he hear the quote by about Governor Bush—there was a question asked about agriculture. Vice President GORE answered the question and it came to Governor Bush. He started talking about using food as a weapon. He made this quote—he said:

We have got to stop using food. It hurts the farmers.

Does the Senator remember that quote?

Mr. REID. I listened with amazement. In responding to my friend from Iowa, following the second debate, the Vice President, during that debate, said that there was a young lady in Florida that wasn't able to get a desk. The Republican spin doctors came back the next day and said that wasn't true, she was only out of a desk for a day. In fact, she missed 7 days because of not having room in that classroom, for whatever reason. I was so amazed that the press picked up on what the Vice President said, which to me indicated that was just one of the minor problems that we have in education.

I heard a day or two after the debate from Governor Bush. He said this. I heard it. He said: Well, I did fine in the debate because the expectations were so low of me that all I had to do was show up and say my name is George W. Bush and win the debate.

I say to my friend from Iowa, that is about how the American press has treated it. All he had to do was show up and tell his name, because if they looked into some of his statements—for one, the statement that the Senator from Iowa asked me about regarding food—it seems to me for our farmers who are suffering so much in our country today that is something the press might want to pick up on.

Does the Senator have another question?

Mr. HARKIN. No.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not have the right to do that. Under the previous order, the Senate will recess until tomorrow morning at 9:30.

Mr. REID. I did not hear the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Nevada was allowed time to speak, and after he spoke, the Senate is to be in recess until tomorrow at 9:30 a.m.

Mr. REID. I want to complete my statement. I will finish that in a hurry. This is a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair: We are going to come in at 9:30 tomorrow morning?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REID. And we are to pick up the older Americans legislation.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I asked for 15 minutes at the end of the time. For some reason it got mixed up and I was not included on the list. It is my intention to ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak for 15 minutes before the Senate goes out on recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Chair.

SHORTAGE OF AIRLINE PASSENGER SPACE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, one of the most serious issues facing our national air transport system is the shortage of space—both in the air and on the ground at key airports. We've seen this most clearly this past summer in the backups at Chicago O'Hare and in much of the airspace in the Northeast.

Americans have developed a tremendous appetite for air travel for both leisure and business needs. In the last few years, with our economy so strong, the result has been an increasing number of packed planes all year round, especially during the peak summer travel season.

But for many Americans trying to enjoy some vacation time, this summer was a season of discontent filled with bad weather, aging air traffic control systems and airline-employee difficulties. Countless Americans spent hours sitting on the tarmac at O'Hare waiting to take off, or sitting in the airport lounge, waiting for their planes to arrive. Thousands of Americans found themselves delayed, stranded and disappointed. A once-reliable system has become increasingly unreliable.

Some of these events are unavoidable. Clearly, there are times when bad weather requires us to delay or cancel flights. But when an airport is near capacity, even the tiniest alteration in landing and takeoff timing can quickly turn into considerable delays.

We've been seeing the warning signs for years. The National Civil Aviation Review Commission, chaired by the current Secretary of Commerce, Norm Mineta, warned us three years ago about our looming air travel crisis.

In fact, the very first sentence of the Commission's report reads as follows:

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.

Mr. President, the future is now. As we have turned the corner into the 21st Century, the predicted air traffic control crisis is clearly upon us.

I believe FAA Administrator Jane Garvey has done a terrific job. However, there are a number of steps that the FAA and the airlines must take—in both the short and long run—to modernize the air traffic control system and reduce congestion, particularly as it affects the heavily traveled northeast air corridors between New York, Boston, and Washington, DC, and Chicago and other key Midwestern airports.

In the short term, the FAA needs to make better use of existing capacity. This means better communication between the FAA and airlines when bad weather ties up key airports and decisions must be made about reducing or rerouting air traffic. Right now, airlines have no coordinated plans on bad weather days, and they're left to guess whether their competitors will cancel or slow their flights or not.

Now I recognize that airlines can't simply pick up the phone and talk to each other about capacity decisions. Such discussions would run afoul of our nation's antitrust laws. But Congress and FAA should consider whether they should grant some form of very limited immunity so that airlines can discuss with the FAA the most efficient way to cope with bad weather.

Another short term solution involves alternative routings. I understand that the airlines, working cooperatively with FAA, have begun flying many routes at lower altitudes. This practice is costly since flying at lower altitude burns more fuel—but it should help increase airspace capacity. FAA also needs to explore the possibility of accessing airspace previously reserved for military use. Much of this military airspace can be made available to commercial operations on a short-term basis during severe weather.

The FAA must also add additional air traffic controllers. And FAA must make sure that these controllers have the most modern, up-to-date tools available to do their jobs.

The FAA needs to take full advantage of GPS technology to allow more direct routings between airports. FAA also needs to develop technology to allow pilots and air traffic controllers to communicate more effectively with each other. One such technology is advanced data links which could reduce controllers' workload and improve their ability to create and communicate alternative routines in severe weather. It would be far more accurate and efficient for many air traffic control commands to be given to pilots in written form. The airlines and the FAA are currently undergoing tests along those lines, but I believe they must move forward more quickly.

Finally, we in Congress must continue to increase FAA research and operating budgets. We need to expand programs that examine the problems of aging aircraft. And we need to invest more in technologies that will give both pilots and air traffic controllers the very best equipment for making safe decisions. We've got to fully fund NASA aviation programs like the one designed to better detect wake-vortex trailing behind aircraft. Such technology can allow the FAA to narrow the decades old 7-mile separation standard and free up more airspace.

But these actions alone will not be sufficient. Our current system can barely handle the roughly 600 million passengers that currently travel each year. Yet, it is projected that the system will need to handle an expected 1 billion annual passengers within the next decade. Indeed, our demand for air travel seems ready to overrun our overburdened system. In some cases, we do need to add additional runway capacity.

Let's look specifically at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport. O'Hare is a place that I—and hundreds of thousands of fellow Iowans who land or connect through there every year—know well. On a blue-sky day, it's one of the best, most efficient airports in America. However, when the rain clouds or thunderstorms roll in, O'Hare can become one gigantic travel obstruction.

When O'Hare backs up, the result is a monumental ripple effect on the entire air traffic control system from Los Angeles to Boston. Because of its central location and population base, Chicago O'Hare has developed into the first or second largest hub airport in this country. It is the only hub that has two major airlines which maintain competing hub operations. This is good for the citizens of Chicago and Illinois, and it is also good for the people of Iowa and surrounding states that use O'Hare to connect to distant destinations.

We in Iowa can connect to our final destinations through such hubs as Minneapolis-St. Paul, Cincinnati, St. Louis or Denver. However, the largest share of Iowans choose to go through O'Hare because it is the largest and most convenient hub for our citizens. O'Hare also provides far more international connections than those other airports. In fact, well over 50 airlines operate there. In the past 12 months, more than 360,000 of my fellow Iowans have flown through O'Hare.

So the problems at O'Hare are not just a Chicago issue, they are a Midwestern issue, and they are a national issue.

This situation calls for immediate action. I strongly believe that the most important step we can take to begin to alleviate our national airline crisis is to provide additional facilities for planes to land and take off at Chicago's O'Hare airport. I believe O'Hare should logically have additional parallel runways to provide expanded capacity.

As we move into this new century, we need to ensure that the critical pathways of our air transport system are not encumbered by local disagreements, which constrain the needs of interstate commerce. In addition, if we want to foster increased competition between airlines and see continued service to O'Hare from the smaller commercial airports like Burlington and Waterloo in Iowa, and if we want to expand services to cities like Sioux City, then we must provide additional take off and landing space for new airlines.

Some have suggested building a new airport south of Chicago to relieve the problems at O'Hare. I feel that this is a poor policy choice. This proposed new airport has yet to attract any airline tenants who would pay for it. Furthermore, this proposed airport would drain customers away from Chicago's Midway Airport, which is the 9th busiest airport in America and provides point to point flights to over 50 cities. In addition, in order to build this new airport, we would have to take 24,000 acres of farmland out of production. Building another airport in Chicago does not solve our current problems at O'Hare.

The solution is new runways at O'Hare. O'Hare certainly has the space for them. We know that building new runways is far more cost-effective than spending billions of dollars on a new airport. And new runways would mean an immediate reduction in delays at O'Hare. These new runways would allow simultaneous landings during all weather periods—something the current configuration does not allow.

Normally, in order for a runway to be built, approval must be granted by the operator of the airport—the City of Chicago in the case of O'Hare—and the FAA. However, under Illinois law, the Governor of Illinois, through his Department of Transportation, must also approve such a plan. Speaking as a friendly neighbor from Iowa, I am sending a letter to both Mayor Richard M. Daley and Governor George H. Ryan asking that they approve new runways in the interest of improving our entire national air transport system.

While I am not privy to all of the local concerns surrounding O'Hare, I know that all airports confront noise mitigation problems. I also know that Chicago O'Hare has the best-funded and most extensive sound mitigation program of any airport in the country. I applaud the Mayor for that far-sighted undertaking. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I offer my assistance to the Mayor and my distinguished colleagues from Illinois to ensure that appropriate Federal dollars are channeled into that effort.

I would say to Governor Ryan, who, I understand, favors a new airport, that I do not see much in the way of Federal assistance for new airport construction in the foreseeable future. Airports today are built and/or rehabilitated by airport tenants and their passengers. I believe that the most efficient way to minimize our tax dollars is to maximize our current facilities and continue to upgrade our air traffic control system.

Earlier this year, the Senate passed overwhelmingly and the President signed, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century, commonly known as Air21. As many of my colleagues know, I worked closely with Senators GRASSLEY, MCCAIN, HOLLINGS, ROCKEFELLER and DURBIN to draft the provision in the Air21 legislation that phases out the artificial slot-constraints at O'Hare by July 1, 2002. The intent of our effort was to increase small and mid-sized communities' access to the national air transportation system via O'Hare and to provide for increased competition at that premier connecting hub. This increased access is critical for business wishing to settle and grow in small and mid-sized communities.

While we succeeded in eliminating the barrier posed by slots, it is clear to me that O'Hare's runway, gate, and terminal space constraints continued to keep small and mid-sized communities from fully realizing the benefits of the Air21 legislation. I was extremely pleased to hear about the substantial progress in Chicago's World Gateway program. This program calls for $3.2 billion in infrastructure investments over the next several years at O'Hare—including 20 new gates and 2 new terminals. My understanding is that the two major carriers at O'Hare—United Airlines and American Airlines—have reached agreement with the City on this. I congratulate Mayor Daley on his work in bringing that agreement to closure. I also applaud American and United for their far-sighted investment in O'Hare. I only request that every effort be made to accelerate that program and to assure that space is allocated to smaller aircraft that serve smaller cities so that small town America gets a fair shake.

Without new runways, we will still be constrained by weather and air traffic control problems. It is time to remove this barrier to small and mid-sized community access to O'Hare. And it is time to expand our current national air traffic system in an effective, cost-efficient, cost-efficient way. We have neither the time nor the money nor the political will to build a new airport. Instead, we need to maximize the resources we already have. In the end, we may have to find a federal solution to this national problem.

New runways would make O'Hare and our entire national air transport system run more smoothly. I am certain that the hundreds of thousands of Iowans and others across the country who travel through O'Hare each year would appreciate this improvement. As would all those whose travel plans to other hubs and destinations are upset because aircraft are tied up at O'Hare. There is no more efficient, effective solution to aircraft delays in the Midwest and much of the Northeast than providing additional runway capacity at O'Hare.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR LAUTENBERG

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to make a few brief remarks about one of our colleagues and a good friend of mine who is retiring this year.

Senator LAUTENBERG is a perfect example of the American dream come true. He grew up the son of immigrants, joined the Army Signal Corps in Europe during World War II, and then attended Columbia University on the G.I. bill. After graduation, Senator LAUTENBERG helped found a payroll services company called Automatic Data Processing. He soon became the firm's CEO, and, with 33,000 employees, his company is now one of the largest computing services companies in the world.

But Senator LAUTENBERG knew that the American dream isn't just about making it to the top. It's about giving back once you get there. That's why he ran for the United States Senate, and that's why, during his eighteen years in this Chamber, he's fought hard to make our country better for all Americans. He has fought hard to leave the ladder of opportunity down for others to climb. He's fought to improve transportation. His legislation and leadership has built and modernized highways and bridges and Amtrak rails across this country, and he's worked hard to make sure our planes and trains and cars are safe.

FRANK LAUTENBERG has fought to clean up our environment. Over the course of his career, he's worked on legislation to improve the Superfund program, redevelop Brownfields, force industry to cut down on pollution, clean up our beaches and protect our air and water. And he's fought to balance our budget. Senator LAUTENBERG focuses his sharp, business mind on the work of the Budget Committee, where he is ranking member and he helped move us from record deficits to record surpluses.

And Senator LAUTENBERG has taken on special interests like few others. He took on the gun lobby when he authored the domestic violence gun ban and other laws to fight gun violence. And he's one of the strongest supporters of the Brady bill in this Congress. He took on the liquor lobby when he became the lead sponsor of the bill that raised the drinking age to twenty-one. And he sponsored the recent provision in the transportation appropriations bill to lower the blood alcohol content standard to .08—a provision that's going to save hundreds of lives each year. And he's taken on big tobacco. When you fly on a commercial flight now, and you can actually take a breath without choking on smoke from other passengers, you can thank Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG, because he wrote the law that bans smoking on airplanes.

You know, after he got that bill passed, I was flying out to Iowa, and several flight attendants came up to me and said, ''Senator, can you please thank Senator LAUTENBERG for us. We can finally work now without all that smoke.'' I hear that to this very day, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey always gets first class service even when he sits in coach. I still can't quite believe that Senator LAUTENBERG is leaving us. But I hope that wherever he goes, he'll find a new way to use his energy, intelligence, and talent to serve the American people. Our country can't afford to lose someone of his caliber.

My wife Ruth and I have been privileged to be friends of FRANK since we first came to the Senate in 1985. We have been privileged to travel on many trips, on many congressional delegations with Senator LAUTENBERG, as he confronted our enemies abroad and spoke with our friends abroad, to strengthen our U.S. position both in our economic endeavors with other countries and in our military position overseas.

We will miss him from this body, but I of course will not miss him as a friend. I sincerely hope that whatever FRANK LAUTENBERG does in the future, he will make himself available for further public service. Someone of his caliber and of his talent, of his compassion, and of his interest in making sure we leave the ladder of opportunity down for all Americans to climb, someone such as that we can't afford to lose from public life.

So, FRANK, we wish you Godspeed, the best in all your endeavors, the best of health and happiness in your future life. But please, if duty calls for public service, I know you will answer.

I thank the Presiding Officer for affording me the opportunity to make these comments this evening.

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, October 26, 2000.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:23 p.m., recessed until Thursday, October 26, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS RECEIVED BY THE SENATE OCTOBER 25, 2000:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

JAMES A. DORSKIND, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, VICE ANDREW J. PINCUS, RESIGNED.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

LOIS N. EPSTEIN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE DEVRA LEE DAVIS, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

KENNETH LEE SMITH, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, VICE DONALD J. BARRY, RESIGNED.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

GEORGE DARDEN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2003. (REAPPOINTMENT)

GEORGE DARDEN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2000, VICE ZELL MILLER.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

MARIA OTERO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2003, VICE THEODORE M. HESBURGH, TERM EXPIRED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DEANNA SAUCEDA DEPARTS KRQE

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest and most respected news anchors in New Mexico, Deanna Sauceda, is departing KRQE television of Albuquerque, New Mexico, after a distinguished career with the news station for nearly 12 years. She has often been credited with making a major contribution toward building KRQE's solid reputation.

There are thousands of loyal KRQE watchers who have great faith in what they see from the Channel 13 KRQE newscasts. They believe them to be fair and thorough—providing news coverage that keeps them well informed by separating fact from opinion. As the lead anchor for the program, Deanna Sauceda insisted on good reporting, crisp writing, visual stories, and accuracy in every thing covered in KRQE's news reports.

I had the privilege of being interviewed by Deanna just over a week ago. That opportunity was afforded because KRQE has committed to giving all the candidates for federal office 5 minutes of free air time to help constituents learn what the issues are and where candidates stand. I applaud KRQE for providing this service and engaging its viewers in our democracy. The professional that she is, during our interview Deanna asked me some hard-hitting and engaging questions. While she was tough, she also had a wonderful sense of humor and it was a lovely dialogue.

I know that Deanna Sauceda will be missed for her judgment, experience, toughness under pressure, and for her vast knowledge of the people, places, and events that have made New Mexico over the last two decades.

Deanna, I wish you the best of luck in your new endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO THE SOUTH BRONX OVERALL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ON ITS 28TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOSE E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I again pay tribute to the South Bronx Overall Economic Development Corporation for its 28 years of fruitful service to the South Bronx community.

In 1972, U.S. Senator Jacob Javits, New York State Attorney General Robert Abrams, and six major banks joined together to establish the South Bronx Overall Economic Development Corporation (SOBRO). The corporation was founded at a time when the South Bronx was suffering from major economic devastation, jobs were scarce, and people were leaving the area.

Over the past 28 years, SOBRO has successfully encouraged investment and economic growth in the South Bronx and has provided education and job training to area residents. Among its many accomplishments, SOBRO has trained or placed in jobs more than 20,000 residents, created or retained more than 30,000 jobs in the area, stimulated more than $120 million in investments, and assisted in the reconstruction of commercial districts.

In collaboration with Mott Haven Neighborhood Strategies Project, SOBRO has been successful in training residents and placing them in jobs with businesses in empowerment zone areas. SOBRO also provides business training and technical assistance to minority entrepreneurs. It has also established a credit loan program to facilitate financial services, including loans for small businesses.

In addition, by forming partnerships with local businesses and area high schools, SOBRO has succeded in providing valuable internship programs and part-time jobs for high school and intermediate school students. The organization also trains adults in many skills including cable installation, computer repair, home health care, customer service, and building maintenance.

Moreover, SOBRO has assisted in the transformation of abandoned buildings into affordable housing and commercial space. It currently has many projects underway, including the reconstruction of a 60-unit housing project for people living with AIDS. In addition, SOBRO has been successful in renovating Bruckner Boulevard, which has attracted many artists, antique shops, and other businesses to the area.

Changes in the welfare law are placing greater constraints on organizations like SOBRO that are trying to assist people in need. Despite this, SOBRO has continued to provide quality services to low-income South Bronx residents and to attract businesses to the area.

I would like to especially compliment this year's honorees, Maura Markus, President Citibank North America, Ken Williams, District Manager, The Home Depot, Bernard Beal, CEO, M.R. Beal & Company, and Dave Valentin, world-renowned jazz flutist, for their leadership in improving the quality of life in our community.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to recognize SOBRO for it 28 years of achievements, training and educating the youth, spurring economic growth, and beautifying our South Bronx congressional district.

ON S. 2950, SAND CREEK MASSACRE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2000

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the companion House legislation, I support the passage of this Senate measure so it can go to the President for signature into law.

This bill is important for the country, and particularly for Colorado because it would authorize establishing a National Historic Site at the site of the Sand Creek Massacre—an event that for more than a century has been regarded as one of the most emotionally charged and controversial events in American history.

On November 29, 1864, Col. John M. Chivington, leading about 700 soldiers of the First and Third Colorado Volunteers, attacked a village of about 500 Cheyenne and Arapaho people. These people were under the overall leadership of Black Kettle, and had camped on Sand Creek at the direction of Major Scott Anthony, who commanded Fort Lyon, about 40 miles to the south. By day's end, the soldiers had killed at least 150 people, including women and children.

The massacre resulted in almost instant controversy, which ultimately led to three federal investigations, all of which condemned Chivington's actions. By the 1865 Treaty of Little Arkansas with the Cheyenne and Arapaho, victims of Sand Creek received minor compensation for their suffering and loss of property. While some efforts were made to understand the massacre, place blame on the responsible parties, and compensate the tribes, little was actually done.

Many people, including Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman, visited the site and collected artifacts of all kinds. The land involved later was used for large-scale cattle operations, and eventually small private landowners farmed and grazed the property. As time passed, evidence of the massacre slowly disappeared. Although the event continued to be remembered, mostly by the tribes and historians, the only commemoration of the massacre was a simple granite marker placed near the site by the local community in 1950.

In 1998, Public Law 105–243 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to identify the location and extent of the Sand Creek Massacre and to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the site as a unit of the National Park System. Starting in 1998 a variety of techniques and methods were used to locate the site of the Sand Creek Massacre. These included a thorough research of written records, archaeology, geomorphology, aerial photographic analysis, traditional tribal methods and recording the oral traditions of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma,

the Northern Cheyenne and the Northern Arapaho.

Once the location of the site was identified, the next task was to determine national significance and suitability and reasonability of the site as a unit of the system. To be eligible for consideration, National Park Service management policies state that an area must possess nationally significant natural, cultural or recreational resources; be a suitable and feasible addition to the system; and require direct NPS management instead of protection by some other governmental agency or private sector. The Special Resource Study for the Sand Creek Massacre site, completed in July 2000, concluded that the area is nationally significant.

I agree with that assessment. The Sand Creek Massacre site possesses exceptional value in illustrating and interpreting the history of U.S.-Indian relations in the American West. The

Thus, a National Park System unit at Sand Creek would provide an opportunity for Americans to better understand the significance of the massacre, the chain of events that led to it, the relationship between Indians and whites during the mid-to late-19th Century, the devastating effects of the massacre upon the Cheyenne and Arapaho peoples, and its far reaching repercussions, many of which linger today. The site also retains a high degree of physical integrity, and its isolated setting will give visitors an opportunity to contemplate the complexities of the human tragedy that unfolded there.

The Interior Department's Special Resource Study also concluded that Sand Creek is both suitable and feasible as a unit of the National Park System—suitable because it represents a cultural theme that is not already adequately represented in the system, and feasible because the area taken as a whole is of sufficient size and configuration to ensure long-term resource protection and accommodate public use.

S. 2950 would authorize the establishment of Sand Creek National Historic Site. The unit would be established once the Secretary of the Interior determines that sufficient lands have been acquired to provide for the protection and commemoration of the Sand Creek Massacre. Lands are identified on a map dated July 1, 2000 and would be acquired through donation, purchase from willing sellers or exchange. Priority for acquisition is given to the site containing the historical member. Keys to managing the site would be protection of the natural and cultural features that and critical to telling the story of Sand Creek; and cooperation and consultation with the tribes in the development of management plans and educational programs.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by commending the senior Senator from Colorado, Senator Campbell, for introducing this bill and for all he has done to make it possible for this bill to be before the House today. I urge its passage.

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO DR. ROBERT J. BLOUGH, FOR HIS DEDICATED SERVICE TO HENRY COUNTY, OHIO

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to pay special tribute to an outstanding individual from the State of Ohio. Dr. Robert J. Blough retired from his family practice in Ohio's 5th Congressional District after nearly five decades of distinguished service.

Dr. Blough joined the U.S. Air Force following high school. It was while stationed in China that he decided to become a doctor. A bomb blast occurred costing many lives with countless injured. The terrible incident inspired him to spend the rest of his life helping people.

Dr. Blough has combined his sound medical skills with his compassionate, personal, and dedicated approach to the practice of medicine for nearly 47 years. One of his patients remarked on his dedication by stating, ''Dr. Blough was on call seven days a week, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. He's touched the life of everybody in this community for miles around, either themselves or their family member.'' His medical career alone distinguishes him as a most valued citizen, but Dr. Blough has contributed so much more.

Dr. Blough has worn many hats throughout his life. Previously, he piloted his own private plane traveling from coast to coast on vacations. He also served as an examiner for the Federal Aviation Administration and as manager for Deshler Airport.

The doctor recently retired from 35 years of service as the on-call doctor for Oak Grove Nursing Home. And Dr. Blough will retire soon as coroner of Henry County when his term expires at the end of the year.

Dr. Blough's dedication to his community is second only to his great love for his family. Along with Celia, his loving wife of more than 55 years, he is blessed with three children.

Mr. Speaker, I have known of Dr. Blough's dedication and service that has earned him the highest regard for his character and abilities as a physician. At this time, I would ask my colleagues of the 106th Congress to join me in paying special tribute to Dr. Robert J. Blough. His professionalism and service to his community is an example for all citizens of Ohio and across the country. We thank him, and wish him and his wife, Celia, the very best in all of his future endeavors.

HONORING ERIC FONOIMOANA

HON. STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Eric Fonoimoana from my district. On Tuesday, September 26th, Eric and his teammate Dain Blanton captured the Olympic gold medal for beach volleyball.

Eric has excelled in the sport of beach volleyball for more than a decade. A lifelong resident of the South Bay, Eric was the star player on both the Manhattan Beach Mira Costa High School and University of California Santa Barbara volleyball teams. Following a storied collegiate career, he turned pro in 1993.

For eight years, Eric has been a dominant beach volleyball player. The endless training and competition culminated with the victory in Sydney. I congratulate Eric Fonoimoana on this outstanding achievement. I commend his commitment and dedication to athletic excellence. He has brought honor to the South Bay. He has brought honor to the United States. Congratulations to one of the best beach volleyball players in the world.

PAY IT FORWARD

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention a concept that I believe has the potential to inspire all people, but particularly middle-school children. It's a unique idea called ''Paying it Forward.'' I am only too pleased to tell my colleagues about this idea.

The idea I am referring to has been encapsulated in the book by Catherine Ryan Hyde entitled ''Pay it Forward.'' This book was also recently released as a motion picture. It is the tender yet powerful story of Trevor McKinney, a twelve-year-old boy with a vivid imagination and a paper route, who takes to heart the challenge of an extra-credit assignment for his Social Studies class: Think of an idea for world change, and put it into action. Responding to the challenge, Trevor chooses three people for whom he will do a good deed. Then, rather than allowing them to pay him back, he tells them to ''pay it forward'' by doing something good for three more people. In turn, those three people are to help three more people and so on. In this way, Trevor believes his acts of kindness will multiply out, geometrically, until the world is a different place. Mr. Speaker, in the end, ''Pay It Forward'' is the story of seemingly ordinary people participating in the extraordinary through the simple faith of a child.

It has been brought to my attention that there is a Pay It Forward Foundation. The purpose of the foundation is to encourage middle school children to get involved in their local communities and to ''pay it forward.'' As children create their own ideas for how to pay it forward with their schools and communities, teachers can incorporate relevant social needs and current affairs into their discussions. A Pay It Forward project can be applied to all aspects of academic institutional life. This is a worthy mission that not only helps the surrounding communities, but also helps our students realize that they can change the world. Quite frankly, that is a message that is long overdue. It is a message about overcoming the belief in our individual cynicism that has resulted in withdrawal from participation in our governmental, educational, and community activities. I encourage each and every one of you to take the message to heart. We can never do enough to make the world a better place.

TRIBUTE TO AQUINAS HOUSING CORPORATION

HON. JOSE E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, it is with joy and pride that I pay tribute to Aquinas Housing Corporation (AHC) which will celebrate its Nineteenth Anniversary of providing services to the community on Wednesday, November 8, 2000, at the Marina Del Rey restaurant in the Bronx.

Aquinas Housing Corporation was founded in 1981 by a group of volunteers who understood the need to provide quality transitional housing services to families in need.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 19 years, Aquinas Housing Corporation has sponsored and developed the rehabilitation of 35 buildings, 990 residential units, 104 cooperatives and 115 two and three family homes. By the year 2000, AHC plans to renovate 10 more buildings with 160 additional units for a total of 1,152 decent and affordable rental housing units that were non existent prior to AHC's creation.

Along with housing development, AHC provides a full range of social services to the residents of its buildings and community at large. Services offered include an adult job readiness program, a computer learning center, a clothing bank, case management, tenant organizing, neighborhood improvement projects, classes in English as a Second Language, parenting skills, senior services, a home based child care resource and referral center, a tree maintenance program, and activities and field trips for youth and seniors.

It is a privilege for me to represent the 16th district of New York where Aquinas Housing Corporation is located, and I am delighted by its success. I have witnessed first-hand the exemplary work they are doing for our community and I am deeply impressed. I applaud the commitment and the efforts of Aquinas Housing Corporation's staff in the assistance they provide to the elderly, and low- and moderate-income families, as well as, in facilitating educational opportunities for our talented youth.

I would like to especially compliment this year's honorees, Monadnock Construction which has been with Aquinas Housing since 1992, Ana Maria Chamorro, a long time resident of Community Board Six, and John DelValle Senior Vice President of retail banking at Banco Popular, for their leadership in improving the quality of life in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Aquinas Housing Corporation and its staff and in wishing them continued success.

SPANISH PEAKS WILDERNESS ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2000

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of the companion House legislation, I rise in support of this important bill to designate the Spanish Peaks as wilderness. Enactment of this legislation has been delayed far too long.

The mountains we call the Spanish Peaks are two volcanic peaks in Las Animas and Huerfano Counties. Their Native American name is Wayatoya. The eastern peak rises to 12,893 feet above sea level, and the summit of the western peak is at 13,626 feet.

These two peaks were landmarks for Native Americans and for some of Colorado's other early settlers and for travelers along the trail between Bent's Old Fort on the Arkansas River and Taos, New Mexico.

This part of the San Isabel National Forest has outstanding scenic, geologic, and wilderness values, including a spectacular system of more than 250 free-standing dikes and ramps of volcanic materials radiating from the peaks. These lands are striking for their beauty and are also very valuable for wildlife habitat.

Since 1977, the Spanish Peaks have been included in the National Registry of Natural Landmarks, and the State of Colorado has designated them as a natural area. The Forest Service first reviewed them for possible wilderness designation as part of its second roadless area review and evaluation and first recommended them for wilderness in 1979. However, the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1980 instead provided for their continued management as a wilderness study area—a status that was continued on an interim basis by the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Spanish Peaks are a very special part of Colorado. As I said, their inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System has been too long delayed. In fact, I had hoped that designation of this area as wilderness would be completed two years ago after the House passed a Spanish Peaks wilderness bill sponsored by my predecessor, Representative David Skaggs, and Representative MCINNIS.

Unfortunately, the Senate did not act on that measure, so it was necessary to start again in this Congress. And again it has taken longer than I would have liked—the House passed a bill more than a year ago, and the bill now before us was passed by the Senate back in April of this year. But, better late than never.

This bill does differ from the prior Skaggs-McInnis bill in a few respects, and in particular by the exclusion from wilderness of an old road, known as the Bulls Eye Mine Road, and the inclusion of language related to that road. There have been some questions about the scope and effect of that language. However, in a floor colloquy when the House debated the companion legislation last year the gentleman from American Samoa, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. MCINNIS clarified matters—and the committee report on the Senate bill echoes that colloquy. That report says:

''Section 3(a) addresses the management of the Bulls Eye Mine road. The subsection directs the Secretary of Agriculture to allow for the continuation of

Like the House colloquy, this report language is an important part of the legislative history of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third wilderness bill involving lands in Colorado that has passed during this Congress. I have supported all of them, because I think we need to make it a priority to protect our state's open spaces and wilderness areas, and I think we should be proud of their enactment.

But much more remains to be done. Still pending in the Resources Committee are two wilderness bills I have introduced, dealing with the James Peak area and with lands within Rocky Mountain National Park, as well as a very important bill by our colleague Ms. DeGette that breaks important new ground in terms of protecting wilderness areas on public lands in Colorado managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

I had hoped that before now all these measures would have been given consideration in our Committee and here on the floor of the House. But that hasn't happened. So, if I have the opportunity to serve in the next Congress, I will do all I can to have them considered next year.

Meanwhile, I urge enactment of the Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act.

HONORING RACING LEGEND DARRELL WALTRIP ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor racing legend Darrell Waltrip of Franklin, Tennessee, on the occasion of his retirement after twenty-nine successful years at the top of the sport. Waltrip is concluding his monumental NASCAR career with a Victory 2000 tour across the nation.

Darrell Waltrip was born February 5, 1947, in Owensboro, Kentucky. His love of racing began at the age of 12 when he first drove a go-kart. Just four short years later, he was racing a stock car. Eventually, his father helped him build a 1936 Chevrolet Coupe that he could race on a dirt track in his hometown. Fortunately, his father was able to share almost his entire career with him until he passed away after an extended illness in early 2000. Today, Waltrip makes his home in Franklin, Tennessee, near Nashville, with his wife Stevie, and children Jessica and Sarah.

Darrell Waltrip's first professional race was a Winston Cup race at the Talladega, Alabama, Superspeedway in 1972. Over the years, Waltrip sped to the top of his field, earning numerous accolades and winning many races including the coveted Winston Cup championship a total of three times. For example, he was voted Most Popular Driver two times by his peers and named American Driver of the Year three times. In 1977, 1981, and 1982, he was named National Motorsports Press Association Driver of the Year. In

addition, the years 1981 and 1982 brought honors as Auto Racing Digest Driver of the Year. Today, he is considered one of the foremost race drivers to participate in the sport, and his influence can be seen among the new generation of NASCAR drivers.

During the years 1981–1986, his partnership with car owner Junior Johnson yielded three series championships, 43 victories and 34 pole positions. The highlight of Waltrip's career came in 1989 when he won the Daytona 500 on February 17, in car No. 17, in his 17th attempt for one of racing's highest honors.

Darrell Waltrip's statistics are phenomenal. With a career that includes 276 top-five finishes, 390 top-ten finishes, 37 Superspeedway wins, 47 short track wins, and winnings totaling nearly $18 million, there is no doubt that Waltrip is a true racing legend.

He has broken many barriers in the sport by becoming both a driver and an owner, and is recognized as the first corporate spokesperson in racing. In Tennessee, he is known and loved for his numerous and continuous charitable contributions to the community. In 1979, he was named Tennessee's Professional Athlete of the Year.

Currently, he owns and operates Darrell Waltrip Honda-Volvo Car Dealership, serving many of his fans. I consider Darrell Waltrip a personal friend. In fact, I was with him for the grand opening of his car dealership in Williamson County.

Darrell Waltrip is to be commended and honored for his incredible racing career, which has entertained and enthralled thousands of fans for the past twenty-nine years. He is a true racing pioneer, taking the sport beyond the racetrack and into the hearts and homes of America.

RECOGNIZING PAUL TOWNSEND'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO LONG ISLAND

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an exceptional man who has dedicated himself to Long Island, its people, its businesses, and its natural resources. A tenth generation Long Islander, Mr. Paul Townsend has worked for more than half a century to promote and preserve Long Island.

Mr. Townsend has provided leadership at the highest level. He has served as a catalyst for change and development of our region. His energy and enthusiasm for a wide range of projects is unparalleled. He promoted landmarks such as Levittown. He worked with the federal government to create the Fire Island National Seashore. He created institutions such as Long Island Business News and North Shore University Hospital. He and his wife Terry, worked to establish Long Island's first professional Equity theatre. He served as editor of the Long Island Business News for 45 years and now serves as editor emeritus.

Using his vision, Mr. Townsend assembled the talent to bring important projects to fruition. He worked to produce affordable housing which is now a model for the nation. He, and his colleagues, developed the United Way of Long Island and he served as its first executive director. Long Island's United Way now consists of over 160 health and human care service agencies. The United Way helps local people and in the process, strengthens the community. This organization has helped to prevent youth violence, help care for the very young and the old, provide emergency food, shelter and clothing, and support job assistance training for the disabled.

Mr. Townsend also founded the Long Island Business Development Council and worked to establish Long Island's Entrepreneur Awards Program. He and his wife received the Long Island Association's first Lifetime Achievement Award. He has been an integral part of the Long Island business community.

Mr. Townsend has made countless contributions to the Long Island community. His dedication to the community distinguishes him as a role model all Americans should aspire to emulate. And so it is with great pleasure that I commend Mr. Townsend on his achievements, and wish him all the best for the future.

HONORING MEMBERS OF THE CREW OF THE GUIDED MISSILE DESTROYER U.S.S. ''COLE''

SPEECH OF

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 2000

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, we gather today to honor the crew of the naval destroyer U.S.S. *Cole*. A tragedy of great magnitude occurred in the Yemen port of Aden on October 12, 2000. While the U.S.S. *Cole* was refueling in Aden, in an apparent terrorist suicide mission, a small boat loaded with explosives struck the U.S.S. *Cole*. The impact of the explosion left a 40-by-45 hole in the side of the destroyer, but this impact extends far beyond the port of Yemen, and into the hearts of the American people.

Not only did this explosion strike a devastating blow to the ship itself, but the ship's crew as well. This deliberate act of terrorism has left seven crewmembers dead, ten missing and presumed dead, and over three dozen wounded.

So, we gather here today to not only express our heartfelt sympathies to the families, friends, and loved ones of these servicemen and women, but also to express our thanks for the ultimate sacrifice that these men and women made for their nation. The United States Government has yet to identify the culprit of this terrible act, but we do know that the U.S.S. *Cole* and its crew were going about routine duties in the area and performed dutifully and selflessly in a situation of great duress.

This unfortunate tragedy has taken seventeen lives and wounded over 40 U.S. servicemen. We cannot commend the crew of the U.S.S. *Cole* highly enough for the exemplary spirit and patriotism which they demonstrated in salvaging their crew and ship. Let the memory of those who perished in the U.S.S. *Cole* attack, motivate us to carry on with the same spirit with which they served to preserve the future peace and security, of our nation.

STROKE THERAPY'S NEW PUSH

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Washington Post reminds us of the urgent attention stroke deserves as the third leading cause of death in this country.

Stroke affects the most delicate and vital organ of the body, the brain. The National Stroke Association uses the term ''brain attack'' to characterize this medical condition and describe the urgent need for prompt medical attention. A stroke occurs when blood flow to the brain is interrupted either by a clogged artery or a blood vessel rupture.

Stroke touches the lives of four out of every five American families. It touched the Congress this year with the tragic death of our friend and colleague, Senator Paul Coverdell. Each year 750,000 Americans will suffer a stroke and 160,000 of them will die. African Americans and Latinos are at an even greater risk of stroke. Stroke is also a leading cause of adult disability, leaving a majority of survivors with disabilities ranging from moderate to severe. The statistics are staggering, but fortunately, many strokes can be prevented.

There are important resources available for stroke prevention, treatment and rehabilitation. The National Stroke Association has a wealth of information available on its web site at www.stroke.org, or by calling 1–800–STROKES. Clearly, stroke is an issue that deserves debate, discussion and our immediate attention as a major public health issue. I submit this article to my colleagues and look forward to discussing approaches we might take to reduce the terrible toll from stroke.

[From The Washington Post, Sept. 24, 2000, Sunday, Final Edition]

STROKE THERAPY'S NEW PUSH; AGGRESSIVE DOCTORS GO DEEP INTO THE BRAIN

(Susan Okie)

Like a wisp of cloud that's really the edge of a hurricane, the first sign of what was about to happen to Garline Perry seemed a small thing.

One morning last month, Perry complained to his wife that he couldn't keep his balance. When he tried to walk, she said, he kept ''listing to the right.''

Susana Perry took her husband, 57, to the emergency room at Inova Fair Oaks Hospital. Minutes after they arrived, the storm hit.

''He yelled, 'I can't hear you! I can't see you!' . . . He fell to the floor and starting convulsing,'' recalled Susana Perry. A two-inch clot had blocked a major artery at the back of Perry's brain, producing a catastrophic stroke.

Unable to move, talk, breathe or even blink, the Fairfax man was placed on a respirator and flown by helicopter to Inova Fairfax Hospital, where radiologist John J. ''Buddy'' Connors embarked on a rescue mission that few doctors would dare attempt. He snaked a long, fine tube through an artery to reach the plug of congealed blood inside Perry's brain and began to drip in a clot-busting drug, hoping to reopen the blocked vessel.

Along with perhaps 300 other doctors in the United States, Connors works on the uncharted borders of stroke therapy, putting novel devices and powerful drugs deep into an organ where a mishap can mean death,

coma or paralysis. Such maneuvers signal a newly activist approach to a disorder that doctors once met with resignation. Strokes, the third-leading cause of death in the United States, are now viewed as emergencies in which rapid and aggressive treatment may save lives and minimize disability.

Although the treatment administered by specialists such as Connors has produced dramatic results for some patients, it remains largely untested except in small pilot studies. The situation underscores the challenge researchers face in developing a new treatment, especially a complex one that combines drugs, devices and technical skill. Often, such therapies are refined and tested one patient at a time, evolving and prolifering for years before anyone is certain how well they work.

''The fact that [a new treatment] seems logical and does what it should doesn't necessarily mean that it's going to benefit the patient,'' said John R. Marler, associate director for clinical trials at the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke.

Doctors such as Connors, faced daily with desperate cases, contend that they are advancing medical knowledge as best they can. ''We have to do this,'' Connors said. ''We know we can help patients. . . . There is no regulatory process for this kind of thing.''

DAMAGE CONTROL

Some 600,000 Americans suffer strokes each year. The problem occurs when a blood vessel in the brain becomes blocked by a clot or hemorrhage, causing nerve cells supplied by the vessel to die. Until recently, there was no way to mitigate the damage, only physical therapy and the hope that the brain would partially recover in time.

That changed in 1996, when the Food and Drug Administration approved the clot-dissolving drug tPA as the first effective treatment. But only about 2 percent of U.S. stroke victims receive tPA. a major reason is time: The intravenous therapy only helps if it is started within three hours of the first symptoms, and few people with an incipient stroke make it to the emergency room and through the required battery of checkups and tests before that deadline has passed.

The approach Connors uses appears to be effective if started within six hours after symptoms begin. Specialists in his field also believe it may produce better outcomes by delivering clot-dissolving drugs directly into an artery of the brain instead of through an arm vein, the only mode of administration approved by the FDA.

When tPA is given intravenously, Connors said, ''they give you a massive amount . . . just so that a teeny bit of it might get to a small clot in your brain.'' It's like pouring Drano into a house's main water intake pipe, hoping that some will reach a blocked sink. In contrast, Connors said, he uses a different clot-dissolving drug at about one-fiftieth the usual intravenous dose and puts it as close as possible to the blockage.

The effectiveness of intra-arterial treatment varies, depending on how soon it is started and on the size and location of the clot. Only two studies, funded by Abbott Laboratories, maker of a clot-dissolving drug called prourokinase, have evaluated such treatment by comparing it with a placebo. In the larger study, involving 180 patients, 40 percent of those who received the therapy recovered enough to live independently, compared with 25 percent of patients given a placebo. The degree of benefit was similar to that seen with intravenous tPA, but the rate of brain hemorrhages was higher—about 10 percent among recipients of intra-arterial prourokinase, compared with 6 percent among patients in the tPA study.

Although the findings suggested that the treatment could be beneficial, the FDA asked the manufacturer to conduct another study to obtain more data about the therapy's safety and effectiveness. Abbott has not decided whether to do so.

Genentech Inc., which makes tPA, also has not decided whether to study intra-arterial treatment, a spokesman said.

Connors believes that companies do not want to fund additional trials because they doubt they will recoup research costs. ''Genentech, Abbott and other companies have done the math. . . . The doses that we use for [intra-arterial] therapy are so small that it would take 500 years for them to make that money back at the rate that we are using the drugs now,'' he said.

Tareta Lewis, an Abbott spokeswoman, said cost is not the only consideration. ''There are many things that go into making the decision,'' she said.

Lacking such studies, Connors and other specialists say they don't know the exact benefits and risks of what they are doing.

''We get the patients who don't meet the three-hour time window'' for intravenous tPA, said Richard Latchaw, chief of neuroradiology at the University of Pittsburgh. ''Using a compassionate view, we will go ahead and give intra-arterial tPA in a dosage that we personally think is efficacious. Do we know exactly what that dosage should be? No.''

The therapy has never been directly compared with intravenous tPA. The National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke plans to fund a study at the University of Cincinnati Medical Center in which researchers will give 80 patients with major strokes a combination of intravenous and intra-arterial treatment. They intend to compare the outcomes to existing data on intravenous tPA.

''Itra-arterial therapy does more than put the drug next to the clot,'' said Marler. ''They're passing the catheter into the clot, trying to break [it] up. . . . There are definitely patients it will help, but does it balance out'' against the increased risk of bleeding?

In the meantime, Connors said, ''hundreds of patients are being treated right now, all over the United States.'' He has organized a training course for doctors to be held in Washington next month and is setting up a registry to collect data on patient outcomes.

''This is a new field and we don't know everything we need to know,'' Connors said. ''You're playing statistics. The whole thing is statistics and odds.''

DIFFICULT DECISIONS

The odds in Perry's case looked to be long. His clot was in the basilar artery, dreaded location for a stroke because it nourishes areas of the brain that control life-support functions such as breathing. Without treatment, he

But there was a third possibility. Perry might end up in a nightmarish state that neurologists call ''locked in''; awake and aware, but permanently unable to speak, move or communicate.

If that were the outcome, Connors told Susana Perry that afternoon, ''if it was me, I wouldn't want to make it.''

He offered to stop treatment if she thought it best.

When Connors posed that question, he and his team had already been working on Perry for an hour at Inova Fairfax Hospital. Perry lay on a table in an operating room equipped with X-ray machines that took magnified pictures of blood flowing through the vessels of his brain.

While an anesthesiologist monitored Perry's vital functions, surgically gowned nurses and technicians rushed to fetch drugs and equipment.

Connors and another doctor, Firas Al-Ali, had threaded a long, slippery tube called a catheter, thinner than a strand of angel hair pasta, through a larger tube in Perry's groin, guiding it along major arteries of his abdomen, chest and neck until the tip rested against the clot inside his skull.

Through the catheter, they squirted dye to illuminate the blocked vessel on X-rays and dribbled in medicines that they hoped would tease apart the clump of protein and blood cells.

Most clots that Connors attacks in this way are the size of a grain of rice. Perry's was the size of his little finger.

Connors asked Susana Perry for permission to ''go for cleaning everything up'' to maximize her husband's chances of recovery—even though doing so would heighten the risk that the drugs might cause bleeding in his brain.

''His outlook was 99 percent death,'' Connors said. ''The options were so bad. It's one thing to have a stroke where you can't move your arm but you're mostly still you. It's another thing to have a stroke where you're paralyzed from the eyes down. . . . There's no right or wrong decision on this. It's something where you have to think, 'What if this was me?' and get the family involved.''

Susana Perry told Connors to go for broke. ''I said, 'I'm not ready to get rid of this guy,' '' she recalled.

Connors treated Perry for eight more hours. At last, he removed the catheter and stitched up the small wound in Perry's groin. He estimated that he had dissolved about 95 percent of the clot. Now, it was a matter of waiting to see whether the treatment had worked.

At 1 a.m. the next day, a nurse woke Susana Perry, who was asleep in a room near the intensive care unit. ''He's responding,'' the nurse said. ''He's nodding 'yes' or 'no' to simple questions.''

Perry was still on a respirator and his left side was paralyzed, but the pace of his recovery over the next few days astonished his doctors. Three days after his stroke, he signaled to his son that he wanted something. A nurse handed him a pad and pencil. He wrote, ''Beer.''

Two days later, doctors disconnected the respirator and Perry was able to breathe on his own. A week after the stroke, he had regained some movement in his left leg and was eating and cracking jokes about the hospital food. ''There's so much I'm learning from the beginning,'' he said, speaking slowly. ''You take so much for granted.''

''His level of recovery is—what can I say?—miraculous,'' said David Grass, Perry's neurologist. ''This would have been fatal, absolutely no doubt. . . . He has a left-sided weakness that is improving. He has normal mental function. He has some mild difficulty seeing to his right, but that's improving. He's had no problems with speech. . . . He's going to need several months of rehabilitation, but I'm optimistic that he may eventually be able to return to work. ''

PRESENTATION OF TERESA OE: NORTH DAKOTA'S STATE BEEF AMBASSADOR

HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, on September 28–30 of this year, the North Dakota Stockmen's Association held its annual convention in Bismarck, ND. I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the remarks of one of the conference presenters. Ms. Teresa Oe, a high school student from Belfield, North Dakota and North Dakota's State Beef Ambassador, gave an impressive speech to the convention delegates. Ms. Oe's remarks addressed the environmental benefits of cattle grazing. I would encourage my colleagues to take a moment to review her remarks which may help to bridge communication between cattlemen and environmentalists.

THE MISUNDERSTANDING

(By: Teresa Oe—North Dakota State Beef Ambassador)

Cattlemen and environmentalists have long regarded each other as the enemy. Rarely do they wish to converse with one another, let alone compromise. When they eventually agreed to ''discuss'' matters, the resulting arguments are based primarily on biased opinion and accusations. This communication gap has led to the disastrous misunderstanding that cattle and conservation cannot successfully coexist.

The irony in this notion, however, is that modern day cattlemen, equipped with new range management tools, are extremely capable and dedicated conservationalists. Believe it or not, grazing cattle are their most valuable means for upgrading environmental well being.

According to the 2000 Cattle and Beef Handbook, produced by the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, ''Grazing lands comprise about one-third of the land in the United States.'' Due to steep terrain or dry conditions, these lands often are not suitable for cultivation or development. Cattle graze these virtually useless lands, utilizing grass, one of our country's most ample, renewable resources. Cattle are capable of efficiently transforming grass and other forage into nutritious high-protein beef.

Nevertheless, more and more every day, environmentalists are questioning if cattle belong on the rangelands. Surely, if environmental agencies only knew the significance of cattle to these areas, then their minds would be at ease and our cattle could continue to do their job. With this motive in mind, it is my privilege to share with you five major environmental benefits of cattle on the rangelands.

First of all, properly grazed cattle promote healthy soil and plant vigor. As a matter of fact, as documented in the Soil and Land Conditions publication, the Wildflower Research Center states, ''Grazing is necessary for the maintenance of grassland systems.'' Cattle actually help plants and grasses grow by aerating the soil with their hooves. When cattle saunter over the land, they loosen the dirt which allows more oxygen to enter the soil. Without this oxygen, the soil develops a hard crust and is unable to readily absorb water and nutrients. Moreover, cattle naturally fertilize the soil in the form of manure.

Cattle also encourage plant reproduction. As a natural means of reseeding, they scatter the seeds of various plant life and bury them in the ground, surrounding them in soil that is necessary for the onset of growth.

Regulating bothersome weeds and shrubs is also characteristic of cattle. They consume these nuisances which, otherwise, without the use of herbicides, would have the potential to grow and reproduce uncontrollably.

Furthermore, cattle are doing a large favor for many species of wildlife. Elk, deer, wild sheep, antelope, and geese, among others, are partial to young, palatable grass shoots. In order to stimulate and enhance this new, preferred growth, cattle must first remove the rank fall vegetation that other animals are hesitant to eat.

Last, but certainly not least, cattle grazing aids in preventing fires. Longer vegetation helps carry uncontrolled wildfires that cause mass destruction and expense. In the Wow that Cow! pamphlet published by the American National Cattle Women Inc., it points out that grazing these areas reduces the amount of matter on the ground, thus limiting the quantity of fuel to burn and restricting the fires ability to spread quickly.

Many members of our society have been misinformed that rangelands are in pitiful condition and that cattle are to blame, when in fact, just the opposite is true. As quoted by Rockwood Research in 1996, ''73 percent of cattlemen's range of pasture land had been reported as improved in the past ten years, while only six percent had declared a decline.'' Not surprisingly, this study also showed that 62 percent of cattlemen reported an increase in wildlife. People for the USA! Grazing Position Paper states, ''Scientists and range experts are constantly proving that rangelands are currently in their best condition since the turn of the 20th century, and the improvement is continuing.''

If statistics verify that rangelands and the wildlife therein are truly thriving, why then do members of the environmental community still feel the cattle should be removed from these areas? Mistakes by ranchers of the past are mostly responsible for the negative attention that cattle receive, but this is unfair. Cattle can only be as efficient workers as their owners are good managers. Ranchers of the past did not have the educational resources that are available to us now. Today's cattlemen have a tremendous understanding of the correlation between the proper maintenance of natural recources and their success as livestock producers. Educated ranchers of this generation are better able to make use of cattle grazing as an effective management tool.

Please, take just a moment to visualize the rangelands without cattle. Better yet, try to imagine McDonald's without hamburgers, a shower without soap, Tupperware

In order to prevent this dilemma, we must enlighten others with the truth about cattle and grazing. The devastating misunderstanding that cattle and conservation cannot successfully coexist will be reversed only by knowledge and communication. Please take it upon yourselves to share with others the virtue of cattle on our rangelands and beef in our every day lives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cattle and Beef Handbook Facts, Figures, and Information, National Cattlemen's Beef Association. Englewood, CO. (June 1999)

Grazing. National Cattlemen's Beef Association. (1996). [Online], Available: http//www.teachfree.com/ffyf/grazing.html

Non-Federal Grazing Lands in the United States. United States Department of Agriculture. (1997). [Online], Available: http//www.nhq.nrcs.usda.gov/BSC/grace/nonfed.html

Grazing Position Paper: Facts vs. Fiction. People for the USA! [Online], Available: www.pfw.org/grazing

Soil and Land Conditions: Myths and Facts about Beef Production. [Online], Available: www.beef.org/library/myths-facts

Wow That Cow! American National CattleWomen, Inc. Englewood, CO.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Eastern Municipal Water District, who observed its 50th anniversary of service to western Riverside County on October 14th. On that nostalgic day Eastern Municipal celebrated with present and past employees, and their families, with a fly-over, antique car show, displays and demonstration, live '50s music, clowns, a magic show and much more.

Formed in 1950 to secure additional water for the western Riverside County, which faced declining groundwater supply and continuing droughts, Eastern Municipal has exceeded expectations. Originally only serving a lightly populated area, it now has a service area of 555 square miles, with a total of nearly 440,000 people, while additionally providing sewage collection and water recycling services. In 1999/2000 Eastern Municipal sold 83,000 acre-feet of fresh water alone (one-acre-foot is 325,900 gallons, or as much as two families use in and around their homes in one year). One quarter of their water supply comes from wells, while the remainder comes from the Colorado River Aqueduct and its connections to the California State Water Project. Additionally, Eastern Municipal sells to eight other water agencies, which serve the areas of: Elsinore Valley, Western Riverside County, Lake Hemet, City of Hemet, Nuevo, City of San Jacinto and Rancho California.

In water storage, Eastern Municipal maintains 76 tanks which hold nearly 170 million gallons of water. These tanks provide assurance that water will be available during possible future droughts or declining water supply.

Mr. Speaker, for the state of California there are two issues constantly at the forefront: water, and more water. Therefore, the importance of municipal water districts cannot be underestimated—they will continue to grow and play an increasingly important role in southern California. As the Riverside and the Inland Empire continue to grow, we will need to find ways to live within the 4.4 million acre-feet restriction on the Colorado River that has been imposed by the Secretary of the Interior on southern California. The goals of reclamation will become even more important. Eastern Municipal Water District has proven itself capable of solving our water supply challenges for the past 50 years. I look forward to working with them on our important shared goals for

years to come. Again, I extend my ''Congratulations!'' to Eastern Municipal Water District.

IN SUPPORT OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2001 AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. JAMES H. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4461, the Fiscal Year Agriculture Appropriations Conference report. Although this bill is flawed, it contains critical provisions which reflect my commitment to providing seniors access to lifesaving prescription medications. The measure provides $78.5 billion—$3 billion more than the House-passed bill—for critical programs from prescription drugs to hunger, food safety, and clean water.

I vigorously support efforts to increase seniors' access to affordable prescription drugs. This Conference agreement allows U.S. pharmacies and wholesalers to buy American-made prescription drugs abroad and reimport them into the United States. Since these drugs are often sold abroad at prices significantly below those charged in the United States, America consumers will be able to purchase these reimported drugs at lower prices than they would otherwise pay.

Although I support the reimportation provisions, this step should not be mistaken as a substitute for much-needed prescription drug coverage under Medicare. I continue to urge my colleagues to join me in calling for the enactment of a comprehensive prescription drug program to be included as a part of all Seniors' basic Medicare benefits.

In addition to addressing the problem of prescription drugs for seniors, the Conferees have taken steps to ameliorate several other pivotal issues in the House-passed bill. The report addresses the ongoing prevalence of hunger and food insecurity in America by incorporating sections of H.R. 3192, the Hunger Relief Act. Low-income families are currently disqualified from participation in the food stamp program if they own a car worth more than $4,650, or if they pay monthly housing costs of more than $275. As a cosponsor of the Hunger Relief Act, I am pleased that under this report both vehicle and housing expenses would be updated to more accurately reflect the expense of reliable transportation, and the high cost of housing incurred by America's working families—allowing increased participation in the nation's first line of defense against hunger.

The measure also improves upon the House bill by providing sufficient funding for critical food safety and conservation programs. The Conference measure increased funding for the Food Safety and Inspection Service by more than $22 million, which will help minimize contamination and ensure consumer food safety. Additionally, the bill provides additional funding for state water quality grants and conservation programs, which include essential flood prevention operations.

Unfortunately, the Conference committee did not act in the best interest of our children, or our farmers, when it agreed to a $500 million subsidy for tobacco companies. I have worked hard to protect America's children from the dangers of tobacco, and I have supported long-term solutions to the fundamental problems facing the small family-run tobacco farm, which is why I am deeply dismayed that the Conferees have included such an ill conceived provision that undermines the health of our children and the viability of the struggling family farm.

My colleagues, as unsatisfactory as some of the provisions in this bill may be, it is up to us to do everything in our power to provide access to prescription drugs that can mean the different between life and death, or between health and chronic disease, for senior citizens. Although the Agriculture Appropriations Conference Report is not a perfect bill, I urge you not to let the perfect be the enemy of the good. For that reason, I support H.R. 4461, the Fiscal Year 2001 Agriculture Appropriations Conference report.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. THELMA M. WILLIAMS

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating a very special person, Mrs. Thelma M. Williams, who will be honored in New Jersey by the Elks Pride of Trenton on October 28th for her many years of dedicated community service.

A native of Freehold, New Jersey, Mrs. Williams is a member of St. Michael's Episcopal Church, where she works on the Building Ground Committee and with the Episcopal Church Women. A caring person who is always there to help others, Mrs. Williams serves as a volunteer in the soup kitchen. Organizations to which she belongs include the Elks Pride of Trenton; the NAACP; and AFSCME, where she holds the post of treasurer. In addition, she works on the Board of Elections and serves as a trustee of the Northwest Community Improvement Association. She was employed by the State for 32 years and retired in 1990.

Mrs. Williams is proud of her family—she has a daughter, Marie Meadow, two grandchildren and three great-grandchildren. She serves as an inspiration to all of those around her.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in expressing our appreciation to Mrs. Williams for her dedicated service and our very best wishes as she is honored this weekend.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHRIS CANNON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on September 7, 2000 the House in recorded vote number 459 voted on H.R. 4844 the Railroad Retirement and Survivors' Improvement Act. During this vote I mistakenly voted Nay against the bill and should have voted Aye in favor of the bill. I am a co-sponsor of H.R. 4844 and wish to express my support for the bill.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT INFILTRATING ORGANIZATIONS TO PROMOTE THE SPECTRE OF ''TERRORISM'' IN PUNJAB

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, it has recently come to light that the police in Punjab have been planting RDX explosives on members of the Babbar Khalsa organization in Punjab and then killing them in encounters, claiming that they are importing the explosives from Pakistan.

The Indian government is known to have infiltrated the organization's top levels. They used their agents within this and other organizations to carry out the bombing of their own Air India airliner off Canada in 1985, which killed 329 innocent people.

In November 1994, the Hitavada, an Indian newspaper, reported that the Indian government paid $1.5 billion to the late Governor of Punjab, a man named Surendra Nath, to foment terrorist activity in Punjab and Kashmir. In March, according to two extensive investigations, the Indian government murdered 35 Sikhs in the village of Chithi Singhpora. Between 1993 and 1994, 50,000 Sikhs ''disappeared'' at the hands of Indian forces. According to Amnesty International, there are thousands of political prisoners being held without charge or trial. Human-rights activists say that there are 50,000 Sikh political prisoners alone. The Akali Dal government in Punjab promised to get these political prisoners released, buy they have made no move to do so.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear who the real terrorists are. As the defenders of freedom and democracy, America must declare India a terrorist state and cut off its aid until the terrorism and human-rights violations end. We should also declare our support for protecting the rights of Sikhs, Christians, Muslims, and other minorities by supporting self-determination for their homelands in the form of a free and fair plebiscite on their political status, with international supervision to make sure that neither side tries to corrupt the vote.

Mr. Speaker, the Council of Khalistan has issued a press release on the Indian government's effort to revive the spectre of ''terrorism'' in Punjab by planting RDX explosives on Sikh activitists. I encourage all my colleagues to read this informative press release, and I would like to insert it into the RECORD at this time.

BABBAR KHALSA MEMBERS BEING KILLED FOR RDX—PLANTING EXPLOSIVE IS MODUS OPERANDI OF INDIAN INTELLIGENCE

INDIAN GOVERNMENT HAS INFILTRATED SIKH ORGANIZATIONS

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 24, 2000.—Punjab Police have been killing members of Babbar Khalsa in encounters in Punjab, claiming that they are bringing RDX explosives in from Pakistan. Planting RDX explosives is the modus operandi of the Indian government. A few years ago, they planted RDX in the car of an American businessman who was visiting Punjab and Pakistan to visit relatives and religious shrines.

''The Indian government has infiltrated the top levels of Babbar Khalsa,'' said Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the

Council of Khalistan, the government pro tempore of Khalistan, the Sikh homeland that declared its independence from India on October 7, 1987. He noted that the book ''Soft Target,'' written by two Canadian journalists, proves that the Indian government carried out the 1985 bombing of an Air India jetliner that killed 329 people. They used their agents within Babbar Khalsa in that operation, he charged.

''There is no terrorism in Punjab except the terrorism of the Indian government,'' Dr. Aulakh said. He noted that in March, during President Clinton's visit to India, the Indian government murdered 35 Sikhs in the village of Chithi Singhpora, Kashmir. Two independent investigations and an Amnesty International report have confirmed the government's responsibility. In November 1994, the Indian newspaper Hitavada reported that the Indian government paid the late Governor of Punjab, Surendra Nath, about $1.5 billion to organize and support covert state terrorism in Punjab, Khalistan and in Kashmir. The Indian Supreme Court described the situation in Punjab as ''worse than a genocide.''

About 50,000 Sikhs languish in Indian prisons as political prisoners without charge or trial. Between 1993 and 1994, 50,000 Sikhs were made to disappear by Indian forces. More than 250,000 Sikhs have been murdered since 1984. Over 200,000 Christians have been killed since 1947 and over 70,000 Kashmiri Muslims have been killed since 1988, as well as tens of thousands of Dalit ''untouchables,'' Assamese, Manipuris, Tamils, and others.

''There are many good people in Babbar Khalsa who just want freedom for our homeland, Khalistan,'' Dr. Aulakh said, ''but they are being used by Indian intelligence and its agents within Babbar Khalsa to revive the myth of Sikh terrorism and undermine the Sikh struggle for freedom. The infiltration goes to the highest levels,'' he said. ''I call on Babbar Khalsa members to make sure that they are not used by Indian infiltrators. I call on them to unite with the Council of Khalistan in the peaceful, democratic, nonviolent movement to liberate Khalistan,'' he said.

''India is on the verge of disintegration,'' said Dr. Aulakh. ''Kashmir is going to be free. Khalistan will also be free during this decade, by the grace of Guru. Guru gave sovereignty to the Sikh Nation,'' he said. ''It is time for a unified effort to liberate Khalistan. We need to support the leadership which is sincere, capable, committed, and dedicated to the liberation of Khalistan,'' he said. ''The Council of Khalistan has led the struggle for the last 15 years and has the above mentioned qualities. We must unite behind the Council of Khalistan, form a Khalsa Paj Party in Punjab, Khalistan, and begin a Shantmai Morcha to liberate Khalistan.''

WILLIAM KENZO NAKAMURA UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

SPEECH OF

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of HR 5302, to designate the United States Courthouse in Seattle, Washington, as the ''William Kenzo Nakamura United States Courthouse''.

This designation is a fitting tribute to a great American who overcame great obstacles to uphold the honor and love he had for America.

Mr. Nakamura displayed immense courage and bravery on the battlefield.

On July 4, 1944, Mr. Nakamura crawled within range of an enemy machine-gun nest and destroyed it with four grenades. Later that afternoon Mr. Nakamura was killed near Castellina, Italy by a sniper as he provided cover fire for his retreating platoon. For his bravery and sacrifice his commanding officer nominated him for the Army's highest honor, the Medal of Honor.

Mr. Nakamura was a Japanese-American. After the bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, Japanese-Americans were immediately targeted as the enemy. It did not matter that we were citizens, or had worked hard alongside other Americans for a better future for ourselves and our children. Up and down the West coast more than 100,000 Japanese-Americans, 70,000 of whom were native-born U.S. citizens, were removed from their homes and communities and placed in internment camps.

On February 1, 1943, President Roosevelt reversed his stance on Japanese-Americans and declared ''Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry.'' With this announcement he established the 442nd Regimental Combat Team (RCT), a regiment composed solely of second generation Japanese-Americans, or Nisei. Mr. Nakamura was one of the nearly 12,000 Nisei who volunteered, 3,400 were inducted into the Army.

After nine months of training the 442nd RCT joined the 100th Infantry Battalion consisting of 1,300 Nisei from Hawaii. During seven major European campaigns the 442nd and 100th received 9,486 Purple Hearts, 18,143 individual decorations, and 21 Congressional Medals of Honor. The 442nd became the most highly decorated military unit in U.S. history.

The Medal of Honor that Mr. Nakamura and other soldiers of the 442nd RCT were nominated for were not officially awarded. It took fifty-six years for the government to award Mr. Nakamura his Medal of Honor. Only seven honorees were alive to receive their award in June 2000.

By designating the United States Courthouse in Seattle, Washington, as the ''William Kenzo Nakamura United States Courthouse'' we acknowledge the courage and the sacrifice made by Mr. Nakamura.

I thank this House for the recognition you have bestowed on this great American who never once doubted his country or his love for it, even from behind the barbed wire of a concentration camp.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ARIZONA WATER SETTLEMENTS ACT OF 2000

HON. J.D. HAYWORTH

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Arizona Water Settlements Act of 2000 with the entire Arizona House delegation. This is landmark legislation which, as stated in the delegation's introductory statement, will resolve long-standing issues pertaining to the repayment obligations of the state of Arizona for the construction of the Central Arizona Project (CAP). In addition, it will address allocation of remaining CAP water to satisfy the water rights claims of a number of Arizona tribes, including the Gila River Indian Community and the Tohono O'odham Nation. This is an issue that is important to the state of Arizona, as evidenced by the delegation's full support. In fact, the principal purpose of introducing this legislation at this time is to encourage all parties involved to expeditiously resolve the few remaining issues of the agreement, and to show the Arizona delegation's full commitment to the issue. We fervently hope that all the parties will work in the coming months to wrap up the last remanining details of the settlement.

Some of these issues also reflect a delicate balance. For example, the issue of lands acquired by the tribes after the settlement date and the procedures with which the tribes bring these lands into ''trust'' is an issue that is still being negotiated. It is my understanding that although the tribes have been working closely with the other parties, and that a tremendous amount of work has already been accomplished, the final details have yet to be agreed upon. All of Indian Country will be looking to this provision because it could very well affect all future Native American water and land dispute settlements.

Another critical component of the bill is the use of the settlement funds. It is important that we come to an agreement with the affected Arizona tribes on how best to utilize the funds associated with the settlement. I know that the Gila River Indian Community has worked hard to come to a consensus on this issue, and I hope we will be able to put this issue to rest prior to the start of the 107th Congress. These are important and difficult issues that still need to be finalized, but I am extremely encouraged that all the parties are so close to an agreement. I commend all the parties involved not only for their perseverance, but more importantly, their willingness to negotiate their differences for the benefit of all Arizonans.

Along with this intoductory statement, I am also including a statement from the Arizona congressional delegation in support of this legislation and a letter from Governor Hull expressing her support for this bill. I am happy to sponsor this bill and look forward to enacting legislation on this issue early in the 107th Congress.

STATEMENT OF THE ARIZONA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION REGARDING THE ARIZONA WATER SETTLEMENTS ACT OF 2000

October 24, 2000.

We are pleased to announce that legislation was introduced today to resolve issues relating to the repayment obligations of the State of Arizona for construction of the Central Arizona Project (CAP), allocation of remaining CAP water (including the use of nearly 200,000 acre-feet of water to satisfy the water rights claims of the Gila River Indian Community, the Tohono O'odham Nation, and other Arizona Indian tribes), and other issues, including final settlement of all claims to waters of the Gila River and its tributaries.

Legislation is needed to codify several aspects of the settlement of these various water related issues. Although not all water users have reached agreement on all issues, negotiations are continuing at a rapid pace. We, therefore, expect that all of the remaining differences will be resolved and settlement agreements will be signed by the parties in the next two months. When final agreements are signed, we intend to introduce the final version of legislation to effectuate those settlements. In the meantime,

we have introduced this first version of legislation to demonstrate our commitment to the settlement process, and to allow all interested parties the time to suggest changes to precisely reflect the terms of the settlement.

One of the purposes of this legislation is to implement the settlement (in lieu of adjudication) of all of the water rights claims to the Gila River and its tributaries. Once this legislation is enacted, and the presiding judge approves the settlement agreement, water litigation over rights to the waters of the Gila River, which has been ongoing since 1978, will be terminated. Resolution of this case, and of other issues addressed in the settlement agreements, will help to ensure that there is a more stable and certain water supply for the various water users. This is a significant benefit to the citizens of Arizona, the tribes, and the United States.

The legislation will also resolve several financial issues. For example, it will effectuate a settlement of litigation between the state and federal government over the state's repayment obligation for construction of the Central Arizona Project. It also amends the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to expand funds from the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund to construct irrigation distribution systems to deliver CAP water to the Gila River Indian Community and other CAP water users.

In addition, this legislation authorizes the reallocation of 65,647 acre-feet of CAP water for use by Arizona communities, and the reallocation of nearly 200,000 acre-feet for the settlement of Indian water claims.

We compliment the parties for their hard work and their commitment to resolving these difficult and sometimes contentious issues. We hope and expect that all parties will continue to

Since the parties have not yet completed their negotiations, this bill is, of necessity, also a work in progress. We point out that some of the provisions in the bill may have to be modified (e.g. Section 207 has not been totally agreed to by all interested parties), and other provisions will have to be added (e.g., resolution of conflicts involving water users in the Upper Gila Valley, the City of Safford, and the San Carlos Apache Tribe).

We note that, while Interior staff have been active in the ongoing negotiations and have served on the committees drafting the bill, the Department of the Interior has not had an opportunity to vet some sections of this draft prior to its introduction. One reason for introducing this bill now rather than waiting until the final settlement agreement has been completed, is to enable Secretary Babbitt to analyze and comment upon the draft legislation before he leaves office in January. Secretary Babbitt has been a major participant in the negotiations over the last two years; and his input into the final legislation will be very important to the successful conclusion of the process.

In summary, our intention is to initiate public discussion of the issues and elicit constructive comments on this bill. Our plan is to reintroduce a modified form of this bill early in the 107th Congress. We expect that the necessary settlement agreements will be complete and signed prior to reintroduction. In relation to the Gila River Indian Community Settlement, we expect that all of the participants named in the attached list will support the settlement agreement, and the implementing legislation, Section 213 has been left open for additional parties to the agreement.

We hope that agreement can be reached to settle the claims of the San Carlos Apache Tribe. Title IV has been left open for this purpose. However, if the San Carlos Tribe cannot reach agreement with the other parties, including the United States, it is our intention to proceed without Title IV. A separate San Carlos settlement will have to be pursued at a later date.

We pledge our continuing effort to work with the parties to successfully conclude these historic settlements.

John McCain, Bob Stump, Jon Kyl, Jim Kolbe, Ed Pastor, Matt Salmon, J.D. Hayworth, John Shadegg.

SETTLEMENT PARTICIPANTS

Gila River Indian Community
United States—Department of the Interior; Department of Justice
State of Arizona/Arizona Department of Water Resources
Central Arizona Water Conservation District
Salt River Project
Roosevelt Water Conservation District
ASARCO
Phelps Dodge
City of Mesa
City of Chandler
City of Scottsdale
City of Peoria
City of Glendale
City of Phoenix
Maricopa Stanfield Irrigation and Drainage District
Central Arizona Irrigation and Drainage District
San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District
Town of Coolidge
Hohokam Irrigation and Drainage District
Gila Valley Irrigation District
Franklin Irrigation District
City of Safford
Town of Kearney
Graham County Utilities
Arizona State Land Department
Arizona Water Company
City of Tempe
Arizona Game and Fish
City of Casa Grande
Town of Gilbert
Town of Florence
Town of Duncan
Buckeye Irrigation Company
Roosevelt Irrigation District
New Magma Irrigation and Drainage District

STATE OF ARIZONA,
Phoenix, AZ, October 11, 2000.

Hon. JON KYL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KYL: I commend you for the introduction of the draft legislation the Arizona Water Settlements Act of 2000. This bill will maintain the momentum toward the completion of negotiations on difficult water issues concerning the Central Arizona Project, the Gila River Indian Community, the Tohono O'odham Nation, and the San Carlos Apache Tribe.

The Central Arizona Project is the lifeblood of Arizona. Confirming the repayment settlement between the United States and the Central Arizona Water Conservation District will benefit all of Arizona's taxpayers. Confirming the agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the Arizona Department of Water Resources on the allocation of CAP water will provide for Arizona's future.

It is my understanding that when this legislation is reintroduced in the next congressional session, the parties will approve the Gila River Indian Community settlement agreement. The Governor of the State of Arizona has traditionally been a signatory to Indian water rights settlements and I expect to be a signatory to the Gila settlement. However, I want to emphasize that I will only support a complete settlement of the Gila River Indian Community claims. For example, the economic well being of the upper Gila River Valley communities and agricultural interests is of great interest of the State of Arizona. I understand that much work remains to resolve these upper valley isues and I urge all the participants to reach an agreement as part of the overall settlement.

Again, I commend your efforts to move the process along, and I look forward to our continued work together on Arizona water resource issues.

Sincerely,

JANE DEE HULL,
Governor.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 782, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2000. I am delighted that we are at long last reauthorizing this very popular program that has helped to improve the lives of America's seniors since it was first established in 1965, my first year in Congress.

Reauthorization of the Older Americans Act (OAA) is long overdue. Authorization of programs under OAA expired at the end of fiscal year 1995. Nonetheless, Congress has continued to appropriate funds for OAA programs. These programs have earned broad bipartisan support.

H.R. 782 contains several provisions that will strengthen the Older Americans Act, including establishment of the National Caregiver Program to aid families in caring for frail elders and for grandparents caring for grandchildren. This program, authorized at $125 million, provides grants to states for a multifaceted system of supportive services including information, assistance, counseling, and respite services.

The bill also provides new demonstration programs on domestic violence, rural health, computer training, and transportation. H.R. 782 authorizes as permanent two current demonstration programs—the Eldercare Locator Service and the Pension Rights and Counseling Program.

These are in addition to the mainstays of the Older Americans Act: elderly nutrition programs that provide congregate and home-delivered meals to over 3 million older persons annually; the Senior Community Service Employment Program, which provides opportunities for part-time employment in community service activities for unemployed, low-income older persons; and elder abuse prevention and long-term care ombudsman programs.

I am very pleased to be given an opportunity to reauthorize this vital legislation, which makes a tremendous difference in the lives of our senior citizens.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE TOM EWING ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM CONGRESS

SPEECH OF

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I have served with TOM EWING since he was elected in a special election on July 2, 1991. TOM is one of a handful of members who serve on four committees: Agriculture; Transportation and Infrastructure; Science; and Administration. He is also a member of the President's Export Council. TOM represents the 15th District of Illinois, which covers the east central portion of our great state. Before his election to Congress, TOM served 17 years in the Illinois House of Representatives. He was the Assistant Republican Leader of the House from 1982 to 1990 and was named Deputy Minority Leader in 1990. During his tenure in the Illinois General Assembly and as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, TOM has received numerous state and national awards from business, education, environmental, senior citizens and agricultural organizations. He has been recognized for his leadership in the areas of crime prevention, welfare reform, economic growth and health care.

TOM's emphasis on fiscal integrity and personal responsibility has earned him praise from such groups as the United States Chamber of Commerce, the 60/Plus Senior Citizens Association, the United Seniors Association, the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, and Americans for Tax Reform. In Congress, TOM has made balancing the budget, reducing the national debt, preserving Social Security, sending more money directly to the classroom and healthcare his top priorities. I know first hand from visiting with farmers in TOM's district that he has been a stalwart champion of agriculture issues and the opening of new, foreign markets for United States agriculture products. I want to wish TOM and his wife Connie all the best as they head toward their golden years.

TURN ON THE LIGHTS! MAKE EVERY SCHOOL A COMMUNITY SCHOOL

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, ''Turn on the Lights! Make Every School a Community School,'' is the theme of the 19th annual National Community Education Day to be observed in communities across the country on Tuesday, November 14, 2000.

Sponsored by the National Community Education Association (NCEA), this special day was established in 1982 to recognize and promote strong working partnerships between schools and communities. In my hometown of Flint, Michigan the day will be celebrated with a Community Education Breakfast for 250 people representing school districts and communities across Genesee County. The featured speaker will be John Windom, the Director of Community Education in St. Louis, Missouri.

Community Education Day in 2000 calls attention to the benefits of the community school, a school that is open beyond the regular school day—in the evenings, on the weekends, during the summer—to all members of the community.

The 20,000 community schools across the country focus on meeting community needs with community resources. Differing from community to community, needs range from health and nutrition services, to literacy training, social services, school-age care, extended day programs, career retraining, workforce preparation, continuing education, and recreation opportunities.

Community schools foster community involvement. They are places where community members can meet to learn, to have fun, to tackle issues. They provide safe, nurturing environments for children and youth.

Schools can serve their communities beyond the traditional six hour day and 180-day school year. Located in most neighborhoods, they're easily accessible, they belong to the public, they have good resources, and their traditional hours leave lots of time for other uses.

National Community Education Day is cosponsored by over 35 organizations, including the Alliance for Children and Families, the Childrens Defense Fund, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National PTA, the National Assembly of Health and Human Service Organizations, and the U.S. Department of Education.

I am pleased to stand before you today to support our community schools and the fine work being done by the National Center for Community Education in Flint, Michigan. The contributions that community education has made to millions of children and families deserve the recognition of the United States Congress.

BEVERLY SAN AGUSTIN: GUAM'S 2001 TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the winner of Guam's 2001 Teacher of the Year Award, Beverly San Agustin.

Beverly teaches Social Studies and American Government at Simon Sanchez High School. Her unique educational and motivational techniques as well as her desire to reach out to every student have distinguished her among her hard working colleagues. Her selection was based on interviews and classroom observations. Beverly also makes extra efforts to see that her classes are learning to their potential and preparing themselves for the demands of the 21st century. A 22-year veteran in the field of education, Beverly's efforts to increase the credibility of teaching as a profession is designed to entice and encourage a new generation of students into following her in this most honorable profession.

As Teacher of the Year, she will be visiting us here in Washington, D.C. while representing Guam at the National Teacher of the Year announcement ceremony. In addition, she will also be the island's representative in a number of Teacher of the Year activities throughout the 2000–2001 school year. These include Space Camp and the National Teacher of the Year Forum.

Also worth mentioning are the finalists: Monina Sunga of Vicente Benavente Middle School, Cheryle Jenson of Price Elementary School, John Randolph Coffman of P.C. Lujan Elementary School, and Alvaro Abaday of my alma mater, John F. Kennedy High School. Ms. Jenson, a first grade teacher, was the runner-up.

Teachers make great contributions towards shaping our future. They provide the foundation and support to foster the education of our children. They help mold and shape students into knowledgeable young adults. Teachers help students realize their potential for success and foster self-confidence. They have a personal commitment to help students become a whole person, equipped with the knowledge, self-confidence, and respect they need to compete and excel in today's ever changing world. Tomorrow's leaders are being prepared for their impending roles in society by today's teachers.

I would like to congratulate this year's Guam finalists and, especially, the 2001 Teach of the Year, Beverly San Nicolas. I take great pride in having these individuals counted as my colleagues in the field of education and I urge them to keep up their excellent work. Si Yu'os Ma'ase'.

COMPUTER SECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2413, the Computer Security Enhancement Act of 2000, contains modest but important changes to the legislation as it was reported by the Committee on Science. These changes to section 12 and other provisions of the bill were made at the request of the Committee on Commerce, and, as a result of their adoption, I have no objection to this bill. I want to thank and commend the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Science Committee, Representative BART GORDON, and their staffs, for their courtesy and cooperation in this matter.

The changes made clear that, as in the case of the Electronic Signatures Act that recently became law, the Federal Government will not establish a one-size-fits-all standard for electronic authentication technology that must be used by government agencies and those entities that report to them. Federal agencies and their committees of proper, legislative jurisdiction must be unconstrained in their ability to see that electronic authentication technologies that best serve their statutory and regulatory purposes are adopted. As a result, this legislation only asks that the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) serve as a resource for federal agencies on electronic authentication technologies, and any guidelines and standards NIST develops are to be both advisory and, very importantly, technology-neutral.

In fact, a provision of the bill as it was reported by the Science Committee would have required NIST to report to Congress within 18 months after enactment, evaluating the extent to which electronic authentication technology being used by federal agencies conforms to NIST standards. That provision of the Committee-reported bill as been deleted. Instead, NIST is only asked to report to Congress concerning progress federal agencies made and problems they encounter in implementing electronic authentication technologies. In addition, a new provision of the bill provides that a study on electronic authentication technologies to be completed by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences may not recommend any single technology for use by government agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Science Committee has focused attention on an important issue, and I thank them for their hard work. I have no objection to suspending the rules and passing this legislation.

AMERICAN HOMEOWNERSHIP AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1452, especially subtitle B of title V. The title expands housing assistance for native Hawaiians by extending to them the same types of federal housing programs available to American Indians and Alaska natives. The provision authorizes appropriations for block grants for affordable housing activities and for loan guarantees for mortgages for owner- and renter-occupied housing. It authorizes technical assistance in cases where administrative capacity is lacking. The block grants would be provided by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands of the government of the State of Hawaii.

I thank the Chairman of the Banking Committee [Mr. LEACH], the Ranking Member [Mr. LAFALCE], the Chairman of the Housing Subcommittee [Mr. LAZIO], and the Ranking Member of Subcommittee [Mr. FRANK] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEREUTER] for their assistance in incorporating the provisions for Native Hawaiian housing in the bill.

Passage of this bill is critical because within the last several years, three studies have documented the housing conditions that confront Native Hawaiians who reside on the Hawaiian home lands or who are eligible to reside on the home lands.

In 1992, the National Commission on American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Housing issued its final report to Congress, ''Building the Future: A Blueprint for Change.'' In its study, the Commission found that Native Hawaiians had the worst housing conditions in the State of Hawaii and the highest percentage of homelessness, representing over 30 percent of the State's homeless population.

In 1995, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development issued a report entitled, ''Housing Problems and Needs of Native Hawaiians.'' This report contained the alarming conclusion that Native Hawaiians experience the highest percentage of housing problems in the nation—49 percent—higher than that of American Indians and Alaska Natives residing on reservations (44 percent) and substantially higher than that of all U.S. households (27 percent). The report also concluded that the percentage of overcrowding within the Native Hawaiian population is 36 percent compared to 3 percent for all other U.S. households.

Also, in 1995, the Hawaii State Department of Hawaiian Home Lands published a Beneficiary Needs Study as a result of research conducted by an independent research group. This study found that among the Native Hawaiians population, the needs of Native Hawaiians eligible to reside on the Hawaiian home lands are the most severe. 95 percent of home lands applicants (16,000) were in need of housing, with one-half of those applicant households facing overcrowding and one-third paying more than 30 percent of their income for shelter.

S. 1452 will provide eligible low-income Native Hawaiians access of Federal housing programs that provide assistance to low-income families. Currently, those Native Hawaiians who are eligible to reside on Hawaiian home lands but who do not qualify for private mortgage loans, are unable to access such Federal assistance.

I look forward to enactment to the bill because it is so important to the native people of Hawaii.

HONORING CAROL BEESE OF BARRINGTON, ILLINOIS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to a good friend, Carol Beese, of Barrington, Illinois. Carol is a community leader without equal, and is retiring from the Barrington Area Chamber of Commerce after 32 years of service.

Carol became involved in the Barrington Area Chamber of Commerce many years ago. A true professional, her career in public service as a leader is rarely equaled. As President of the Chamber of Commerce, Carol has built the organization into one of the most energetic and engaged Chambers in the State of Illinois. She has been both dedicated and adamant with regard to the issues facing Chamber members, and is active as liaison between local businesses and Village officials.

She is truly deserving of this tribute, and I am certain she will remain committed to serving the Barrington community for many years to come.

HONORING FLINT, MI OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you to call attention to an event taking place in my hometown of Flint, Michigan. Today, civic and community leaders will gather to mark the official relocation of the Social Security Administration's Flint Office of Hearings and Appeals to 300 W. Second Street.

Last year, the Flint Office of Hearings and Appeals celebrated its 25th Anniversary. Since 1974, the office has existed in the downtown business district, providing an accessible service for thousands of individuals. The office provides a public service not only to residents of Flint, but also to Ann Arbor, Bay City, Saginaw, West Branch, Alpena, and many other surrounding communities. Staffed by three Administrative Law Judges, a Senior Administrative Law Judge, and 25 loyal staff members, the office is one of the Social Security Administration's ten most productive offices nationally. During the 2000 fiscal year, the Flint OHA processed 1,994 dispositions.

I would also like to recognize Paul C. Lillios, Regional Chief Administrative Law Judge for Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. Judge Lillios will be in attendance to officiate the ceremony. His presence is proof of the SSA's commitment to the city, and its pledge to implement reform that will prove beneficial to its customers.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I consider it both my duty and my privilege to work to improve the quality of life for our citizens. I am glad that one person who shares this sentiment is Kenneth Apfel, the Commissioner of Social Security. He has diligently worked to ensure that the offices under his care maintain a high standard of productivity. I am pleased that the Flint OHA is one such office that has lived up to this ideal. I ask my fellow Members of Congress to join me in recognizing the opening of the new OHA office, and the beginning of a new era in public service.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Breast Cancer Awareness Month, I rise in support of all of the women and families across this nation who have been affected by or are at risk of breast cancer.

Breast cancer is a serious health concern for all women. Besides skin cancer, more women in the United States are diagnosed with breast cancer than any other cancer each year. One in nine American women will be diagnosed with breast cancer during her lifetime, and about 40,800 will die from this disease during this year alone.

All women are at risk. Two-thirds of women with breast cancer have no family history of the disease or show other risk factors. Although there is a greater chance of incidence in women over 50 years old, breast cancer can occur at any age. White women are more likely to develop breast cancer than other women, however women of all races can be affected. For example, Asian Pacific Americans have a rate of 72.6 incidences per 100,000 people, and Hispanics have a rate of 69.4 of incidences per 100,000 people.

Such facts and figures illustrate the widespread severity of this issue, and I commend

the many local and national organizations who have dedicated their time and efforts in the fight against breast cancer. Many organizations are active in developing programs to raise awareness on breast cancer, conducting extensive research, organizing programs and support groups for breast cancer patients and families, performing community services and volunteer work, and compiling and distributing information. With the help of such efforts, women have detected breast cancer earlier through monthly breast exams and annual mammograms. Currently, there are two million breast cancer survivors in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to join the battle against breast cancer and support initiatives that help women across our nation face the challenges of this deadly disease. Therefore, I recognize Breast Cancer Awareness Month for all of the mothers, sisters, and daughters, families, and friends across the nation who have been affected by or are at risk of breast cancer, and I pay tribute to those who have passed on due to this disease.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BASIC ACCESS TO SECURE INSURANCE COVERAGE (BASIC) HEALTH PLAN ACT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Basic Access to Secure Insurance Coverage Health Plan (BASIC) Act which builds on existing health insurance programs to provide all uninsured Americans, regardless of age or family status, the opportunity to get health insurance. The BASIC plan would create a universal guarantee for health insurance for all Americans.

While we are experiencing unprecedented prosperity and a strong economy, yet there are still 43 million of Americans who are uninsured. Being uninsured is not a ''Washington problem.'' It is a human problem, as those 43 million people understand. In any given year, one-third of the uninsured go without needed medical care. Eight million uninsured Americans fail to take medication their doctors prescribe, because they cannot afford to fill the prescription. A new study published this month in the Journal of the American Medical Association confirms the serious health consequences of lacking insurance. Long-term and short-term uninsured adults were more likely than insured adults to face cost barriers to care and forgo needed care.

Lack of health insurance can have serious financial consequences as well. An uninsured family is exposed to financial disaster in the event of serious illness. Unpaid medical bills account for 200,000 bankruptcies annually. Over 9 million families spend more than one fifth of their total income on medical costs.

The BASIC Health Plan Act builds on two successful federal-state health insurance programs: Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). The BASIC plan would extend these programs to all individuals and families with income up to 300% of the poverty level through a multi-year phase in. Other uninsured individuals may buy in to the program by paying the cost through premiums. Since nearly three-fourths of the uninsured have family incomes below 300 percent of the poverty level, this expansion is targeted at those who need it.

This bill also includes a number of provisions to ensure that families can easily access health insurance through the BASIC program. First, it simplifies and streamlines the application and enrollment process for these programs to make them seamless. Second, the bill would make it easier for states to identify and enroll families in coverage. Third, the bill improves upon the CHIP benefit package to guarantee all children receive adequate preventive services and treatment.

Additionally, since 82 percent of the uninsured are workers or dependents of workers, this bill seeks to use families' connection to employment to facilitate access to health insurance coverage. Employers will not be required to provide coverage or contribute to the cost of coverage, although they may if they so wish. However, they will be required to facilitate access to the coverage by withholding any required premium contributions from the employee's periodic pay, just like they do for taxes today.

I believe the BASIC Health Plan Act is an excellent starting point for providing health care coverage for every American. Over the past few years, Congress has lost focus on addressing this pressing issue. This time is upon us again to place health insurance at the forefront of our agenda.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House and the Senate on the BASIC Health Plan Act to help provide health insurance coverage to many of the millions of Americans who are currently without health insurance.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION AND SUMMARY OF THE ''BASIC'' HEALTH PROGRAM: UNIVERSAL ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE QUALITY HEALTH INSURANCE

America is the only industrial country in the world, except South Africa, that does not guarantee health care for all its citizens. The number of uninsured declined last year for the first time in more than a decade—but 43 million Americans remain uninsured, and any slowdown in the economy is likely to send the number up again. The vast majority of the uninsured are workers or dependents of workers. The consequences of being uninsured go far beyond vulnerability to catastrophic medical costs. The uninsured often lack timely access to quality health care, especially preventive care. They suffer unnecessary illness and even death because they have no coverage.

Growth in the Uninsured

The number of the uninsured has grown from 32 million in 1987 to 43 million this year. Except for a brief pause in 1993 and 1994, the number of uninsured has consistently increased by a million or more each year until this year. Even these figures understate the number of the uninsured. During the course of a year, 70 million Americans will be uninsured for an extended period of time.

Characteristics of the Uninsured

The vast majority of privately insured Americans—161 million citizens under 65—receive coverage on the job as workers or members of their families. But the uninsured are also overwhelmingly workers or their dependents. Eighty-two percent of those without insurance are employees or family members of employees. Of these uninsured workers, most are members of families with at least one person working full-time.

Most uninsured workers are uninsured because their employer either does not offer coverage, or because they are not eligible for the coverage offered. Seventy percent of uninsured workers are in firms where no coverage is offered. Eighteen percent are in firms that offer coverage, but they are not eligible for it, usually because they are part-time workers or have not been employed by the firm long enough to qualify for coverage. Only 12% of uninsured workers are offered coverage and decline.

The uninsured are predominantly low and moderate income persons. Almost 25 percent are poor (income of $8,501 or less for a single individual; $13,290 or less for a family of three). Twenty-eight percent have incomes between 100 and 200 percent of poverty. Eighteen percent have incomes between 200 and 300 percent of poverty. Almost three-fourths have incomes below 300 percent of poverty.

Consequences of Being Uninsured

An uninsured family is exposed to financial disaster in the event of serious illness. Unpaid medical bills account for 200,000 bankruptcies annually. Over 9 million families spend more than one fifth of their total income on medical costs. The health consequences of being uninsured are often as devastating as the economic costs:

In any given year, one-third of the uninsured go without needed medical care.

Eight million uninsured Americans fail to take medication their doctors prescribe, because they cannot afford to fill the prescription.

Thirty-two thousand Americans with heart disease go without life-saving and life-enhancing bypass surgery or angioplasty, because they are uninsured.

Twenty-seven thousand uninsured women are diagnosed with breast cancer each year. They are twice as likely as insured women not to receive medical treatment until their cancer has already spread in their bodies. As a result, they are 50% more likely to die of the disease.

The tragic bottom line is that 83,000 Americans die every year because they have no insurance. Being uninsured is the seventh leading cause of death in America. Our failure to provide health insurance for every citizen kills more people than kidney disease, liver disease, and AIDS combined.

THE PROPOSAL: SUMMARY OF BASIC ACCESS TO SECURE INSURANCE COVERAGE HEALTH PLAN (''BASIC'' HEALTH PLAN)

Overview

The BASIC program builds on two successful federal-state health insurance programs: Medicaid and the Child Health Insurance Program (CHIP). It also incorporates a number of elements from Vice-President Gore's proposal to improve and expand upon insurance coverage under CHIP and Medicaid to the parents of eligible children. The BASIC plan extends the availability of subsidized coverage to all uninsured low and moderate income Americans, regardless of age or family status. It guarantees the availability of coverage in every state for every uninsured person, and includes provisions to encourage enrollment by those who are eligible. The plan also allows other uninsured individuals to buy-in to the program by paying the full premium.

Key Provisions

PHASE I: COVERAGE FOR CHILDREN AND PARENTS—EXPANSION OF CHIP AND MEDICAID

Eligibility levels are raised to 300% of poverty ($42,450 for a family of three) for all uninsured children over 2 years.

Coverage is made available to all uninsured parents of enrolled children.

Coverage is made available to legal immigrant children, and their parents.

The minimum benefit package under CHIP for children is improved by adding eye-glasses, hearing aids, and medically necessary rehabilitative services for disabled or developmentally delayed children.

Additional steps are established to encourage enrollment of eligible children and their parents, including presumptive eligibility, qualification for at least twelve months, and simplified application forms.

The system of capped state allotments under CHIP is eliminated and federal matching funds are made available for all eligible persons enrolled in the program.

PHASE II: COVERAGE FOR THE REMAINING UNINSURED

Subsidized coverage is made available for the remaining uninsured with incomes below 300% of the poverty level. Coverage is phased in by income levels, beginning with those below 50% of the poverty level in the third year of the program, rising to 300% of the poverty level in the ninth year.

Other uninsured individuals above 300% of poverty may buy-in to the program by paying the cost through premiums.

Responsibility of Employers

Eighty-two percent of the uninsured are workers or dependents of workers. Employers will not be required to provide coverage or contribute to the cost of coverage—but they will be required to offer their uninsured employees an opportunity to enroll in the program and agree to facilitate the coverage by withholding any required premium contributions from the employee's periodic pay.

Cost

Preliminary estimates of similar proposals indicate that the federal cost will be $200–300 billion over the next ten years, beyond the amount already budgeted for expansions of coverage under the current CHIP program.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Domestic Violence Awareness Month, and on behalf of the victims and families affected by domestic violence, I rise to speak on this rapidly growing and widespread health concern. Domestic violence involves serious physical, sexual and psychological consequences not only for women, but for children and entire families. It affects our entire nation and cuts across all lines of race, age, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, and religion. Not only does domestic violence include spouse or partner abuse and woman battering, it also involves child abuse, elder abuse, and violence between roommates.

The devastating statistics demonstrates the urgency of this matter. Every year, 3 to 4 million women are beaten by male partners. Every 21 days, a woman is killed by domestic violence, and every 15 seconds, a domestic violence act occurs somewhere in the U.S. This means that there are over 2.5 million victims of domestic violence per year. Almost 2 out of 3 females from this group have been attacked by a family member or acquaintance. In addition, more than 53 percent of male abusers beat their children, and 32 out of 1,000 people over age 65 experience elder abuse.

Domestic violence not only affects the victim but also affects families, relatives, and unborn children. While victims are traumatized and left with a sense of vulnerability and helplessness, the over 3 million children who witness acts of domestic violence display emotional and behavorial disturbances. Also, pregnant women who are victims of physical abuse have greater chance of miscarriage.

Unfortunately, domestic violence involves victims from all walks of life and all geographic locations. In Guam, of the 2,090 violent offenses reported to the Guam Police Department, 661 arrests were made for family violence. In 1999, the Guam Child Protective Services received 1,908 referrals, and between 1997 and 1999, the Guam Adult Protective Services received 907 referrals for the elderly and persons with disabilities.

Such violence should not be tolerated. Every woman, man, and child has the right to a healthy and safe environment. Numerous national and state organizations have contributed to efforts in raising awareness, conducting programs encouraging preventive mechanisms, providing counseling services, and building centers or shelters for victims and their families.

In recognition of this growing concern and the need to address this issue, October has been declared ''Family Violence Awareness Month'' by the Governor of Guam. It has included a Silent Witness Ceremony in honor of domestic violence victims, a Hands Across Guam Rally for island wide community outreach, a Family Violence Conference for the general public and professional staff, and a Poster Exhibition for Elementary Schools including children's artwork on family and love.

Guam has also benefitted from the $300 million in ''STOP (Services, Training, Officers and Prosecution) Violence Against Women'' grant funds, which were awarded by the U.S. Department of Justice's Violence Against Women Office to 4,715 grant recipients nationwide. Of these funds, 51 grants were awarded to agencies and organizations in Guam, totaling more than $2.5 million.

Domestic violence is a widespread and growing problem needing urgent and constant attention. We must all work together so that women, children, and families can live in a safe and nurturing home environment. I will continually support this issue for all victims of domestic violence and for the healthy and safe environment of our entire Nation.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO RENAME ''MEDICARE+CHOICE'' AS ''MEDICARE-NO-CHOICE''

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, sometimes a lie is repeated so often, that people forget what a falsehood it is.

For years, people who want to privatize Medicare have been saying that joining a managed care plan—an HMO—will give seniors more choice. In 1997, they even renamed the whole HMO program, ''Medicare+Choice,'' pronounced Medicare Plus Choice.

What a lie.

In traditional, fee-for-service Medicare, you have total freedom of choice. One of my constituents in Medicare from Fremont, California can decide to go to Baltimore's Johns Hopkins, which US News consistently rates as the Nation's best hospital, and Medicare will pay.

But when you join a Medicare+Choice HMO, all of a sudden you are limited in the hospitals you can go to and the doctors you can see that the HMO and Medicare will pay for.

So Medicare+Choice really isn't ''more choice.'' More HMOs simply mean ''more choices of plans that limit your choice of doctors and hospitals.''

Therefore, let's be honest: to stop the lie and make it clear what managed care is all about, I am today introducing a bill that says, in its entirety,

''Strike the words 'Medicare+Choice' wherever it appears in the law, and substitute the words 'Medicare-No-Choice'.''

This name change may seem like a silly idea at first blush, but there is a good reason for it. The current name gives the impression that you are getting more than you would in traditional Medicare. All too often, that is not the case. The reality is that seniors are being duped by HMOs each and every day into joining plans that offer the world and then take most of those benefits away year by year—if they even remain in the program at all.

''Medicare-No-Choice''—this name change would give Medicare beneficiaries pause and might cause them to look at the details of the plan more than is currently the case. And, Mr. Speaker, that is not a silly change at all.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK GREEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to vote on the following measures yesterday.

On roll No. 541—H. Res. 634 (Rule on H.R. 4656), if I had been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

On roll No. 542—H. Con. Res. 414 (Regarding establishment of representative government in Afghanistan), if I had been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

On roll No. 543—H.R. 4271—National Science Education Act, if I had been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

HAIL THE VETERAN

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, as Veterans' Day approaches, I wanted to share a poem which was written by one of my constituents, Charlie Reese, with my colleagues.

Hail the Veteran—whose noble deeds,
Nurtured Liberty's growing seeds,
Soldier, Sailor, airman, grunt,
Who held this Nation's battle fronts.

These selfless people who paid the price,
With years or life in sacrifice.

In war or peace they joined the ranks.
Hail the Veteran—and give them thanks.

Hail the Veteran—whose heroic duty,
Helped preserve this Nation's beauty,
Who came to their great country's aid,
With dedication that will never fade.

In barracks or bulwarks, on sea or soil,
Our freedom protected because of their toil.
The campaigns and marches and endless drills—
Hail the Veteran—for their mighty will.

Who through the years answered the call,
Who soared and swam and stood and crawled.
Who in our history shall ever stand tall,
Hail the Veteran—they gave their all.

PROVIDING FOR CONCURRENCE BY HOUSE WITH AMENDMENT IN SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4868, TARIFF SUSPENSION AND TRADE ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I am disappointed that a section of H.R. 4868 may ease the process in which gum arabic from Sudan may be imported into the United States.

The President imposed comprehensive sanctions against Sudan because of its horrible human rights record, sponsorship of terrorism, and implication in the assassination attempt on Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, under Executive Order 13067, on November 3, 1997.

With the events of the past few weeks, including the bombing of the U.S.S. *Cole*, this Congress should not be weakening or adjusting the sanctions in place on Sudan. We have reports that Osama bin Laden has been involved in and may still have a role in the gum arabic industry in Sudan. It has also been reported that bin Laden could be a prime suspect in masterminding the bombing of the U.S.S. *Cole*. We do know that he has been implicated in the attacks on two U.S. embassies in Africa.

In short, this is a horrible time for Congress and for the Administration to weaken our resolve on sanctions against Sudan.

LACK OF HEALTH INSURANCE BANKRUPTS MILLIONS OF AMERICANS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the record of the 106th Congress on major health care policy issues—Medicare prescription drug coverage, managed care reform, and extension of coverage to the 44 million Americans who lack it—is appalling. Our failure to enact legislation that provides baseline coverage for all of our citizens is not simply that emergency rooms are overcrowded and public health clinics are overflowing. Our lack of a guaranteed health care safety net indirectly plunges millions into bankruptcy and financial ruin who, once sick, cannot afford to pay for their high medical treatment costs out-of-pocket.

This piercing fact is highlighted in a column that was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Oct. 8. Health care economist Uwe Reinhardt points out the fallacy of self-reliance when it comes to health insurance. I submit the following article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 8, 2000]

ISSUE NO. 1: HEALTH-CARE SYSTEM WANTED

(By Uwe Reinhardt)

Several years ago, in a fit of compassion, New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani appointed former Republican Mayor John Lindsay to two no-show municipal jobs, solely to provide the latter with city-financed insurance coverage for health care not covered by Medicare. Lindsay, after several strokes and with Parkinson's disease, was facing out-of-pocket outlays for health care that had begun to strain his finances.

Millions of fellow Americans share Lindsay's predicament. The most recent estimate by the U.S. Bureau of the Census revealed that about 42 million Americans find themselves without any health insurance coverage for at least part of the year. Almost half the uninsured at any time have been uninsured for more than two years. Many millions more, including Medicare beneficiaries like John Lindsay, have shallow insurance coverage.

To be sure, most of the uninsured probably are relatively healthy. When they do fall seriously ill, they usually receive critically needed care at nearby hospitals. Ultimately, the hospital tries to recover the cost of its ''charity care'' from insured patients, but only after first hounding the uninsured themselves for payment, often with the help of tough collection agencies. According to survey research by Harvard law professor Elizabeth Warren, medical bills now are the second most frequently cited reason for the bankruptcy of American families, right behind ''job loss'' and ahead of ''divorce.''

Political leaders in any other industrialized nation would think it unacceptable nation would think it unacceptable to force families, stricken by serious illness, to face the added prospect of bankruptcy. Not so with this nation's policy-making elite. To illustrate, in their first debate, neither presidential candidate addressed the problem on his own. And moderator Jim Lehreer saw no reason to accord the issue an explicit question. Perhaps all of them surmised that, in these times of economic bounty, their audience would have little interest in the acute distress of a misfortunate few.

Alas, the economy may not always remain bountiful. If it doesn't, American consumers, feeling poorer, might tighten their belts, thereby triggering a consumption-led recession. With a recession would come layoffs, and with them a loss of employment-based health insurance. The middle class might then be reminded once more that it lacks what families in all other industrialized nations enjoy; universal, permanent protection against the financial consequences of illness.

Universal coverage could easily be provided in this country, if only the nation's political elite were willing to do three things. First, there must be a mandate on every individual to have at least catastrophic health insurance. Second, between $60 billion and $100 billion a year would have to be appropriated to subsidize the health insurance of low-income families. Third, government regulation would have to ensure an efficient market for individually purchased health insurance. That insurance could be private or, should private insurance fail to meet social needs, public (e.g., Medicaid and Medicare). The shelves of the nation's think tanks bend under the weight of ready-to-go proposals that could achieve both objectives.

Opponents of such measures are fond of reminding us of this nation's ''rugged individualism'' and its tradition of ''self-reliance.'' For the most part, it is empty talk. Most corporate executives, for example, enjoy comprehensive, tax-sheltered ''social insurance'' paid for by their corporations, literally until these executives' last day on earth. Furthermore, the plight of former Mayor Lindsay stands as a stark warning to all would-be rugged individualists who believe that self-reliance is the proper solution to this nation's health-care woes. In the end, even he could not be protected by our nation's brittle private health-insurance system. He was saved by what is otherwise decried as ''a complete government takeover'' of his health-care needs.

A common lament is that the typical college student today insists on doing well by doing good. Too few of them are said to heed President John Kennedy's eloquent exhortation to self-sacrifice: ''Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.'' But why would any American youngster seek to lay out for a country that thinks nothing of letting its citizens slide into the undignified status of health-care beggars, and into financial destitution, simply because serious illness struck? America's allegedly selfish young have read their country's soul and are acting accordingly.

AMERICAN HOMEOWNERSHIP AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK GREEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House today considered S. 1452, the Manufactured Housing Improvement Act, and I would like to thank Housing Subcommittee Chairman RICK LAZIO for all of his efforts to open homeownership opportunities to so many American families.

This bill encompasses many important provisions from H.R. 1776, the homeownership bill that passed the House overwhelmingly earlier this year. It also includes important provisions to preserve affordable housing for seniors, and other low-income and working families.

I would like to mention two provisions that I introduced (H.R. 2860 and H.R. 2931) which were included in H.R. 1776, and now S. 1452.

The first would create a pilot program to assist law enforcement officers purchase homes in locally designated ''at risk'' areas. The proposal would allow law enforcement officers to purchase homes with no downpayment. They must use the property as their primary residence for at least 3 years, and have 6 months of service. It is modeled after a pilot program that was conducted in Wisconsin. The Milwaukee pilot was successful because it offered a ''no downpayment option.'' Seventy-five percent of those who participated in the program said they did so because of the no downpayment requirement.

This proposal will not only provide homeownership opportunities for law enforcement officers who might otherwise not have the

money for a downpayment on a home, but will also deter crime. Criminals will be far less likely to commit an act of violence if they know a police officer lives right next door. Finally, this gives control to local officials, allowing mayors to designate the areas they believe need the most protection.

My second provision expands on the Section 8 homeownership rule to make it more accessible to persons with disabilities. This provision provides incentives for employment and homeownership for the most underserved group of homeowners in the country. Nationally unemployment rates among the disabled of working age exceed 70 percent and homeownership rates at less than 5 percent.

Two of the biggest barriers to homeownership for persons with disabilities are affordability and accessibility. It costs $20–$40 thousand to customize a home for some disabled individuals. This pilot program addresses these problems by allowing disabled families making up to 100 percent of the area median income to qualify to use their Section 8 voucher for homeownership. The benefit may continue for the entire term of the mortgage provided they remain eligible for such assistance. It also requires one or more members of the family to have achieved employment and participation in a homeownership counseling program.

While I am very pleased with the outcome of the negotiations on S. 1452, I am concerned at the omission of one provision in particular. Section 102 of H.R. 1776 requires the federal government to perform a housing impact analysis before it issues new regulations. This important provision would give the private sector an opportunity to see the impacts on housing before a rule is implemented. Hopefully, this would result in less costly regulations that impede homeownership. While it was omitted from the final version we considered today, I am hopeful we can come back to this next year and pass it into law.

S. 1452 will help so many Americans achieve the dream of homeownership. I am pleased at the House's actions, and am hopeful that the other body will quickly take up and pass this extremely important legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on October 24, 2000, I missed rollcall votes 541, 542 and 543. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on all three votes.

HONORING DR. ROBIN BEACH

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to recognize a remarkable member of the medical community, Dr. Robin Beach. Her contributions to the citizens of Colorado are immeasurable and deserve the recognition of this body. I would at this time like to pay tribute to a truly inspirational and compassionate human being.

Robin began her distinguished career in medicine with an education almost as impressive as her work in medicine. She received her undergraduate degree in Zoology from Duke University graduating with distinction. Robin then went on to receive her M.D. from Duke and her M.P.H. from the University of California at Berkeley. This impressive educational background easily prepared her to become the expert in Pediatrics she is today.

Robin's illustrious career in pediatrics began at the University of Colorado Medical Center where she completed her residency. She then went on to work for the University Health Services in Boulder, Colorado where she served as Chief of Staff and Chief of the Medical Services. Her expert knowledge of medicine along with her natural ability to lead has propelled her into leadership roles for many different organizations within the medical community. She has served the Denver Health Authority in the capacities, of assistant director of Community Health Services, and Director of the Westside Medical Center, the Adolescent Ambulatory Services, and the Westside Teen Clinic.

Robin's career has been one of great distinction and has been full of many immeasurable contributions to her community. But it is her recent academic appointment that may rank above all when it comes to her accomplishments. She is now able to utilize her advanced knowledge of pediatric medicine to educate future doctors. She is currently a professor of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center. In addition to this great honor she has also received a number of awards for her work in the medical community, the Kathleen Ann Mullen Memorial Award and the Adele Dellenbaugh Hofmann Award both for her work with adolescent medicine.

Robin is a truly remarkable human being and her contributions, not only to her community but also to the field of Pediatrics, are unparalleled. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the State of Colorado and the US Congress I would like to commend Dr. Beach on her many accomplishments and wish her the very best as she continues to educate Colorado's future doctors in the field of Pediatrics.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, on October 24, 2000 the House debated and voted on H. Res. 634, ''Providing for the consideration of H.R. 4656, Lake Tahoe Basin School Site Land Conveyance Act'', H. Con. Res. 414, ''Relating to the Reestablishment of Representative Government in Afghanistan'', and H.R. 4271, the ''National Science Education Act.'' Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on H. Res. 634, (roll call vote number 541) ''aye'' on H. Con. Res. 414 (roll call vote number 542), and ''aye'' on H.R. 4271 (roll call vote number 543).

HONORING A FORGOTTEN HERO, SEAMAN ARTHUR REID, JR.

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, more than five decades have passed since a massive explosion at the Port Chicago naval base in California claimed the life of a courageous young Seaman, Arthur Reid, Jr. and 319 other servicemen, mostly African Americans. Nearly 400 more were wounded in the incident.

On October 26, 2000, I will have the privilege of presenting to Seaman Reid's sister, Margaret Reid Severin, three long overdue military awards in his behalf—the American Campaign Medal, the Gold Star Lapel Button, and the World War II Victory Medal. Mrs. Severin was only 13 at the time she lost her brother, but she has faithfully honored his memory ever since, despite the fact that the Navy provided very little information or support following the tragic loss of his life.

I was pleased to have the opportunity to help secure Seaman Reid's service records from the National Personnel Records Center in St. Louis, which confirmed his meritorious military record recommending him for leadership.

It was through the efforts and outstanding research of Mrs. Severin's coworker, Ms. Sheri Humphrey, that the story of Seaman Reid came to light. Ms. Humphrey worked diligently to track down information from veterans' files which revealed the plight of Seaman Reid and his fellow servicemen at Port Chicago.

The Port Chicago tragedy has been described as ''America's Dark Secret'' because of the circumstances surrounding the disaster. It was on the evening of July 17th, 1944, during World War II, that the munitions blast occurred. In an era of a segregated military, enlisted African Americans were relegated to duties separate from those of their white counterparts. Instead of obtaining ship duty, they were assigned to load ammunition and explosives on ships at port without the benefit of proper training for this potentially dangerous responsibility. After the terrible tragedy, African American servicemen still suffering from the trauma of the explosion were ordered back to work handling ammunition at another location. At that point, 258 of them refused that specific assignment, saying they would take any other duty but that one in view of their experience. At a racially charged court martial trial, 208 servicemen were given bad conduct discharges and denied three months' pay. Another 50 were convicted of mutiny, which could have resulted in the death penalty. Sentences of 8 and 15 years at hard labor were meted out, but eventually clemency was granted at the conclusion of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in honoring a true World War II hero, Seaman Arthur Reid, Jr., and in expressing to his sister Margaret Reid Severin our profound appreciation for his ultimate sacrifice for our country.

IN MEMORY OF ENSIGN ANDREW TRIPLETT

HON. CHARLES W. "CHIP" PICKERING

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, today I come before the House of Representatives to honor the life of an outstanding American, and member of the United States Navy, Ensign Andrew Triplett, originally of Shuqualak, Mississippi. Ensign Triplett was among the 17 brave sailors who gave their lives for our country in the attack on the U.S.S. *Cole*, on Thursday, October 12, 2000. This attack also injured 33 other sailors in the harbor of Aden, Yemen.

Andrew Triplett, noted for his quiet, shy nature, grew up near Willow Grove in Shuqualak, Mississippi, where he attended Reed Elementary School and in 1987 graduated from Noxubee High School in Macon, Mississippi. Upon his graduation Andrew Triplett enlisted in the Navy, where while serving his country he met his wife, Lorrie, a Detroit native. Just seven years ago, they began their family with the birth of their first daughter, Andrea, and three years later their second child Savannah Renee was born. Andrew and Lorrie lived in Virginia Beach, Virginia and were members of Pleasant Grove Baptist Church.

Successfully moving up the ladder as an enlisted man, Andrew was accepted for Officers' Candidate School and received his commission as an officer in April, 1999. On the U.S.S. *Cole*, he was assigned to the engineering department, a job that he was said to love. Tragically, it was the engineering department that suffered the blast damage from the explosive in the harbor.

For Ensign Andrew Triplett's thirteen years of service to the United States of America in the United States Navy, and for his life-long devotion as a son, husband, brother, father and citizen, I pay tribute. Ensign Triplett was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Ree D. Triplett of Shuqualak, Mississippi. He is survived by his wife, Lorrie, and his two little girls, Andrea (age seven) and Savannah Renee (age four); his parents, Savannah and Ree Triplett of Shuqualak, Mississippi; and his two brothers, two former servicemen, Theotis Donald (Air Force) and Wayne (Marine Corps).

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in remembering this present day hero, Ensign Andrew Triplett. Our sincere prayers and thoughts are with the Triplett family at this difficult time, and the other families who lost loves ones on the U.S.S. *Cole*.

RECOGNIZING THE HONORABLE HUGH DESMOND HOYTE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize His Excellency, the Honorable Hugh Desmond Hoyte, the former President of Guyana and current leader of the People's National Congress.

During his Presidency from August 1985 to October 1992, Mr. Hoyte initiated far-reaching electoral and economic reforms that strengthened the bases of the democratic culture of Guyana, promoted market-oriented policies and stimulated economic growth. Prior to becoming President, Mr. Hoyte served as First Vice President and Prime Minister. In addition, he held numerous Ministerial posts, including those of Home Affairs, Finance, Works and Communications, and Economic Development.

As a Minister of Government, Mr. Hoyte had at various times responsibility for African, Caribbean and Pacific affairs under the Lome Convention. His portfolio also included Caribbean Community Affairs. As a member of its Conference, the Heads of Government of the Caribbean Community charged him with responsibility for promoting freedom of movement within the Community and for coordinating the Caribbean Community's policy on the environment for the Earth Summit in Rio in 1992.

In fact, Mr. Hoyte has always taken a keen interest in ecological and environmental matters, working closely with the London-based Commonwealth Human Ecology Council. He is the architect of the Iwokrama International Rainforest Project in Guyana, which he initiated as the Commonwealth Heads of Government Conference in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, in 1989.

Born in Georgetown, Guyana in March 1929, Mr. Hoyte received B.A. and LL.B. degrees from the University of London. He is a British-trained lawyer, a Barrister-at-Law of the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple and a Member of the Guyana Bar. He was appointed to the Queen's Council in 1969, and his designation was changed to Senior Counsel in 1970 when Guyana became a republic.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hoyte is more than worthy of receiving this honor and our praises, and I hope that all of my colleagues will join his wife, Joyce Hoyte, and me in recognizing this truly remarkable man.

INTRODUCTION OF THE RESPONSIBLE DEBT RELIEF AND DEMOCRACY REFORM ACT

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the Responsible Debt Relief and Democracy Reform Act, legislation intended to provide debt relief to poor countries that have an insurmountable debt burden and to encourage these same countries to implement reforms for sound democracy and the maintenance of a civil society.

Many of the poorest countries of the world are struggling with democracy or with bad governance, and they are caught in a downward spiral of debt. Their futures are difficult and uncertain because of an overwhelming debt burden.

Many of the poorest countries have to spend an exorbitant amount of their budgets simply to make their debt payments. The rock singer, Bono, a vocal advocate for providing debt relief to heavily indebted poor countries, says, "A country like Niger, with a life expectancy of 47 years, spends more paying off their debts than on health and education combined."

Indeed, a country like Niger is not alone. Debt payments by the poor countries of the world can consume as much as 30–40 percent of a country's revenue. The chances of these countries ever paying back their loans is slim, to none. Realistically, none of their debt is going to be repaid.

The problem is that it is the poorest people of the world in the poorest countries who suffer as a result of their governments' massive debt. The poorest of the poor struggle to find food to survive. Suffering from malnourishment, their immune systems are lowered and people catch horrible diseases that wrack their bodies. The poor countries of the world have an alarmingly low life expectancy rate, with reports indicating that the average person in Sierra Leone only lives for 27 years. Canceling or reducing the debt of the poorest countries of the world is an opportunity for the U.S. to alleviate the suffering that these people face.

An article in Sojourners magazine describes part of the problem in Africa:

> It might seem odd to describe Hamsatou, a 13-year old girl in the West African country of Niger, as lucky. A mysterious flesh-eating disease known as "the Grazer" has consumed the left side of her face, leaving a gaping hole at the side of her nose, through which you can see her pink, unprotected tongue. She shields her head in embarrassment in her village, has no prospect of marriage, and rarely walks further than the nearby well. "When I go to the market . . . I'm ashamed of myself. I cover my face so people won't stare at me and laugh."
>
> But Hamsatou is lucky because she is alive. One in three children in Niger, the world's poorest country, do not reach 5 years of age. And while the Grazer will kill 120,000 children in the world this year, a $3 mouthwash would have ensured she need never have succumbed to its ravages. Unfortunately the government of Niger does not have $3 to spare. Three quarters of its annual tax revenue is spent on servicing its $1.4 billion international debt. Sojourners May–June 2000

Unfortunately, many of these poor countries that have insurmountable debt and that need democratic reform are in Africa. The Clinton Administration's Africa policies have failed across the board. "'African Renaissance' Hailed By Clinton Now a Distant Memory" is the title of a recent article in the Los Angeles Times by Robin Wright. Ms. Wright says that just two years ago, President Clinton hailed what he called an "African renaissance." Now, despite several years of rhetoric on Africa by the Clinton administration, this article states that a recent national intelligence estimate says that "Africa faces a bleaker future than at any time in the past century." Most Africans are worse off now than they were eight years ago.

The U.S. can help provide hope and opportunity for those who may be hopeless. Providing debt relief to the poorest governments of the world, if done in the right way, can free these governments to better address the needs of their own people.

But simply canceling a country's debt doesn't necessarily pave the way to good government. The governments of poor countries are often part of the

That is why the legislation I propose today will provide incentives to countries to reform

their governments, to institute needed democratic reforms and basic structures of a civil society such as, respect for human rights, promoting religious freedom, freedom of the press, and freedom of association.

This legislation says that debt relief by the U.S. will be provided to countries that meet the following requirements, as determined by the President of the U.S.: freedom of the press, freedom of association, an independent and non-discriminatory judiciary, reduction or elimination of corruption relating to public officials, including the promulgation of laws prohibiting bribery of public officials and disclosure of assets by such officials; the establishment of an independent anti-corruption commission; the establishment of an independent agency to audit financial activities of public officials, free and fair elections, practice of internationally recognized human rights, opposition to international terrorism as determined by the Secretary of State.

The President may waive one or more of these requirements for emergency humanitarian relief purposes, if the President determines and certifies to Congress that it is in the national security interests of the U.S., or if the President determines that a recipient country is making demonstrable progress in the aforementioned areas.

The President is to notify Congress of the justification for the determination of the countries that will receive a cancellation or reduction of debt according to the conditions in this legislation.

Finally, this legislation conveys the sense of Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. director at each international financial institution to which the U.S. is a member to use the voice, vote, and influence of the U.S. to urge the cancellation or reduction of debt owed to the institution by a country only if the country meets the same requirements applicable in this legislation.

Debt relief to poor countries as described in this legislation is responsible debt relief. Passage of this legislation could help to foster the growth and development of democracy, respect for human rights, the promotion of religious freedom, the establishment of freedom of the press, and greater freedom of association in poor countries through helping these countries to have economic growth that will help their people.

We need to help poor people in these countries overcome their debt burdens but it must be done responsibly. Rather than just write off debt from poor countries, this legislation sets up a framework to help those nations in their struggle toward democracy. It says progress in democratic reforms, honoring human rights, and opposition to terrorism are important for developing or poor countries. It says that one of the ways to help the poor is to give them opportunities created by engendering democracy, transparency, and much needed relief from their country's overwhelming debt burden. Lastly it says that if those goals are met, the U.S. will help those countries struggling to help their citizens to a better, more prosperous life.

I introduce this legislation to begin the discussion of how the U.S. can help bring hope to the poorest people in the world through the promotion of debt relief and good government. While this legislation may not be the perfect answer, I am hopeful this legislation could provide the foundation for discussion on how to help the poor and give them opportunities so that the next Congress and the next Administration can deal with this important issue.

H.R. —

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 ''Responsible Debt Relief and Democracy Reform Act''.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CANCELLATION OR REDUCTION OF DEBT OWED TO THE UNITED STATES.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) is maneded by adding at the end the following:

''PART VI—ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CANCELLATION OR REDUCTION OF DEBT OWED TO THE UNITED STATES

''SEC. 901. CANCELLATION OR REDUCTION OF DEBT.

''Beginning on and after the date of the enactment of this part, the President may cancel or reduce amounts owed to the United States (or any agency of the United States) by foreign countries as a result of concessional or nonconcessional loans made, guarantees issued, or credits extended under any other provision of law only if, in addition to the requirements contained under the applicable provisions of law providing authority for the debt cancellation or reduction, the requirements contained in section 902 are satisfied.

''SEC. 902. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A foreign country shall be eligible for cancellation or reduction of debt under any other provision of law only if the government of the country—

''(1) ensures freedom of the press;

''(2) ensures freedom of association;

''(3) has established an independent and nondiscriminatory judiciary;

''(4) provides for the reduction or elimination of corruption relating to public officials, including—

''(A) the promulgation of laws to prohibit bribery of and by public officials, including disclosure of assets by such officials upon taking office, periodically while in office, and upon leaving office;

''(B) the establishment of an independent anti-corruption commission—

''(i) to receive and verify the disclosure of assets by public officials in accordance with subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) to investigate allegations or corruption or misconduct by public officials and to make all findings available to the appropriate administrative or judicial entities; and

''(C) the establishment of an independent agency—

''(i) to audit the financial activities of public officials and agencies; and

''(ii) to make all audits under clause (i) available to the appropriate administrative or judicial entities;

''(5) is elected through free and fair elections

''(6) does not engage in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights; and

''(7) does not repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism, as determined by the Secretary of State under section 6(j)(1) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405(j)(1)) or section 620A(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371(a)).

''(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The President may waive the application of 1 or more of the requirements of subsection (a) with respect to the cancellation or reduction of debt owed to the United States by a foreign country—

''(1) for emergency humanitarian relief purposes;

''(2) if the President determines that it is in the national security interests of the United States to do so; or

''(3) if the President determines that the foreign country is making demonstrable progress in meeting the requirements of paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (a) by adopting appropriate legal and other related reforms.

''(c) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 7 days prior to the cancellation or reduction of debt in accordance with section 901, the President shall transmit to the Congress a report that contains a justification for the determination by the President that—

''(1) the requirements contained in each of paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (a) have been satisfied with respect to the foreign country involved; or

''(2) the requirement of paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (b) has been satisfied with respect to the foreign country involved.''

SEC. 3. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS RELATING TO CANCELLATION OR REDUCTION OF MULTILATERAL DEBT.

It is the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution to which the United States is a member to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to urge that the cancellation or reduction of debt owed to the institution by a country may be provided only if the country meets the same requirements applicable to the cancellation or reduction of amounts owed to the United States under paragraphs (1) through (7) of section 902(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as added by section 2).

A TRIBUTE TO BOB GREGORY

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a man who has given his considerable talent and energy for the betterment of his community, Mr. Bob Gregory of Colonia, New Jersey.

As Chairman of the Merck Volunteer Focus Group, Mr. Gregory personally coordinated more than fifty community service initiatives last year which raised about $128,000 while providing hundreds of hours of in-kind and volunteer services. He also chaired the Rahway Downtown Revitalization team as part of the Neighbor of Choice initiative and was instrumental in effectively aligning the efforts of the Volunteer Focus Group with Rahway's revitalization goals. He remains very active in local community organizations, including Merrill Park Youth, Rahway P.A.L., Rahway Aesthetic Committee, Union County Board of Agriculture, Rahway Lions, Rahway Honorary P.B.A., Rahway Excellence in Education, John Shippen Minority Youth Association, and as an advisor to Union County VoTech Schools.

Mr. Gregory has been a positive influence in the lives of children in his community. Last year, he worked on the Environmental Champions project which involved the completion of horticulture projects with children at all of the Rahway Schools, the Library, City Parks, City Hall, JFK Youth Center and the Capo Bianco Housing Project. He also helped spearhead

the renovation of the Rahway Elks banquet hall, with all profits earned from rentals going to support handicapped children. He coordinated the Linden Interfaith Council Food Drive to feed 100 needy families in Linden and the Cancer Care Golf Outing to raise funds for Cancer Research and Home Care. His good works have extended to an international level, as he traveled to the Dominican Republic with the Volunteer Medical Team sponsored by Healing the Children.

Mr. Speaker, we owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Gregory for all that he has done to improve the lives of so many people. Please join me in commending him for his outstanding work and in wishing him continued success.

IN MEMORY OF MR. PRENTISS WALKER

HON. CHARLES W. "CHIP" PICKERING

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, whereas Mr. Prentiss Walker, a former citizen of Mize, Mississippi, dedicated many years of his life in working for the conservative Christian principles on which this nation was built; and

Whereas, Mr. Walker sacrificed in working to build the Republican party in the South and especially Mississippi; and

Whereas Mr. Walker believed so strongly in conservative Christian principles that he offered himself as a candidate for Congress of the United States and was elected in 1964 as the first Republican Congressman from Mississippi in over 100 years.

Whereas Mr. Walker served his state and his nation in this office demonstrating his strong convictions by every vote he made and by leading others to join in his patriotic stand; and

Whereas Mr. Walker was a true political pioneer in the state of Mississippi, making the way for many others to follow in his path of service in our nation's capitol; and

Whereas Mr. Walker continued to lead in the development of the Mississippi Republican Party and leading the citizens of Mississippi to dedication to conservative Christian principles long after he left the Congress, be it therefore resolved:

We express our deep appreciation to his wife Dimple and to his memory for his tireless service to the cause of returning our nation to the greatness it achieved by following the foundational beliefs on which our forefathers founded these United States of America.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed Continuing Resolution.

Senate agreed to Foreign Operations Appropriations Conference Report.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S10951–S11025

Measures Introduced: Eleven bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3232–3242. **Page S10999**

Measures Reported:

Special Report entitled "Further Revised Allocation To Subcommittees Of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2001". (S. Rept. No. 106–508) **Page S10999**

Measures Passed:

Dairy Market Enhancement Act: Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry was discharged from further consideration of S. 2773, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to enhance dairy markets through dairy product mandatory reporting, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S10952–53**

Stevens (for Craig) Amendment No. 4340, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S10952–53**

National Recording Preservation Act: Senate passed H.R. 4846, to establish the National Recording Registry in the Library of Congress to maintain and preserve sound recordings and collections of sound recordings that are culturally, historically, or aesthetically significant, after agreeing to the following amendments proposed thereto: **Page S10953**

Stevens (for Daschle) Amendment No. 4341, to make certain technical corrections and to encourage accessibility to registry and out of print recordings. **Page S10953**

Stevens (for Daschle) Amendment No. 4342, to amend the title. **Page S10953**

Colorado Ute Settlement Act Amendments: By 85 yeas to 5 nays (Vote No. 282), Senate passed S. 2508, to amend the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988 to provide for a final settlement of the claims of the Colorado Ute Indian Tribes, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S10984–86**

Adopted:

Campbell Amendment No. 4303, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S10984–85**

Rejected:

Feingold Amendment No. 4326 (to Amendment No. 4303), to improve certain provisions of the bill. (By 56 yeas to 34 nays (Vote No. 281), Senate tabled the amendment. **Pages S10984–85**

Continuing Resolution: By 87 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 283), Senate passed H.J. Res. 115, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001. **Page S10986**

James Madison Commemorative Commission Act: Senate passed S. 3137, to establish a commission to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the birth of James Madison. **Pages S11009–11**

Interstate Transportation of Dangerous Criminals Act: Senate passed S. 1898, to provide protection against the risks to the public that are inherent in the interstate transportation of violent prisoners, after agreeing to a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S11011–12**

U.S. International Broadcasting Employee Special Immigrant Status: Senate passed S. 3239, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide special immigrant status for certain United States international broadcasting employees. **Pages S11012–13**

Social Security Number Confidentiality Act: Senate passed H.R. 3218, to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit the appearance of Social Security account numbers on or through unopened mailings of checks or other drafts issued on public money in the Treasury, clearing the measure for the President. **Page S11013**

Belarus Parliamentary Election: Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of S. Con. Res. 153, expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the parliamentary elections held in Belarus on October 15, 2000, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S11013**

James Guelff Body Armor Act: Senate passed S. 783, to limit access to body armor by violent felons and to facilitate the donation of Federal surplus body armor to State and local law enforcement agencies, after agreeing to a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S11013–14**

Celebrating James Madison's Birth/Contributions: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 396, celebrating the birth of James Madison and his contributions to the Nation. **Pages S11014–15**

Foreign Operations Appropriations Conference Report: By 65 yeas to 27 nays (Vote No. 280), Senate agreed to the conference report on H.R. 4811, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, clearing the measure for the President. **Pages S10972–84**

Airport Security Improvement Act: Senate concurred in the amendment of the House to S. 2440, to amend title 49, United States Code, to improve airport security, clearing the measure for the President. **Pages S11007–09**

Fisheries Survey Vessel Authorization Act: Senate concurred in the amendment of the House to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1651, to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 to extend the period during which reimbursement may be provided to owners of United States fishing vessels for costs incurred when such a vessel is seized and detained by a foreign country, clearing the measure for the President. **Page S11019**

Appointment:

Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission: The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 106–173, announced the following appointments to the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission: Senator Bunning, and Dr. Gabor S. Boritt, of Pennsylvania. **Page S11009**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

James A. Dorskind, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

Lois N. Epstein, of New York, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years.

Kenneth Lee Smith, of Arkansas, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

George Darden, of Georgia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2003. (Reappointment)

George Darden, of Georgia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for the remainder of the term expiring December 17, 2000.

Maria Otero, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2003. **Page S11025**

Messages From the House: **Pages S10997–99**

Petitions: **Page S10999**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S10999**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S10999–S11005**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S11005–06**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S11006–07**

Additional Statements: **Pages S10996–97**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—283) **Pages S10984–86**

Recess: Senate convened at 11:01 a.m., and recessed at 8:23 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, October 26, 2000. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S11020.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

U.S.S. *COLE* ATTACK

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded open and closed hearings to examine issues related to the attack on the U.S.S. *Cole* in Yemen, after receiving testimony from Walter B. Slocombe, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy; Edward S. Walker, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs; Gen. Tommy R. Franks, USA, Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Central Command; and an official of the Intelligence Community.

GORE/CHERNOMYRDIN DIPLOMACY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on European Affairs and the Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs concluded open and closed joint hearings to examine issues related to allegations made of Vice President Gore and former

Russian Prime Minister Victor Chernomyrdin diplomacy regarding alleged Russian weapons sales to Iran, after receiving testimony from John P. Barker, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nonproliferation Controls, Joseph M. DeThomas, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regional Nonproliferation, Newell L. Highsmith, Attorney Adviser, Office of Legal Adviser for Political Military Affairs, and Robert E. Dalton, Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Office of Legal Adviser, all of the Department of State.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: (See next issue.)

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows.

H.R. 1552, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 for the Marine Research and related environmental research and development program activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Science Foundation, amended (H. Rept. 106–987, Pt. 2);

H.R. 3112, to amend the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act to provide for a final settlement of the claims of the Colorado Ute Indian Tribes, amended (H. Rept. 106–1001);

H.R. 1798, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide additional support for and to expand clinical research programs (H. Rept. 106–1002);

H.R. 1689, 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, amended (H. Rept. 106–1003 Pt. 1). Page H10907 (Continued next issue)

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Pease to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H10811

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, the Rev. Dr. Ronald F. Christian of Fairfax, Virginia. Page H10811

Journal: Agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of Tuesday, Oct. 24 by a yea and nay vote of 332 yeas to 51 nays, Roll No. 544.

Pages H10811, H10817

Foreign Operations Appropriations Conference Report: The House agreed to the conference report on H.R. 4811, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001 by a yea and nay vote of 307 yeas to 101 nays, Roll No. 546.

Pages H10825–41

Agreed to H. Res. 647, the rule that waived points of order against the conference report by voice vote. Earlier, agreed to order the previous question by of 210 yeas to 197 nays, Roll No. 545.

Pages H10817–25

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures that were debated on Tuesday, Oct. 24:

Older Americans Act Amendments: H.R. 782, amended, to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 (passed by a yea and nay vote of 405 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 547). Agreed to amend the title; Pages H10841–42

Violence in the Middle East: H. Con. Res. 426, concerning the violence in the Middle East (a yea and nay vote of 365 yeas to 30 nays with 11 voting "present," Roll No. 549); and Pages H10842–43

Great Sand Dunes National Preserve in the State of Colorado: S. 2547, to provide for the establishment of the Great Sand Dunes National Park and the Great Sand Dunes National Preserve in the State of Colorado (passed by a yea and nay vote of 366 yeas to 34 nays, Roll No. 550)—clearing the measure for the President. Pages H10843–44

Suspension Failed—Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor: The House failed to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5375, amended, to establish the Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor in the State of New York (failed to pass by a ⅔ yea and nay vote of 223 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 548). The bill was debated on Tuesday, Oct. 24.

Page H10842

Rule Providing for Further Continuing Appropriations Resolutions: The House agreed to H. Res. 646, providing for consideration of House Joint Resolutions 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, and 120, each making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2001 by a yea and nay vote of 205 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 551. Pages H10844–49

Further Continuing Appropriations: The House passed H.J. Res. 115, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001 by a yea and nay vote of 395 yeas to 9 nays, Roll No. 552.

Pages H10849–56

Estuaries and Clean Waters Act: The House agreed to the conference report on S. 835, to encourage the restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient project financing and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs by voice vote. **Pages H10857–67**

H. Res. 648, the rule that waived points of order against the conference report was agreed to by voice vote. **Pages H10856–57**

Federal Courts Improvement: The House passed S. 2915, to make improvements in the operation and administration of the Federal courts. Earlier, agreed to an amendment that makes technical changes and strikes section 103. **Pages H10867–71**

Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grants: The House passed 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 clearing the measure for the President. **Pages H10871–72**

Presidential Threat Protection: The House disagreed with the Senate amendments numbered 1 and 3; agreed to the Senate amendments numbered 2 and 4; and agreed to the Senate amendment numbered 5 with an amendment to 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. **Pages H10872–74**

Dairy Market Enhancement: The House passed S. 2773, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to enhance dairy markets through dairy product mandatory reporting—clearing the measure for the President. **Pages H10874–75**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate appear on pages H10812, H10844, and H10880.

Referrals: S. 2811 was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, S. 3164 was referred to the Committees on Judiciary and Commerce, S. 3194 and S.J. Res. 36 were referred to the Committee on Government Reform, and S. Con. Res. 155 was referred to the Committee on International Relations.

(See next issue.)

Quorum Calls—Votes: Nine yea and nay votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H10817, H10824–25, H10840–41, H10841–42, H10842, H10843, H10843–44, H10848–49, and H10855–56. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10:00 a.m. and recessed at 10:35 p.m.

Committee Meetings

U.S.S. *COLE* ATTACK

Committee on Armed Services: Held a hearing on the attack on the U.S.S. *Cole.* Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Walter B. Slocombe, Under Secretary (Policy); and Gen. Tommy R. Franks, USA, Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Central Command; and Edward S. Walker, Jr., Assistant Secretary (Near Eastern Affairs), Department of State.

"WASTE, FRAUD AND PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AT THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION"

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Held a hearing on "Waste, Fraud and Program Implementation at the U.S. Department of Education." Testimony was heard from Richard Riley, Secretary of Education.

Joint Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Conferees, on Tuesday, October 24, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate and House passed versions of H.R. 4811, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. *D1113)*

H.R. 2302, to designate the building of the United States Postal Service located at 307 Main Street in Johnson City, New York, as the "James W. McCabe, Sr. Post Office Building". Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–315)

H.R. 2496, to reauthorize the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–316)

H.R. 2641, to make technical corrections to title X of the Energy Policy Act of 1992. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–317)

H.R. 2778, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Taunton River in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–318)

H.R. 2833, to establish the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–319)

H.R. 2938, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 424 South Michigan Street in South Bend, Indiana, as the ''John Brademas Post Office''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–320)

H.R. 3030, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 757 Warren Road in Ithaca, New York, as the ''Matthew F. McHugh Post Office''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–321)

H.R. 3454, to designate the United States post office located at 451 College Street in Macon, Georgia, as the ''Henry McNeal Turner Post Office''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–322)

H.R. 3745, to authorize the addition of certain parcels to the Effigy Mounds National Monument, Iowa. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–323)

H.R. 3817, to dedicate the Big South Trail in the Comanche Peak Wilderness Area of Roosevelt National Forest in Colorado to the legacy of Jaryd Atadero. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–324)

H.R. 3909, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4601 South Cottage Grove Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''Henry W. McGee Post Office Building''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–325)

H.R. 3985, to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14900 Southwest 30th Street in Miramar, Florida, as the ''Vicki Coceano Post Office Building''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–326)

H.R. 4157, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 600 Lincoln Avenue in Pasadena, California, as the ''Matthew 'Mack' Robinson Post Office Building''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–327)

H.R. 4169, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Vassar Street in Reno, Nevada, as the ''Barbara F. Vucanovich Post Office Building''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–328)

H.R. 4226, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange all or part of certain administrative sites and other land in the Black Hills National Forest and to use funds derived from the sale or exchange to acquire replacement sites and to acquire or construct administrative improvements in connection with the Black Hills National Forest. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–329)

H.R. 4285, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain administrative sites for National Forest System lands in the State of Texas, to convey certain National Forest System land to the New Waverly Gulf Coast Trades Center. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–330)

H.R. 4286, to provide for the establishment of the Cahaba River National Wildlife Refuge in Bibb County, Alabama. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–331)

H.R. 4435, to clarify certain boundaries on the map relating to Unit NC–01 of the Coastal Barrier Resources System. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–332)

H.R. 4447, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 919 West 34th Street in Baltimore, Maryland, as the ''Samuel H. Lacy, Sr. Post Office Building''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–333)

H.R. 4448, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3500 Dolfield Avenue in Baltimore, Maryland, as the ''Judge Robert Bernard Watts, Sr. Post Office Building''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–334)

H.R. 4449, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1908 North Ellamont Street in Baltimore, Maryland, as the ''Dr. Flossie McClain Dedmond Post Office Building''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–335)

H.R. 4484, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 North Washington Street in Rockville, Maryland, as the ''Everett Alvarez, Jr. Post Office Building''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–336)

H.R. 4517, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 24 Tsienneto Road in Derry, New Hampshire, as the ''Alan B. Shepard, Jr. Post Office Building''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–337)

H.R. 4534, to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 114 Ridge Street, N.W. in Lenoir, North Carolina, as the ''James T. Broyhill Post Office Building''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–338)

H.R. 4554, to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1602 Frankford Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the ''Joseph F. Smith Post Office Building''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–339)

H.R. 4615, to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3030 Meredith Avenue in Omaha, Nebraska, as the ''Reverend J.C. Wade Post Office''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–340)

H.R. 4658, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 301 Green Street in Fayetteville, North Carolina, as the ''J.L. Dawkins Post Office Building''. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–341)

S. 1236, to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act for commencement of the construction of the Arrowrock Dam Hydroelectric Project in the State of Idaho. Signed October 19, 2000. (P.L. 106–343)

H.J. Res. 114, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001. Signed October 20, 2000. (P.L. 106–344)

S. 2311, to revise and extend the Ryan White CARE Act programs under title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, to improve access to health care and the quality of health care under such programs, and to provide for the development of increased capacity to provide health care and related support services to individuals and families with HIV disease. Signed October 20, 2000. (P.L. 106–345)

H.R. 4475, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001. Signed October 23, 2000. (P.L. 106–346)

H.R. 4975, to designate the post office and courthouse located at 2 Federal Square, Newark, New Jersey, as the ''Frank R. Lautenberg Post office and Courthouse''. Signed October 23, 2000. (P.L. 106–347)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2000

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No Committee meetings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, October 26

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate may consider S. 1536, Older Americans Act Authorization.

At 11 a.m., Senate will begin a period of morning business (not to extend beyond 12 noon). Also, Senate may consider District of Columbia Appropriations Conference Report and the Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations Conference Report, if available, and any other cleared legislative and executive business.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, October 26

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of conference report on H.R. 4942, District of Columbia Appropriations (subject to a rule being granted);

Consideration of conference report on H.R. 2614, Small Business Certified Development Company Program Improvements (subject to a rule being granted); and

Consideration of H.J. Res. 116, Making Further Continuing Appropriations (closed rule, one hour of debate).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bilirakis, Michael, Fla., E1909, E1911
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E1902
Cannon, Chris, Utah, E1903
Clement, Bob, Tenn., E1899
Crane, Philip M., Ill., E1906, E1907
Dingell, John D., Mich., E1906, E1908
Forbes, Michael P., N.Y., E1900
Gillmor, Paul E., Ohio, E1898
Green, Mark, Wisc., E1909, E1910
Hayworth, J.D., Ariz., E1904
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E1906, E1907
Kolbe, Jim, Ariz., E1911
Kuykendall, Steven T., Calif., E1898
McInnis, Scott, Colo., E1911
Maloney, James H., Conn., E1903
Mink, Patsy T., Hawaii, E1904, E1905, E1907
Payne, Donald M., N.J., E1903, E1911, E1913
Pickering, Charles W. ''Chip'', Miss., E1912, E1914
Pomeroy, Earl, N.D., E1902
Price, David E., N.C., E1900
Quinn, Jack, N.Y., E1900
Serrano, Jose E., N.Y., E1897, E1899
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E1909, E1910
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E1903, E1912
Udall, Mark, Colo., E1897, E1899
Udall, Tom, N.M., E1897, E1898
Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E1906, E1907, E1909
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1910, E1912

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $179.00 for six months, $357.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (202) 512–1800, or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.