burdens our military widows. Instead, they would get what they and their deceased spouses thought they would get: fifty-five percent of retired military pay. To put it simply, no offset.

When I introduced that legislation and talked to my colleagues about it several months ago, I received letters from all over the country supporting this position, widows who described for me the situations that they were in. Let me read, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, several of the letters that I received:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FILNER: I hear from my friends that you have presented in Congress a bill concerning our Survivor Benefit Plan, SBP. Thank you very much.

I have been a widow since November 1, 1973. My husband retired from the U.S. Air Force after 20 years, 6 months and 4 days of active duty in 1964. He died on November 1st, 1973.

The Social Security offset has been hard to take since my income is only $1,300 a month. I am now 75 years of age and I really could use the money that is rightfully mine. I have raised two sons alone on this small income, and I must watch every penny I spend. My sons were 14 and 11 years of age when their father died. Thank you for helping me in this matter.

Another letter from a different part of the country:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FILNER: I was reading in the Army Echo that you are working on a bill to repeal the SBP Social Security offset that occurs at age 62. I just want to tell you briefly what happened to me.

My husband, who served in the Army for 20 years, was on Social Security disability because of heart problems and could no longer work. He died in July of 1995. I was then 61 years old. I received Social Security plus my SBP. With both of these incomes, I was doing just fine, paying my monthly bills and having enough left for groceries. Then a few months later I turned 62 and was notified that my SBP was reduced from $476 to $302. What a shock. That meant I had $174 a month less. I knew right then I could not make it. This was my grocery money they took away from me.

I really don't know what they thought when they made this law. I just hope and pray that some day our people in Congress could look that law over again and make a change. I just want to say it is a shame and disgrace the way we get treated. After all, our husbands worked hard for their country and don't deserve this kind of treatment.

Another letter:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FILNER: Of all the literature on Social Security offset, there is no mention of 35 percent of retirement pay ever made. My husband thought I would be getting at least half of his retired pay, should he pass away before I did. He believed that he had conscientiously and diligently provided insurance for me. I belief it will take about 10 years just to recoup the monies he paid into the fund, if I should live that long, and with the current offset it could take even longer.

My husband paid into Social Security and into the Survivor Benefit Plan. These two funds should be separate and treated as such.

I know that surviving spouses are financially suffering. I believe it to be a slap in the face to the deceased service members who gave so much in the service of their country. It was also a slap in the face to the surviving spouse, who more often than not served the same amount of years as his or her spouse.

Imagine this scenario: November 1, you received a total of $882 in the form of a retirement check from the U.S. Government. December 1, your spouse passed away. January 1, you receive a check in the amount of $295. This decrease negatively affects the quality of life of the surviving spouse.

I hope and pray that you and Members of Congress will try to put themselves in the shoes of that widow or widower who is always trying to make ends meet with less.

Just lastly today, Mr. Speaker, another letter from outside my district, as I tried to present this bill to the Nation:

I realize I forfeited my pension to be with my husband. We married to be together, not in separate States or countries. We felt the military took care of its own. We paid for several years for a pension which will now be cut when I reach age 62. I really do feel this is unfair.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this Congress will look at H.R. 165, the Military Survivors Equity Act, and finally provide some equity to the surviving spouses of our veterans who we remember today on the anniversary of the Normandy invasion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DREIER addresssed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

PROTESTING MILITARIST GOVERNMENT OF BURMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years now I have been deeply concerned about the militarist government in Burma and by its repression of human and civil rights of the citizens of Burma. In particular, I have protested the many years of house arrests suffered by Nobel Prize winner, Aung San Suu Kyi.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased when on April 22 the Clinton administration imposed sanctions on Burma, and I wrote to Secretary Albright about this. I would like to read into the RECORD the letter I received from the Secretary's office:

As you know, on April 22 the President announced his decision to impose a ban on new U.S. investment in Burma. He took this step in response to a constant and continuing pattern of severe repression by the SLORC. He imposed the ban under the terms of the Burma sanctions provisions of the Consolidated Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1997.

During the past 7 months, the SLORC has arrested and detained large numbers of students and opposition supporters, sentenced dozens to long-term imprisonment, and prevented the expression of political views by the democratic opposition, including Aung San Suu Kyi and the National League for Democracy. The SLORC has also committed serious abuses in its military campaign against Burma's Karen minority, forcibly conscripting civilians and compelling thousands to flee into Thailand.

She goes on to say:

The United States and other Members of the international community have firmly and repeatedly taken steps to encourage democratization and human rights in Burma. With the imposition of the ban on new U.S. investment, we seek to keep faith with the people of Burma, who made clear their support for human rights and democracy in 1990 elections that the regime chose to disregard. We join with many others in the international community calling for reform in Burma, and we emphasize that the U.S. Burma relationship will improve only as there is progress on democratization and respect for human rights. We continue to urge the SLORC to lift restrictions on Aung San Suu Kyi and the political opposition, to respect the rights of free expression, assembly and association, and to undertake a dialogue on Burma's political future that includes leaders of the NLD and the ethnic minorities.

□ 0915

I congratulate the President and the Secretary of State for their actions, and I pledge my continued support to the people of Burma in their brave and continuing struggle for democracy in their own land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MCINTOSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ISSUES AFFECTING GUAM AND NORTHERN MARIANAS ISLANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks just made by the previous speaker the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about some recent stories regarding the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands who are neighbors to my home island of Guam, and I want to be able to explain not for the purposes of comparison but certainly for the purposes to distinguish and to clarify perhaps for Members of the House and to certainly clarify at least for the record what the situation is in the Marianas Islands.

Over 2 or 3 months ago, there were a number of stories that appeared in the Washington Post and other newspapers which referred to a series of allegations about fundraising scandals in the Clinton reelection. As part of this corpus of stories regarding this issue, there was an effort to stigmatize my home island of Guam in the context of those donations. It was alleged that the people of Guam were seeking local control of immigration in order to be able to bring

in thousands of foreign workers under exploitative conditions in order to set up sweatshops for the purpose of moving cheaply made goods into the United States, into the 50 States. Those allegations, of course, are unfounded and have absolutely no basis in fact or even interpretation. The people of Guam have consistently wanted local control over immigration in order to mitigate population growth and in order to limit population growth. All the existing laws regarding labor and minimum wage that are fully applicable in the 50 States are also applicable in Guam and there is no desire on the part of the people of Guam to get out from under those applications of those laws.

For the past week, there have been stories, many of them have been prompted by a letter written by President Clinton to the Governor of the CNMI, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, Froilan Tenorio, regarding alleged labor abuses in the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas and calling basically for changes to the covenant which governs the relationship between the U.S. Government and the CNMI.

The reason why I come to the floor today is to try to provide a little bit of historical background as to how the covenant came to be and also its relationship to my own home island of Guam. It is important to understand that the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands and Guam are both part of the Marianas Islands chain. This is a chain of some 15 islands of which only 5 are inhabited. The islands were all settled originally by the same group of people, the indigenous people of the Marianas Islands called the Chamorro people of which I am a member and, of course, the people of the CNMI are in the preponderance, also descendants of the original inhabitants as are the people of Guam.

Guam is by far the largest island of this 15-island chain, but the island which is most known in the CNMI is Saipan. Ironically both Guam and Saipan are probably better known in the context of larger American society for being battlegrounds during World War II. Guam, of course, has been a major military facility since World War II as well as being a major battleground.

The CNMI and Guam, what is now referred to as the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands and Guam, were part of an integrated island chain sharing the same culture, sharing the same language and sharing the same basic historical development. The Spaniards came to the region. Magellan in his trans-Pacific voyage stopped on Guam and the Marianas Islands were the first islands to be settled by the European nation in the late 1670's.

In 1898, as a result of the Spanish-American War in which we are commemorating the 100th anniversary next year, Guam was separated from the remaining group of the Marianas Islands. Guam was taken specifically by the United States in the Treaty of Paris ending the Spanish-American War. But the balance of the Marianas Islands was left to Spain. As a consequence since that time, 1898, Guam and basically our cousins in the Northern Marianas have experienced different political and economic as well as social developments.

The Northern Marianas were then turned around and sold to Germany by Spain in 1899, and then subsequently Japan inherited the Northern Marianas as part of the settlement ending World War I and they became part of a League of Nations mandate, the Micronesian Islands mandate, all this time Guam being a United States territory being run by the United States Navy.

At the end of World War II, as a result of World War II and the Pacific war between Japan and the United States, the entire Micronesian region, again remembering that Guam all this time was a United States territory, the entire Micronesian region was put in what was called the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands or the TTPI. The sovereignty over this was inherent in the native people and it was to be administered by the United States with the oversight of the United Nations. There were 11 such trust territories coming out of World War II. All of those trust territories have since been resolved and almost all of them have become independent nations. The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands split into three what are now freely associated states with the United States, technically independent but having a contractual or a compact arrangement with the United States, and those are the Republic of Palau, the freely associated states of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands which is more well known again in the American public eye with the atomic bomb testing and hydrogen bomb testing in the late 1940's and into the 1950's as well as the fact of Kwajalein which continues to be part of the missile targeting range from California.

The CNMI, the Northern Marianas, became a commonwealth of the United States which is different than the other three remaining areas. And so in 1976 when the Northern Marianas became the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands, it represents the only territorial acquisition by the United States in this century. This is a fact that is not often noted and not often fully understood. After World War II there was also the acquisition of the United States Virgin Islands as purchased from Denmark as a consequence of World War I, but the Northern Marianas was acquired in 1976 as part of the breakup of the trust territory, and the CNMI then signed a covenant with the United States establishing the fact that the people became United States citizens. But there were four elements of the compact and laws related to the compact which gave authority to the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands. One was the right to control immigration into the Northern Marianas; the right to be exempted from the Federal minimum wage; the right to participate in the Headnote 3A Program which allows an area like the Northern Marianas, which is outside the customs zone of the United States, to manufacture goods and bring them into the U.S. customs zone as if they were made in the United States.

In fact, they are a U.S. area, but because of the anomaly of the customs zone, they are outside the customs zone but they are part of the United States. But they are allowed to bring in products under the Headnote 3A. Fourth, is a land alienation provision which is very unique and there is only the Northern Marianas and American Samoa, where the only people who can own land are natives of the islands of American Samoa and the Northern Marianas.

The purpose of granting the CNMI authority over immigration and authority over exemption over the Federal minimum wage and participation in the Headnote 3A Program is to understand that it was meant to facilitate the economic growth of the people of the Northern Marianas Islands while not overwhelming the local population. That was the original intent, the original purpose.

In 1976, when the commonwealth first became part of the United States, the average wage of anybody who was working in the CNMI was probably around 75 cents an hour. So it was clear that the economy was very different than the rest of the United States even though it was coming into the United States It was also very different even from Guam which had always had the Federal minimum wage applying, even though they are our neighbors, only 40 to 50 miles to the north of us. The purpose of bringing the CNMI into the fold and granting them this authority was to facilitate the economic growth of the place without overwhelming the local population.

Guam, on the other hand, had an entirely different historical and political experience. It became a United States territory in 1898 as a result of the Treaty of Paris, was basically administered by the Department of the Navy until the onset of World War II, was occupied by the Japanese as part of World War II, therefore making Guam the only United States area with civilians on it that was occupied by a foreign power in this century.

Then in 1950, Guam was granted what is called an organic act or an organizing act by Congress which establishes the framework for local government and made the people of Guam U.S. citizens. But the people of Guam do not have local control over immigration and they do not have nor do they seek exemption from the Federal minimum wage. They do participate in the Headnote 3A Program, but it is hard to participate in the Headnote 3A Program and compete when you have minimum

wage laws applying and you have basically a pretty healthy economy like you have on Guam which is run primarily by bringing in tourists from Asia.

Recent stories, and obviously there have been efforts by various Members of this body, including most notably the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], an effort to try to take back some of this authority, accepting the fact that they have somehow abused this and have, in a sense, perverted the original purpose of granting this authority.

It is important to understand in order to fully comprehend not only the differences between Guam and the CNMI but just to understand generally the tenor of United States territorial policy which is an area which of course is primarily of little consequence to most U.S. citizens except to those U.S. citizens who happen to live in the territories. But I want to make clear some characteristics of Federal policy toward territories.

Territories are not fully integrated into the American political system. They are non-self-governing, meaning that they are not fully participant in all the processes of government which have control over their lives and, of course, most notably they have no participation or minimal participation in the Federal lawmaking and rulemaking process, nor do they elect officials who make decisions about that.

Technically the title of the position I hold is nonvoting delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives, which means that I represent Guam here, but I am not entitled to vote on the floor of the House. What that means basically for the people of Guam is that although they are U.S. citizens, and also it means this for other territorial delegates, although they are U.S. citizens, they may participate in the debate and introduce legislation and otherwise try to effect legislation as other Members of this body, but they do not make a final vote on any legislation, even that legislation which affects them.

□ 0930

Of course they also do not vote for President, and as a consequence they are not part of the process when the President is elected. The President in turn selects Cabinet members and the departments then in turn make regulations which also govern and regulate the lives of citizens in the territories.

So clearly, citizens of the territories are non-self-governing, although they have various levels of local self-government, meaning they do elect their own Governor and they do elect their own legislature, but the laws and the regulations that they deal with are purely local in scope. It is also up to Congress to make the distinction between what is purely local in scope and what is Federal in nature, because in the territorial clause, Congress can come in and overturn any law that is made by a local legislature, and Congress can come in and basically work its will on anything regarding the territories.

There is no Federal representation, not because of taxation, as some people like to surmise. It is always interesting that when a discussion of territories comes up, they always say, well, there is no representation because there is no taxation, thereby inverting the Revolutionary War slogan, which was no taxation without representation, but in this instance there is no representation without taxation. I think that is kind of a curious version of what the original intent and purpose of that was, which was not really about taxation but, again, about representation in the process of making laws and regulations which govern our lives.

So territories in that sense are clearly non-self-governing, and they are qualitatively different from States. States obviously are the meat and substance of the United States of America, exactly statehood, and the preponderance of relationships and intergovernmental relationships that we are always dealing with are also in the context of what appropriately Federal authority and what is appropriately State authority.

It used to be historically that we always thought of territories as in the 19th century, the territory of Arizona or the territory of Kansas, as kind of States-in-waiting. They were undergoing a form of tutelage, awaiting the day in which they would eventually become States.

Well, that is not necessarily the case, obviously, because we are now dealing with territories that are quote, overseas territories, and we are dealing with Guam, the Northern Marianas, Puerto Rico, which is a special example on its own, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. So the point of referencing this is to point out that the nature of territorial and Federal relationships is not governed by State relationships. That is a qualitatively different relationship, and it is I think inappropriate to assume that somehow statehood is the apex of the relationship and that territories are trying to become States but are not quite there yet, or to assume that what is granted to a territory cannot exceed that which is granted to a State, and that is clearly not the case.

Territories can be outside the customs zone. I do not think one can take any State outside the customs zone. Some territories, two territories, have local control over immigration. I do not think one can grant Texas or Hawaii or any State local control over immigration.

The reason for that is inherent in the constitutional process which has been organized, which makes a distinction between the laws and regulations that Congress can do in relationship to territories under the territorial clause, and the rest of the Constitution which regulates and unifies the relationship between States and the Federal Government.

So the territorial policy of the Federal Government of the United States basically is characterized by three things. One is that they are flexible, that they can do things with territories they cannot do with States. They could also minimize the authority of a territory far below that which a State has, but they could also maximize in certain instances the authority of a territory beyond that which a State has.

So as I have indicated, not all Federal laws apply to the territories. That is up to Congress making that decision. It is part of my task here, sometimes an unhappy task, to continually make the case and ask the question, does this law apply to Guam or does this law not apply to Guam, what is the intent and purpose, and sometimes the laws apply to Guam and sometimes they do not.

As I pointed out, the other items, the Jones Act, which is an act regulating the maritime trade, some territories are exempted from that, the Northern Marianas and the Virgin Islands and American Samoa. But other territories are included in that. Notably, Guam and Puerto Rico.

So we have a whole series of laws, some which apply to some territories, some which do not apply to others. That brings us to the second characteristic of the relationships, and that is that there is a recognition of the fact that each territory is treated differently, and each territory is treated differently in large measure because they came into the U.S. system under different conditions.

The Virgin Islands came in under a bill of sale, so to speak, from Denmark, in which there were certain conditions about that. The Northern Marianas came in from the first territory under certain conditions. Guam came in under the Treaty of Paris, and specifically it entrusts Congress to determine the political status of the native inhabitants of the territories, thereby indicating that the political change of Guam must consult directly the native inhabitants of that territory.

So each area has been dealt with differently, in large measure as a result of the conditions that they have come under.

Now, this does not mean that each territory cannot be mindful of some basic American principles, and I think those apply in general, such as fair treatment for people, fair treatment for workers, nondiscriminatory treatment. So it is legitimate to make the claim, if one so feels, that even if Congress grants a specific authority to a territory, for example, immigration control, it does not mean that the territory can then engage in all kinds of various machinations of that immigration control without being called into question for applying what we would call basic American principles.

So the bottom line, the bottom line in this whole discussion is to understand that territories are treated differently, not only from the rest of the

country as a general principle, but even within that context, each territory has an unique relationship with the Federal Government.

Now, some people would argue that this is odd and confusing, and maybe we should just have a one-size-fits-all for territories. The problem is that we are really treading on the relationship between what is the meaning of my being a U.S. citizen and other people from the territories being U.S. citizens and not being self-governing, and how do we resolve that dilemma. That dilemma could be resolved by a grant of statehood, but admittedly it is a steep political hill to climb. It is already a steep enough political hill to climb for those who advocate statehood for Puerto Rico, let alone trying to consider how that might work for people who come from what are admittedly small jurisdictions. My own home island of Guam has approximately 135,000 people on it.

So it remains open to question, and it remains clearly in the will of Congress and for the people of the territories to rely on the good judgment of the people of Congress, which sometimes makes us feel very vulnerable, as indeed it does the general American public. But it remains open to question, and that is why it is a very serious matter to us, because we have no specific governing relationship other than a series of commitments that may have been made historically at a given point in time.

So I want to come back to the general issue of what has been termed labor abuses in the CNMI and its relationship to Guam.

The CNMI, in 1976, was given a grant of authority to regulate immigration, was specifically exempted from the application of the minimum wage, was specifically authorized to participate in the Headnote 3A Program. This authority and this grant of authority has allowed them to grow their economy in a very dramatic way.

It is also clear that there has been an increased number of allegations regarding labor abuses, regarding the garment, so-called garment sweat shops, regarding the abuses of domestic workers for people that have been brought in as domestic workers. So we really are running the issue here of what constitutes basic American principles, are there violations of basic American principles, and the manner in which the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands is conducting its business as legitimately authorized by the U.S. Congress.

I would argue that in the CNMI, if there are problems in the CNMI, and I recognize that there are, we need to address them in the context of the enforcement of existing laws and possible changes in the existing laws, while keeping in mind the original purposes of the freedoms and the latitude that have been given to them in the CNMI.

If the original purposes of granting them this authority, local control over immigration and exemption from the minimum wage, if those original purposes have been perverted or taken advantage of, then I certainly would support an effort to put them back on track. But at the same time, it must be made clear that it is very easy to make comparisons and say, well, what happens in one jurisdiction will happen in another.

In the meantime, while this has been occurring, remember that the CNMI has only been associated under the United States since 1976. It has been barely 20 years. In the meantime, Guam has been under U.S. sovereignty almost 100 years, and it has successfully dealt with U.S. labor laws and it has successfully dealt with their economic livelihood, even with the application of Federal minimum wage.

So I would hasten to add that anyone who wants to make these comparisons is going to make them on very shaky ground. But in the meantime, it is important to be mindful that the people of the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas are not an evil population, they do not have a corrupt political leadership that is designed to abuse people who come to the CNMI for work. They are new Americans. Think about it. They are new Americans, barely 20-year-old Americans, who have deep traditions of their own and, as I have indicated, have a very unique historical experience.

We have to engage them as fellow citizens with whom we have an existing legal framework, the covenant of the Northern Marianas, to resolve differences. We have to clarify when we think they have violated basic American principles. But we also have to understand their circumstances. Some of the articles regarding the CNMI I think, and certainly in my experience with the CNMI, have gone beyond the reality of the CNMI and have reached certain levels of almost caricature.

□ 0945

The CNMI is not the hotbed of labor abuse as some have portrayed, but I want to point out just as clearly, it is not the conscious experiment of economic freedom that some think tanks want to believe that it is. This is not about a government that is consciously trying to deal with how to survive without a minimum wage. The argument about all of that is very unrealistic if we look exactly within the context of the CNMI.

The CNMI is the product of an historical experiment in the extension of American principles of some 20 years duration. When a small Pacific island population like the CNMI has experienced the sudden impact of change which has occurred in the CNMI during the past 20 years, it is understandable that there will be problems. Like new automobile drivers, it is inevitable that there will be wrong turns and it is inevitable that they will go down a blind alley and perhaps inevitable that they will have some fender-benders, but we should engage them in a process which teaches them to have better driving habits and not simply take away their license.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FURSE, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 46 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, June 7, 1997, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3680. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imazamox; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300502; FRL–5721–1] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received May 29, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3681. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—RUS Standard for Acceptance Tests and Measurements of Telecommunications Plant [7 CFR Part 1755] received May 30, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3682. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Exemptions of RUS Operational Controls under Section 306E of the Rural Electrification Act; Timing of Notification to Borrowers [7 CFR Part 1710] received May 30, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3683. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting Final Priorities——Research in Education of Individuals with Disabilities Program; Program for Children with Severe Disabilities; Training Personnel for the Education of Individuals with Disabilities, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3684. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's report on the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3685. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Test Procedures for Furnaces/Boilers,