United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 22, 1997 No. 104

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mrs. EMERSON].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 22, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable JO ANN EMERSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 858) ''an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes,'' agrees to a conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints from the Select Committee on Intelligence: Mr. SHELBY, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. KYL, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. COATS, Mr. KERREY, Mr. GLENN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ROBB, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. LEVIN, and from the Committee on Armed Services: Mr. THURMOND, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 21, 1997, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leader limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH] for 5 minutes.

IMPACT ON INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS IN REVENUE RECONCILIATION ACT

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, the independent contractor provision in the Revenue Reconciliation Act will do great damage to employer relations in our country. Millions of Americans would lose health care coverage and pension benefits.

Working women would suffer the most. For women, being an independent contractor means much lower wages than male employees in similar jobs. What about health care and pensions? Only 2 percent of women independent contractors have health care and pensions paid by their employers. Women also would lose critical employment protections.

Independent contractors are not covered by equal employment opportunity laws. They do not receive family and medical leave. Some employers have misclassified janitors and garment workers to evade minimum wage and overtime laws affecting many low-wage workers who are women.

Working women have fought hard to win equal employment opportunity, fair wages, and economic security. The independent contractor provision would be a disaster for them and their families. That is why a coalition of 130 women's organizations is against this measure.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the bipartisan budget bill is the wrong vehicle to carry this issue. As my colleague from Connecticut, [Mrs. JOHNSON] pointed out in a letter to the Speaker of the House, Congress needs to protect working women and to delete this clause from the budget bill.

THE TRUTH IS IN THE NUMBERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I will bet most Americans would be surprised to realize that they are rich. To accomplish this amazing feat, the Clinton administration has formulated a new exercise in wordspeak that simply defines a significant portion of all Americans as rich. But, frankly, most Americans probably do not feel rich. Most probably rely on two incomes, have a couple of children, a lot of bills to pay and, in fact, feel very far from being rich.

But, more than anything else, Madam Speaker, they deserve a tax break today. Well, why should the White House have any interest in inventing a new measurement of wealth? Well, it is actually quite simple. In order for the administration to score political points at the expense of hard-working middle-class Americans, they must create millions of wealthy taxpayers where none exist.

For decades, American taxpayers have paid taxes based upon the adjusted gross income, the AGI. The AGI is a rather simple and straightforward calculation of earnings. It is at the bottom of the first page of everyone's tax return.

Perhaps the AGI is too simple for the White House, for they have worked diligently over the recent past to prejudice the AGI and with it the tax package that the President initiated. They have done everything in their power to modify and create a new formula to

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

calculate the supposed wealth of American taxpayers today.

Here is how it works. Instead of using the adjusted gross income in tax computations, the administration uses a complicated formula known as the Family Economic Income, or FEI, which adds to one's income the fringe benefits they receive every year: Keogh deductions, most nontaxable cash transfer payments, the buildup of the IRA, your pension.

Here is the real catch. The FEI even adds something known as imputed rental income, or what a family would earn if they were to rent out their home. What? Yes. If you had to rent out your home, that is part of your family income.

To say the least, this is an unusual and rather inaccurate definition of a family's income. To say the most, the administration is engaging in political gamesmanship, designed solely to demagog an issue that otherwise only serves to assist middle-income Americans.

Madam Speaker, put simply, by employing the imputed income calculation, the administration is able to considerably overstate income levels for most households today, making middle-class taxpayers appear to be much richer than they themselves would ever, ever recognize.

For example, employing the administration's new income formula, 1.7 million union members, 2.4 million teachers, 8.1 million government workers, and 4.2 million mechanics, repairmen, and construction workers are now considered rich by the administration and therefore are undeserving of a tax break.

The problem is that the Clinton administration chooses to employ this odd income calculation to change the idea of who is wealthy. They are working hard to mislead the public and turn a positive situation into a negative political game.

The bottom line is this: The Republican tax plan accurately targets America's middle-income class. In fact, 76 percent of the relief provided in the Republican plan will go to those Americans who make less than $75,000 a year. Although the President has worked hard to distort this fact, it remains difficult for anyone to argue that these Americans are rich and that they are undeserving of a tax break.

Madam Speaker, the Republican Congress has passed real tax relief for all middle-class taxpayers at every stage of their lives, from child tax credits to estate tax reform. We are doing the right thing.

Meanwhile, the President is trying to change the debate with this new ''imputed rental income formula.'' But the truth is in the numbers; and no amount of imagined, imputed income will turn hard-working middle-class Americans into what the President calls the evil rich.

Middle-class Americans deserve a tax break today. The Republican Congress wants to give that to them. For the millions of Americans who do not consider themselves rich, for the two-earner families who struggle to provide a nice home and a good education for their children, for all the middle-class Americans, I implore the President today to put politics aside, stop the distortions, join the Republican Congress in providing some much-needed and much-deserved tax relief to middle-class Americans.

TAX BILL MUST PASS CLEAR TESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, as the press now starts to report and to analyze the Republican tax cut legislation, the reviews are coming in from across the country and from independent journalists. What we now see is a recognition that what the Republican bill does is provide for a forced feeding of tax cuts to the wealthiest people in this country.

As Time magazine's journalist Jonathan Alter noted, the Republican bill showers millions of dollars on the richest 1 percent of Americans.

As the Wall Street Journal noted, it allows the IRA provisions to create opportunities primarily for upper income Americans to shift large chunks of their assets into tax-free accounts, where they would be beyond the reach of Uncle Sam forever.

The Washington Post notes that the Republican tax bill is heavily tilted toward the better off, and the Democrats are right for calling the Republicans on this.

They go on to note that the plain facts are that the bill would not only benefit the better off but would cost the Government revenues it cannot afford.

Yesterday, the Post quoted a number of economists supporting different political parties which reached agreement that the Republicans are relying on numbers that mask the extent of the size of the Republican tax proposals favoring high-income households which would mushroom over the years to come.

What we now see as the conventional economic analysis suggests that the permanent benefits of the tax cut will favor high-income individuals, and it will do so by denying the $500 tax credit to families who pay thousands of dollars in payroll taxes but the Republicans have determined somehow are welfare families and not entitled to the $500 tax credit. Unfortunately, for thousands of working families in America today, they pay more in payroll taxes than they pay in income taxes; and yet the Republican proposal would not share the child care tax credit with them.

What we now see is someone like Gary Bauer, the conservative head of the Family Research Council, saying, ''The family tax credit ought to go to any working families that pay income or payroll taxes. That is not welfare.''

Gary Bauer has it right. The Republicans have it wrong. These families are entitled to share this. But why can't they share in the tax cuts, the family child credit tax cut? They cannot share in that because the Republicans are so busy providing capital gains tax cuts to the wealthiest people in this country, the vast majority of which goes to the top 2, 3, 4 percent of the taxpayers in the United States.

These are not the people who need relief from taxes. The people who need relief from taxes are people who are trying to raise their children, educate their children, provide shelter for their children and are doing it on a few thousand dollars a year. Yet the Republicans say they cannot do that. They cannot do that because they want to get rid of the alternative minimum tax that suggests that corporations ought to pay something for the privilege of doing business in America.

When they get done with all of their deductions, where they can eliminate their obligation to pay taxes, there ought to be something they pay in this country. By giving away capital gains tax, by doing estate tax relief for the wealthiest people in this country, there is no money left. There is no money left for hard-working families in this country that, unfortunately, earn between $15,000 and $30,000 a year; and the Republicans are going to deny them a tax cut.

The bill should be changed in conference, it should be fair, and it should take care of working families. It does not do that now.

A BLOODY SHIRT ON TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I have taken this time to continue with the debate that my very good friend from Martinez, CA, Mr. MILLER, was engaged in; but I have a completely different view. Actually, it was put forward very well by a former adviser to President Clinton.

Yes, he served also in Republican administrations; but he most recently in his public service was an adviser to President Clinton. I am referring to the editor-at-large of U.S. News & World Report, who in this week's U.S. News & World Report on the back page has an editorial, which I would commend to all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as this debate proceeds.

The editorial is entitled ''A Bloody Shirt on Taxes: It's time for the left to stop twisting the truth about tax relief.''

Now, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] was referring to many

people who have said that this package that we have put forward is nothing but a sop for the rich. But if we look at the facts, I am very happy to say that many Democrats in this House know full well that this tax package is, in fact, very, very helpful to middle and lower income wage earners in this country.

There are a few points that Mr. Gergen makes in this piece which I would like to share with my colleagues. He says, the central liberal charge is that the bills adopted by the GOP-led Senate and House would give as much tax relief to the top 1 percent as to the bottom 60 percent combined. Sounds horrific, doesn't it? What they ignore, as Jim Glassman of U.S. News & World Report noted, is the top 1 percent also pay more in taxes than the bottom 60 percent combined, a lot more. IRS records show that the top 1 percent shoulder 29 percent of the Nation's total tax bill, while the bottom 60 percent pay some 9 percent.

Recognize that we singled out the top 1 percent for tax hikes in that 1993 bill that the President moved through. It also would not be terribly unfair to include them in at least a modicum of tax relief today.

He goes on to talk about this issue of funny money, which my friend from Florida, [Mr. STEARNS] mentioned earlier, this imputed income whereby if someone paid off their mortgage, they in fact have what would be the rental income included as income to them, and it is actually obviously money they would never see.

Mr. Gergen writes that stripping away the funny money, the Census Bureau shows that the top 20 percent really starts with households earning $65,124 a year. That means that the criticism that has come from the left, Madam Speaker, is they are pretending that families that make $65,124 are categorized as rich.

Then a very important item that needs to be mentioned, one that I have been working on since the opening day of this Congress and, frankly, for a number of years, is this issue of capital gains.

When I mention how Democrats have joined with me in cosponsoring very important legislation, H.R. 14, to bring about an across-the-board reduction in capital gains, it is because they know that the average family of four would see an increase of $1,500 per year over a 7-year period in their take-home pay.

Mr. Gergen says another shell game on the left involves proposed reductions in capital gains and estate taxes. Liberals say it is selfish for people who invest in stocks or save for their children to receive tax relief. But they ignore the fact that these funds have already been taxed, when they were first earned. To tax earnings a second time at rates as high as 55 percent, which is the case with inheritance taxes, borders on confiscation.

Now, Madam Speaker, we know full well that we are in this together, and I think Gergen's closing paragraph is a very telling one.

This country does face serious challenges in addressing the growing income gap between those who are affluent and everyone else. Clearly, we should be working harder to ensure that children of poor and middle-class families have an equal chance at the starting line of life. Just as clearly, those who have the most should give the most back. But the way the left is trying to twist this tax debate, bullyragging successful Americans as a way to score political points trivializes the real issues and divides us as a people. We don't need another bloody shirt.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to read this editorial, and I will send it around to everyone.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT MEDAL OF HONOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHALE. Madam Speaker, for the last 2 nights I have joined millions of Americans in watching the Rough Riders on Turner Broadcasting. When Teddy Roosevelt served as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, he argued vigorously that the United States should intervene in Cuba and be prepared for possible war with Spain. In what was for Teddy Roosevelt characteristic language, he said, ''I had deeply felt it was our duty to free Cuba, and I publicly expressed this feeling; and when a man takes such a position, he ought to be willing to make his words good by his deeds. He should pay with his body.''

So, in that spirit, Teddy Roosevelt resigned his office and offered to serve as a lieutenant colonel with the First U.S. Volunteer Cavalry, what history now calls the Rough Riders.

On July 1, 1898, in what Roosevelt would call for the rest of his life his crowded hour, he placed his body on the line. He backed up his words with his courage. Leading two vicious bloody assaults on Kettle Hill and the San Juan Heights, Teddy Roosevelt made history and led his men with extraordinary valor.

The fighting was brutal. Four hundred ninety Rough Riders went into battle that day; 89 were killed or wounded, the heaviest loss suffered by any regiment in the cavalry division.

From the beginning to the very end, Theodore Roosevelt was at the forefront of battle, leading by example, encouraging his men, oblivious to danger, firing his revolver at point-blank range and killing the enemy with his own hand, this future president of the United States displayed extraordinary valor under the most difficult of combat conditions.

Gen. Leonard Wood, Roosevelt's commanding officer, recommended Roosevelt for the Medal of Honor with the following citation: Colonel Roosevelt led a very desperate and extremely gallant charge on San Juan Hill, thereby setting a splendid example to the troops and encouraging them to pass over the open country. In leading this charge, he started off first. He then returned and gathered a few men and led them in the charge, an extremely gallant one, and the example set a most inspiring one to the troops in that part of the line.

Madam Speaker, by universal consensus among the officers and men who witnessed Roosevelt's bravery, he had earned our Nation's highest military decoration. But he never received it.

During the weeks after the battle for San Juan Heights, Roosevelt watched with mounting frustration as his men suffered and died from tropical disease. Angered by Roosevelt's public statements that the Rough Riders should be brought home as quickly as possible, Secretary of War Alger refused to sign Roosevelt's Medal of Honor citation.

As a result, Col. Theodore Roosevelt was denied the recognition he had earned in battle. Edith Roosevelt, after Teddy's death, said that the failure to receive the Medal of Honor was one of the most bitter disappointments of his life.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to tell you that it is not too late to correct that injustice. Later this week I will be introducing legislation with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], authorizing the Medal of Honor for Col. Theodore Roosevelt, First United States Volunteer Cavalry, for extraordinary bravery under enemy fire. Members wishing to be original cosponsors should contact my office.

A century of political retry bugs and injustice can now be corrected by the posthumous recognition of Teddy Roosevelt's courage.

AMERICA'S SPACE PROGRAM: A SOURCE OF PRIDE AND INSPIRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Madam Speaker, let me begin by saying that I would like to be a cosponsor of the legislation being submitted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE], and I very much endorse his very eloquent comments. I know Teddy Roosevelt has been an inspiration for me, not so much in my political career, but as well as a young man growing up and seeing how somebody like him could overcome adversity and take the risks that he did. So I congratulate the gentleman and the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], on your endeavor, and I would like to support you in that.

Madam Speaker, I rise this afternoon to talk about our Nation's space program. As all Americans know, our Nation's success in the arena of space has

been a source of great pride and inspiration for many Americans, particularly our Nation's youth. Of course, it all got started by the people who were willing to take risks.

There is probably nobody who has taken more of a risk than John Kennedy when he made the commitment to go to the Moon, and he said we go to the Moon not because it is easy, but because it is hard. The way to the Moon was paved by those many men and women who worked on the programs Mercury and Gemini, and then ultimately the successful Apollo program.

Of course, following that we had the tremendous success of our shuttle program. The shuttle has proven its durability and its tremendous versatility, a vehicle that can go up and come back, a vehicle that can go up, retrieve satellites, bring them back to Earth and then launch them again.

Of course, we recently all across the world were spellbound by the tremendous success of the unmanned program to Mars, the Mars Pathfinder, and the rover Sojourner and how that fascinated not only all Americans, but particularly our Nation's youth.

Now we are getting very close to the point where we will be launching and assembling our Nation's space station, a tremendous international cooperative event involving people not only here in the United States, but as well people in Europe and in Japan.

I have with me on my left a diagram of what the orbiting space station would look like. In this particular diagram, you can see the shuttle in the background there docked to the space station, and it is delivering another element.

This will be hopefully becoming a reality in the next 12 to 18 months. We have some ongoing serious problems that we need to work through with the Russians and their failure to fund their components of the space station, but if we are really going to have an ongoing, growing space program, one of the things we need to overcome is the problem of the high cost of getting payloads into orbit.

One of the ways we are hoping to do that is with this vehicle shown here in this poster, the X–33, the next reusable launch vehicle. This a vehicle that is being developed right now by Lockheed-Martin out in California, and this vehicle hopefully will dramatically reduce the cost of getting payloads into orbit.

The goal or desire is to reduce the cost by a factor of 10, because that is one of the most expensive things about us going into space, is the actual cost of getting a pound from the surface up into orbit. This vehicle will be very similar to the shuttle, in that it will go up and come back and go up and come back, but will be using new modern technology that we all hope, all of us here in the House of Representatives, but as well all of those men and women that work in our space program at places like Kennedy Space Center and Johnson Space Center, at the Jet Propulsion Center in Pasadena, CA, we hope it will dramatically lower the cost so we can do more. What do we want to do? What are our hopes and dreams in terms of the future of going up into space, and what would we like to be able to accomplish?

Well, this next poster I have here shows something that I think has some real potential. It shows men and women working on the surface of the moon and doing what? Well, one of the proposals that has been put forward is that we may be able to collect solar energy on the Moon and actually send it by microwave beams. The technology on this has all been worked out. It is not new technology. Send it to the Earth in a way that we could get electricity so we would not have to use nuclear powerplants and use fossil fuels. You are talking about a completely clean way to generate abundant forms of electrical power. If we can develop cheaper, more inexpensive ways to get payloads into orbit, it may be possible for us to reduce the cost of electricity to as little as 3 cents per kilowatt.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all our colleagues to support the Nation's space program and the tremendous promise that it holds.

SUPPORT CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997 the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES], is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, today we will continue consideration of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education amendments. I rise this afternoon to support vocational education because of its importance to this country and to my district of El Paso, TX. Carl Perkins provides Federal funding to improve the quality of vocational education and to provide access to quality vocational education to special populations which include disadvantaged students.

My home in El Paso is one of the poorest districts in this country. Many students there cannot afford to attend college. Vocational education, especially as funded through Carl Perkins, provides these students the skills that they need to move immediately into higher paying jobs, and upon graduation for some it provides the skills developed that will set them for a career path in life. For others, vocational education provides job opportunities which will allow individuals to work and to save for college in their future.

Schools in my district are using this funding to teach our kids in innovative ways and to prepare them for the working world or to continue their education and college if they so choose.

I was very disappointed to learn that the bill excludes a requirement to spend vocational education funds for programs for single parents and pregnant women. The Ysleta School System in my district has developed a very important program which could make use of such funds.

This program at Ysleta Academy of Science and Technology helps teenage parents through its Teen Parenting Academy and the Teen Parenting Program, which takes pregnant students out of the regular classroom and provides them academic and vocational education.

The Teen Parenting Academy uses State funds for academics and Carl Perkins funds for vocational education. Within 6 weeks of the child's birth, other schools would send the student back to regular classes. This program, however, allows students to complete their academic career at the Teen Parenting Academy.

Normally teenage parents, male and female, have a very high dropout rate, especially soon after their babies are born. In this program, however, students stay in school, complete their academic education and learn a vocation. The dropout rate for single parents in the Teen Parenting Academy is well below the national and local dropout average.

Continued vocational education funding for single pregnant women and single parents would help this school continue to provide these kids opportunities that they might otherwise miss, and it helps to keep these kids from falling into the vicious cycle of poverty.

The support a bipartisan amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SANCHEZ], and others, which will restore this requirement.

I believe that quality education is the key to helping children and adults in communities like mine to raise their standard of living. We must, therefore, continue to provide Federal support for important educational programs like Carl D. Perkins. The way to make this country a better, more productive society is to increase the educational level of all its residents.

A TRIBUTE TO HENRY SALVATORI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, one of the great opportunities of this job of being a Member of Congress is to officially bid farewell to great people. One such great American recently passed away. He was a teacher, a patriot, and a friend. His name was Henry Salvatori.

Many Americans have no idea who Henry Salvatori was, but to many of us who are politically active and followed behind the scenes what has happened in

America and some of the great developments in the oil industry and some of the great philanthropic works in California, we know very well who Henry Salvatori was. He was a great American, and it is an honor today for us to say a few nice words about him and to recall him for the American people, because he added so much to our way of life.

Henry Salvatori died over the Fourth of July weekend at age 96. That date was fitting, because Henry was a man whose life epitomized what being an American is all about.

He was, like many American patriots, a man who came to the United States from another country. Henry came to us from Italy. He came here when he was 5 years old, and during his lifetime, he enthusiastically embraced the ideals that are at the foundation of our country. Thus, he epitomized what being an American is all about, because we have always said that these American values are not just for the people of the United States and people born here, but being an American means those things that our Founding Fathers fought for and sought after.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I would first like to congratulate him for taking out this time to talk about a great American hero, Henry Salvatori.

I think the last point that my friend has made is really right on target here, because many have said that the very best citizens in this country are those who become American citizens by choice. Henry Salvatori really epitomized that, having been a member of Ronald Reagan's Kitchen Cabinet and having played such a key role in the conservative movement. He established at my alma mater the Salvatori Center, which has done a great deal of research.

So, rather than simply being involved in politics, not a lot of attention has been focused on his tremendous philanthropic involvement and his support of education. He has provided to my friend and to me and many others tremendous inspiration, and a great deal of advice and counsel and support.

I would simply like to join my friend and say Henry Salvatori will be sorely missed by so many of us. It is a great loss for the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, we will be benefiting from his not only generosity, but the standards that he set for us. Henry Salvatori was a man who believed in free enterprise and free speech. He believed in honor, in truth, in decency and hard work and responsibility, and he took these principles to heart and into his hands. With them he built a very successful life, and this success Henry shared with everyone.

Henry Salvatori's motto was ''whoever crosses my path, I will leave them at least as well off, or, if possible, better off than he was before.'' Henry's life is an inspiration, and he tried to follow that formula, not through one career, but through three careers. In each one of those he tried to better people's lives.

Henry's first career was in the oil business, when as a young man he pioneered a new oil exploration technology of charting geological structures by sending shock waves through the ground. Inspired by the spirit of enterprise that he found in America, Henry invested all of his assets into a company based on the seismic method and the company, Western Geophysical, grew into a multibillion dollar corporation and he became its leader. The business remains a leader today even as Henry passes on.

Henry's second career was that of an philanthropist. He believed that the best way to help others is not with Government entitlements, but through the private sector, through caring individuals who are taking the responsibility to help others. In this, he lent a hand to so many people to try to help them get the basics, but at no time trying to make any individual dependent on the Government or someone else's largess.

He demonstrated this belief time and again by bestowing gifts on universities and colleges, hospitals, children's clubs, community groups, and the arts. He also supported civic education organizations which put forth ideas of limited Government and expanded individual opportunity, ideas that guide our society today.

In particular, Henry supported the youth organizations like the Young Americans for Freedom and the Young Republicans and others. This helped a whole generation of young people meet the responsibility of picking up the torch and caring the torch of American freedom as it was passed from one generation to another. I am a beneficiary of that largess, as was Ronald Reagan and many others, as Henry Salvatori engaged himself in the political process in the United States he loved so much, and it was a tribute to all Americans at all times.

It was during his third career—his career in politics—that I was fortunate enough to come to know Henry. He never sought, won or held elected office, but Henry served his fellow Americans honorably by effectively using one of the most powerful rights that the U.S. Constitution bestows upon its citizens: free speech. He engaged in debate on State and national issues, and financially supported candidates who shared his beliefs in freedom. In hindsight, Henry spoke out for some of America's greatest leaders.

Henry became a respected and trusted advisor to Barry Goldwater, Gerald Ford, and Richard Nixon. But he was best known for launching the career of the man who has ignited the political spirit of the modern generation: Ronald Reagan.

Henry enticed Reagan to enter politics with two simple promises that to this day resonate with courage and integrity. He promised to take care of the campaign funding and promised to take nothing in return: no favor, no office, no appointment. Henry supported Reagan from the Governor's Mansion to the White House, and today the history books show he kept both promises.

He remained close to President Reagan as part of a so-called Kitchen Cabinet. Though Reagan entertained all ideas, in the end the President made the decisions. Of course, it was through the support and dedication of patriotic Americans like Henry Salvatori that Ronald Reagan ever had a chance to lead.

Henry did himself, his neighbors and this country many great services. He expanded access to our national energy supply. He funded charities that help people in need. He supported political ideas and candidates who brought our country closer to freedom, and expanded the opportunities available to average people.

In doing so Henry Salvatori crossed all our paths. And rest assured, we are much better off.

As we close this today, I would hope all people on the next Fourth of July will remember the great contributions this man made to our country.

CONGRESS NOT BEING KIND TO SMALL FAMILY FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, this Congress has not been very kind to small family farmers this year as the Agriculture Appropriation bill cuts funding by $3.7 billion over last year's bill. That cut is on top of a $10.3 billion cut last year, and an additional $5.8 billion less than the year before.

In addition, we will face an amendment later that, if it passes, small tobacco farmers could be the sole category of farmers effectively barred from obtaining Federal crop insurance, even though the purchase of crop insurance is mandatory for all farmers through the passage of the Federal Crop Insurance Reform Act of 1994.

Later today, we will also face an amendment that targets peanut farmers. That amendment will help large corporations with moneys earned at the expense of small family farmers.

But inattention to a situation that has plagued small family farmers for more than four decades is one of the biggest acts of omission of this Congress. The farmers and ranchers of America, including minority and limited resource farmers, through their labor and hard work sustain each and every one of us and maintain the lifeblood of our Nation and the world. These people do not discriminate; their products are for all of us. Therefore, it is important that we do all within our powers to ensure that each and every producer is able to farm without the additional burden of institutional racism rearing its ugly head.

Madam Speaker, it has greatly concerned me that in my home State of North Carolina, there has been a 64-percent decline in minority farmers just over the last 15 years, from 6,696 farmers in 1978 to 2,498 farmers in 1992.

There are several reasons as to why the number of minority and limited resource farmers are declining so rapidly, but the one that has been documented time and time again is the discriminatory environment present in the Department of Agriculture, which was the very agency established by the U.S. Government to accommodate and assist the special needs of all farmers and ranchers.

On February 28, 1997, the Civil Rights Action Team [CRAT] report was issued, a report entitled ''Civil Rights at the United States Department of Agriculture.'' It was done by the Civil Rights Implementation Team at USDA under the direction of Secretary Don Glickman, which documents the decades of discrimination against minorities and women within the Department. Ninety-two recommendations for change were made in the report, 13 of which required legislative action.

I have introduced a bill which seeks to implement most of the legislative recommendations within the CRAT report. This is a beginning, not complete.

My bill achieves this goal by first, changing the structure of county committees; second, changing the status of county employees from non-Federal to Federal; third, making sure that socially disadvantaged farmers can obtain credit and other assistance to maintain their farms as other farmers are able to do; and, fourth, making sure USDA has sufficient funds to carry out its loans, technical assistance, and outreach programs. The bill is H.R. 2185 and is entitled the USDA Accountability and Equity Act of 1997. I urge all of my colleagues to join in support of this bill.

Farmers and ranchers are an invaluable resource to all of us. American producers, who now represent less than 3 percent of the population, provide more than enough food and fiber to meet the needs of our Nation and most nations overseas. Twenty-two million Americans are employed in the processing, selling, trading of our national foods and fiber. Seventy-five million Americans are recipients of USDA benefits. Crops are produced, the soil and water are cared for, and the most available, highest quality and the least expensive food supply in the world is provided through agriculture and related programs.

The Food Stamp Program, the School Breakfast and Lunch Program, meat and poultry inspections and the world's greatest quantity of agricultural exports as well as the world's largest donations of foreign food aid also result from agriculture programs.

In rural communities, agriculture programs dispense loans and grants for housing, utilities, and economic development. Forest protection and preservation is another important product of such programs.

And so, Madam Speaker, I would ask my colleagues that, as we consider the Agriculture appropriations bill, think of small farmers, their families, and the communities they serve.

As debate continues on peanuts and tobacco, bear in mind the burden small farmers have carried in recent years in budget matters.

When we vote on the tobacco amendments and peanut amendment, do not be blind to who we are helping and who we are hurting.

And, finally, I urge each of my colleagues to consider cosponsoring H.R. 2185, the USDA Accountability and Equity Act of 1997.

Small family farmers, particularly socially disadvantaged and minority farmers deserve a chance.

This bill, H.R. 2185 begins to give them that chance.

Madam Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2185, the USDA an accountability act, and remember that all of our farmers, minority and disadvantaged farmers, deserve the protection of the U.S. Constitution and of this Congress.

A FRESH LOOK AT THE ANTI-TOBACCO CAMPAIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise to welcome my friends and constituents from the Greater Fall River-Fresh Air Kids Program to Washington, DC and to the U.S. Congress. This community youth group has put the phrase, Think Globally/Act Locally, into action with their efforts to combat environmental tobacco smoke. I continue to support the thousands of youthful volunteers whom the Fresh Air Kids have recruited as they use direct action to combat the tobacco industry's advertising campaign against the young people in America.

Within 25 years, tobacco-related illnesses are expected to overtake infectious disease as the leading threat to human health worldwide. In spite of this fact, tobacco companies continue to produce cigarettes at the rate of 5.5 trillion a year. That is nearly 1,000 cigarettes for every person on the planet, including our young children.

Every day, over 3,000 kids become regular smokers, despite laws in every State that prohibit tobacco use by minors. Every year, 1 million young children start using tobacco, with the average teenage smoker starting at 13 and becoming a daily smoker by 14½.

An estimated 419,000 Americans die each year from diseases caused by smoking. That number is more than die from AIDS, alcohol, illegal drugs, fires, car crashes, suicides, and murder combined. Tobacco use is the No. 1 cause of preventable disease and death in my State of Massachusetts, taking 10,000 lives every year.

Ninety percent of all adult smokers begin smoking before the age of 18. In my own family, I watched my mother-in-law, a lifetime smoker, recently become one of the hundreds of thousands of Americans to die annually from lung cancer. My grandfather continues to suffer daily from emphysema, the product of years of smoking.

In light of these sad but very real statistics, the Fresh Air Kids have made remarkable progress in the 2 years since their organization was founded by Maureen Glisson of Citizens for Citizens of Fall River, Joseph Borges of the Fall River Tobacco Control Program, and Jacqueline Goyette of the Swansea/Somerset Board of Health Tobacco Control Program.

With the encouragement and support of parent groups, educators, community leaders, and members of the media, some 3,000 volunteer youth have fueled the local movement against tobacco in their community.

The Fresh Air Kids have spoken to Massachusetts, and their voices have been heard loud and clear. In a community where 34 percent of residents smoke, these youngsters have pledged never to start, and to work to keep others tobacco-free.

Last October, I had the privilege of joining with the Fresh Air Kids in a march that celebrated their successful campaign to create the first smoke-free mall in southeastern Massachusetts. The kids marched to the mall with placards and petitions from their many supporters in the community. They obtained permission to set up a store front to display signs and collect signatures of support.

At the end of the victory march, I watched with pride as the mall manager stood up and declared this mall is smoke free due to the efforts of the Fresh Air Kids.

Currently the Fresh Air Kids are conducting a billboard campaign encouraging local businesses to buy back billboards which feature tobacco advertising like Joe Camel signs, replacing them with pro-health messages of the Fresh Air Kids. We hope these efforts will encourage Congress to address other such harmful advertising practices, such as tobacco product placement in movies.

The Fresh Air Kids understand and have articulated what I believe is the very foundation of an effective democracy, that informed and active citizens, willing to stand up for causes they care about, really can make a difference.

Here in the U.S. Congress we can try to pass laws that we hope will keep our children healthy, but it is up to the efforts and actions of grass-roots groups in every community across America to take up the fight in keeping our children safe and healthy.

The Fresh Air Kids are a shining example of what citizen action and grass-roots community effort can accomplish. That is one reason why they have been selected as a National Pilot Program by the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids, a national antismoking group that has set the standard for keeping our kids healthy.

I thank the Fresh Air Kids, their parents, their educators, the local media, the local elected officials, and fresh air boosters everywhere for making southeastern Massachusetts a better place to live and a safer place to breathe.

I look forward to many, many years of working with them and, once again, to the Fresh Air Kids, I say welcome to Washington, and I am very proud of you.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

We know, O gracious God, that the pace of living is brisk, and we know too that we need to have time to meditate on Your good gifts to us and to reflect on how we can interpret these gifts in our daily lives.

May we use the gift of faith so our lives develop meaning and purpose; may we use the gift of hope so we can anticipate a new and brighter day; may we use the gift of love so that we know others with trust and affection and share with them our feelings and experiences. May Your gifts of faith and hope and love, O God, that have nourished us along the way be with us this day and every day, we pray. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAMPSON] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LAMPSON 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.

LET US GIVE THE PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY THE TAX RELIEF THEY DESERVE

(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, our liberal colleagues have used every trick in the book to avoid giving the American people a tax break. After failed attempts at scaring welfare recipients and working taxpayers, now they are trying the same on senior citizens. Well, the truth is the Republican Taxpayer Relief Act will greatly benefit seniors in their retirement years because we believe that those who have worked hard, played by the rules, and saved for retirement should be rewarded, not threatened and not penalized.

Opponents of the capital gains tax relief say, ''You're rich if you put money into mutual funds or contributed to a company retirement plan or built a small business with your own sweat and labor.'' But more than half of all taxpayers claiming capital gains have incomes less than $50,000, and many are seniors who are able live a better life by converting their lifelong investments. In fact nearly 80 percent of assets other than homes are owned by the elderly and seniors.

No more excuses, my colleagues on the left. For the first time in 16 years, let us give the people of this country a tax break they deserve.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2003

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name from cosponsorship of H.R. 2003.

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

There was no objection.

WORKING FAMILIES NEED A BREAK

(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, as my colleagues know, in Congress we are working on giving Americans an $85 billion tax cut. The question is who should reap the greatest benefits from these tax cuts? Should it be the wealthiest corporations and the wealthiest Americans? Well, that is what I believe my Republican colleagues suggest. Or should it be the middle-class families who are struggling to obtain their dreams and could greatly benefit from these tax cuts?

The Republican tax plan gives tax breaks to America's most profitable corporations and wealthiest individuals while leaving middle-class families with little help. According to a Treasury Department analysis, 63 percent of the Republican tax cuts will go to the top 20 percent of the wealthiest Americans.

The Democrats' tax plan provides for middle-income families by giving a break to those families making less than $75,000 a year. It also provides a $500-per-child tax credit to middle- and low-income working families.

The Republican plan denies millions of these families such tax breaks. I believe that is wrong. Working families need a break.

PINOCCHI-NOMICS

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel like we are surrounded by a bunch of Pinocchios. It appears we have two different groups of Pinocchios. On the one hand we have got some liberals who are calling millions of middle-class families rich by using something called family economic income. Family economic income is a magic formula that some ingenious bureaucrat at the Treasury Department dreamed up that means your income is actually 50 percent or more higher than people think it is. On the other hand we have got some liberals who want, now listen to this one, who want to reduce the income tax burden on people whose income tax burden is already zero. Their ideas of a tax cut is to, and now I am not making this up, is to increase the tax burden on the actual taxpayers to give tax decreases to those who pay no taxes. It is hard to know which group is growing the longest noses.

I do not know how to decide which arguments are more absurd, the family economic income liberals or the tax cut to the welfare crowd. Mr. Speaker, this is Pinocchi-nomics.

NEW DEFINITION OF INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR IS GOP EXTREMISM AT ITS ABSOLUTE WORST

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if there is any doubt about the Republicans' dedication to helping the rich at the expense of the average working American, one need only look at the new definition of independent contractor in the GOP's tax agenda. The definition has been drastically broadened to allow employers to reclassify longtime employees as independent contractors. By so doing, employers would no longer be obligated to provide health and pension coverage as well as a host of other labor protections to millions, and I repeat millions, of Americans who are now entitled to such benefits; and to add insult to injury, individuals reclassified as independent contractors will be hit with a tax increase. They will be forced to pick up the Medicare and Social Security taxes that employers were formerly responsible for paying.

On top of all this, Mr. Speaker, there are reports that Speaker GINGRICH, in an effort to placate the conservative forces that almost brought him down, may once again be gearing up to shut down the Government in the name of tax breaks for the rich.

Mr. Speaker, the GOP just does not get it. The American people are not interested in tax breaks for the rich and Government shutdowns. They are interested in job security and health care. The GOP should let honest people make an honest living and leave the definition of independent contractor alone.

TOO MUCH POWER IN THE HANDS OF GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. RYUN. Mr. Speaker, when our Founding Fathers were debating the Constitution in Philadelphia in 1787, one of the most important subjects they discussed was concerning our freedoms. Some thought too much governmental power was the threat to freedom. Others thought too much power in the hands of the majority would be a threat to the freedom of minorities. Yet others thought that too much power in the hands of factions or what we call today special interest groups was the greatest threat to the general public. Men such as Thomas Jefferson and James Madison wrote extensively about these threats to freedom. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison were right about all three of these threats to freedom.

Today I would like to call special interests or special attention to the threat to freedom that Thomas Jefferson feared the most: Too much power in the hands of Government. When the Government takes between one-fourth and one-half of everyone's income, that is too much power in the hands of Government. Let us heed the words of Thomas Jefferson and reduce the power of Government by passing the first tax package in 16 years, one that guarantees a $500-per-child tax credit, allowing families to keep more of what they earn.

TWO HUANGS DO NOT MAKE A RIGHT

(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, John Huang says he never broke the law, he never raised campaign money for the Democrats while he worked for the Commerce Department. The gutless wonder now says, ''My wife did it.'' That is right. John Huang says that Jane Huang was the one that raised the half million dollars from the Indonesian landscaper that ended up having to be returned because the landscaper never filed his taxes. In addition, Jane Huang raised $12,000 from John Huang's old boss at Lippo.

And after all this, John Huang says, ''Hey, behind every good man is a good woman. I did nothing wrong.''

Jane Huang says, ''I did nothing wrong.''

Tell it like it is. Two Huangs do not make a right. If there is any consolation, my colleagues, John Huang could have blamed Jane Doe, not Jane Huang.

I yield back the balance of this Communist intrusion into our political process.

THE TIP OF THE EGG ROLL

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to talk about Chinagate figure John Huang because he had a real tough job. As the president of his holding company, Hip Hing, a subsidiary of Lippo Group, he had to work many, many long hours. See, when one's only asset is a vacant parking lot, we would not believe the pressures they are under. Nevertheless he had the time to get deeply involved in Democrat politics, and when he donated $50,000, no one raised an eye about how a vacant parking lot attendant could afford such largess. Of course they did not know he was reimbursed by his parent company, the one-half Chinese Communist government owned Lippo Group, but now even Democrats admit this was an illegal donation and apparently only the tip of the egg roll.

PROVIDE TAX RELIEF TO THE FAMILIES WHO NEED IT THE MOST

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

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, we need to pass a tax relief package that works for working Americans. By the way, the method of calculating income by the Treasury Department was indeed devised by the Reagan administration.

The tax reconciliation bill denies tax relief to millions of working families who pay Federal taxes but who earn less than $30,000 a year. These folks would be unable to claim the $500-per-child tax credit even though they pay Federal taxes.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about nurses, teachers, junior police officers who are trying to raise their families on limited incomes. We are talking about small business owners, family farmers, hourly wage earners. We are talking about people who put a significant percentage of their salaries toward paying Federal payroll taxes. We are talking about people who need tax relief. We are talking about people who get nothing under this tax plan.

Let us not pass up this golden opportunity to provide tax relief to families that need it most. It is time to restore the full $500-per-child credit to working families.

THE WHITE HOUSE BLAMES IT ON THE SYSTEM

(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, if compromise of our national security and corruption of the electoral process itself were not involved, I would find great humor in the attempts to change the subject by the other side. Everyone knows how absolutely brilliant children can be at changing the subject, how inventive our kids can be at shifting responsibility and finding excuses for their behavior.

It is like a child playing with a dog in a way that he is not supposed to, pulling his tail or poking the dog where he hates to be poked, and then when the dog reacts by barking or biting, the child indignantly blames the dog.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what we have is the White House in clear violation of the law and then turning around and blaming the system for making them break the law. The system somehow required the Democrat National Committee to take foreign money. The system somehow required the White House to turn the White House into the mother of all fundraising operations. The system somehow required the DNC to accept drug money from drug traffickers.

Great example for our kids, Mr. Speaker; break the law then blame it all on the system.

BILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN TAX BREAKS FOR MILLIONAIRES AND NOTHING FOR DANIEL

(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, Republicans continue to try to sell their huge tax break for the rich by promising tax relief for middle-class Americans. But under the Republican plan millions of working Americans get no tax cuts, they only get empty promises. Let us take an example:

Daniel is a police officer. He works hard and supports his wife and four children on his $26,000 salary. He pays thousands of dollars in taxes. What does Daniel get from the Republican tax bill? Nothing, zero, zip. Democrats want to give Daniel and millions of other working families a tax cut.

What do Republicans say about Daniel? Daniel, the police officer? They said Daniel is on welfare. Billions of dollars in tax breaks for millionaires, nothing for Daniel, nothing for millions of hardworking families. That is the Republican tax bill, that is the Republican tax plan.

□ 1415

PHILOSOPHICAL DIFFERENCES ON TAX RELIEF

(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, there is a great philosophical divide between we Republicans and the Democrats when it comes to the issue of tax cuts. For the 40 years that the Democrats controlled this Chamber, they ended their regin by giving America the highest tax increase in American history. For 2 years the Republicans have controlled this Chamber, and in each Congress we have offered a tax cut for middle class families. Democrats consistently oppose these tax cuts because the less money that gets to come back to Washington by way of the IRS means there is less money available for them to spend on their favorite projects.

We Republicans believe that those people who go to work each day ought to be able to keep more of their hard-earned money to spend for their families. The choice is simply this: If American taxpayers really believe that they do not have enough common sense to spend the money they earn for their families, then they should support the liberal rhetoric that supports high taxes. If, on the other hand, families believe that they ought to be able to make spending decisions for their families, they should support the Republican plan to cut taxes for the middle class.

THE CHOICE IS CLEAR

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week Democratic and Republican negotiators will decide what sort of tax bill to send to President Clinton. I think the choice is very clear. We can give them the Republican bill, with handouts for the rich, or the Democratic bill, with help for the rest.

As far as I am concerned parents working full time and making $30,000 a year or less need a lot more help than corporate frequent flyers who use company jets for personal use and then want a tax exemption for it.

The Democratic bill, Mr. Speaker, helps hospitals and will send 214,000 more Massachusetts students to college, and it is a far better bill than the Republican bill, that will cut $70,000,000 from Massachusetts hospitals and do very little to help students.

The Republican bill skimps on tax breaks for students. It shortchanges lower income working families, it gives enormous tax breaks to the very rich, and it gives handouts to the people who need a leg up, and for people making less than $93,000. It is a bad idea, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

TUITION CREDIT ASPECTS OF TAX PROPOSALS

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, while the Republican tax bill is loaded with benefits for the rich, it offers little to make higher education affordable for the rest of us. The Democratic tax cut, in contrast, provides a credit of up to $1,500 in tuition for 2 years of community college.

For example, if you go to a college where the tuition is $1,500 you will get a full $1,500 tax credit. Compare that to the Republican plan, where you get only 50 percent of tuition costs up to $3,000. The $1,500 tuition bill will get you only a $750 credit, or half as much.

The Democratic plan would allow employers to continue to deduct tuition expenses. Therefore, millions of workers who are hitting the books to improve their skills through employer-paid plans would be allowed to continue. The Republicans would end the deduction, and put an end to many of those programs.

That is why the Republicans are getting an F for their education plan from student and business groups nationwide. Building opportunity for more Americans by making education affordable is one of the building blocks of the Democratic tax cut. We urge the President to continue to fight for this provision as the negotiations continue.

IN OPPOSITION TO TRADE BARRIERS BETWEEN STATES

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

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend the Los Angeles Times ran an insightful article about the cooperative spirit of the California delegation. In the spirit of this bipartisanship, I along with my Republican colleague, the gentleman from California, Mr. FRANK RIGGS, and the California delegation have urged the Governor of Florida to repeal an egregious law which unfairly targets small wineries.

Under this law, if a Florida resident orders a bottle of wine from another State, the vintner, the delivery person, and the unsuspecting consumer are all guilty of felonies, punishable by up to 5 years in prison and a $5,000 fine.

Mr. Speaker, none of us wants trade wars. Florida's own attorney general is against this questionable legislation. Our small wineries are critical to the economy of my district and to the entire State of California. They should not be subject to unfair and extreme trade barriers within this great Nation. Mr. Speaker, we must support the rights of small businesses and interstate commerce.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 5 p.m. today

SHACKLEFORD BANKS WILD HORSES PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 765) to ensure maintenance of a herd of wild horses in Cape Lookout National Seashore.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 765

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 ''Shackleford Banks Wild Horses Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. MAINTENANCE OF WILD HORSES IN CAPE LOOKOUT NATIONAL SEASHORE.

Section 5 of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes'', approved March 10, 1966 (16 U.S.C. 459g–4), is amended by inserting ''(a)'' after ''SEC. 5.'', and by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b)(1) The Secretary, in accordance with this subsection, shall allow a herd of free roaming horses in the seashore.

''(2) Within 180 days after enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Foundation for Shackleford Horses (a nonprofit corporation established under the laws of the State of North Carolina) to provide for management of free roaming horses in the seashore. The agreement shall—

''(A) provide for cost-effective management of the horses; and

''(B) allow the Foundation to adopt any of those horses that the Secretary removes from the seashore.

''(3)(A) The Secretary shall accommodate the historic population level of the free roaming horse herd in the seashore, which shall be considered to be not less than 100 horses and not more than 110 horses.

''(B) The Secretary may not remove, or assist in or permit the removal of, any free roaming horses from Federal lands within the boundaries of the seashore unless—

''(i) the number of free roaming horses in the seashore exceeds 110;

''(ii) there is an emergency or a need to protect public health and safety, as defined in the agreement under paragraph (2); or

''(iii) there is concern for the persistence and viability of the horse population that is cited in the most recent findings of annual monitoring of the horses under paragraph (4).

''(4) The Secretary shall annually monitor, assess, and make available to the public findings regarding the population structure and health of the free roaming horses in the national seashore.

''(5) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as creating liability for the United

States for any damages caused by the free roaming horses to property located inside or outside the boundaries of the seashore.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 765 was introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] to ensure the maintenance of a herd of wild horses in Cape Lookout National Seashore, North Carolina. This bill is entitled ''The Shackleford Banks Wild Horses Protection Act.'' H.R. 765 would amend section 5 of the establishment act for Cape Lookout National Seashore to require the Secretary of the Interior to manage a herd of free-roaming wild horses on the island under agreement with the Foundation for Shackleford Horses, a nonprofit corporation established under the laws of North Carolina.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, the bill mandates that the National Park Service maintain a population of 100 to 110 wild horses at the seashore. The National Park Service has an inconsistent policy in managing wild horses. This bill assures that a healthy survivable herd will remain at the seashore, which has historically existed at a 100-horse level. These wild horses have been on the Outer Banks of North Carolina for over 300 years, but the National Park Service will not recognize their cultural value.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], for his diligence in moving H.R. 765 to the House floor. He was persuasive in the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, and also in the full Committee on Resources to express the concerns his North Carolina constituents have for the wild horses of the Shackleford Banks.

These wild roaming horses truly are a cultural resource that is important not only to North Carolina but to the entire Nation. H.R. 765 protects the wild roaming horses in Cape Lookout National Seashore. I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to support this worthwhile legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 765 introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], requires the National Park Service to maintain a herd of wild horses on Shackleford Banks in Cape Lookout National Seashore. I recognize and appreciate my good friend's deep personal interest in this matter, as well as the concern this issue has generated in the local community. As such, I am supporting the bill in the House today. I must note for the record that the administration has strong concerns and objections to the bill which are also shared by the National Parks and Conservation Association, a park advocacy group.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 765 has been very specific in management directives for the National Park Service, right down to specifying that the number of wild horses that must be maintained at the National Seashore be no less than 100 and no more than 110. That detailed a number may well cause some significant management problems, I am sure. We do not know the genetic diversity of this herd, nor the carrying capacity of the small barrier island on which they live. In fact, a report on the genetic diversity of the horses is due by sometime next month. We would do well to have better scientific information as we consider this legislation.

Part of the problem here, Mr. Speaker, is that the National Park Service waited for years to develop a management plan to deal with these horses. The National Park Service's handling of this matter has also raised concerns within the local community. I understand that the Foundation for Shackleford Horses, a local group, is currently reviewing a draft memorandum of understanding between the National Park Service and the foundation that will address many of the issues that H.R. 765 now involves. This I hope will be a positive step.

It seems to me that a great deal of time and effort has been spent by the National Park Service and others in this matter. Perhaps from these efforts scientific and management processes could be made to work cooperatively, and before this bill is sent to the President we would have a product that all parties could support. This legislation also has the full support of the Governor of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I support the legislation of the gentleman from North Carolina, with the hope that we will try to iron out some of the difficulties or provisions of the bill before it is sent to the White House.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], the chief sponsor of this piece of legislation, who has done such an outstanding job on it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee for their time and support in helping to secure passage of H.R. 765, the Shackleford Banks Wild Horses Protection Act.

As the chairman mentioned, H.R. 765 simply requires the National Park Service to maintain a representative herd of wild horses on Shackleford Banks, a part of the Cape Lookout National Seashore. These horses have been roaming free for over 300 years, much like their descendents, the Spanish mustangs which swam ashore after Spanish galleons wrecked off the North Carolina coast centuries ago.

As one can imagine, these horses have become a permanent part of North Carolina's heritage. Generation after generation of schoolchildren have been taught about these horses and their unique story. Some time ago the Park Service ignored the cultural importance of these horses and began initiating a management plan to reduce the size of the herd. I was amazed at the arrogance of the Park Service in its inability to work with local citizens for the best interests of the community and the region.

After witnessing the behavior and track record of the Park Service, I introduced H.R. 765 out of a concern for the health and the future of the Shackleford Banks wild horses. This legislation requires the Park Service to maintain a herd of not less than 100 horses and not more than 110 horses, a number determined by sound science, not unelected bureaucrats.

The numbers were reached in consultation with Dr. Dan Rubenstein, a professor of biology at Princeton University who has been studying these horses for more than 14 years. Also, a genetic scientist working in consultation with the Park Service also believes the herd should consist of at least 100 horses. The numbers are consistent with the number of horses that were on the island when the Park Service assumed ownership of the land back in the 1970's.

This legislation, as mentioned before, is strongly supported by North Carolina's Democratic Governor, Jim Hunt, our Democratic secretary of cultural resources, Betty McCain, and numerous local elected officials. I have even received petitions signed by schoolchildren across the State of North Carolina encouraging passage of this legislation.

After being part of the effort to save these horses, I believe this legislation is the only line of protection between the Park Service's intent to manage the vegetation instead of this national treasure.

□ 1430

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support passage of this legislation and the continuation of this historical rich herd, which is so important to the State of North Carolina.

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

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting to note that in the hearings process, maybe the gentleman will for the record, it is my understanding that this issue has been going on now for over 10 years and that very much the National Park Service was properly informed; but yet they sat on this issue for all this time until the gentleman practically was forced

to have to introduce legislation to get them moving. Is that correct?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, yes, sir, I appreciate the gentleman's question. I tried before this legislation was introduced to reach some common ground with the Park Service, and quite frankly I saw no sincere interest on their part, I use the word sincere, until I introduced the bill.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, so now they are more sincere than ever.

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his help, too.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I too appreciate the gentleman from North Carolina for introducing this bill. I think it is very important that we recognize that maybe these horses are not indigenous to the island but they do add and enhance the beauty and the preservation of it. I represent coastal Georgia, and we have Cumberland Island there where there is a herd of wild horses. These horses are also of Spanish descent.

The interesting thing about Cumberland Island is that the environmental community wants to eliminate the horses. Their reasoning is that it is not indigenous. Not all environmentalists feel this way, but many of them do. They come up with very specious reasons for doing so. We were told last year that the Cumberland horse population had been going up 15 percent a year for the last 10 years. Upon researching it within our office we found that the horse population on Cumberland Island had in fact been in the 250 to 260 range for about 10 years, and there was not an increase in the horse population.

We further found this year after another census was done that the horse population had in fact declined. So I think it is very important that we recognize that on wild horse populations, many times we are arguing not necessarily based on science but based on political correctness.

I believe that the gentleman from North Carolina is doing the right thing. Let the folks down there decide. Let them work with the biologists, get the emotion of the Park Service who sometimes gets involved in the politics on the politically correct politics, which says that nonindigenous animals have to go.

I think that this is a great piece of legislation, and I enthusiastically support it. I hope the day does not come when we have to have similar legislation to protect the wild horses on Cumberland Island. Right now they are being protected, but it does take a nudge to the Park Service.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SNOWBARGER]. 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. 765.

The question was taken.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. 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 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 765, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

WARNER CANYON SKI HILL LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 1997

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1944) to provide for a land exchange involving the Warner Canyon Ski Area and other land in the State of Oregon.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1944

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 ''Warner Canyon Ski Hill Land Exchange Act of 1977''.

SEC. 2. LAND EXCHANGE INVOLVING WARNER CANYON SKI AREA AND OTHER LAND IN OREGON.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF EXCHANGE.—If title acceptable to the Secretary for non-Federal land described in subsection (b) is conveyed to the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey to Lake County, Oregon, subject to valid existing rights of record, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of Federal land consisting of approximately 295 acres within the Warner Canyon Ski Area of the Freemont National Forest, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Warner Canyon Ski Hill Land Exchange'', dated June 1997.

(b) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The non-Federal land referred to in subsection (a) consists of—

(1) approximately 320 acres within the Hart Mountain National Wildlife Refuge, as generally depicted on the map referred to in subsection (a); and

(2) such other parcels of land owned by Lake County, Oregon, within the Refuge as are necessary to ensure that the values of the Federal land and non-Federal land to be exchanged under this section are approximately equal in value, as determined by appraisals.

(c) ACCEPTABLE TITLE.—Title to the non-Federal land conveyed to the United States under subsection (a) shall be such title as is acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior, in conformance with title approval standards applicable to Federal land acquisitions.

(d) VALID EXISTING RIGHTS.—The conveyance shall be subject to such valid existing rights of record as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall process the land exchange authorized by this section in the manner provided in subpart 2200 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

(f) MAP.—The map referred to in subsection (a) shall be on file and available for inspection in 1 or more local offices of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

(g) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyances under this section as either Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA], each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

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

H.R. 1944, introduced by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], provides for a land exchange involving the Warner Canyon Ski Area and other land in the State of Oregon. I commend Chairman BOB SMITH for bringing this bill before us today.

H.R. 1944 deeds approximately 290 acres of Forest Service land comprising the Warner Canyon Ski Hill to Lake County, Oregon. In exchange, Lake County will deed approximately 320 acres of land that is currently owned by Lake County within the Hart Mountain National Antelope Refuge to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The specific acreage offered by Lake County will be dependent upon an appraisal of all the lands to determine what amounts to an equal value trade in this exchange.

The Warner Canyon Ski Hill has been operated by the nonprofit group, the Fremont Highlanders Ski Club, since 1938. It is one of America's last nonprofit ski hills, the kind I learned to ski on, and I love them. The Warner Canyon Ski Hill anticipates many benefits by the trade including the reduction in the cost of liability insurance as well as better management of the ski area. The Forest Service will benefit by reducing the cost of managing this recreational property.

H.R. 1944 is noncontroversial and supported by all interested parties. This legislation is good for national taxpayers as well as the local taxpayers in Oregon. I would urge support for this bill.

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

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the legislation introduced by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH]. H.R. 1944 directs the Forest Service to convey about 295 acres of Federal land within the Warner Canyon Ski Area of Fremont National Forest to Lake County, Oregon. In exchange, the county would convey to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service about 320 acres of inholdings within the Hart Mountain National Wildlife Refuge. Significantly, the bill provides that this exchange would be of equal value, subject to appraisals, and under terms acceptable to both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior.

The administration has support and testified in support of this legislation. The Forest Service property contains a small ski area that costs the Federal Government about $10,000 per year to administer but generates only $400 in ski fees to the U.S. Treasury. The proposed exchange appears to be a good deal, Mr. Speaker, both for the Lake County, which wants the ski area to continue to operate for the benefit of community residents, and for the Federal Government, which would receive additional lands for the wildlife refuge.

Mr. Speaker, I do compliment the gentleman from Oregon on his legislation and urge Members to support this bill.

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

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH].

(Mr. SMITH of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time and my dear friend, the gentleman from American Samoa, for his support. This is, as has been identified, a very small land exchange which can assist in a time of need, a very small county in the southern part of the State of Oregon in the southeast suffering from what we have suffered from in the West in many areas, the problem with the lack of timber receipts because we cannot harvest timber any longer for various reasons, including the spotted owl and other Federal management objections.

Just to give an example, this little county received about $6.5 million in 1993 from forest receipts. Now it is receiving about $1.2 million from forest receipts. And with 75 percent of the county owned by the Federal Government, we can see the pinch that results in how in the world these people can provide for their infrastructure. One opportunity is with a little more tourism. One of those opportunities is with this land exchange, which could in fact expand the ski area.

I thank both of my friends for helping in this effort for a very good group of people and a very small county in America.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for allowing this bipartisan, noncontroversial bill to come to the floor today. H.R. 1944 is supported by Oregon Senators RON WYDEN and GORDON SMITH, the Forest Service, and the good people of Lake County, OR. Hopefully, with your assistance, we can move this bill in an expeditious manner so that Lake County will enjoy its benefits when the ski season begins again in the fall.

H.R. 1944 deeds approximately 290 acres of Fremont National Forest land from the U.S. Forest Service, comprising the Warner Canyon Ski Hill, to Lake County. In exchange, the county will deed roughly 320 acres of land within the Hart Mountain National Antelope Refuge to the Federal Government. The specific acreage offered by the county will be determined upon appraisal of all lands in order to facilitate an equal trade.

Lake County has been devastated over the last 4 years by this administration's policy of drastically reducing the amount of available timber in the Northwest. In 1993, there was $6.5 million brought into the Lake County treasury from timber receipts. By last year that figure had dropped to $1.2 million. This has had an extremely negative effect on local schools, law enforcement and county services. In addition, mills have been closed and hundreds of good, hard-working people have been forced to relocate and find new jobs causing further erosion of the tax base. This bill will provide a shot in the arm to the local economy by increasing seasonal employment and boosting tourism.

The Warner Canyon Ski Hill has been operated by the nonprofit Fremont Highlanders Ski Club since 1938. It is one of America's last nonprofit ski hills and has 780 vertical feet of skiing and one lift—a T-bar. The ski area is about 5 miles from the town of Lakeview, which has a population of roughly 2,500.

The benefits of transferring this small parcel of Federal land to the county are numerous. First, the Fremont National Forest will save about $2,600 per year. The cost of administering the ski area permit for Warner Canyon is about $3,000 per year, while the revenues generated by the ski area average about $400 annually. The U.S. Treasury is forced to absorb that additional cost. Second, the Fremont Highlanders Ski Club is currently responsible for providing liability insurance for Warner Canyon Ski Hill. Unfortunately, because it is Forest Service land, the Federal Government is forced to be coinsured on the property. This raises the cost of annual liability insurance to about $8,000. If the land were deeded to Lake County, which already has a liability insurance policy, this cost would be negated.

In short, H.R. 1944 is a ''win-win'' proposal that will benefit the U.S. Treasury, Lake County, and the recreationists who have been enjoying Warner Canyon Ski Hill for decades. I urge my colleagues in the House to support the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1944.

The question was taken.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. 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 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PROVIDING FOR MAINTENANCE OF DAMS IN EMIGRANT WILDERNESS

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1663) to clarify the intent of the Congress in Public Law 93–632 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to provide for the maintenance of 18 concrete dams and weirs that were located in the Emigrant Wilderness at the time the wilderness area was designated as wilderness in that Public Law, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1663

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

SECTION 1. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING DAMS AND WEIRS, EMIGRANT WILDERNESS, STANISLAUS NATIONAL FOREST, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall enter into an agreement with a non-Federal entity, under which the entity will retain, maintain, and operate at private expense the 18 concrete dams and weirs located within the boundaries of the Emigrant Wilderness in the Stanislaus National Forest, California, as designated by section 2(b) of Public Law 93–632 (88 Stat. 2154; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note). The Secretary shall require the entity to operate and maintain the dams and weirs at the level of operation and maintenance that applied to such dams and weirs before the date of the enactment of such Act, January 3, 1975.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1663, introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], clarifies the intent of Congress in Public Law 93–632 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to provide for the maintenance of 18 concrete and rock impoundment facilities. These structures were located in the Emigrant Wilderness area at the time the wilderness area was designated as wilderness in that public law, and they need to be properly maintained.

Additionally, it should be noted for the record that the maintenance of the dams and weirs will be done in accordance with the Wilderness Act of 1964. It is not the intention of the author nor of the committee to allow for motorized vehicles to be used to maintain these structures.

I would like to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] for his work on bringing this measure to the House. This is a good bill. It protects the interests of the constituents of the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] while at the same time it preserves the intent of the original law that created the Emigrant Wilderness area. I urge Members to support this bill.

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

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation sponsored by the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

While the concept of dams in the wilderness area may raise concerns, this bill addresses some very unique circumstances. The 18 small dams and weirs at issue were in existence in 1975 at the time Congress designated the Emigrant Wilderness within the Stanislaus National Forest in California. The Forest Service has released a draft management plan that would provide for the continued maintenance of 7 of the 18 structures. The bill, however, directs that all 18 structures be repaired and maintained.

Initially, Mr. Speaker, the Forest Service opposed this legislation primarily because they were concerned about the added costs of repairing and maintaining of these facilities. In response to their testimony, the committee adopted a substitute to clarify that the maintenance and operation of these facilities shall be at private expense.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that we are grandfathering preexisting uses and not providing a blanket exemption from the Wilderness Act in this legislation. This bill is about people with backpacks, not bulldozers, who will be involved in the repair and maintenance of these small structures. The legislation does not contemplate that motorized vehicles of any kind will be allowed in the wilderness area.

The small lakes created by these dams receive heavy use by recreationists, including fishermen. A positive aspect of this bill is that the recreational uses are more widely dispersed, rather than concentrated in fewer areas as would be the case if the dams were allowed to deteriorate.

□ 1445

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] for his comments. My colleague is indeed right; the maintenance chores will not be done by bulldozers but rather individuals with backpacks.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1663, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. 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 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bills just considered, H.R. 1663 and H.R. 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

TRADEMARK LAW TREATY IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1661) to implement the provisions of the Trademark Law Treaty, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1661

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 ''Trademark Law Treaty Implementation Act''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCE TO THE TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946.

For purposes of this Act, the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes'', approved July 5, 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.), shall be referred to as the ''Trademark Act of 1946''.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION; VERIFICATION.

(a) APPLICATION FOR USE OF TRADEMARK.—Section 1(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''SECTION 1. (a)(1) The owner of a trademark used in commerce may request registration of its trademark on the principal register hereby established by paying the prescribed fee and filing in the Patent and Trademark Office an application and a verified statement, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, and such number of specimens or facsimiles of the mark as used as may be required by the Commissioner.

''(2) The application shall include specification of the applicant's domicile and citizenship, the date of the applicant's first use of the mark, the date of the applicant's first use of the mark in commerce, the goods in connection with which the mark is used, and a drawing of the mark.

''(3) The statement shall be verified by the applicant and specify that—

''(A) the person making the verification believes that he or she, or the juristic person in whose behalf he or she makes the verification, to be the owner of the mark sought to be registered;

''(B) to the best of the verifier's knowledge and belief, the facts recited in the application are accurate;

''(C) the mark is in use in commerce; and

''(D) to the best of the verifier's knowledge and belief, no other person has the right to use such mark in commerce either in the identical form thereof or in such near resemblance thereto as to be likely, when used on or in connection with the goods of such other person, to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive, except that, in the case of every application claiming concurrent use, the applicant shall—

''(i) state exceptions to the claim of exclusive use; and

''(ii) shall specify, to the extent of the verifier's knowledge—

''(I) any concurrent use by others;

''(II) the goods on or in connection with which and the areas in which each concurrent use exists;

''(III) the periods of each use; and

''(IV) the goods and area for which the applicant desires registration.

''(4) The applicant shall comply with such rules or regulations as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall promulgate rules prescribing the requirements for the application and for obtaining a filing date herein.''.

(b) APPLICATION FOR BONA FIDE INTENTION TO USE TRADEMARK.—Subsection (b) of section 1 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b)(1) A person who has a bona fide intention, under circumstances showing the good faith of such person, to use a trademark in commerce may request registration of its trademark on the principal register hereby established by paying the prescribed fee and filing in the Patent and Trademark Office an application and a verified statement, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

''(2) The application shall include specification of the applicant's domicile and citizenship, the goods in connection with which the applicant has a bona fide intention to use the mark, and a drawing of the mark.

''(3) The statement shall be verified by the applicant and specify—

''(A) that the person making the verification believes that he or she, or the juristic person in whose behalf he or she makes the verification, to be entitled to use the mark in commerce;

''(B) the applicant's bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce;

''(C) that, to the best of the verifier's knowledge and belief, the facts recited in the application are accurate; and

''(D) that, to the best of the verifier's knowledge and belief, no other person has the right to use such mark in commerce either in the identical form thereof or in such near resemblance thereto as to be likely, when used on or in connection with the

goods of such other person, to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive.

Except for applications filed pursuant to section 44, no mark shall be registered until the applicant has met the requirements of subsections (c) and (d) of this section.

''(4) The applicant shall comply with such rules or regulations as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall promulgate rules prescribing the requirements for the application and for obtaining a filing date herein.''.

(c) CONSEQUENCE OF DELAYS.—Paragraph (4) of section 1(d) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051(d)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) The failure to timely file a verified statement of use under paragraph (1) or an extension request under paragraph (2) shall result in abandonment of the application, unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the delay in responding was unintentional, in which case the time for filing may be extended, but for a period not to exceed the period specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) for filing a statement of use.''.

SEC. 4. REVIVAL OF ABANDONED APPLICATION.

Section 12(b) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1062(b)) is amended in the last sentence by striking ''unavoidable'' and by inserting ''unintentional''.

SEC. 5. DURATION OF REGISTRATION; CANCELLATION; AFFIDAVIT OF CONTINUED USE; NOTICE OF COMMISSIONER'S ACTION.

Section 8 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1058) is amended to read as follows:

''DURATION

''SEC. 8. (a) Each registration shall remain in force for 10 years, except that the registration of any mark shall be canceled by the Commissioner for failure to comply with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, upon the expiration of the following time periods, as applicable:

''(1) For registrations issued pursuant to the provisions of this Act, at the end of 6 years following the date of registration.

''(2) For registrations published under the provisions of section 12(c), at the end of 6 years following the date of publication under such section.

''(3) For all registrations, at the end of each successive 10-year period following the date of registration.

''(b) During the 1-year period immediately preceding the end of the applicable time period set forth in subsection (a), the owner of the registration shall pay the prescribed fee and file in the Patent and Trademark Office—

''(1) an affidavit setting forth those goods or services recited in the registration on or in connection with which the mark is in use in commerce and such number of specimens or facsimiles showing current use of the mark as may be required by the Commissioner; or

''(2) an affidavit setting forth those goods or services recited in the registration on or in connection with which the mark is not in use in commerce and showing that any such nonuse is due to special circumstances which excuse such nonuse and is not due to any intention to abandon the mark.

''(c) The owner of the registration may make the submissions required by this section, or correct any deficiency in a timely filed submission, within a grace period of 6 months after the end of the applicable time period set forth in subsection (a). Such submission must be accompanied by a surcharge prescribed therefor. If any submission required by this section filed during the grace period is deficient, the deficiency may be corrected within the time prescribed after notification of the deficiency. Such submission must be accompanied by a surcharge prescribed therefor.

''(d) Special notice of the requirement for affidavits under this section shall be attached to each certificate of registration and notice of publication under section 12(c).

''(e) The Commissioner shall notify any owner who files 1 of the affidavits required by this section of the Commissioner's acceptance or refusal thereof and, in the case of a refusal, the reasons therefor.

''(f) If the registrant is not domiciled in the United States, the registrant shall designate by a written document filed in the Patent and Trademark Office the name and address of some person resident in the United States on whom may be served notices or process in proceedings affecting the mark. Such notices or process may be served upon the person so designated by leaving with that person or mailing to that person a copy thereof at the address specified in the last designation so filed. If the person so designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, such notice or process may be served upon the Commissioner.''.

SEC. 6. RENEWAL OF REGISTRATION.

Section 9 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1059) is amended to read as follows:

''RENEWAL OF REGISTRATION

''SEC. 9. (a) Subject to the provisions of section 8, each registration may be renewed for periods of 10 years at the end of each successive 10-year period following the date of registration upon payment of the prescribed fee and the filing of a written application, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. Such application may be made at any time within 1 year before the end of each successive 10-year period for which the registration was issued or renewed, or it may be made within a grace period of 6 months after the end of each successive 10-year period, upon payment of a fee and surcharge prescribed therefor. If any application filed during the grace period is deficient, the deficiency may be corrected within the time prescribed after notification of the deficiency, upon payment of a surcharge prescribed therefor.

''(b) If the Commissioner refuses to renew the registration, the Commissioner shall notify the registrant of the Commissioner's refusal and the reasons therefor.

''(c) If the registrant is not domiciled in the United States, the registrant shall designate by a written document filed in the Patent and Trademark Office the name and address of some person resident in the United States on whom may be served notices or process in proceedings affecting the mark. Such notices or process may be served upon the person so designated by leaving with that person or mailing to that person a copy thereof at the address specified in the last designation so filed. If the person so designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, such notice or process may be served upon the Commissioner.''.

SEC. 7. RECORDING ASSIGNMENT OF MARK.

Section 10 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1060) is amended to read as follows:

''ASSIGNMENT

''SEC. 10. (a) A registered mark or a mark for which an application to register has been filed shall be assignable with the good will of the business in which the mark is used, or with that part of the good will of the business connected with the use of and symbolized by the mark. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, no application to register a mark under section 1(b) shall be assignable prior to the filing of an amendment under section 1(c) to bring the application into conformity with section 1(a) or the filing of the verified statement of use under section 1(d), except for an assignment to a successor to the business of the applicant, or portion thereof, to which the mark pertains, if that business is ongoing and existing. In any assignment authorized by this section, it shall not be necessary to include the good will of the business connected with the use of and symbolized by any other mark used in the business or by the name or style under which the business is conducted. Assignments shall be by instruments in writing duly executed. Acknowledgment shall be prima facie evidence of the execution of an assignment, and when the prescribed information reporting the assignment is recorded in the Patent and Trademark Office, the record shall be prima facie evidence of execution. An assignment shall be void against any subsequent purchaser for valuable consideration without notice, unless the prescribed information reporting the assignment is recorded in the Patent and Trademark Office within 3 months after the date of the subsequent purchase or prior to the subsequent purchase. The Patent and Trademark Office shall maintain a record of information on assignments, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

''(b) An assignee not domiciled in the United States shall designate by a written document filed in the Patent and Trademark Office the name and address of some person resident in the United States on whom may be served notices or process in proceedings affecting the mark. Such notices or process may be served upon the person so designated by leaving with that person or mailing to that person a copy thereof at the address specified in the last designation so filed. If the person so designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, such notice or process may be served upon the Commissioner.''.

SEC. 8. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS; COPY OF FOREIGN REGISTRATION.

Section 44 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1126) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking ''23, or 44(e) of this Act'' and inserting ''or 23 of this Act or under subsection (e) of this section''; and

(B) in paragraphs (3) and (4), by striking ''this subsection (d)'' and inserting ''this subsection''; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: ''Such applicant shall submit, within such time period as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, a certification or a certified copy of the registration in the country of origin of the applicant.''.

SEC. 9. MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS.

(a) CANCELLATION OF FUNCTIONAL MARKS.—Section 14(3) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1064(3)) is amended by inserting ''or is functional,'' before ''or has been abandoned''.

(b) INCONTESTABILITY DEFENSES.—Section 33(b) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1115(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

''(8) That the mark is functional; or''.

(c) REMEDIES IN CASES OF DILUTION OF FAMOUS MARKS.—

(1) INJUNCTIONS.—(A) Section 34(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1116(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''section 43(a)'' and inserting ''subsection (a) or (c) of section 43''.

(B) Section 43(c)(2) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1125(c)(2)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting ''as set forth in section 34'' after ''relief''.

(2) DAMAGES.—Section 35(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1117(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''or a violation under section 43(a),'' and inserting ''a violation under section 43(a), or a willful violation under section 43(c),''.

(3) DESTRUCTION OF ARTICLES.—Section 36 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1118) is amended in the first sentence—

(A) by striking ''or a violation under section 43(a),'' and inserting ''a violation under section 43(a), or a willful violation under section 43(c),''; and

(B) by inserting after ''in the case of a violation of section 43(a)'' the following: ''or a willful violation under section 43(c)''.

SEC. 10. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect—

(1) on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(2) upon the entry into force of the Trademark Law Treaty with respect to the United States,

whichever occurs first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] will each control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1661, the Trademark Law Treaty Implementation Act. The Trademark Law Treaty Implementation Act, popularly known as TLT, sets a ceiling on certain filing and renewal requirements which its member nations may not exceed. Here in the United States, it removes some of the procedural hurdles to processing trademark applications and renewals thereby streamlining the process for the users.

Additionally, the bill we are considering today contains a minor housekeeping amendment which seeks to harmonize the remedy provisions passed last year as part of the trademark dilution statute, with the other remedy provisions of the Latham Act. There is no opposition to the bill as amended, and it is supported by the International Trademark Association and the American Intellectual Property Law Association.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bipartisan bill.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] and include his statement for the RECORD.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1661, the Trademark Law Treaty Implementation Act, a measure recently passed out of the House Judiciary Committee with unanimous support.

This act, a long awaited implementation of a treaty entered into previously, is supported without objection. The import of this measure is that it would put the United States squarely behind the important goal of international uniformity of trademark registration requirements, a goal which, when achieved, will redound to the overwhelming benefit of Americans, who are by far lead producers of trademarks in the world.

I and the other Democrats on the Judiciary Committee strongly support this measure. I commend Chairman COBLE, ranking member BARNEY FRANK, and the other members and staff of the Intellectual Property Subcommittee for moving this legislation forward, and I urge its adoption today under suspension of the rules.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA], and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1661, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. 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 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

CALLING FOR UNITED STATES INITIATIVE SEEKING JUST AND PEACEFUL RESOLUTION OF SITUATION ON CYPRUS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 81) calling for a United States initiative seeking a just and peaceful resolution of the situation on Cyprus, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 81

Whereas the Republic of Cyprus has been divided and occupied by foreign forces since 1974 in violation of United Nations resolutions;

Whereas the international community, the Congress, and United States administrations have called for an end to the status quo on Cyprus, considering that it perpetuates an unacceptable violation of international law and fundamental human rights affecting all the people of Cyprus, and undermines significant United States interests in the Eastern Mediterranean region;

Whereas the international community and the United States Government have repeatedly called for the speedy withdrawal of all foreign forces from the territory of Cyprus;

Whereas there are internationally acceptable means, including the demilitarization of Cyprus and the establishment of a multinational force, to ensure the security of both communities in Cyprus;

Whereas the House of Representatives has endorsed the objective of the total demilitarization of Cyprus;

Whereas during the past year tensions on Cyprus have dramatically increased, with violent incidents occurring along ceasefire lines at a level not reached since 1974;

Whereas recent events in Cyprus have heightened the potential for armed conflict in the region involving two North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies, Greece and Turkey, which would threaten vital United States interests in the already volatile Eastern Mediterranean area and beyond;

Whereas a peaceful, just, and lasting solution to the Cyprus problem would greatly benefit the security, and the political, economic, and social well-being of all Cypriots, as well as contribute to improved relations between Greece and Turkey;

Whereas a lasting solution to the Cyprus problem would also strengthen peace and stability in the Eastern Mediterranean and serve important interests of the United States;

Whereas the United Nations has repeatedly stated the parameters for such a solution, most recently in United Nations Security Council Resolution 1092, adopted on December 23, 1996, with United States support;

Whereas the prospect of the accession by Cyprus to the European Union, which the United States has actively supported, could serve as a catalyst for a solution to the Cyprus problem:

Whereas President Bill Clinton has pledged that in 1997 the United States will ''play a heightened role in promoting a resolution in Cyprus''; and

Whereas united States leadership will be a crucial factor in achieving a solution to the Cyprus problem, and increased United States involvement in the search for this solution will contribute to a reduction of tensions on Cyprus; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) reaffirms its view that the status quo on Cyprus is unacceptable and detrimental to the interests of the United States in the Eastern Mediterranean and beyond;

(2) considers lasting peace and stability on Cyprus could be best secured by a process of complete demilitarization leading to the withdrawal of all foreign occupation forces, the cessation of foreign arms transfer to Cyprus, and providing for alternative internationally acceptable and effective security arrangements as negotiated by the parties;

(3) welcomes and supports the commitment by President Clinton to give increased attention to Cyprus and make the search for a solution a priority of United States foreign policy;

(4) encourages the President to launch an early substantive initiative, in close coordination with the United Nations, the European Union, and interested governments to promote a speedy resolution of the Cyprus problem on the basis of international law, the provisions of relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions, democratic principles, including respect for human rights, and in accordance with the norms and requirements for accession to the European Union;

(5) calls upon the parties to lend their full support and cooperation to such an initiative; and

(6) requests the President to report actions taken to give effect to the objectives set forth in paragraph (4) in the bimonthly report on Cyprus transmitted to the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr.

FALEOMAVAEGA] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, we marked the 23d anniversary of the invasion and occupation of Cyprus. The Cyprus problem is a situation that cries out for just redress and an end to the occupation of Cyprus by foreign troops. Although the world has dramatically changed for the better during this decade, Cyprus remains as a pressing international problem. Indeed, Cyprus has almost become a code word for intractability in the realm of diplomacy.

I have been encouraged, nevertheless, by recent statements from high-level officials of the Clinton administration, including the President himself, that indicate that there may be new willingness on the part of our Government to exert its leadership in promoting a solution to the Cyprus problem.

Indeed, the President's appointment of Ambassador Richard Holbrooke as special envoy for Cyprus is a sign of a renewed commitment to finding a solution on the part of the administration. I strongly believe that our Government should invest some of our prestige in such an effort, because Americans have always supported justice and because we have significant interests that can be affected by instability in Cyprus. It is for these reasons that I introduced this resolution that is now before the House.

Over the past year, there have been a number of events and incidents that have increased tensions in Cyprus and in the eastern Mediterranean region. There is a distressing trend of increased militarization of the island, already one of the most highly militarized parts of the globe.

There are, however, also positive developments that could have the ability to catalyze a peaceful and just solution. One of these is the pending negotiation on Cyprus' accession to the European Union that may begin by the end of the year.

The Foreign Ministers in Greece and Turkey recently agreed on resolving disputes between them through peaceful means. There has been increased diplomatic activity in Europe and in the United Nations to bring the two sides together. In short, the risks of inaction far outweigh those of taking the initiative on Cyprus now.

This resolution points out the interests and developments regarding the Cyprus situation and urges the President to keep his pledge to give increased attention to Cyprus. I am pleased to be joined by a group of distinguished cosponsors, including the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], and in excess of 50 other distinguished Members of the House who have shared an interest in Cyprus and their concern over what may arise from a continued stalemate on the island.

It is our hope that this resolution will help spur the resolve of the Clinton administration to indeed make 1997 the year of Cyprus. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to help us send a signal of our commitment to resolving the Cyprus problem by adopting House Concurrent Resolution 81.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 81, calling for a United States initiative in seeking a just and peaceful resolution of the situation in Cyprus.

I am pleased to announce that the ranking Democratic member of the full Committee on International Relations is an original cosponsor of this important and timely resolution. I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], our distinguished chairman, for his foresight and leadership in moving this legislation forward.

Earlier this year, Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration announced that it intends to give high priority this year to move a settlement of Cyprus forward, easing Greek-Turkish relations. I agree with the administration that now is the time to try to move the peace process in Cyprus forward. That is why the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and the chairman are original cosponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 81, which puts the Congress firmly behind an energetic United States leadership role in seeking a realistic solution to the Cyprus situation.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the emphasis in the resolutions is on the key role for United States' leadership on Cyprus and calls for an early substantive initiative by the administration to promote a Cyprus settlement. This tracks with longstanding congressional concerns that have been expressed to a series of administrations.

The violence in Cyprus last summer, and the problems this year as a result of arms acquisitions, have underscored the long-held view of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] that progress in Cyprus is long overdue and should be a high United States priority. It remains our hope and expectation that a firm, fair, and lasting settlement of the Cyprus dispute can be reached in the coming months.

I also want to applaud the Clinton administration's recent appointment of Richard Holbrooke as United States special envoy for Cyprus. His appointment is the best signal yet that the Clinton administration intends to give high priority this year to a settlement on Cyprus and moving Greek-Turkish relations forward.

It has always been my firm belief, Mr. Speaker, that only high level sustained United States attention will convince all parties, and particularly the people of Turkey, to resolve the Cyprus issue. Substantively, Mr. Speaker, the outlines of a settlement have been on the table for some time, with the United Nations plan for a bicommunal, bizonal federation.

The floor consideration of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is coming at a time of positive developments in the eastern Mediterranean region in Cyprus. Earlier this month, direct talks between Cyprus President Clerides and Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash, under the auspices of the U.N. Secretary General Annan, were held in New York. These were the first face-to-face talks in more than 2 years. A followup round of talks will hopefully be held in Geneva next month.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, in a recent NATO summit in Madrid, the Greek and Turkish Foreign Ministers at a meeting with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright undertook an explicit commitment to settle disputes by peaceful means without further use of force. Turkey remains the key to further progress, Mr. Speaker. Only Turkey can push Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash toward a settlement.

We must hope that a new government in Turkey under Prime Minister Yilmaz will be prepared to play a pivotal role in the process that other Turkish leaders have promised in the past. In the final analysis, it is in U.S. interests, as well as for the people in the region, that we find a just and lasting solution to treat these problems.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that House Concurrent Resolution 81 will make a helpful contribution to this process. I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support this resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York, Mr. GILMAN, for yielding to me. And of course I also wanted to commend the chairman, the gentleman from New York, Mr. GILMAN, for all the work that he has done on this important issue for many, many years. Mr. Speaker, we live in a world where regional conflicts of one sort or another are still prevalent. However, time and time again, we have seen the concepts of freedom and democracy triumph over tyranny and oppression.

Nowhere was this more profoundly demonstrated than with the change of

the Berlin Wall in late 1989 and with the withering of communism that followed. A divided city was reunited, families separated for decades enjoyed emotional unions. In the West, we congratulated ourselves because our persistence and way of life had finally prevailed. But Berlin was not the only divided city in the world, nor was Germany the only divided country. It is our sad duty to once again bring the plight of Cyprus to the attention of the American people.

□ 1500

In 1974, Turkey invaded the Island of Cyprus. Some 6,000 Turkish troops and over 100 tanks forcibly seized approximately 40 percent of the island, including half of the capital city, Nicosia. In the process, they displaced and divided thousands of Greek Cypriot families. To this day 1,619 people are still missing, including five U.S. citizens.

Today I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 81, which calls for a United States initiative seeking a just and peaceful resolution of the situation in Cyprus. For 23 years, the United Nations has stationed troops on the island to prevent the spread of violence, and yet the violence has not abated. Therefore, I do not believe that a lasting peace settlement can be negotiated without U.S. leadership.

Some wonder why we should involve ourselves in the problems of nations as distant as Cyprus. To them I would point out Cyprus is a vital strategic and economic importance to the United States. During the Persian Gulf war, Cyprus served as a major staging point for our military operations. In peacetime it serves as a critical listening post in the Middle East.

Cyprus is also close to the shipping lanes of the Aegean Sea and the Suez Canal, which is the gateway for oil and other materials. These shipping lanes are essential to the stability of the entire region and the rest of the world.

In the national archives here in Washington, DC, there is a piece of the Berlin Wall on display which was sent to former President Ronald Reagan by a young American. It is my sincere hope that someday in the near future we might be able to display a peace of the wall that marks the green line which divides Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me and the gentleman from New York, Chairman GILMAN, in demonstrating our intentions with regards to Cyprus by unequivocally supporting this concurrent resolution. We must send a signal to the world that the division of a nation and the suppression of fundamental human rights are not to be tolerated. A just and peaceful resolution to the issue is a real possibility, but only with the leadership of the United States.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for his support and his remarks. He has been a longtime proponent of Cyprus and bringing peace to the region.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this concurrent resolution. I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of the committee, and also the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking member, as well as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], and others, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], other Members of the Congressional Caucus on Helenic Issues that have been keeping this issue in the spotlight.

For almost a quarter of a century now the people of Cyprus have lived on a divided, militarized, and occupied island. On July 9 of this year high level negotiations between some of the key principals involved once again got underway, and we are very happy with that development. At the invitation of the Secretary General of the United Nations, the President of Cyprus and the Turkish Cypriot leader met face to face for the first time in 3 years. This is certainly a very positive development, as was the joint statement released by Greece and Turkey the day before the talks in New York began, in which the two countries vowed to ''settle their disputes by peaceful means, based on mutual consent and without use of force or threat of force.''

As everyone is aware by now, I know it has been mentioned that President Clinton recently signaled his commitment to resolving the problem in Cyprus by appointing Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, the architect of the Dayton peace accords, as the Special Emissary to Cyprus, and I want to congratulate the President for signaling his serious interest in the Cyprus issue through the appointment of Ambassador Holbrooke.

Because the Cyprus problem is clearly one of illegal invasion and occupation, there are a number of conditions I have mentioned before, and I want to stress again, that I believe the United States must pressure the Turkish Government to accept. The first of these concerns the issue of sovereignty. Any solution reached must be consistent with U.N. Resolution 750 of 1992, which states,

> A Cyprus settlement must be based on a State of Cyprus with a single sovereignty and international personality and a single citizenship, with its independence and territorial integrity safeguarded.

To facilitate the goal of a State of Cyprus with a single sovereignty, I believe the United States should push for the establishment of a federation, with two federated states, one Greek Cypriot and one Turkish Cypriot, administered by a federal government. This would be much like the constitutional democracy of the United States, where the states receive their powers from a federal government. What I am saying is a rotating Presidency and/or separate sovereignties for the Greek and Turkish communities should be viewed as completely unacceptable proposals.

Second, Mr. Speaker, any solution to the Cyprus problem must be based on internationally accepted standards of human rights. Simply stated, all Cypriots must be guaranteed three basic freedoms, freedom of movement, property and settlement.

Third, all foreign troops should be withdrawn from the island. In 1994, President Clerides proposed the demilitarization of the island as a precursor to meaningful negotiations. In 1995, this House went on record in support of this peaceful gesture when it passed the Cyprus Demilitarization Act.

The United States must use its influence with the Turkish government to facilitate the removal of the Turkish occupying force and the introduction of NATO or U.N. peacekeeping forces, if necessary, so negotiations can begin in earnest.

Last, I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, that other matters, such as Cypriot accession to the European Union, must also be pursued. I know some of my colleagues have mentioned this. Integrating Cyprus into the framework of the European Union would demonstrate unequivocally to Turkey that its only real option is to accept a sovereign, independent Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, the United States should embrace the opportunity to make progress, but we must not reach an agreement just for the sake of reaching an agreement. It is tragic that Cyprus has been divided for 23 years now. We will, however, wait as long as we must to bring true and lasting freedom to the Cypriot people.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. WEYGAND].

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to echo the comments of my fellow colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], who spoke so eloquently about the situation.

Mr. Speaker, in July 1974 Turkish troops advanced into the Republic of Cyprus, and since then Cyprus has been divided. Over the past 23 years, there have been several instances where actions have led to increased tensions resulting in little progress toward resolving the conflict over Cyprus.

Cyprus remains divided today, at a time when we have seen significant progress in the proliferation of democracy throughout this great world. In the last 10 years we have seen the fall of the Berlin Wall, the lifting of the Iron Curtain, the advancement of the peace process in the Middle East, yet, as has been mentioned just recently, the green line still remains across the Island of Cyprus.

It is my hope that the green line will soon be erased and Cyprus will be added to the list of places where the conflict has been resolved and democracy flourishes. In light of the anticipated accession of Cyprus into the European Union, the appointment of

Richard Holbrooke as special envoy and renewed peace talks, I think the opportunity for progress has presented itself clearly before us now.

It is my hope that both sides will realize the economic and political importance of resolving their differences. With the cooperation of Ambassador Holbrooke, the United Nations and our President, I believe that the peace talks can reunify the Island of Cyprus. However, the agreement must abide by applicable international law, should include provisions for strengthening democracy, should protect human rights, and take into account the relevant United Nations security resolutions.

A unified Cyprus will result in economic and political stability. In the Middle East we have seen that kind of work be very fruitful. Here in Cyprus we want it to be the same.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues and applaud this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS].

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on International Relations for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of this resolution and urge its passage.

Twenty-three years ago Turkish troops invaded Cyprus and divided a nation and community. Today, 1,619 people remain missing, including 5 Americans. A barbed-wire fence divides the northern part of Cyprus from its southern portion, separating communities and families that had lived together in peace and harmony for generations. The longer the world waits, the harder it will be to reconcile these communities in the future. The time to act is now, the status quo is simply unacceptable.

In order to make progress, we will need to have willingness on all sides of this issue. The Republic of Cyprus has announced its willingness to delay the purchase of defensive missile systems pending advances in negotiations. I am hopeful that Turkey will also act in this manner and can begin by withdrawing its troops and by stopping the unhealthy rhetoric by its leaders toward Cyprus.

There are many players in the complicated issue of Cyprus. I am hopeful that this resolution being debated today will put pressure on all parties to roll up their sleeves and return stability to that part of the world.

The recent decision of the European Union to admit Cyprus to its ranks demonstrates the strength of its economy and democratic form of government and should be used to show Turkey that its occupation of the northern part of Cyprus is simply counterproductive to its own stated goal of joining the European Union. As such, the European Union, NATO, the United States, Cyprus, Turkey, Greece, and the United Nations all must actively search for common ground and create ways to restore the proud communities of Cyprus, to possibly demilitarize the island, and take down the last wall in the world.

I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking member, are to be commended for their efforts for years to raise awareness of this issue, and I urge support and I urge a strong United States role in justly resolving the issue with Cyprus and our NATO partners, Turkey and Greece. Through this resolution and through this debate we are able to show the world that America still stands against armed aggression and supports peaceful resolutions of dispute.

As a new Member of Congress, it has been my honor to work with these gentlemen, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], and many others on issues relating to southeastern Europe. As a freshman, I am optimistic that we can produce results now if the rest of the world community joins with this Congress in insisting on a just and peaceful resolution for the people of the Republic of Cyprus.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Twenty-three years of an armed occupation of Cyprus is too long. This should have been ended long ago. This resolution is reaffirmation that the status quo in Cyprus is unacceptable, that it is detrimental to the security interests of the United States, and it emphasizes that we can only get a true and just and lasting peace and stability in Cyprus through a process of demilitarization.

In view of the recent beginning of talks between Turkey and Greece, and in view of the administration's initiative, this is a good time to reemphasize these points and to encourage the President to launch the kind of initiative that has met with some success in other parts of the Middle East.

So I commend the sponsor of this resolution and I urge its strong support. And, Mr. Speaker, I wish to join as a sponsor of this resolution also.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROTHMAN].

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those of my colleagues who have today so eloquently spoken in support of House Concurrent Resolution 81.

For Cyprus, this proud island nation, the cause of peace, the cause of freedom, the pursuit of unity is more than sloganeering. For the people of Cyprus and the Cypriot Americans I am proud and honored to represent in Congress, when we talk about freedom, we talk about an important element of that nation's identity that was robbed from them in 1974. For the people of Cyprus and the Cypriot Americans in my district, when we talk about justice, we talk about an ideal unseen since the de facto partition of that island nation in 1974. For the people of Cyprus and all those in America who believe in and cherish the value of peace, when we talk about Cyprus, we talk of an island where peace has been absent for 23 years. And that has been, in my estimation, 23 years too long.

So today I stand here as a Member of Congress, as a member of the House Committee on International Relations, as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 81 to say that I believe strongly in the following: I believe in freedom for Cyprus, I believe in a united Cyprus, and I believe that we must support the efforts of the parties to negotiate and secure a long-lasting and genuine peace for Cyprus.

As my colleagues know, in 1974 Cyprus was invaded by Turkey. It was an illegal invasion, illegal and against all international norms recognized then or now. And most important, we must recognize that this invasion cannot stand, just as we took that same position with regard to the invasion of Kuwait.

Some might argue that freedom for Cyprus might not be in the national interest of the United States. I wholeheartedly and emphatically disagree. Part of our makeup, part of our national history is founded on the simple belief that we are a people who believe in justice.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, the little nation of Cyprus has a big dream, to be free. It is a dream I support, it is a dream I will continue to fight for, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 81.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

(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 gentleman for yielding me this time. First, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for his leadership for peace and justice on Cyprus. This weekend we remembered the 23d anniversary of the illegal invasion of Cyprus and the horrible complications that have cost lives and stolen freedoms.

When one thinks of a people or a country as a whole, it is easy to gloss over the real tragedies. So I would like to remember two people who lost their lives 1 year ago this August. A 24-year-old protester, Tassos Isaac, was savagely beaten to death on August 11, 1996, by Turks, using rocks and iron poles. Three days later a group of mourners, people who were not even armed, became the targets of Turkish troop gunfire. The 26-year-old cousin of Tassos was gunned down, 11 others were injured.

Additionally, just 2 months after that, 58-year-old Petros Kakoullis was

out snail gathering with his son-in-law when he was gunned down as he assumed a position of surrender. Petros' only mistake was that he had wandered across the green line into the occupied area.

Our country must take an active role in stopping these abuses. The illegal occupation of Cyprus must end. The island must be demilitarized. Turkish troops must be forced off the island. The island must be unified, justice must be served, and the President of the United States must make it a foreign policy priority. I urge a vote in support of this resolution and in support of this island in crisis.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support as cosponsor for this resolution and commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for their leadership in bringing it before the House.

On Sunday we commemorated the unhappy anniversary and tragic circumstances of 23 years of division on the island of Cyprus, which has been artificially divided following an invasion by Turkish troops on July 20, 1974. On that date, over 200,000 Greek Cypriots became refugees in their own country and to this date are denied return to their homes. Today, a full 37 percent of the island remains under occupation by Turkish troops which in defiance of United Nations resolutions, now number 35,000, making Cyprus one of the most militarized places in the world.

After 23 years, the people of Cyprus in both communities deserve a solution which will reunite the island, its communities, and its people. As Secretary of State Albright recently pointed out, ''U.S.-Cyprus relations extend far beyond the so-called Cyprus problem. * * * Cyprus is a valued partner against new global threats.'' A resolution would strengthen peace and stability in the volatile eastern Mediterranean and significantly advance U.S. national security interests in the region and beyond.

I recently sent a letter to President Clinton with 67 of my colleagues in the House. The letter outlines what we believe should be the parameters of any Cyprus solution. They are that Cyprus should be reunited with a strong federal government in which the federated states derive their powers from the federal constitution, a democratic constitution which would ensure the rights of all of its citizens and communities and which would guarantee the right to private property and free travel to all parts of the country. If Turkey is serious about its commitment to a permanent solution, then it must bring its views into conformity with the United Nations framework on issues of sovereignty and political equality which they have refused to do.

Cyprus should not be a prisoner to Turkey's objections or threats. This is an opportunity for us to make a difference and the swift passage of this resolution sends a message of Congress' deep desire to see a settlement and the reunification of Cyprus for all of its people.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 81 to express my strong support for this resolution and to thank my friend from New York, the chairman of the International Relations Committee, for his leadership in bringing this important issue before the House.

For too long, the beautiful Mediterranean country of Cyprus has been politically and physically divided. Last week, a number of my colleagues, led by my good friend Mr. BILIRAKIS, marked the 23d anniversary of the division of Cyprus with a special order. The remarks which were delivered last Thursday clearly showed the commitment and interest that this body has in bringing an end to this deplorable situation. While we welcome the recent efforts undertaken by the Clinton administration, including the appointment of Richard Holbrooke as special envoy, we hope that this will not be just the latest in a long line of failed efforts which lacked the political will to find a just solution to the Cyprus problem. Over the past 20 years, there have been almost continual efforts by the United States and the international community, none of which has achieved the result we hope for.

In our efforts to resolve this problem, we must not forget the history of this issue and the strong feelings that it evokes. By the same token, we must realize that the world has changed dramatically in the past 23 years and the situation that created this division simply no longer exists. The legitimate Government of Cyprus is a thriving democracy with a robust economy and growing international prestige. Cyprus is a candidate to join the European Union in the near future.

Yet this prosperous, democratic country remains, in the north, occupied by 35,000 Turkish troops and divided by U.N. peacekeepers. In the past year, there have been tragic episodes of violence along the Green Line that divides Cyprus, resulting in needless loss of life and heightening of tensions. As you walk the streets of Nicosia, just steps from the pleasant pedestrian square filled with quaint shops and happy tourists you are confronted with U.N. peacekeepers, and beyond them, the forlorn-looking abandoned section of the city located in the buffer zone. This situation seems absurd on its face, and this should be the year that it ends. I hope that this resolution and the attention of the House to the matter will prompt a complete and far-reaching effort by the United States and the international community to demilitarize Cyprus and bring peace to this island once again.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for House Concurrent Resolution 81, a resolution calling for an early initiative to resolve the longstanding conflict on Cyprus.

Twenty-two years ago, Turkey invaded the sovereign Republic of Cyprus, capturing almost 40 percent of the island and driving more than 200,000 Cypriots from their land. Today, in one of the most heavily armed areas on Earth, more than 30,000 Turkish troops continue to occupy the northern part of the island.

Congress, further, still awaits a report by the President on the fate of 5 Americans and more than 1,500 others missing in the wake of the Turkish invasion. The Presidential investigation and upcoming report are being prepared pursuant to a bill I authored in the 103d Congress. Clearly, the status quo on Cyprus is unacceptable.

In 1995, the House of Representatives took an important step in the effort to promote a resolution of the long-standing Cypriot conflict. By passing a resolution which I sponsored calling for the demilitarization of Cyprus, Congress presented an option which would reduce tensions and help remove the oppressive Turkish troops.

Today, Congress is again taking a leading role. In the important resolution now under consideration, Congress urges the President to launch an initiative, in coordination with the United Nations, the European Union, and interested governments to promote a speedy resolution of the Cyprus problem.

President Clinton has already taken the first steps in this regard. By appointing former Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke, who negotiated the Dayton Accord on Bosnia, to the post of Special Envoy for Cyprus, the President has selected one of the most able negotiators to handle one of the world's most difficult disputes. With the hopeful entry of Cyprus into the European Union and the recent meeting in New York between Republic of Cyprus President Glafcos Clerides and Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash, it is my hope that a new, sustained effort to solve the Cyprus dispute will now help to bring this sad conflict to a just resolution.

I commend Chairman BEN GILMAN and Ranking Minority Member LEE HAMILTON of the International Relations Committee for their fine work on House Concurrent Resolution 81 and urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SNOWBARGER]. 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, House Concurrent Resolution 81, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. 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 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

CONGRATULATING EL SALVADOR ON SUCCESSFUL ELECTIONS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 88) congratulating the Government and the people of the Republic of El Salvador on successfully completing free

and democratic elections on March 16, 1997.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 88

Whereas on March 16, 1997, the Republic of El Salvador successfully completed democratic, multiparty elections for 84 national legislative assembly seats and 262 mayoral and municipal council posts;

Whereas the elections were deemed by international and domestic observers to be free and fair and a legitimate non-violent expression of the will of the people of the Republic of El Salvador;

Whereas the United States has consistently supported the efforts of the people of El Salvador to consolidate their democracy and to implement the provisions of the 1992 peace accords;

Whereas these elections demonstrate the strength and diversity of El Salvador's democratic expression and promotes confidence that all political parties can work cooperatively in the new assembly and at the municipal level; and

Whereas these open, fair, and democratic elections of the new assembly and at the municipal level should be broadly commended: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) congratulates the Government and the people of the Republic of El Salvador for the successful completion of democratic, multiparty elections held on March 16, 1997, for 84 national legislative assembly seats and 262 mayoral and municipal council posts;

(2) congratulates El Salvadoran President Armando Calderón Sol for his personal commitment to democracy, which has helped in the building of national unity in the Republic of El Salvador;

(3) commends all Salvadorans for their efforts to work together to take risks for democracy and to willfully pursue national reconciliation in order to cement a lasting peace and democratic traditions in El Salvador;

(4) supports Salvadoran attempts to continue their cooperation in order to ensure democracy, national reconciliation, and economic prosperity; and

(5) reaffirms that the United States is unequivocally committed to encouraging democracy and peaceful development throughout Central America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] for this bipartisan resolution commending the people of El Salvador. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] is a senior member of our Committee on International Relations and we consider him our leading expert on events in Central America. His long-term commitment to that important region gives him unique insight that is a valuable resource to our committee's work.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 88 congratulates the people and the Government of El Salvador for taking yet another step on the path to democracy. As a result of the peaceful and fair elections of March 1997, a broader cross section of Salvadoran society has a voice in local government and the national assembly. Because of the March 1997 elections, people who may have felt shut out of the democratic process now have a stake in making democratic government work for them. That is the essence of democracy, which the American people have supported for decades in El Salvador.

Some observers may be disappointed that participation in these elections was down sharply from the 1994 elections, around 37 percent, down from 54 percent 3 years ago. We hope that the more vigorous policy debates taking place today in the more pluralistic national assembly will restore the interest of more Salvadorans in the democratic process.

I would like to especially commend all of the political leaders across the political spectrum who took part in these elections and who have respected the results. We also congratulate President Armando Calderon and all of the officials of his government who conducted these transparent and honest elections.

Mr. Speaker, our Government has supported the cause of representative democracy for several decades in El Salvador. I am pleased to stand with my colleagues today to applaud the people of that great country for showing the world that democracy does work. Once again, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] for bringing this bipartisan resolution before us. I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 88.

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

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] for introducing this resolution and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the committee, for pursuing this resolution.

As all of us know, Central America has come a long way in the last several years. Until recently, the region was beset by civil wars and insurgencies. The peace accords were signed just 5 years ago in El Salvador after a very bloody civil war. Today we are commending that country for an election wherein the opposition party, the FMLN, freely and fairly won the second most powerful position in the country, the mayorship of San Salvador.

All sides in El Salvador can now see that change occurs most effectively through the ballot box. That is a clear triumph for democracy, and it is also a remarkable transformation for El Salvador. I am pleased that the U.S. Congress through this resolution is now congratulating the Salvadoran people for making such a transformation.

Yet Central America has a long way to go. The region still struggles with devastating poverty, corruption, common crime, and weak educational institutions. I think, therefore, it is highly appropriate for the United States through this resolution to also pledge our continued commitment to help El Salvador overcome those challenges. I therefore urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] who, as we all know, has a long-standing and very distinguished history of involvement on this and other Central America issues.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, today I am very proud to rise in support of this resolution to recognize El Salvador for its fair and free elections. The people and the leaders of that nation have made a commitment toward peace and justice that just a few years ago seemed impossible. On behalf of the people in this country who feel a great affinity for El Salvador, I rise to thank and also to congratulate them.

As many Members know, I have been in El Salvador many times. Unfortunately, it was not always under the best set of circumstances. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN] and I went down to try to solve the murders of the six Jesuit priests, their housekeeper, and her daughter. During those times we met Salvadorans from all walks of life. We met the military leaders, guerrillas, and the everyday working people. I have looked into the scared and often sad faces of the Salvadoran people during their brutal civil war. But I have also seen them since. I have been to El Salvador during peacetime and seen their fear replaced by hope.

Over the last few years, I have developed a great fondness and a great respect for the Salvadoran people, and their most recent democratic election is cause for great celebration.

Mr. Speaker, the results of the March 16 elections literally changed the face of the government in El Salvador. In this very historic election, the Salvadoran people went out and voted without fear of persecution. That may not sound like much here but, believe me, in El Salvador, that is a big, big change.

After the Salvadorans voted, their votes were collected and calculated without widespread claims of fraud, and the once-feared military did not play any role in the elections. In fact, the military is now doing its job of protecting the people, and that, Mr. Speaker, is great cause for hope.

The results of these elections have created the pluralism in El Salvador that we have never seen before. Several opposition parties now control many of

the municipal governments, including several of the most populous municipalities. Opposition party candidates also have made many gains in the assembly. Now the challenge is in the hands of the various parties to work together, build coalitions, and do what is best for all of the people of El Salvador.

Mr. Speaker, they have their work cut out for them. As the country takes on the tremendous challenges of a struggling economy, horrible poverty, a frighteningly high crime rate, and the need for widespread judicial reform, we have to encourage Salvadoran leaders to continue to work together for what is best for all of its citizens. The difference is that today there is hope and political room for positive change.

□ 1550

Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure getting to know the people of El Salvador, and I am very honored to have been given that opportunity, and I want to congratulate my friends for their tremendous accomplishment. Today's democratic elections means tomorrow's prosperity.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, in 1962, 35 years ago, my wife and I went to El Salvador to help in developing their economy. It was peaceful and quiet then, the war had not started, and we have been working ever since to continue that growth and the growth in the democracy.

On June 25, 1997, the Committee on International Relations unanimously passed a resolution that I introduced, House Concurrent Resolution 88, congratulating the government and the people of the Republic of El Salvador on successfully completing free and democratic elections for the fourth time. On March 16, 1997, El Salvador held free and fair elections for 84 national legislative assembly seats, 262 mayoral and municipal council posts. This was yet another milestone in the normalization of the democratic process in El Salvador, and I wish to commend that nation for its efforts.

El Salvador has come a long way since the 1980's when the nation was in the midst of a terrible civil war. Many of my colleagues will recall that that war cost the lives of tens of thousands of El Salvadorans and left the country in shambles. Now the Salvadorans have replaced bullets with ballots. It was a strong leadership and guidance coupled with the courage demonstrated by former President Alfredo Cristiani that rescued the country and paved the way for El Savador's future. He continued to seek peace in spite of the fact that the war continued. His successor, the new President Armando Calderon Sol, elected in a free and fair contest, had the same commitment to democracy and will strive to keep this nation moving forward in the next century. The stark contrast between war-torn El Salvador and the El Salvador of today is a tribute to its people and its leaders.

In addition to holding successful elections, we see the Salvadoran Government's effort to foster free-market enterprise and privatization of certain industries as part of its move toward a free and fair society. Most importantly, we continue to witness the successful implementation of the 1992 peace accords. I believe the Americans must continue to show support for our Salvadoran neighbors through this long and fragile process, and I hope my colleagues will join me and congratulate El Salvador in this latest and most remarkable accomplishment.

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

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

Again I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] for his outstanding leadership on this issue and certainly want to thank him on behalf of the minority caucus for his outstanding leadership and for his understanding of the speakers here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have had the opportunity to work with my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], to introduce this resolution. El Salvador means ''the Savior'' in Spanish, and I believe that El Salvador represents hope and salvation for all of Central America.

During the civil war in the 1980's, about 75,000 Salvadorans lost their lives in this country, a small country of 5 million people, but they have managed to find peace, democracy, and a market economy, and today El Salvador leads the region economically with an average annual growth rate of 6 percent in this decade.

This resolution is an expression of good will toward the people of El Salvador and toward President Armando Calderon del Sol who was just recently here, and we have had discussions with him and as he faces the challenges that are still present before El Salvador. But we are confident that El Salvador, as has been mentioned here, will continue to progress, building democratic institutions and improving the lives of the Salvadoran people.

We can do our part by making sure that the seeds of democracy which are taking root in El Salvador are fully cemented, and that is why I want to hail the Attorney General's decision not to deport, not to deport Salvadorans who came to the United States, fleeing from civil war, as a result of our foreign policy in part, and now would have made a dramatic economic impact on El Salvador if, in fact, they were massively deported. These are people who I believe had rights under the law which were eviscerated under the Immigration Reform Act of last year, and whose rights retroactively should never have been abolished in that manner. In essence, by preserving their opportunity to go ahead and make their case before the Immigration Court of Appeals, this provides an opportunity for El Salvador also to flourish in the process.

So I want to commend all of those and also the Congressional Hispanic Caucus who worked very hard on this with the administration. For our part we want to make sure that the United States Congress and administration provide El Salvador with the necessary resources and the type of policy that continues stability and growth, stability which is clearly in the national interests of the United States in a region that is so close to our borders.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). 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, House Concurrent Resolution 88.

The question was taken.

Mr. LUTHER. 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 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE CONGO

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 175) expressing concern over the outbreak of violence in the Republic of Congo and the resulting threat to scheduled elections and constitutional government in that country, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 175

Whereas President Pascal Lissouba defeated former President Denis Sassou-Nguesso in a 1992 election that was determined to be free and fair;

Whereas losing candidates raised questions concerning the results of the 1993 legislative election and used those concerns to cast doubt on the entire democratic process in the Republic of Congo and as the rationale for creating private militias;

Whereas thousands of citizens of the Republic of Congo have been killed in intermittent fighting between Government soldiers and private militiamen since 1993;

Whereas there are concerns about the unfinished census and resulting electoral list to be used in the scheduled July 27 election;

Whereas the recent fighting resulted from the Government's attempt to disarm former

President Sassou-Nguesso's ''Cobra'' militia in advance of the scheduled July 27 election;

Whereas the fighting and uneasy peace has caused serious loss of life and diminished ability to care for those who are without access to adequate medical care or food and water;

Whereas the fighting between Government troops and militiamen have forced the evacuation from the country of foreign nationals and endangered refugees from both Rwanda and the former Zaire; and

Whereas African governments have attempted to bring about a negotiated settlement to the current crisis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the current fighting and urges the warring parties to reach a lasting ceasefire that will allow for humanitarian needs to be addressed as soon as possible;

(2) calls on all private militia to disarm and disband immediately to end the continuing threat to peace and stability in the Republic of Congo;

(3) commends African leaders from Gabon, Equatorial Guinea, Cameroon, Benin, Central African Republic, Senegal, and Chad for their efforts to negotiate a peaceful settlement and encourages their continuing efforts to find a sustainable political settlement in this matter;

(4) supports the deployment of an African peacekeeping force to the Republic of Congo if deemed necessary;

(5) urges the Government of the Republic of Congo, in cooperation with all legal political parties, to resolve in a transparent manner questions concerning the scheduled elections and to prepare for open and transparent elections at the earliest feasible time; and

(6) encourages the United States government to provide technical assistance on election related matters if requested by the Government of the Republic of Congo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us was introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Africa. This resolution expresses our grave concern about the violence and chaos that have taken hold in the Republic of Congo. This is Congo Brazzaville, Mr. Speaker, not the Democratic Republic of Congo which was formerly known as Zaire.

The Republic of Congo is a small nation with only 2½ million people, but over the past few years it has been a beacon of hope in a troubled region. Congo held democratic elections in 1992. Recent oil discoveries have given hope for a better life for the Congolese people. Although Congo has always been troubled by ethnic difficulties, many people believe that there was a new opportunity for reconciliation and democracy. Regrettably, those hopes have now been dashed by the recent violence in Congo which has taken thousands of lives in the capital of Brazzaville and other areas.

Mr. Speaker, there are no good guys in this latest violence. Neither the elected government nor its opponents have demonstrated an ability to restrain their worst impulses. This resolution firmly puts the Congress on the side of the Congolese people, urging an end to the fighting and supporting the work of those who seek reconciliation between the warring factions.

Accordingly I urge the House to adopt this resolution.

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

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa, I and a cosponsor of this resolution, and I want to thank the chairman of the committee for his diligence in putting it forth and for working with us on its language; we are very concerned about the ongoing violence in the Republic of Congo, and although a truce was called between President Lissouba and former President Denis Sassou Nguesso on June 17, reports of gunfire and shellings still continue to this date, and it has been estimated that between 1,000 and 3,000 people have died as a result of the fighting.

President Lissouba won his seat in 1992 in an election that was determined to be free and fair and, as in Sierra Leone, we cannot tolerate violence as a format for change. The Congo was scheduled to hold elections on July 27. Elections are the appropriate format for change, if so decided by the people of the Congo. It is crucial that the two parties come together to negotiate a real truce and to reschedule elections, and certainly it is not too late to get things back on track.

The draft declaration issued by the Foreign Ministers of the West African Economic and Monetary Union in which they stated that they are prepared to join a peacekeeping force to restore peace in the Congo is demonstrative of a growing consensus among African nations for a proactive and African response to the outbreak of violence on the continent, and I think we should welcome their declaration.

Again I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] for responding quickly in drafting the resolution. It is important that the Congress clearly condemn the fighting, place its support behind democracy, negotiation, elections, peace, and ultimately behind the will of the people of the Republic of the Congo.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], our chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, since violence in the Congo escalated several weeks ago, an estimated 3,000 lives have been lost. What started as an effort by Congo President Pascal Lissouba to safeguard the upcoming election by neutralizing the so-called cobra militia which is operated by a political rival, this situation has degenerated into ethnic cleansing and into political wrangling.

All this has developed beneath the media's radar. As the world watched the unraveling of the Mobutu regime in the neighboring country then known as Zaire, now the Congo, the Congo itself was seen as a safe haven for refugees from the collapsing nation. Western nations sent military forces to Congo to evacuate their citizens from Zaire. So it was shocking to find several weeks later that foreign nationals had to be evacuated from Congo Brazzaville and that refugees from that nation were running for safety to what is now sometimes called Congo-Kinshasa.

Today nearly a quarter of the population of the capital city of Brazzaville has left town to avoid being caught in the fighting. Unfortunately, these refugees have found themselves stopped along the way, and if they belong to the wrong ethnic group, militia men do what is called there making them travel, and to make someone travel means being taken away and killed. More than 2,500 Congolese were killed in ethnic fighting after the disputed 1993 election, and now ethnic tensions in the central African nation has dramatically worsened.

It is too late for elections to be held as planned on July 27. A dispute between President Lissouba and former President Denis Sassou Nguesso on the elections now threatens the future of Congo's developing democracy. President Lissouba has called for a 3-month postponement of elections and for his ruling mandate which expires next month. However, Mr. Sassou Nguesso wants the President to leave office next month and be replaced by a transitional government for 2 years. This resolution is a reinforcement of our Government's commitment to the democratic process in Congo-Brazzaville.

The threat to elected government and rule of law in Congo must be dealt with now, and a lasting solution to this ethnic and political crisis must be found. African nations and African leaders have been trying to broker a peace. There have been several cease-fires since the fighting began in June, but none of them have held longer than a few days. We are in the midst of yet another cease-fire as we speak. Meanwhile, a peacekeeping force is being gathered, but it will not be deployed until both factions agree to stand down. U.S. encouragement of the ongoing peace process as expressed in this resolution would bolster the peace process at this point.

This resolution I am offering calls for a halt to the fighting and a lasting

peace that will allow for considerable humanitarian needs of the Congolese people to be met and for the holding of elections at the earliest agreeable time.

□ 1545

Moreover, we call for the disarming and disbandment of the private militias, which are a continuing threat to peace and stability. And, finally, we call upon the parties involved in the elections to address and resolve questions concerning the election process so that there can be fair and free elections in the Congo.

Over the past several years nations caught in seemingly intractable conflict have managed to successfully complete a democratic transition: South Africa, Malawi, and Mozambique are but three examples of this process, and Liberia, we will see if that will be a new example.

There is no reason to expect any less from the Congo. Although these developments are halfway around the world, they matter. America has a great deal to gain from a healthy democratic Africa, and a stable Congo is a part of that. We have discussed this measure with the administration, which supports the approach taken on the resolution to the current crisis in the Congo. I urge the House to approve this resolution and to address the worsening crisis in the Republic of Congo.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution because I believe this draws attention to an explosive situation in Central Africa. I commend the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, for introducing it and for working with the chairman of the committee to move it forward.

By reflecting the views of the U.S. Congress on this important issue, I hope this resolution will encourage the parties to maintain the question and reach a political solution in their ongoing talks. I urge adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege, along with Chairman ARCHER of the Committee on Ways and Means, to travel to Brazzaville and then to the Ndoke Forest in the Republic of Congo. While there we spent considerable time with President Lissouba and got to know him quite well, as well as his daughter, who is a medical doctor.

President Lissouba by background is a college professor. He is a very gentle man who believes in the democratic process, and believes deeply in the future of his country, and believes deeply in the welfare of the people that he serves.

The Republic of Congo is an emerging country in Africa that does have a number of important natural resources. The American investors are finding a friendly reception in Brazzaville as they are investing not only in the oil but also in many of the other assets and resources in the Republic of Congo.

I am very concerned, as I am sure other Members are, of the virus of revolution which seems to be spreading across Africa. It is important that we show our resolve to put forth and help enforce and hold in place democratic principles. The election that was scheduled for just next week has been postponed, not because of any fault of the present administration under President Lissouba but because of the revolt that is going on in that country today. Never did I think when we were there just a few months ago that the democratic process would be interfered with as it is today.

I would like to speak briefly of another interest that the United States has in the Republic of Congo. The Republic of Congo has been very cooperative with us in looking at and supporting a United States AID project in the Ndoke Forest which goes toward the preservation not only of the rain forest but also of the rain forest elephants that are present there, as well as the rain forest gorillas. These are species that are very much endangered. We have found great cooperation from the Republic of Congo in cooperating with the United States' interest in the preservation of these wonderful creatures.

We have also found the need and concern that we have to do more for the preservation of the rain forest, and the great concern that we have as to some of the logging operations which are not only devastating these rain forests, but also because of the use of the gorillas and other wildlife in the area, using them as camp meat.

The rain forest does have a very definite effect on our weather. Being from Florida, this is right in the area where hurricanes are created. We do have a very, very large stake in seeing that there is a friendly government that we can work with for the preservation of these great natural resources.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] for his supporting comments.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 175, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. LUTHER. 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 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of order of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

EXPRESSING CONCERN OVER RECENT EVENTS IN SIERRA LEONE IN WAKE OF RECENT MILITARY COUP D'ETAT

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) expressing concern over recent events in the Republic of Sierra Leone in the wake of the recent military coup d'etat of that country's first democratically elected president.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 99

Whereas for the first time in almost 30 years, the Republic of Sierra Leone held their first truly democratic multiparty elections to elect a president and parliament and put an end to military rule;

Whereas the elections held on February 26, 1996, and the subsequent runoff election held on March 15, 1996, were deemed by international and domestic observers to be free and fair and legitimate expressions of the will of the people of the Republic of Sierra Leone;

Whereas on May 25, 1997, a military coup d'etat against the democratically elected Government of the Republic of Sierra Leone, including President Ahmed Tejan Kabbah, took place;

Whereas the coup d'etat, led by Major Johnny Paul Koroma and the Armed Forces Ruling Council (AFRC) on May 25, 1997, signifies a giant step backward for freedom and democracy in the Republic of Sierra Leone;

Whereas there has been fighting, killing, looting and a disruption of relief supplies in the Republic of Sierra Leone since the coup d'etat; and

Whereas the best solution to this crisis would be a peaceful solution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) condemns the leaders and members of the rebellious Armed Forces Ruling Council (AFRC) for ousting the democratically elected Government of the Republic of Sierra Leone, including President Ahmed Tejan Kabbah;

(2) urges an immediate end to all violence in the Republic of Sierra Leone;

(3) encourages the members of the AFRC to negotiate a hand-over of power back to the democratically elected Government of the Republic of Sierra Leone in order to restore order and democracy in the country;

(4) encourages all citizens of the Republic of Sierra Leone to work together to bring about a peaceful solution to the current conflict;

(5) reaffirms the United States support of the democratically elected Government of the Republic of Sierra Leone led by President Ahmed Tejan Kabbah;

(6) urges the members of the AFRC and all armed elements involved in the conflict to ensure the protection and safety of international aid agencies and personnel serving in the country, and allow them unobstructed access to affected areas to deliver emergency humanitarian relief to people in need; and

(7) commends the Organization of African Unity for calling on all African countries, and the international community at large, to refrain from recognizing the new regime or lending support in any form whatsoever to the perpetrators of the coup d'etat, the AFRC.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER] will each control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us expresses the grave concerns of the Congress over the recent coup in Sierra Leone. This resolution was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS], who have followed the crisis in Sierra Leone very closely over the years.

Like the Republic of Congo which we considered earlier, Sierra Leone has had a period of hope dashed by renewed violence and chaos. Last year democratic elections were held, bringing to a close years of instability and fighting between the government and rebel forces. Regrettably, the peace did not hold, and a combination of government forces and rebel soldiers overthrew the elected government of President Kabbah.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in Sierra Leone is so desperate that the best hope for the restoration of democratic rule lies with the hundreds of Nigerian troops who have blockaded the capital and are supporting the reinstatement of Kabbah's administration. Mr. Speaker, this resolution will put the Congress firmly on the side of democracy in Sierra Leone, and accordingly, I urge the House to adopt this measure.

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

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

I rise in support of the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 99, which condemns the recent military coup d'etat in Sierra Leone staged by Johnny Paul Koromah and the Armed Forces Ruling Council. I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], for introducing the resolution, which passed both our Subcommittee on Africa and the Committee on International Relations unanimously.

In 1996 Sierra Leone held free, fair, and democratic elections. Those elections and the people's choice of President Ahmad Tejan Kabbah to lead Sierra Leone were not dissolved by the coup d'etat. They cannot be erased or suspended by undemocratic or violate means.

While the coup is certainly disturbing, as we continue to see some of these actions in other places, I think what is encouraging is that many African nations and the Organization of African Unity were swift in their condemnation and asking that governments refrain from recognizing or supporting the new regime.

With this resolution, the United States Congress joins the chorus of voices which have spoken out against the coup, and calls upon Mr. Koromah and the AFRC to return power to the true and democratically-elected government, the government that was chosen by the people of Sierra Leone.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], the sponsor of this resolution, who is a member of our Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to speak on behalf of House Concurrent Resolution 99.

I also would like to, before I begin my brief remarks, thank very much the original cosponsors, the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. ALCEE HASTINGS], and the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. TONY HALL], and also I want to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, the gentleman from California, [Mr. ED ROYCE] and the entire membership of that committee; also the former head of that committee, the gentlewoman from Florida, [Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN], and our chairman, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. BEN GILMAN].

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad resolution in a way because it was barely a year ago that we stood here and talked about the great strides toward a free and democratic government which the people of Sierra Leone had made. This really was the first time in over 30 years that they had had any elections. But now the whole world has changed, and they have been taken over by a band of thugs. It is sad. It happened this year on May 25.

What we are trying to do is to sponsor a resolution which really signifies not only to the people of Sierra Leone but the other nations around the world who believe in the great strides they have made prior to May, that it is important to end violence, to restore the democratically-elected government led by President Kabbah, and also make sure the protection and safety of international aid workers are ensured.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and members on the other side. I want to also put in a special word of appreciation to Ambassador John Hirsch and Ambassador George Moose.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, [Mr. ALCEE HASTINGS], who is an original cosponsor of this resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], which I find very poignant. In addition thereto, I appreciate him so very much for originally being a cosponsor of this effort. Assuredly, I thank the chair of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. BEN GILMAN], the subcommittee chair, the gentleman from California, [Mr. ED ROYCE], and the ranking member, the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. ROBERT MENENDEZ], who have produced not only in this instance but in several a plethora of activity dealing with the continent of Africa in a very positive way.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to express my continued support for this resolution that was offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] and myself to condemn the coup d'etat in Sierra Leone. We certainly must stop the violence in Sierra Leone now.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this necessary and timely legislation which, first, condemns the Armed Forces Ruling Council members for ousting the democratically-elected government of the Republic of Sierra Leone, and second, orders an immediate cessation to the violence in this nation, and encourages the AFRC to negotiate a return to power of the elected leadership.

The military coup led by Johnny Paul Koromah in Sierra Leone on May 25, 1997, was a savage assault on an emerging democracy in this African nation. Just 15 months prior to the coup democratic elections were held and President Kabbah was chosen to lead his country into a new era, one which promised liberty and constitutional order for Sierra Leonians.

International election observers were there and the citizenry declared this election to be free and fair. The people of Sierra Leone signified their determination to vote, even if it cost them their lives, and they were successful. But this country's march towards democratic government was suddenly stopped by those who wanted to end its forward strides by undertaking violence. With their coup came chaos marked by fighting, and killing, and looting.

We must speak out forcefully with one voice against the travesty and tragedy being played out in Sierra Leone. If we do not, we are sanctioning the blatant robbery of the freedoms of the people of Sierra Leone.

This legislation is especially timely. In response to events in Sierra Leone, ECOMOG has imposed an air, land, and sea blockade in response to an ECOWAS decision to impose economic sanctions on this military junta.

□ 1600

These interventions have given way to negotiations. According to the Embassy of Sierra Leone in Washington,

negotiations between four foreign ministers of ECOWAS and representatives of the AFRC are now taking place in Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire. A strong message by the U.S. Congress at this point then could be helpful in restoring power to the democratically elected government. I urge adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 99.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] and also the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS], coauthors of this resolution, as well as members of the Subcommittee on Africa for their support. They unanimously endorsed this resolution.

When democratic government was restored through elections in Sierra Leone last year, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] reminded us, it was counted as a great achievement for the people of west African nations. This country had suffered two coups and 4 years of military rule. It was the scene of a ferocious civil war as we have heard today. The military tried its best to extend its rule, but the people were so eager for democracy that they demanded that elections be delayed no longer, despite threats of reprisal. I remember the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] telling me that some had their hands cut off in reprisal for casting ballots by rebels trying to frustrate a democratic transition in this country. Yet, they had the bravery to go to the polls and cast those votes.

Imagine now how the citizens of Sierra Leone must feel when on May 24 a group of military officers staged another coup. That coup, of course, sent the President into exile. Since then, this group of thugs in uniform have looted the country, virtually holding the nation hostage to their shifting demands.

The long-suffering citizens of Sierra Leone have responded by resisting the coup leaders. They have staged strikes. Labor unions, professional associations, and civic groups have opposed the coup. The Kabbah government is broadcasting to the nation on a secret transmitter to bolster the people's resolve to resist this illegal power grab.

There is a positive trend in Africa today toward political and economic reform. The transition in Sierra Leone often was cited as part of that positive trend. Their very worthy efforts are made meaningless if we accept the undoing of reform in a nation in which the people have supported the democratic process. In many cases they supported it with their lives.

Let us join the Organization of African Unity in supporting a west African diplomatic and military initiative to free Sierra Leone from its unelected leaders. I urge passage of this resolution.

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

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. SNYDER], an outstanding new Member of Congress.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, Sierra Leone is a small country. My guess is that many Members of Congress and many folks in America would not be able to find it on a map. I can say that, being from Arkansas, I know that many people cannot find Arkansas on a map. And it was my pleasure to have lived and worked at a mission hospital in Sierra Leone for 6 months a number of years ago.

At that time it was a dictatorship. It was corrupt. We would actually have to bribe the postman to get the mail. Life expectancy was 42 years old. As one of those folks who had lived there, like many Members here would have been overseas, one follows a country closely after that.

I was very excited a year ago when these elections occurred. I have been in that town of Bo where those people had their hands cut off trying to vote. We went there in search of the elusive American cheeseburger when we were trying to find recreation. I know how much that democracy would have meant to those people. It is a terrible tragedy what happened during those elections, but it shows democracy does not come cheap in certain parts of the world. Some of us who have worked in Africa, and I have been there a couple of times to work, were concerned that perhaps with the end of the cold war that we would ignore Africa with our trade policy, with our failure to support an adequate foreign operations budget for Africa, with our failure to support an adequate military to military relationship with Africa, student exchanges. That is our responsibility, to do what we can to nourish democracy. But the responsibility for this coup is those folks in Sierra Leone that did this bloody and brutal act. It is wrong. This body knows who is responsible for it. I commend the folks that put this resolution together and ask every Member to support it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I merely want to conclude by commending the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], also the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] for their sponsorship of the resolution. I certainly want to commend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. SNYDER] for bringing his personal experiences to bear on this particular issue. I think it is just outstanding for him to provide us with that kind of insight on this issue.

The Congress by this resolution should send a clear message that this coup against the democratically elected President must not stand and that the United States will work with the international community to restore the legitimate democratic government in Sierra Leone to power. This resolution supports that policy and I am pleased that the President of the United States supports this resolution. I urge its adoption.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SNOWBARGER]. 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, House Concurrent Resolution 99.

The question was taken.

Mr. LUTHER. 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 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

REGARDING INTERFERENCE OF EUROPEAN COMMISSION IN MERGER OF BOEING CO. AND McDONNELL DOUGLAS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 191) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the interference of the European Commission in the merger of the Boeing Co. and McDonnell Douglas.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 191

Whereas the Boeing Company and McDonnell Douglas have announced their merger;

Whereas the Department of Defense has approved the merger as consistent with the national security of the United States;

Whereas the Federal Trade Commission has found that the merger does not violate the antitrust laws of the United States;

Whereas the European Commission has been highly critical of the merger in its consideration of the facts;

Whereas the European Commission is apparently determined to disapprove the merger to gain an unfair competitive advantage for Airbus Industries, a government-owned aircraft manufacturer; and

Whereas this dispute could threaten to disrupt the overall relationship between the European Union and the United States which had a two-way trade in goods and services of approximately $366,000,000,000 in 1996: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) any disapproval by the European Commission of the merger of the Boeing Company and McDonnell Douglas would constitute an unwarranted and unprecedented interference in a United States business transaction that would directly threaten thousands of American aerospace jobs and potentially put many more jobs at risk on both sides of the Atlantic; and

(2) the President should take such actions as he considers to be appropriate to protect United States interests in connection with this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and gentleman from

Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER] each will control on 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before yielding time to the sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF], I want to commend him for introducing this resolution and working for its early consideration on the floor and in a very timely manner as the European Union is meeting on this same matter.

I strongly support this resolution. It is the height of irony for the European Union, which has hounded our Nation unmercifully for so-called extraterritorial legislation such as the Helms-Burton Act or the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act, which are not extraterritorial and which were drafted to avoid any extraterritoriality, to attack a merger between two United States-headquartered corporations which do not manufacture in Europe.

It is true that the welfare of the flying public, the price the airlines have to pay for the aircraft and the need for competition in aircraft manufacturing, ought to be considered as mergers are judged by antitrust authorities.

But who is better equipped than the independent U.S. Federal Trade Commission to make that determination? Obviously the United States flying public is most directly affected by this than any other because Boeing and the combined Boeing-McDonnell Douglas Corp. will be so strong in the domestic marketplace.

The European Commission's attitude gives rise to a strong belief, set out in this resolution, that the commission is primarily motivated by questions of industrial policy, the welfare of Airbus Industries, rather than consumer welfare. In other words, the European Commission is apparently using its competition policy hat to threaten to impose barriers to U.S. competition. That is obviously wrong.

I am also concerned that the Commission of the European Union may be taking action at this time in an attempt to establish certain political credentials or make political points in intra-EU disputes. That could be disastrous.

Mr. Speaker, I am known as a friend of warm relations between our Nation and the European Union. The United States and the European Union are one another's largest trading partners. Moreover, we are very close allies on a large range of political, security and other global issues. I am frankly concerned that the EU is going to take an ill-considered step that could lead to a trade war. Too much is at stake for this to occur. I appeal for cooler heads to prevail before the European Commission takes an irrevocable step.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF], sponsor of this resolution.

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking member, for their support in allowing this legislation to come up under suspension. I am pleased that they agree that this is an urgent issue facing Congress and requires immediate action. Their indulgence in allowing a vote today without a markup is appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the European Commission is scheduled to vote on the merger of the Boeing Co. and McDonnell Douglas. It is anticipated that they will vote to disapprove the merger.

Mr. Speaker, any disapproval by the European Commission would constitute an unwarranted and unprecedented interference in a U.S. business transaction. The review by the European Commission has been dominated by Airbus Industries from the outset. It is unfortunate that the European Union would allow their process to be dominated by a government owned and subsidized company.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that my colleagues understand that this is a merger between two wholly owned U.S. defense contractors, consistent with DOD directives issued to downsize our military-industrial complex in the post-cold war era, and it was ratified by the Federal Trade Commission. Any attempt to block this is nothing short of a foreign government trying to dictate America's vital national security policy. As such, it is an assault on our national sovereignty.

The objections raised by the European Commission revolve around the signing of sole provider contracts by Boeing. However, Airbus was an eligible competitor for these contracts. In fact, Airbus signed the first long-term contract with a U.S. carrier. That action started these exclusive type agreements. Throughout the entire bidding process, neither Airbus nor the European Commission raised any objections whatsoever to the bidding on exclusive agreements until they lost out to Boeing.

Another argument used by the European Commission is that the merged company will dominate the commercial airline business. Quite frankly, Boeing's share of the commercial aviation market has remained relatively stable at 60 percent or so for the last decade. It is the heavily subsidized Airbus that has taken market share from McDonnell Douglas. The only antitrust violation in the commercial aviation industry is by Airbus and its European government partners.

While we all agree that more companies in the market would be optimal, the truth is that there are only two viable companies today, even before the merger. Last year, McDonnell Douglas was responsible for less than 5 percent of the total orders in the world.

The Europeans are using this opportunity to obtain a competitive advantage against an American company, which could cost over 14,000 jobs in the near term and many more in the long term. It is vital that the House take this opportunity to send a clear message to the Europeans that this act will not be tolerated.

My legislation provides the President with leverage if it becomes necessary to intervene. He can be confident that he has the support of both the Senate, which passed a similar resolution last week, and the House of Representatives.

The European Community believes that it should have veto authority over U.S. business decisions. The Europeans have stated that they may fine the merged company over $4.5 billion and potentially seize aircraft built by American workers here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is truly an issue of national significance. We must draw a clear line in the sand now to prevent any further infringements by foreign governments on U.S. business decisions.

□ 1615

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I thank the chairman and ranking member again for their support.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington, [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Minnesota for yielding me this time, and I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] for their outstanding effort on this resolution which I rise in strong support of.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to be able to tell the House that there may have been a breakthrough today between the parties. We were very concerned, my colleagues and I from Washington State, about what would happen if the European Commission turned down the Boeing, McDonnell-Douglas merger. We are hopeful now that, after further negotiating between the Boeing Company and the European Commission, that there may be a prospect for a favorable outcome.

I think all of us have learned a lesson here, and that is I think both sides have to be careful in reviewing agreements, especially when we have two U.S. corporations that have no manufacturing facilities at all in Europe. The idea that the European Commission can exert jurisdiction and say that these two companies cannot merge, especially after this has been approved by the Department of Defense, it has been approved by the Federal Trade Commission, and under our process here in the United States, is wrong.

The Federal Trade Commission does not go out and look and see what the

impact is going to be on Airbus. It goes out and looks at the airlines and says will this merger, in fact, have an anti-competitive impact. What they found was that it would not; that, in fact, McDonnell-Douglas today is declining in terms of its ability to produce and manufacture commercial aircraft. They just do not have the orders.

The real competition out there is between Boeing and Airbus, and it is a healthy competition that will continue into the future. This is what the airlines in Europe should be concerned about; this is what the airlines in the United States should be concerned about.

So what we have here is a situation in which the European Commission used this opportunity to leverage Boeing, to try to realign the competitive field to the benefit of Airbus, not to look at this in terms of anti-competitive behavior but to try to get things from Boeing to help Airbus in its ongoing competition. I think that is wrong.

I am saddened to hear that there may have had to have been some compromise reached. I am always for compromise, but I think in this case forcing Boeing to give up on what we call exclusive, although it is not really exclusive, but exclusion agreements with American, Delta and Continental, after they were competed for, after Airbus and Boeing competed and Boeing won, and now in this process they are making Boeing give those exclusives back, I do not think that is fair. I think that goes beyond what this process should be about.

I hope American companies in the future will be a little more cautious about agreeing in the first instance that the European Commission should have a right to review these mergers, especially when there are no facilities in Europe.

As someone who has served on defense appropriations for 19 years, I would also like to point out that another area of attack came on the question of whether there is indirect subsidy because Boeing or McDonnell-Douglas have contracts with the Defense Department. Well, we have these aerospace companies go out and they bid and compete to do the C–17, the F–18, the F–22, the Joint Strike fighter. And, yes, they may learn some things from that about how to build better airplanes and, in fact, they may even bring their commercial experience to the defense arena and help bring down the cost of our defense products. But to assert that there is somehow an indirect subsidy here is really almost laughable.

So, I think that area of concern is one also that should have been dismissed. I think we have shown that there is no indirect subsidy. Of course, the companies over there, the four companies that comprise Airbus, also receive defense contracts from their various countries, and there has been a record, a historic record of subsidy up to 1992 for Airbus.

So I am glad that the House and my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF], have worked together on this. We have taken the floor and made our speeches. I think because of that and because of the good work of this administration, and I want to compliment President Clinton, Stuart Eizenstat, Dan Turallo, the people in the administration who have been working on this for the last several weeks. They stayed with it, they talked to the top officials in the governments of the various countries.

And I am glad to see today in the newspaper, in the press accounts, that Reuters says that the British now see this would have been a mistake and the Germans see that this would have been a mistake. The bottom line is that they recognize, and I am just pleased that the administration said that there will be a major trade problem controversy with the United States if we do not reach agreement, and that has, I think, helped us break the ice here.

So it has been a good combination of congressional support and support from the administration, and again I want to thank the chairman for bringing this out promptly and giving us his help and support, and my colleagues on the Democratic side for cooperating on this. This means a lot.

It is not just in Washington State. If this had gone down, the jobs that would have been lost first are in Long Beach, CA. Fifteen thousand jobs at McDonnell-Douglas in Long Beach, CA would have been on the line. So it is not just Washington State and St. Louis, it is California that have a real stake in this decision.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. LINDA SMITH].

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a special thanks to the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

This is very, very important because it says something more than is before us today. It does not just talk about another country intervening in American politics, it talks about them dictating how we deal in commerce.

Boeing and McDonnell-Douglas are both American corporations. They are not international corporations, they are not other countries. We do not even manufacture in the European market or the Community, and yet they had decided that they are going to protect one of their own, who is already subsidized, and try to change competition.

Well, we believe in competition in America but we also believe in sovereignty. So if this is to go through, and if the President were to roll on this one, as someone said earlier, then we would set a precedent for the future, and that would be a precedent of other countries deciding to direct how we deal with our business in America.

McDonnell-Douglas and Boeing have come together in an honest merger that has been OK in America, is fair, honest and competitive. We should not have another country come in and tell us to do something different.

I think it has been said that this particular merger not going through would jeopardize jobs in California, but I think that it would jeopardize other American jobs, again as we see other countries, including this European Community, making a decision to do this in the future.

Again I want to commend the sponsor of this, he has taken the time to bring it forward, and the committee chair, who has given us this time to make this statement but also to reaffirm the sovereignty of America.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT].

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, for the opportunity to speak on this very important issue not only to our State but to our entire country.

I support the resolution offered by the gentleman from Everett, WA [Mr. METCALF]. Tomorrow, as we know, the European Commission will rule on the merger of Boeing and McDonnell-Douglas. Several news stories today have noted that the President has spoken with a number of European leaders about the Wednesday decision but, according to Reuters, ''There was virtually no chance that Boeing could produce an offer acceptable to the Commission by then.''

Unfortunately, I think this has characterized the European bargaining position to date. Each time Boeing nears agreement, the Commission escalates its demands, claiming the merger would hurt fair competition in Europe.

The current hang-up involves the so-called exclusive agreements between Boeing and three American carriers. These agreements are wholly unrelated to the merger, and the Federal Trade Commission definitively ruled that no basis exists to challenge them under U.S. law. Yet the European Commission is holding the merger hostage to extort concessions from Boeing on this issue.

The German Economics Minister is reported to have said that current concessions offered by Boeing were clearly not enough, while last week President Chirac of France simply noted the merger could be extremely dangerous to Europeans.

I had the opportunity to visit the Boeing facility in Everett just this last weekend, and I can report to my colleagues that this company represents the best in what the U.S. economy can expect from free trade. It has gained a global reputation by building the best airplanes in the world. The Europeans are not seeking to block the merger because of honest concerns about free trade. In my judgment, they are doing so because they fear their state-subsidized firm cannot hope to compete.

I urge my colleagues to join in disapproving this potentially unprecedented interference by the European Commission and passing this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. It is vitally important for this body to express our outrage at the European Union's interference in an issue already settled by our Federal Trade Commission. I commend the strong support and actions taken by President Clinton and his staff to protect American jobs by resisting this European pressure.

The approved merger of McDonnell-Douglas and Boeing will provide thousands of solid, high-paying, high-skilled jobs throughout the United States. This new company will not threaten the European Union or Airbus, a company largely subsidized by that consortium's member nations. The Federal Trade Commission has heard the arguments; it has approved the merger.

In its attack upon the merger, the European Union has explicitly targeted more than 11,000 workers at Douglas Aircraft, which is headquartered in the district I have the honor to represent. The European Union is attempting to blackmail the United States into accepting its position. I do not believe we can allow our aviation industry to be shaped by our competitors overseas.

To his credit, the President has stood firm. We all want him to remain so. No one wants a trade war with Europe, but we should not be afraid of that risk if that is what is needed to guarantee American control of our key industries and to protect American jobs.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from California for his statement. He recognizes, as I recognize, that the problem we have here is that this merger is absolutely essential for the commercial part of the McDonnell-Douglas Company which exists down in the gentleman's district, and to protect those jobs there is absolutely crucial. That would be the first casualty if somehow this agreement could not go forward.

I think the gentleman from Washington pointed out one of the things I did not realize, that the European Commission claims it could fine Boeing $4.5 billion if they went ahead with this merger, if the EC turned it down. So this takes on very serious implications. Also, that they can seize Boeing aircraft in Europe and demand payment from the various airlines in Europe. So, hopefully, we can avoid this.

And I appreciate the gentleman's comments regarding the administration, because we have been working with them. We have been talking to Stuart Eizenstat at the State Department and Dan Turallo at the White House and with the President and his immediate staff. They have been there working hard on this, and I think quietly and diplomatically, and we have taken a little higher profile up here in the Congress. But I think together it has worked effectively, and I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

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

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. It is good we are on the same team from now on. It is sort of sad that the European Community is talking about fines when their countries have subsidized Airbus to the tune of $34 billion or more dollars over the last decade.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is absolutely correct. Let us hope now, maybe, that they are coming to an agreement and then, after that, the two companies can come together, and the stockholders can meet and approve this merger here in the United States.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I believe it absolutely will be good for the country and good for Washington and California.

Mr. DICKS. And a few other States, too.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAM SMITH], another outstanding new Member of Congress.

□ 1630

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of this resolution and in opposition to European interference with the Boeing-McDonnell Douglas merger.

What this should be about is competition. I think to the extent we move toward global competition rewarding the best competitor, the most efficient participator in a given market, then that is good and we are moving forward.

The problem that the European Union and Airbus seem to have is that that best competitor right now has been Boeing for the last several years. They have consistently won the better contracts through fair and efficient competition. And we should reward that, not punish it.

If the European Union raised an argument that Boeing was doing something improper, unfair competition on some levels, they would have a point and it would be appropriate. But they do not, and it is not. The type of things that they are raising is basic competition. It is almost like Airbus is negotiating this deal, not the European Union, and that is totally inappropriate.

Airbus should compete on the economic field, in the marketplace with Boeing, not through the use of their government, as has been mentioned. Airbus is subsidized itself. Their complaints in this ring very, very hollow.

The last point that I want to make is that our Government and our country must stand strong on behalf of Boeing, McDonnell Douglas and the entire country and not let the European Union unfairly use trade agreements to push us around and stop our economic advancement. It is in the best interest of the whole marketplace of the world in addition to the United States, and we must do it.

I strongly urge the President to stand strong and stand behind Boeing for fairness, and I support this resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution offered by Mr. METCALF. This resolution simply expresses the view that the merger of two American companies should be the concern of regulatory agencies of the U.S. Government, not the European Union. Despite the approval of the Federal Trade Commission, bureaucrats in Brussels have threatened to impose fines on Boeing and McDonnell-Douglas, or even seize their planes in Europe, in order to protect a government-subsidized European manufacturer.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have recognized the actions of the European Union as unjustified and based on obvious self interest. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this resolution, and protect these American companies and their employees from Europe's efforts to prevent fair competition.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, recently, the European Union objected to the merger of McDonnell Douglas and the Boeing Co. I find this decision extremely troubling and rise in strong support of House Resolution 191 as introduced by my colleague from Washington State, Mr. METCALF. These two wholly owned American companies should be allowed to merge without fear of reprisal from a foreign government. The sole reason for the European Union criticism and imminent disapproval of the merger is to gain an unfair competitive advantage for Airbus, a government-owned aircraft manufacturer. It is ridiculous to allow a foreign government to block this merger because they cannot compete with our workers in a fair market.

European Union's opposition to this merger is unacceptable for several reasons. First, there are sovereignty concerns about foreign intervention in an American merger. Second, the parties involved are both wholly owned U.S. companies with an international customer base. Third, this merger between two U.S. companies has already been approved by our Government. Fourth, the objections raised by the European Union regarding the abandonment of exclusive contracts awarded to Boeing is inappropriate. The Boeing Co. should not be punished because it obtains more contracts than Airbus Industries in a competitive market. Airbus has never objected to carrier requests to make the contracts exclusive in return for reduced prices. In fact, the European Commission objected only after the agreements were concluded. It is both irresponsible and inappropriate to risk U.S. jobs because the free market worked its will. Contracts that establish fixed purchase prices are directly related to the number of aircraft the customer agrees to purchase. Any abdication of these contracts is contrary to good commercial practices.

The proposal by the European Union to require Boeing to divest their interest in McDonnell Douglas commercial aircraft business is

unacceptable as well. After the U.S. Federal Trade Commission [FTC] conducted a thorough review of the proposed merger, the FTC concluded that McDonnell Douglas is no longer able to sell enough aircraft to raise significant concerns about the loss of its competitive ability. Last year, McDonnell Douglas was responsible for only 4 percent of the international commercial aircraft business. The divestiture by Boeing of the McDonnell Douglas commercial aircraft business would have severe ramifications worldwide. First, it threatens American jobs that are tied into the continued support of McDonnell Douglas aircraft by the Boeing Co. Further, McDonnell Douglas' commercial aviation division cannot maintain itself as an independent company and previous efforts to sell the commercial aviation division have been unsuccessful. Therefore, any divestiture would threaten the safety of McDonnell Douglas commercial aircraft already in service if the commercial division were to close.

Finally, it is vital to the health of the United States to downsize, through mergers, the military industrial base as we celebrate the end of the cold war period and adjust military budgets accordingly. Due to the large defense business that will be conducted by the Boeing Co., any action by the European Community is an infringement on the sovereign rights of the United States to provide for U.S. national security.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a trend we as Americans should allow to continue. We declared our independence from European rule in 1776 and should not revert to those days in conducting the business of today.

I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 191 and call upon the President to take all necessary steps to protect American sovereignty and the jobs of hard working Americans.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 191 because the prospect of the European Union ruling against this merger and effectively cutting an American corporation out of an entire market greatly disturbs me. I am absolutely appalled that leaders of other nations feel bold enough to tell America how to run.

The EU will vote on the $14 billion merger Wednesday morning and comments by leaders from across the Atlantic strongly suggest that a vote of disapproval is imminent. I believe that disapproval would be an unmistakable shot across the bow of American business interests. We know our products can compete and succeed in a fair market. But if the EU would rather play hardball, I won't hesitate to say that we can too. We are heading toward a situation that is bad for American workers, and potentially devastating for States like California that depend on a strong American interest in this industry.

Mr. Speaker, critics of the EU stance on the merger have pointed to the sagging performance of Europe's Airbus, a key competitor to American aerospace interests, as the true cause for EU opposition. European officials insist that the merger would simply create an unfair playing field for all interested parties. This is nothing more than a red herring to mask the fact that these nations have pumped over $26 billion in government subsidies into Airbus and they still don't have a competitive product. They are literally holding this merger hostage for a sweeter deal which allows more government subsidies to keep Airbus afloat. They are not fooling anyone.

The bottom line is, the Federal Trade Commission reviewed over 5 million documents in their approval of this merger and they found no cause for concern. This has nothing to do with fair global markets. It is all about gaining an unfair competitive advantage for a government-owned aircraft manufacturer. We simply cannot afford to let that happen. I encourage all of my colleagues to support House Resolution 191.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 191.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

STAMP OUT BREAST CANCER ACT

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1585) to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for breast-cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued U.S. postage stamps, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1585

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 ''Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act''.

SEC. 2. SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 414. Special postage stamps

''(a) In order to afford the public a convenient way to contribute to funding for breast cancer research, the Postal Service shall establish a special rate of postage for first-class mail under this section.

''(b) The rate of postage established under this section—

''(1) shall be equal to the regular first-class rate of postage, plus a differential of not to exceed 25 percent;

''(2) shall be set by the Governors in accordance with such procedures as the Governors shall by regulations prescribe (in lieu of the procedures under chapter 36); and

''(3) shall be offered as an alternative to the regular first-class rate of postage.

The use of the special rate of postage established under this section shall be voluntary on the part of postal patrons.

''(c)(1) Of the amounts becoming available for breast cancer research pursuant to this section, the Postal Service shall pay—

''(A) 70 percent to the National Institutes of Health, and

''(B) the remainder to the Department of Defense.

Payments under this paragraph to an agency shall be made under such arrangements as the Postal Service shall by mutual agreement with such agency establish in order to carry out the purposes of this section, except that, under those arrangements, payments to such agency shall be made at least twice a year.

''(2) For purposes of this section, the term 'amounts becoming available for breast cancer research pursuant to this section' means—

''(A) the total amounts received by the Postal Service that it would not have received but for the enactment of this section, reduced by

''(B) an amount sufficient to cover reasonable costs incurred by the Postal Service in carrying out this section, including those attributable to the printing, sale, and distribution of stamps under this section,

as determined by the Postal Service under regulations that it shall prescribe.

''(d) It is the sense of the Congress that nothing in this section should—

''(1) directly or indirectly cause a net decrease in total funds received by the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Defense, or any other agency of the Government (or any component or program thereof) below the level that would otherwise have been received but for the enactment of this section; or

''(2) affect regular first-class rates of postage or any other regular rates of postage.

''(e) Special postage stamps under this section shall be made available to the public beginning on such date as the Postal Service shall by regulation prescribe, but in no event later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this section.

''(f) The Postmaster General shall include in each report rendered under section 2402 with respect to any period during any portion of which this section is in effect information concerning the operation of this section, except that, at a minimum, each shall include—

''(1) the total amount described in subsection (c)(2)(A) which was received by the Postal Service during the period covered by such report; and

''(2) of the amount under paragraph (1), how much (in the aggregate and by category) was required for the purposes described in subsection (c)(2)(B).

''(g) This section shall cease to be effective at the end of the 2-year period beginning on the date on which special postage stamps under this section are first made available to the public.''.

(b) REPORT BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.—No later than 3 months (but no earlier than 6 months) before the end of the 2-year period referred to in section 414(g) of title 39, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a)), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Congress a report on the operation of such section. Such report shall include—

(1) an evaluation of the effectiveness and the appropriateness of the authority provided by such section as a means of fundraising; and

(2) a description of the monetary and other resources required of the Postal Service in carrying out such section.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 4 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''414. Special postage stamps.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1585 was introduced by the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], our distinguished colleague, on May 13. She was joined at that time by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] in cosponsoring the bill at introduction.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to recognize the work done by these Members in promoting the need for the additional funds hopefully provided under this bill for breast cancer research and for bringing the measure to the floor. I think they have all done a very, very admirable piece of legislating.

Mr. Speaker, I would, however, also like to particularly sing loud the efforts of the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], whose efforts here in this session of Congress I really think generated the support amongst the leadership that was necessary to bring this measure to the floor at this time, and also the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for his early work in helping develop a former bill.

Also, Mr. Speaker, a tip of the hat to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], chairman of the full committee, for his leadership in assisting us through the subcommittee and to the floor, and of course to the entire House leadership for their understanding.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act, as introduced, allows postal patrons, for the first time in this country, to contribute to funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued U.S. postal stamps.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill represents an innovative way to generate money for breast cancer research and is similar to a measure that was passed in the other body as an amendment to this year's Treasury appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are aware that some concerns regarding the bill as originally written have been expressed. Therefore, the manager's amendment at the desk, I believe, will improve the legislation even further and, hopefully, will address many of those concerns.

The idea of this kind of postage stamp, semipostal, as it is known in the industry, is indeed innovative in the United States. As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the first time this approach has been taken here in America, but the concept is not new. Semipostals have been discussed and the proposals for such have been floated over the years for various causes, but they have not had in the past the support that this proposal has garnered.

It may interest the body to know, Mr. Speaker, that Canada, the largest geographic nation in our hemisphere, but with less population and less mail than the mail stream in the United States, has been issuing these kinds of postal stamps since 1990. Canada Post Corporation adopted a literacy awareness as its cause of choice in 1989 and has been issuing these kinds of stamps without governmental and parliamentary intervention ever since.

Mr. Speaker, these special postage stamps will be made available to the public no later than 1 year after the date of enactment. The amount designated for breast cancer research due to this bill will be the total amount of revenue received by the Postal Service because of the enactment minus the reasonable cost incurred by the Postal Service attributed to the printing, sale, and distribution of these stamps.

Under this legislation, Mr. Speaker, the Postmaster General would be required to include this program in the annual report of the Postal Service and transmit its findings to the Congress. At a minimum, the report would include the amount of funds received as a result of this legislation and the reasonable cost claimed to be incurred in establishing the volunteer program.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller of the United States, through the offices of the GAO, will be required to complete an evaluation to judge the effectiveness and the appropriateness of the authority to raise funds in this manner in a description of the cost to the Postal Service incurred for the administration of the program.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that a good deal of thought has gone into this base bill, a great deal of additional work on the part of all the cosponsors has gone into the compromise that is entailed in the amended version in the manager's amendment. But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, I know this proposal represents a necessary, thoughtful, and ultimately productive way to assist this Nation's scientific community in the vitally important quest for a cure of this deadly killer.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, most people in the United States have in some way been impacted by this terrible disease. Today, through the adoption of this bill, the House has its opportunity to make a stand against this disease, and in the process, give every woman and including those who know, love, and care for them, new hope.

Again, I thank the sponsors of this legislation for their hard work and concerns, and as a final note again, to particularly the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] for once again being the conscience of this House.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act, which will allow postal patrons to continue funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of newly created specially issued U.S. postage stamps.

As a cosponsor of a similar bill, H.R. 407, introduced in the Congress by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], my friend, I am pleased to join the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], the chairman, in bringing this piece of legislation to the floor of the House.

The idea of creating a breast cancer research stamp originally surfaced in the 104th Congress, when the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], at the suggestion of his constituent, Dr. Ernie Bodai, introduced this legislation.

H.R. 3401 will provide additional funding for breast cancer research through the sale of a semipostal stamp. The term ''semipostal'' means stamps with a surtax on the regular postal rate with the extra revenue earmarked for a designated charity.

An identical measure was introduced by Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN in the other body. At the opening of this session of Congress, Senator FEINSTEIN joined the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], following his leadership, and reintroduced her breast cancer research stamp bill, S. 726, in the Senate. In May, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] adopted the idea by introducing her version of the special breast cancer postage stamp.

The incidence of breast cancer continues to far outstrip available resources and funds, and the statistics are as sobering as they are rising. Breast cancer kills almost 50,000 women every year. Every 12 minutes an American woman succumbs to breast cancer. It is the leading cause of death for women between the ages of 35 and 62, and it is the second leading cause of death for all women.

More than 1.8 million women in America have been diagnosed with breast cancer, and an additional million more are unaware that they have breast cancer. It affects our wives, our sisters, our mothers, our daughters, all American women.

The financial resources to fight breast cancer are just not enough. That is why the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act is before us today. It provides a vehicle for those of us who are concerned about breast cancer research and the funding to buy a semipostal stamp.

The language of this legislation has now been changed. The price of the semipostal breast cancer stamp can be anywhere from 1 to 8 cents more than the regular postage stamp. And we have an opportunity of funneling significant funds to the National Institutes of Health for breast cancer research. The program is entirely voluntary. It does not affect the regular rate of the postal stamp. It will allow the U.S. Postal Service to cover its administrative costs prior to directing the funds to cancer research. And, of course, this experiment will run only 2 years, after which it will be evaluated.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, the other body overwhelmingly adopted by a vote of 83 to 17 this same legislation. I strongly urge all of my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, to join us in approving this legislation. I want to commend the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], my friend, for her leadership on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the original author of this legislation.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1585, sponsored by the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] and myself.

We come to the floor today with the idea of an experiment whereby the American people would contribute to public health causes through the voluntary purchase of a U.S. postage stamp, or a semipostal, as it is known around the world.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] said, in May 1996, Dr. Ernie Bodai, one of my constituents and chief of surgery at the Kaiser Permanente Medical Center in Sacramento, CA, came to my office with what I thought was an innovative proposal. Dr. Bodai's idea involved a bill to establish a special first class postage stamp priced at 1 cent above normal first class postage, with the additional penny going toward breast cancer research.

As a result of Dr. Bodai's unflagging personal effort, I was pleased to introduce the Breast Cancer Research Stamp Act in the 104th Congress. That piece of legislation gained the support of 86 Members of the House of Representatives and thousands and thousands of people across the country who strongly advocated its cosponsorship.

This year, I reintroduced this bill in the 105th Congress, and H.R. 407 has now the support of 125 of my colleagues.

□ 1645

Thanks to some energetic and tireless efforts by several compassionate groups within the breast cancer advocacy community and a special thank you to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], we are considering today H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act of 1997.

H.R. 1585 remains true to the idea of the American public participating in the search for a cure for breast cancer. It also ensures that money raised by the breast cancer research stamp will not replace current Federal funding levels at NIH or the Department of Defense. It will only add to it. It provides a workable and realistic framework for a cooperative effort between the Postal Service and the American public to take place.

I know questions have been raised, how much money could be raised by the sale of a stamp priced above the normal first class postage rate and how much would such an endeavor cost the Postal Service to administer. This bill, H.R. 1585, sets up a demonstration project to answer those and other questions. After 2 years, the General Accounting Office will provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of this project and after 2 years perhaps there will be additional money from the stamp going toward breast cancer research at both NIH and at the very innovative programs at DOD.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Service for working out the details of this bill so that we may finally put this project into place, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], chairman of the full committee, for helping to assure this bill could come to the floor. I particularly want to thank again the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] for her effort and commitment to seeing that this bill and this cause moves forward in the House of Representatives. I am so pleased it could be accomplished at least in this House while she remains a Member.

We have made tremendous progress in raising money, in raising awareness, and in raising the spirits of so many in the battle against a disease that has devastated the lives of millions of loved ones, but we all know we still have a long way to go. I know that we will get there through the support of legislators in Congress and the grassroots support throughout our communities.

By passing H.R. 1585, we will be enabling the people of the United States to demonstrate a spirit of volunteerism to advance our successes in finding a cure for breast cancer. I think now the ball is passed to those people who have made it so important that this Congress consider this legislation. They will be able to prove the degree to which their voluntary spirit and community commitment can produce the results we all seek.

I urge my colleagues to vote to suspend the rules and to pass this important piece of legislation and then find a way to take the legislation that is somewhat different, that has passed the Senate by an overwhelming margin, meld them together and produce a piece of legislation that will cause this experiment to take life.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California again for his work and for his kind comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], whose important efforts on this bill have already been amply described.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my unequivocal support for the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank from the bottom of my heart the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for their support, their guidance, their attention and all their important contributions in developing this stronger bill. Finally, I would like to thank and salute the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for his assistance in leading the fight to craft a bipartisan bill on an issue so close to all of us.

For the first time in our Nation's history, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act will give Americans, every American, the opportunity to become more personally involved in funding breast cancer research. This legislation will allow all of us to contribute to the effort to put an end to what is now an incurable disease by giving us all the option of purchasing a specifically issued first class stamp.

That is one of the beauties of this bill. It is a completely voluntary method of raising money for a worthwhile cause. I envision if we do this right an opportunity for people when it comes time for Christmas shopping, when it comes time for birthday presents, alongside with the little gift, you buy them a roll of stamps so that that individual knows that you might have spent an extra $5 or $10 to give your friend a present that also went toward reducing the risk of dying from breast cancer in this country. I envision companies having the impact of their employees coming to them purchasing stamps that have the stamp out breast cancer insignia on it, companies having contests amongst each other. I believe the American people will rise to the challenge of saying if we make it easy for you, if we make it an opportunity in your daily life of completing chores to donate to breast cancer, they will all absolutely rise to that challenge and help us conquer this disease.

I also believe that it will take us all a little less pain when we pay our bills if we know that while we are paying those bills, sending off those credit card company payments that we may also be contributing to finding a cure for cancer. Husbands, daughters, brothers and sisters will all have an opportunity to buy a stamp toward saving a life.

As has been said, the voluntary purchase of this stamp will direct funds to the noble research efforts led by the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Defense.

Over 9 years ago I lost my best friend to breast cancer. My grandmother, Susan, battled breast cancer and was not the only life forever shattered by this terrible disease. In fact, my husband's mother too has fought a breast cancer fight for years. It is now my hope that my daughter, Susan Paxon, named after my grandmother, will never have to know the fear that I go through every year, the sweaty palms the night before a mammography, the inability to concentrate until you hear from the doctor that says it is all clear again for the next year. I want to make sure that her generation of young women will not know the fright that our generation has known because we have lost an entire generation of women to breast cancer way too early. I, like so many other women and men, would appreciate knowing that I helped make a difference in the fight against breast cancer just by spending a few extra pennies for a stamp I needed anyway.

Mr. Speaker, let me just close by saying that if the Postal Service can issue a stamp in honor of Bugs Bunny or Elvis Presley, surely we can ensure

that the lives and legacies of women who have suffered the ravaging effects of breast cancer will not go unnoticed. In closing, let me thank Dr. Ernest Bodai for developing this mechanism, my staff assistant Jennifer Prazmark for believing so clearly, and my colleagues the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] for giving me an opportunity to leave this Congress with my head held extremely high, believing that we may have passed a very, if not one of the most important pieces of legislation in a bipartisan fashion that may save some women's lives sooner than we thought, hoped and prayed.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], who has been a champion of all issues relating to women.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words and for yielding me this time. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] for their leadership on the floor on this bill, and I particularly thank the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for their overall leadership in this important bill. I know I speak for the Women's Caucus, which I cochair, when I embrace this bill in their behalf.

The Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act has two purposes as far as I am concerned. The very fact of the stamp will help to raise the consciousness of women to go for a mammogram, and the voluntary funding mechanism is most important. We have already gotten some considerable distance on breast cancer simply by raising the consciousness of women to go and get a mammogram. We now see rates falling, including rates for African-American women which were rising steadily before.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have got to move on to the next important plateaus, and those are prevention and research. We have a whole set of notions about how we may go at prevention, but none of them has been proven. We are told about lifestyle and environmental factors. We are told to do aerobics. We are told that diet has an effect, that alcohol consumption, that obesity, that chemical hazards and radiation have an effect, but nobody knows because the research is yet to be done. With this research at the National Institutes of Health and in the Department of Defense, we would look to such areas as the contribution to breast cancer made by the environment, by hormones, by genes. We would look at areas still to be uncovered, such as the role of accessibility and delivery of medical care to underserved populations. We would look at gene therapy and vaccines and chemotherapeutics. We would look at the susceptibility of various groups of women and why. Until we do that, we will not be able to conquer this disease. We have gone very far with cervical cancer because of research. We need to go the rest of the distance, and this stamp will make that possible.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the chairman of the full committee and, as we have heard here today, one of the instrumental players in this victory here today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] for yielding me this time. I want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] and the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], especially for their leadership in getting this bill to the floor and passed.

I have had a personal experience in my family with breast cancer, and I do not think people realize the impact that it has until they see somebody that they care about lose their hair. They come home one day and there are tears and they say my hair is falling out because they are under chemotherapy. Then they have to cut the hair off and buy a wig. Then they go through the problems of sickness because of chemotherapy and the radiation. It is something that people cannot imagine unless they have had it happen in their own family or to somebody that they care about.

That is why it is so important for us in this body and across this country to do everything we can to wipe out the last vestiges of cancer, all kinds of cancer, but especially breast cancer. One in eight women are going to get breast cancer in their lifetime. That is a statistic that we just simply cannot live with. The mammograms that we talk about women getting annually when they get above 40 years old many times misses the cancer, and so sometimes women carry that cancer in their body for 4 or 5 years before it manifests itself and many times it is too late for them to be saved. So anything that we can do, anything we can do to help bring about an end to breast cancer is something that this body ought to be working very hard to accomplish.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to add my support for this bill. It may not raise a lot of money but if it does not raise lot of money, at least it will raise a lot of awareness and people will realize that we have to make this a No. 1 priority in this country. I hope that one day everybody in this body who is sponsoring this bill and everybody who is supporting it will live to see cancer eradicated once and for all and women not having to wake up every day of their lives fearing a lump in their breast may be the end of their lives.

I rise in support of H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act.

I would like to commend the gentlewoman from New York, Representative MOLINARI, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Service, Representative MCHUGH, for the good work they have done on this important piece of legislation.

Breast cancer is the most common type of cancer in women. In 1996, an estimated 184,000 women were diagnosed with breast cancer and 46,000 died of the disease. Women continue to face a one in eight chance of developing breast cancer during their lifetime. Breast cancer is the leading cause of cancer death for all women aged 35–44.

Congress has made much progress in the past few years in providing funding for breast cancer research. During the 104th Congress we increased breast cancer research by increasing funding to the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Defense's Peer-Reviewed Breast Cancer Research Program by 25 percent

For fiscal year 1998, the House Appropriations Committee has approved a 9-percent funding increase to the NIH—$704 million over last year's appropriation.

However, in spite of the significant research advances that have been made in regard to breast cancer, there is still much more to be done. We still do not know what causes breast cancer, how to prevent it, or how to cure it.

We must continue to remain committed to investment in breast cancer research until we find out these answers. The more we invest in breast cancer research, the more we will be able to offer hope to women and their families.

For these reasons, I would like to voice my strong support for the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act. This bill would provide another funding stream for breast cancer research.

I would like to point out that this is an experimental program that seeks to determine whether or not this is an effective way to raise money for breast cancer research. Under this bill, the program will sunset after 2 years and GAO is required to do a study to evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of this type of fundraising.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill. Hopefully, through passage of this bill, the funding raised from this stamp will help bring us closer to eradicating breast cancer once and for all.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], who in the very short time that she has been with us has made a remarkable impact on the work of this body.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from California both for his words and also for the commitment that he has made to so many causes improving the quality of life for humankind.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that this is the best of the U.S. Congress. This act today, this exhibition of unity is really what this Congress is all about. Might I add my applause and congratulations to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], certainly the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], and the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], and certainly the words of the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS]. This is a coming together in a recognition that we need to fight a problem and pay tribute at the same time.

I would like to offer a tribute to all of the women who have lived with and maybe later died because of breast cancer, to all of the survivors and fighters day after day after day. I would like to further say to them that we are going to join this race with them, we are going to do it by passing this legislation, H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act, which would direct the U.S. Postal Service to establish a special postage rate for first class mail.

Breast cancer is the most common form of cancer in American women; 2.6 million women in the United States are living with breast cancer, 1.6 million who have been diagnosed and an estimated 1 million who do not yet know they have the disease. That is the most frightening part of this disease, as was noted earlier. It is a disease that can be in the body of women over a period of time without their knowing it: young women, women with children, women with promise, women with a future in front of them, women who are dynamic and yes, day-to-day women who are nurturers and workers every day keeping this country going.

In 1997, approximately 184,300 new cases of breast cancer will be diagnosed and 44,300 women will die from this disease. Thirty-eight percent of African-American women with breast cancer will not live more than 5 years. Of course this disease affects our families, mothers, daughters, neighbors, sisters. It is a disease that all of us want to put on our boxing gloves and fight fair, but we want to win this victory.

□ 1700

It is important to know that it impacts women who have not had a child before the age of 30. Most breast cancer, over 70 percent, however, occurs in women who have no identifiable risk factors, maybe other than knowing that women and their families have likewise had breast cancer.

And so we see this is a hidden disease, this is a frightening disease, this is a disease that is sometimes whispered around family members when they hear that Aunt Mary or Cousin Susan or their mom has breast cancer. We want to stamp out breast cancer, and we want to pay tribute to those who work so hard.

As someone who has participated year after year in the Susan Coleman Race for the Cure, so many people around the country have shown themselves proud by every fall coming together in sisterhood, along with our brothers, to fight against breast cancer. Let me say that this stamp to help us stamp out breast cancer, Mr. Speaker, is the right way for this Congress to go. Thanks to all of those who had the fortitude to do this, and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting and passing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, to express my support for H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act. This bill would direct the U.S. Postal Service to establish a special postage designation for first-class mail that will contribute a set amount to breast cancer research and education. This plan allows patrons to voluntarily choose to contribute to this funding effort. The effort cannot be minimized in any way, the crisis of breast cancer for women in the United States is claiming hundreds of thousands of lives. Experts estimate that over 2.6 million women in the U.S. are living with breast cancer, 1.6 million women who have been diagnosed, and another 1 million women who do not yet know that they have the disease. The best hope that these women have who have not yet been diagnosed is the continuing education of the public about the importance of regular examinations for the early detection of a malignancy and tireless cancer research in search for a cure. The frightening numbers go on and on, 1 out of 8 women in the United States will develop breast cancer in her lifetime. this year, a new case of breast cancer will be diagnosed every 3 minutes, and we lose a women to breast cancer in this country, every 12 minutes.

The scientific community apparently has no new answers; we know no more about breast cancer and how to cure it in 1997 as we did in 1937. The same basic treatment methods from three score ago, are unfortunately still being used today, surgery, chemotherapy, and radiation. We must find the answers, we must resolve among ourselves today, to make the difference. For too long, the diagnosis of breast cancer for America's women has been a likely death sentence, particularly for African-American women. In all, 38 percent of African-American women with breast cancer live no more than 5 years after diagnosis and 25 percent of White American women. Both of these figures are entirely too high, too many of our grandmothers, mothers, aunts, sisters, daughters, and friends have fallen to this cruel disease.

Every woman is at risk to develop breast cancer, a likelihood that increases as a women ages. Unbelievably, over 70 percent of breast cancer cases occur in women who have had no identifiable risk factors. But only 40 percent of women follow the recommended guidelines for screening mammography. It is so easy for us to think that it will never be us, it will always be someone else, but who among us is really willing to take that chance? We would say none of us, but millions of American women do so everyday. I hope that the Stamp Our Breast Cancer Act can start its efforts by educating American women that they are the most effective weapon that we have to combat the encroaching effects of breast cancer. The importance of this effort cannot be minimized because most irregularities that are found to be malignant are actually found by aware and educated women as to the obvious dangers of breast cancer.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1585, because if this option to give to the effort to end this unfortunate crisis saves one life, it has done more than enough. For our families, for our daughters and granddaughters, we must act now, so that their world is a much safer and better place than our own.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] a woman who has always been at the forefront of health issues, and particularly women's health issues, and an original cosponsor of the first Fazio bill on this initiative.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank the gentleman, the chairman of the subcommittee that had this legislation, not only for yielding the time, but for the work and leadership that he has provided.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act. It enhances the quality of life, it enhances and keeps families together.

This bill, which was sponsored by the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is built on legislation offered in this Congress and in the laws by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]. I am a cosponsor of both bills, and I am really pleased that my two colleagues have worked with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] to develop a bill that we hope will open up a new avenue for biomedical research funding. I also want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for their cooperation in bringing this bill to the floor.

H.R. 1585 authorizes a 2-year demonstration program establishing a special postal rate for first class mail for those who wish to contribute to breast cancer research. After administrative expenses have been covered, 70 percent of the funds raised will go to the National Institutes for Health for breast cancer research, 30 percent will go to the Department of Defense for its peer-reviewed breast cancer research program. At the end of the 2-year demonstration, the General Accounting Office will be required to report to Congress on the effectiveness of this fundraising strategy. The bill includes provisions to ensure adequate oversight and payment for administrative costs incurred by the postal service; in other words, a very well-crafted bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides a potential source of additional funding for breast cancer and other public health priorities. Despite the progress that has been made, we still know very little about breast cancer treatment and prevention. Last year approximately 182,000 women were diagnosed with breast cancer, and 46,000 died from the disease. Women have a 1 in 8 chance of breast cancer during their lifetimes. Establishing a new source of research dollars is particularly important at a time when Federal resources are being squeezed as a result of our efforts to balance the budget. We must be more creative in our efforts to increase our investment in biomedical research, and this bill does it.

Again I commend the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for their work on this innovative approach. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I too have no further requests for time. Let me just briefly, in closing, again thank all of those who have been involved in this initiative.

I want to pay, too, a tribute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], my colleague, for his leadership here today. I think it very clearly emphasizes the bipartisan nature of this bill and certainly recognizes the bipartisan tragedy that this disease can bring, and I urge all my colleagues to support this initiative.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act.

Over the past 3 years, I have had the honor of leading many Members of this House in the fight to promote breast cancer awareness. Last year my efforts culminated in the creation of the breast cancer stamp. The stamp is a tribute to those who have survived breast cancer and those who have not. More likely than not, each one of us, if we haven't already, will come face to face with the tragedy of breast cancer—through a mother, daughter, wife, grandmother, niece, aunt, or neighbor. Every time a book of stamps is purchased at the post office, people will be reminded of the urgency for early detection of breast cancer in order to save millions of women's lives.

Unfortunately, increasing public awareness and educating women about the importance of early detection and diagnosis is not enough. We must do more.

According to the National Cancer Institute, Nassau and Suffolk Counties rank first and fourth respectively, in breast cancer mortality rates among the 116 largest counties in the United States. Research is a valuable and indispensable instrument in trying to understand this devastating disease. Right now on Long Island, the National Cancer Institute is conducting a $15 million study examining the environmental effects that may be factors in breast cancer in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. Yet, we must do more.

H.R. 1585 builds upon the success of the Breast Cancer Awareness Stamp, by authorizing a 2-year demonstration project to offer the public a new way to fund research for breast cancer by raising money through specially designed U.S. postage stamps. The stamps will be offered for purchase as an alternative to regular first-class postage. Seventy percent of the funds raised by this bill will be directed to the National Institute of Health and the remainder to the Department of Defense solely for the purpose of breast cancer research. Mr. Speaker, too many of our mothers, daughters, and sisters have been afflicted with this destructive disease. We must do more, and I urge my colleagues to vote today to stamp out breast cancer forever.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in supporting H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act. Breast cancer is an especially horrific disease that attacks one out of eight women in the United States. With these numbers, almost no family in the United States is immune from this disease that kills thousands each year. Too many of our mothers, sisters, and daughters each year suffer from the ravages of this disease. Nearly 45,000 women will die this year from breast cancer alone, with more than 180,000 new cases diagnosed. In Texas, 2,800 women will die, and we will add 11,500 new breast cancer cases to the rolls.

We have made progress in recent years, in early detection, diagnosis, and treatment. But we are too far from adequate treatment and too far from a cure. We need to make cancer research, and breast cancer research in particular, a priority.

This bill would provide an innovative, new source of badly needed funding for breast cancer research for a 2-year demonstration period. The Postal Service would create a new postage rate for first-class mail as an alternative to the regular rate, and customers would have the choice of buying either. The Postal Service would distribute 70 percent of the revenues raised to the National Institutes of Health and 30 percent to the Department of Defense breast cancer research program. These moneys will not displace any other funding.

I support this effort and urge passage of the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act. My hometown of San Antonio is a growing cancer research center, where doctors and researchers work with brave, valiant women to improve treatment and further our understanding of breast cancer. I am confident that with perseverance and proper funding, we will find ways to conquer breast cancer. This legislation is a step in the right direction.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Snowbarger). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHugh) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1585, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. LANTOS. 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 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1585, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

POSTPONING VOTES DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1853, CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1997

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 1853, pursuant to House Resolution 187, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may, first, postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment, and, second, reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes.

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

Mr. CLAY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, there is no agreement to rolling the vote on this side after five. Who did the gentleman from Pennsylvania negotiate that with?

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 187 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1853.

□ 1707

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1853) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, with Mr. Ewing in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, July 17, 1997, pending was the amendment by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do that so that I can call to the attention of the Members and anyone who may be watching the proceeding exactly what legislation we are dealing with today. My colleagues will hear more emotional comments made, but in many instances not too relevant to what we are doing.

H.R. 1853 authorizes funding for vocational-technical education. I repeat: H.R. 1853 authorizes funding for vocational-technical education. For the first time in this legislation we deal with access to excellence instead of access to mediocrity. The most difficult thing to do around here over the years, has been to get people to think beyond access, because in so many instances it was access to mediocrity.

But here we are talking about authorizing funding for vocational-technical education in 43 of the 50 States, that funding goes primarily to vocational-technical education at the secondary level, vocational-technical education at the secondary level, area vocational-technical schools at the secondary level. That is primarily what we are talking about in this legislation.

Now if we have a one-size-fits-all, and we decide this one-size-fits-all set-aside is good, then we have to keep in mind that the money must come from somewhere. And under this proposal we would take it from the secondary education programs for which 43 of the States use the money that we are talking about today. So it is extremely important that we understand what we are doing today. We are talking primarily about secondary vocational-technical education.

Now, I do not take a back seat to anybody when we talk about the importance of special populations. And so, I remind my colleagues again, that in this legislation section 114 on the State application asks the State to describe, (A) how to provide vocational technical education programs that lead to high-skill, high-wage careers for members of special populations, including displaced homemakers, single parents, single pregnant women, and (B) ensure that members of special populations meet State benchmarks, because again we are talking about excellence now, not access to mediocrity.

In section 115, on accountability, each State that receives an allotment under section 102 shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report on how the State is performing on State benchmarks that relate to vocational-technical education programs. In preparing the report, the State may include information about technical education benchmarks that the State may establish; and (B), Special Populations—the report submitted by the State in accordance with subparagraph (A) shall include a description of how special populations, displaced homemakers, single parents and single pregnant women have performed on meeting these benchmarks established by the State.

Then we talk in section 201 about State uses of funds, and again we talk about special populations, and the State must tell in an assessment how the needs of special populations are being met.

So I want to make very sure that everyone understands that we have one, two, three, four, five, six different statements, six different sections dealing with special populations. But more importantly when we talk about special populations, as I indicated, here we are talking primarily about taking money away from secondary vocational education programs in 43 of those States.

But we have other programs, one that just came from our Committee back in May. We passed the Employment Training and Literacy Enhancement Act that significantly expands services, for displaced homemakers. The bill includes displaced homemakers in the definition of dislocated workers, making them eligible for $1.3 billion in employment and training services. In addition, displaced homemakers are eligible to receive services under the Disadvantaged Adult Employment Training Program, another billion dollars, and then another $3 billion for welfare-to-work in the Balanced Budget Act.

So we have not done anything other than increase the opportunity for special populations, not just to get access, but to get access to quality.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, for the past 10 years, the Perkins Act has contained strong provisions to address the needs of displaced homemakers and to encourage advancement of women in nontraditional employment. Unfortunately, this bill repeals the act's emphasis on gender equity, and I think that is a shame, Mr. Chairman.

□ 1715

I think that the amendment of the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] will put that back into the bill, and I rise in support of that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the House that we cut off debate and consideration of this amendment on Thursday last, and we were not able to bring it to a vote. There was a very large number of Members who were here on the floor to speak about the amendment, but just to refresh our memories on the pending amendment, what it seeks to do is simply to say, hold harmless the amounts of monies and numbers of programs that are in existence today specifically to deal with vocational education and training for displaced homemakers, single parents, pregnant women, and to particularly allocate funding for a gender equity coordinator for this program. The reason for the amendment is that the bill we are considering eliminates the targeted program that has been in place and established for over 13 years.

If it were simply a matter of eliminating this set-aside of funding, and the program directives and direction and so forth are the same, perhaps this is an overly sensitive concern. But bear in mind that this program has been totally rewritten, overhauled. We have a new approach which has been now set down by the majority. If we do not hold harmless this program, I fear that the program will just simply be lost in the confusion.

We saw how difficult it was for the States to accommodate to the new rules under welfare. They had to completely revamp their programs, and in the process there was much confusion, and many of the people were left out in the process. This group of individuals, the single parents and displaced homemakers, is too critical a group of individuals to cause this confusion because we are rewriting this legislation.

It seems to me absolutely critical that we hold harmless this program. We are not adding any more money. We are not even keeping the 10 percent set-aside. We are simply saying that those programs that exist now should continue to exist, and the program emphasis, to deal with the special problems of displaced homemakers and single parents, ought to have the consideration of this Congress.

In view of the fact that the welfare legislation has now put a very high premium on jobs for those on welfare, the single parents we are so concerned about, that they find work and get off of welfare and become self-sufficient, in the language of the bill we have specifically said that work activity includes vocational education and training and they may have this benefit for 12 months. So the Congress has recognized the importance of vocational education and training and directed work activity as including the definition of vocational education.

So with that as a mandate by this Congress in the welfare reform act, it seems extremely urgent that we continue this program in order that these individuals now, under the demand of the Congress that they find work, not find empty spaces, nonexistent programs, when they are looking for vocational training in order to better their skills and get employment that can put them into the position of supporting their families and being self-sufficient. That is what this Congress said: Get out and work, get trained if you do not have the skills, support your own families, and become part of the contributing part of our society.

So it seems to me absolutely parallel that we support this amendment, continue the vocational education programs, and target this program to this special needs community. So I urge this House to support this amendment and continue the program with a hold harmless provision.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I just want to echo the

comments of my friend, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], and support this amendment. What we are talking about here is a program that has worked, that has a proven track record of improving the lives of women and girls.

Let me just say that if Members are in doubt of that, all they need to do is look at the 1996 GAO study entitled ''Employment Training: Successful Projects, Shared and Common Strategy.'' The single parent displaced homemaker program funded through the Florida set-aside was cited as one of the most successful training programs. Most of the 1,300 single parent displaced homemakers programs that we have follow this Florida model.

A study of Oregon's displaced homemaker, single parent program documented the long-term success of this program in increased employment rates from 28 to 71 percent of the participants, 28 to 71 percent; increased median wage rates from $6 an hour to $7.45 an hour, and a reduction of the AFDC dependency from 29 percent to 15 percent.

In Arizona, participants in these programs averaged higher median wages and worked more hours than they did prior to their participation. Women in nontraditional jobs have increased in Arizona from 7 to 17 percent. And in Georgia, participant salaries increased from an average of $11,000 prior to participation to about $16,500.

So these programs are important. They are important to women, they are important to girls, they are important to raising the standard of living of people who are in a situation who are trying to move from work. They are terribly important to our society.

Here we have a program with a proven track record. It has had bipartisan support. As I understand it, this was Senator HATCH's idea in the Senate. It has had great support here in Republicans and Democrats in the past. I hope that we will continue with this program. It is a set-aside of a reasonable percent. It is not a huge percent. It is a reasonable percent of programs that work. If we are trying to move people from welfare to work, we ought to stick with this program that has had a proven track record.

I commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], and all those who are working in support of this program.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Mink amendment because the distinction the amendment makes is vital. It is a distinction that this body makes all the time in favor of the most vulnerable and the least likely to take advantage of Federal fund opportunities. These are the women who are most likely to have been tracked into low-wage jobs. We can untrack them and undo that discrimination by allotting a very small portion of these funds for them.

Why go to that trouble? Why not use what is already in the bill? The reason is that there is no question but that these funds, like most Federal funds, are likely to go disproportionately to the best-educated and the most conscious; those who understand their rights and the availability of funds. Those happen not to be displaced homemakers, single pregnant women, or single parents.

This body has a vested interest in the Mink amendment because these are the women most likely to cost the government the most, because these are the women most likely to be dependent and the women least armed with education and experience. We make distinctions of this kind all the time, and ought to continue to make them.

Constantly, Mr. Chairman, I see Federal opportunities getting to people who would get them anyway. We need to make it impossible to spend a certain amount of this money, this small amount, except for the most vulnerable. Nothing guarantees that except the Mink amendment. What it means is that the funders, the States and cities, are going to have to do outreach rather than simply report to us that they tried to do outreach.

The Mink amendment encompasses a long, bipartisan tradition. This is not the year to break that tradition. I thank the gentlewoman for indeed striving to continue this important tradition.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mink amendment. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has a duty to provide political leadership in our Nation. We hear a lot of talk these days about States' rights. I was a State Senator in Ohio, and I know about the importance of State government action. But I also know that State officials look very carefully at the policies put forward by the Federal Government. We shirk our duties if we do not convey to the States the issues and the approaches which Congress considers to be important for the unity and economic security of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the Mink amendment provides an excellent example of the importance of Federal leadership. I have watched the progress of the vocational education bill carefully. I have seen my colleagues insert a special set-aside for rural areas, a provision that has been expanded to rural and urban areas. At the same time, I have seen a set-aside for gender equity programs eliminated from the bill.

Need I point out the inconsistency here? Are people somehow more important because they live in a particular rural or urban area? What about the importance of women and girls having the opportunity to enter any and all occupations so they can make the maximum contribution to our economy?

Mr. Chairman, for 13 years the Congress has felt that programs for displaced homemakers, for single parents, gender equity programs, were so important in vocational education that we required States to spend a certain percentage of the Federal funds that they received. Is the Congress now saying that this policy was wrong?

Mr. Chairman, the Mink amendment is a reasonable and moderate measure to continue Federal Government policy. It would restore the vocational education equity coordinator. It would require that localities that now have gender equity programs continue those programs.

If this amendment is defeated, it will send a clear signal to the States. It will signal that the rights of women and girls are not important when it comes to vocational education programs. It will lead to the elimination of dozens of very successful programs that have helped thousands of single parents and displaced homemakers. It will harm the ability of women to move into nontraditional jobs, the sort of high skill-high wage jobs that allow them to move out of the pink collar ghetto.

I commend my colleagues who have exercised the commitment and determination to keep these programs alive for the benefit of all students, and I ask my colleagues to join with me in supporting the Mink amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Let me remind Members that training women for a livable wage for jobs that are nontraditional, for the same jobs their counterparts trained for, the men that earn a livable wage, by training these women for those jobs, we prevent welfare. In fact, we get people off of welfare.

With welfare reform in our face, we now have the challenge to help women support their families, to help women who have children move from welfare to work. We must help these women by supporting them through vocational education programs that will get them into jobs that pay a livable wage, the same jobs the males in their lives have that can and will support a family.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not train women for nontraditional jobs we are saying to those women, women, stay behind the typewriter, stay as a service worker, stay as a nurse's aide, but do not compete with the men, because the men have the jobs that pay a livable wage. We want to prevent welfare. We want to get families off of welfare. We must, we must, and we must give women a chance by supporting them in vocational education. Please support the Mink amendment.

□ 1730

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the very distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding to me, the gentleman from New York.

I say that because I know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has been concerned about questions of set-aside programs and certainly special populations, and most explicitly I know of his extraordinary interest in vocational education per se. I want to explain not only to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] but to others here, because there is a misperception, particularly a misperception of the last speaker based on his own experience in the State legislature that somehow we are leaving the special populations, particularly women, out there in this legislation without any protection that the Federal Government or this legislation is going to have some sort of control or monitoring of the State programs.

I wanted to tell my colleagues that that is a wrong understanding of what we are trying to do here. The Mink amendment would set up a set-aside, and some would even say quotas, actually, but precise set-aside for only those populations. However, the bill is reformed to provide grants to the States for all special populations and to have, and I must stress this, to have enforcement mechanisms in there to ensure that the States do their jobs. That is why I wanted to address this.

For example, the concerns of the special populations under this bill are accommodated under page 29, which I specifically referenced the other day when we were talking about this and debating this. This statement on page 29 refers to how the State has to take certain actions in accordance with the legislation that include all populations in specifically displaced homemakers, single parents and pregnant women.

Further, the legislation does include the necessary enforcement mechanisms and penalties. If the State application fails to show where the State will ensure that the special populations meet or exceed the benchmarks, then the Secretary can disapprove the State application; that is, the Secretary of Education. In addition, the Secretary and the Department could also sanction the State by withholding all or part of the grant.

I think also we must turn to section 115 on accountability, which mentions in section B, and I am reading now, quoting from the legislation, B, special populations, the report submitted by the State in accordance with paragraph (a) shall include, not may, shall include a description of how special populations, displaced homemakers, single parents and single pregnant women participating in vocational technical programs have performed in meeting the vocational technical education benchmarks established by the State.

Then it goes on to tell how they are required in terms of the funding to comply with the requirement.

I appreciate the gentleman from New York yielding to me. I hope this satisfies his questions on the subject.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, it most certainly does. I thank the gentlewoman for a wonderful explanation.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Mink-Morella-Sanchez amendment to ensure gender equity in vocational technical education. I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, immediately prior to my election to this body, I served for 8 years, or two terms, as the elected State superintendent of the schools of the State of North Carolina. As a former State school chief, I know firsthand how important gender equity is in vocational education. According to the 1990 census data, there were more than 15.6 million homemakers in this Nation that were displaced, and a half a million of those homemakers live in North Carolina. In North Carolina single mothers care for more than 130,000 children. In my State an estimated 128,000 families with children live in poverty, and 81,000 or 63.6 percent of those families are headed by women. We must empower these women to succeed in today's economy.

Mr. Chairman, gender equity has produced significant and positive results in female enrollment and work force development in North Carolina. In 1986, there were 140,000 women enrolled in vocational education. Today in North Carolina that number is 190,000. These students have a 98 percent completion rate; 84 percent go on to post-high school education or training at our technical schools or in the job market.

Female participation in the apprenticeships have an 87 percent completion rate in their efforts to prepare workers for the work force.

Finally, in North Carolina our gender equity is linked, or maybe I should say partnered, with our local community groups and with business groups to match their skills when they come out of the public school. This arrangement provides for effective use of our resources and effectively and efficiently expands opportunities.

This amendment would protect efforts serving these displaced homemakers, single parents and pregnant women. The amendment would simply require that localities maintain funding at the same level as they did in 1997 and restore current law with respect to the vocational education equity coordinators that oversee, coordinate and make sure that equity is there.

Mr. Chairman, public education is the great equalizer in our society. By equipping people with the tools they need to make the most of their God-given talents, we must empower them to achieve the American dream and to succeed. Every American citizen deserves no less.

Not a guaranteed result, but a guaranteed opportunity. That is what this Congress ought to do. Sadly, without gender equity, women and girls will be shortchanged. If we are going to keep raising the bar, we better make sure that people can jump.

Equity access to education initiatives help women become self-sufficient and stay off welfare. Gender equity helps women attain higher skills, higher technical training that is necessary to land the best jobs in today's economy and will be essential to America's economic prospects in the 21st century. Without this amendment to H.R. 1853, it would fundamentally change our vocational education policy and threaten to roll back the clock against gains women have made in the workplace.

The effect of this change would be to reward localities that have lagged behind the effort to expand educational opportunity to girls and women. It would send a signal that this Congress no longer believes that efforts for girls and women, for displaced homemakers and single parents should be a priority. That is exactly the wrong signal that we should be sending in 1997.

Under H.R. 1853, a State can serve no displaced homemakers, no single parents, no single pregnant women and no individual training for nontraditional employment and under this bill it would be OK. That is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, during the previous Congress, Members of this House launched an all-out attack on public education that was devastating to the morale of the people who worked in the public schools. I stood with them shoulder to shoulder. I am here to tell my colleagues today, that is not going to happen in 1997. We need to stand up for girls and women and pass this amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mink-Morella amendment. I do so for the following reasons: First of all, in this body we all tend to talk in bumper sticker solutions. We all say, families first agenda. We all say, fix welfare now.

Well, this Mink-Morella amendment is the vehicle that these bumper stickers are attached to because this is the car that actually solves some of these problems. The solution does not fit on a bumper sticker. It is much more complicated than that. It is about getting education and fairness and equity to some of the people that have the most difficult time in America getting that education and equity and justice and fairness.

The Mink-Morella legislation would restore the 10.5 percent set-aside and also make sure that we have the equity coordinator. We have heard some speakers get up and say, well, there is no reason for this legislation. There is no reason to do this.

Prior to the Perkins law in 1984, less than 1 percent, less than 1 percent of all basic State grant money was spent

for displaced homemakers, and only 0.2 percent of all State and local matching funds went for these activities. So if we just assume that these problems are going to be fixed by leaving it up to some magic wand theory or bumper sticker, then they are not going to get fixed.

Previous speakers have also said that 63 percent of those welfare families are headed by females. This program is completely oriented toward helping those people get off of welfare and not tracking them into low wage, low pay jobs but giving them some of the necessary skills so that they can work up the ladder and get higher skills and higher pay down the ladder.

I know that a lot of Members in this body, particularly on the other side, are concerned about costs. What about costs? Well, I am a strong advocate of balancing the budget, and costs are certainly one of the most compelling reasons to vote for the Mink-Morella legislation.

In 1996, sex equity reserves were documented in several States to reduce welfare expenditures. Let me say that again. In 1996, sex equity reserves were documented in several States to reduce the welfare expenditure costs. So making sure that we spend money on education and training and equity reduces the costs later on on welfare expenditures.

In States like Missouri, they have saved more than $1.4 million in welfare payments. In Georgia's New Connections to Work Program, they saved $13 million over 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, if Members want to help some of the most vulnerable people in America, if they truly want to put families first, if they want to help us fix welfare and not just put bumper sticker solutions out there, if we want to do real things to help people, to help single parents, to help pregnant women, to help displaced homemakers, then they will vote for the Mink-Morella amendment. They will help put a vehicle, a car, fueled with gas, with answers, with strength, with solutions to propel that bumper sticker slogan that wants to put families first, to fix welfare, they will vote for that vehicle that will help us solve some of these problems in America.

Vote for the displaced homeworker. Vote for the single parent. Vote for the pregnant woman. Vote to fix welfare and put our families first. Vote for the Mink-Morella amendment.

□ 1745

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to speak in support of the Mink-Morella amendment to the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act. This amendment is essential in preserving an existing program that effectively serves the needs of girls and women in our vocational education system.

This amendment provides the programs serving displaced homemakers, single parents, pregnant women and those that promote gender equity in vocational education should be held harmless. The whole notion of set-aside is the same way of saying we hold harmless at the same rates that we had already, 10.5 percent for these programs.

These programs have proven themselves effective. For instance, in 1996, there was a GAO study entitled ''Employment Training: Successful Projects Share Common Strategy,'' stating that these programs are very effective indeed in moving people from welfare to work. Again, a similar program evaluated in the State of Oregon showed their displaced homemaker, single parent program, documenting its long-term success in increasing the number of people who were earning beyond the minimum wage, from $6.00 per hour to $7.45.

Mr. Chairman, this program indeed is effective. It has indeed proven what other programs promise to do, and for that reason I am delighted indeed to support this program.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Much has been said about the effect of provisions in the legislation that we are considering today that call for benchmarks and for the preparation of a State plan which include language for consideration for displaced homemakers, single parents and pregnant women. I acknowledged that in the earlier debate last week. But what we are concerned about is that once submitting a State plan, once acceding to the idea that there would be benchmarks, there is no enforcement mechanism.

Under the provisions of this bill, the State could serve not a single displaced homemaker because there is no way in which there can be any sort of enforcement, and that is the consequence that we fear.

Most people on both sides of the aisle acknowledge that the funding that was created 13 years ago, setting aside 10 percent of this program for the displaced homemaker, for the single parents, was an extremely worthwhile program. Why create a bill now that is totally different in its mechanism and risk the chance that some of these programs will fall by the wayside at the very time when we are enforcing the welfare reform bill and saying that people on welfare or single parents must find work activity?

Work activity is vocational training, and they need to have a place that can give them special attention, recognizing the fact that they are on welfare and want to make the 12 months that they are entitled to have of vocational training produce the kind of skills that can guarantee them a job which can support their family.

That is the whole idea of this, to get women into a position where they can qualify for nontraditional jobs, make enough money so that they can support their families.

In the brief time I have left, I wanted to also note that in the debate on Thursday there was mention that no one has come forth discussing the needs of this special program for the single parents, for the pregnant women, displaced homemakers, and for the sex equity coordinator. Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, many of the people who wrote to the committee also sent copies to the minority side and we have here a whole pile of letters that came in.

They are dated early June, mid-June, June 6, June 12, June 8, and so forth, from people all across the country addressing their concerns to the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], who is the chair of the subcommittee. And I am sure that if the staff will look in their files, they will find many of these letters.

Not only that, there was a witness that testified in the subcommittee that brought forth the importance of this program and urged the subcommittee continue the funding of this special emphasis program. So I am startled that there was reference to the fact that there were no letters.

At an appropriate time I will ask the House to allow me to insert these letters in the RECORD for the benefit of the House.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise not just as a woman, but also as a single parent in opposition to the Mink amendment.

H.R. 1853 authorizes funding for vocational-technical education. This bill benefits women already because it directs funds to local vo-tech programs giving women the opportunity to receive a quality education.

The bill also requires States to establish benchmarks and show how these vo-tech programs prepare special students groups: Specifically, displaced homemakers, single parents, and single pregnant women for postsecondary education or entry into high-skilled, high-wage jobs. In this way, Mr. Chairman, this bill actually protects the funds going into programs for women.

The Mink amendment, however, would mandate that States set aside funds for local areas to maintain gender-based programs even where they might not be needed. For example, Washington State is due to receive more than $19 million for vocational educational spending under title II and title III of the Carl D. Perkins Act, 90 percent of which will go directly to the local level.

Under the Mink amendment, more than $2 million of the $19 million would be reserved, set aside, for gender-based programs that are already adequately addressed and protected in H.R. 1853.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose the Mink amendment and support the thoughtful, pro-woman bill reported by the committee.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DUNN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. This has been an interesting debate to listen to. I support the goals of the Mink amendment, I support the gentleman from Indiana and what his goals are, and the gentleman from Cleveland and the gentlewomen from the different parts of this country. But what we are really doing with the Mink amendment is we are going to be putting a lot more money in bureaucracy and less money in the classroom. It is a bureaucracy builder.

Historically, we set aside at the State level. The Mink amendment says that each and every school district must spend no less than it did in the previous year. That means we have to have a Federal bureaucracy and a State bureaucracy that will monitor every district in this country, every vocational school in this country to make sure that they spend the exact dollar amount that they spent last year. Do we need this kind of oversight from the Federal Government?

My colleagues keep talking about the welfare-to-work bill. I helped write Pennsylvania's welfare bill. Every State is targeting the population of displaced homemakers, single pregnant women and sex equity program because that is the majority of the welfare population. They are using Federal and State welfare-to-work moneys to do that. We have expanded the ability to use the job training moneys in a bill we recently passed. Many States have promoted and expanded their homemaker training programs. And any State that wants to meet the Federal mandate is going to target this population.

The bill, in four different areas, talks about this population, that it must be part of the plan, it must be a benchmark, we must meet those goals or they do not get the money. To put a mandate on every vocational training program in America, that they must spend the exact same amount as last year, does nothing but create a bureaucracy that will waste millions of dollars that will train nobody.

I think the Mink amendment, Mr. Chairman, has laudable goals, but I think it misses the mark. What the gentlewoman is talking about is happening. Any State that is not making it happen is not going to be able to implement the welfare reform bill.

It is an unneeded amendment, it is an amendment that will waste dollars in bureaucracy at the national and at the State level. It will force every State to hire a $60,000 sex equity coordinator, whether needed or not. Let us leave that up to the States.

Every State has a built-in incentive to make this happen. This amendment will only put money into the hands of bureaucrats and not train displaced homemakers, single pregnant women, or bring sex equity.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the last dialog indicates that we really do need a mandate to affirmatively ensure that there is a reality in this bill, and that is that we do have vocational training for women, and as well that we remedy the equity disparity that comes across in many instances.

A 1993 CRS report on the educational status of women confirms that public high school girls participating in vocational educational programs tend to be clustered in traditionally female occupations and, as well, an analysis reported in an American Association of University Women Report, ''How Schools Shortchange Girls'' concluded that the problem of sex segregation in vocational education programs continues to exist both at the secondary and postsecondary level.

This particular amendment, does not add amount of moneys for women vocational programs, homemakers, single parents, pregnant women but rather it requires States to maintain fiscal year 1997 funding as well as it provides for an equity gender specialist for each State to make sure women are treated fairly in vocational training programs.

Let me just simply say, Why do we not have women airplane mechanics, and there may be some; why are there not more computer technicians, and there may be some; why are there not more women specializing in the building trades, and there may be some? The reason is because we need someone who oversees the programs in the State who says, ''I do not want to give an incentive, I want to see the job done.''

We want the job done. This is a good amendment to get the job done, to ensure that women have equal access along with men in training in unusual vocational trades that traditionally are geared toward men.

In this time when Republicans are pushing welfare to work—let us give women, single parents, displaced homemakers, pregnant, a fighting chance to get good high-paying jobs with the right kind of vocational training.

I clearly think we must pass this amendment, the Mink-Morella-Sanchez-Woolsey-Millender-McDonald amendment that fairly says to women, ''You, too, can do it.''

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment and thank Congresswomen MINK, MORELLA, SANCHEZ, and WOOLSEY for their leadership in protecting vocational and educational programs for women and girls.

This amendment to H.R. 1853 will preserve existing programs serving the needs of girls and women in our vocational education system. The amendment will accomplish this by requiring that local recipients of vocational education funds spend at least as much as they spent in fiscal year 1997 on programs for displaced homemakers, single parents, single pregnant women, and programs which promote gender equity.

This amendment is critical to remedy the cuts that have been made in H.R. 1853. The vocational education reauthorization bill in its current form eliminates a 10.5-percent set-aside of State moneys required under current law for these programs. The bill also eliminates the equity coordinator required in every State to oversee, coordinate, and evaluate equity initiatives in vocational education.

My colleagues, it is critical that we pass this amendment for while we have made significant progress in the area of educational equity, to end our emphasis on these areas now would result in serious setbacks as illustrated by a 1993 CRS report on the educational status of women. This study confirms that public high school girls participating in vocational educational programs tend to be clustered in traditionally female occupations. Additionally, analysis reported in the American Association of University Women report, ''How Schools Shortchange Girls,'' concluded that the problem of sex segregation in vocational education programs continues to exist at both the secondary and postsecondary level.

For these reasons I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to pass this important amendment and in so doing to protect these important programs. Thank you.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from California, who happens to be a cosponsor of this very good and positive legislation.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, the gracious gentlewoman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard the old adage, I have been there, done that. As the former director of a gender equity program, I can tell my colleagues firsthand how successful these programs are. It is not by happenstance, it is because there was a gender equity coordinator at the State level that ensured that we followed an accountability trail of these programs.

I cannot imagine that we are trying to argue with success or even challenge it. These are successful programs that were done by this person, who was the director of gender equity programs for the second largest unified school district in America, the Los Angeles one, and we simply ensured that those women who were most vulnerable received the type of access to the vocational programs that gender equity ensured.

What is missing here is the whole notion that one thinks that we can put this money in vocational programs and those vulnerable groups would be serviced. Let me just say that these are women who need not only the vocational training and the skills, but they need the self-esteem, the self-worth. That is what comes when the gender equity coordinator at the helm, at the State level, ensures that those of us directors throughout the Nation and throughout the States provide for these women.

This amendment, our amendment, is a hold harmless amendment which does not restore the set-aside that has been

articulated numerous times, much to my chagrin. The main purpose of the Perkins Act is to improve the quality of vocational education and to provide access to quality vocational education for special populations.

I have seen 80 percent of the participants with children, 80 percent of participants on some form of public assistance be enhanced and enriched by this Perkins equity program. I say to my colleagues that those who do not see the need to service those who are most vulnerable, those who are moving from welfare to work to get gender equity programs, I feel are short-sighted.

□ 1800

So I say to my colleague, a person who has been there and done that, do know the success of this program, gender equity programs, Mr. Chairman, do work for those women, those pregnant women, the displaced homemakers, and those who are in need of this program.

I would say to all of my colleagues to support the Mink, et al. amendment, of which I am one of the cosponsors.

The amendment: This is a hold-harmless amendment which does not restore the 10.5 percent set-aside, at the State level but rather, assures that these valuable services to an often overlooked population continue. The Mink - Morella - Woolsey - Sanchez - Millender- McDonald amendment would require that localities currently funding such programs continue to provide funding for these purposes at, at least, the same level as fiscal year 1997. This amendment would also restore the requirement that a vocational education equity coordinator exist in every State.

The main purpose of the Perkins Act is to improve the quality of vocational education and to provide access to quality vocational education for special populations such as women who are single mothers and displaced homemakers. We need this amendment to ensure that we continue to meet this purpose.

In the Los Angeles Unified School District, where I served as the director of gender equity programs, the preliminary statistics for the 1996–97 year: 1,642 adult women completed programs offered through the Perkins grants—several more attended classes but did not complete the courses; 2,600 teen mothers benefiting from these programs—5,000 total teen mothers in Los Angeles city school district, 10,000 in Los Angeles country; ages range from 14 to 62, median age is 30's; 80 percent of participants have children; 80 percent of participants on some form of public assistance; 68 percent of participants are Hispanic; 14–16 percent of participants are African-American; and 4–6 percent of participants are Asian-Americans.

Results of the Los Angeles Unified School District's gender equity programs: 50 percent of participants are employed after completing these programs which directly results in reducing the number of people receiving public assistance.

State of California—98 percent of the Perkins Act funding in 1996 was distributed to local districts in the State of California

These programs help over 1,000 school districts and 107 community colleges in California regardless of whether they receive the Perkins funding

Throughout the country the long-term success rate of these single and displaced homemaker programs is very impressive. in the neighboring State of Oregon in 1996: Employment rates soared from 28 to 71 percent; median wage rates increased from $6 per hour to $7.45 per hour; and dependence on AFDC of the program participants fell from 29 to 15 percent.

In Arizona, women in nontraditional jobs have increased from 7 to 17 percent.

In Georgia, participants' annual salaries increased from an average of $11,000 prior to participation to an average of $16,500, and the New Connections to Work Program saved the State $13 million in welfare savings over 10 years.

In Pennsylvania, these programs saved the State $2.3 million in welfare savings in the 1994 program year.

MR. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, did you hear objection when previous speakers who spoke on this subject at some length in earlier days sought to address the House?

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, no one on this side has spoken more than once. We have yielded to everybody who spoke. Someone has yielded, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Members who spoke on this amendment last week, have been allowed to speak again this week with unanimous consent.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, we have not had a single speaker today who spoke on his or her own time last week. The ones who spoke last week were yielded time by other speakers. My colleague cannot name one person who has spoken twice.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] for his courtesy in yielding and would just note to him, I must marvel at our colleagues' selective memory in terms of how this debate has unfolded on the floor.

But my point in seeking to be recognized, Mr. Chairman, is to let our colleagues know that our bill, as reported out of committee, is a vast improvement upon current law. It reduces bureaucracy at the Federal and State government levels, it caps State administrative expenses so that more dollars can actually reach students, and it decreases mandates on States and local school districts so that they may create vocational programs that reflect their own needs and priorities.

The Mink amendment would undercut each of the improvements I have just mentioned. Rather than allowing States and localities to set their own priorities based on their own local vocational needs, and I know that is a radical thought to our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, sex equity programs would be mandated. And we have heard several speakers on this side of the aisle refer to it as just what it is, and that is a mandate.

All we are doing in this amendment is talking about transferring a State set-aside down to the local level so a State set-aside becomes a local set-aside, and we replace a State mandate with a local mandate. I would love to hear any speaker on the other side of the aisle stand up and deny that as the case.

This does not make sense. The gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] made reference to testimony before the subcommittee. May I remind her that Paul Cole, the vice president of the American Federation of Teachers, testified in front our Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families in support of eliminating set-asides. My colleagues heard me correct. Paul Cole, vice president of the American Federation of Teachers.

In fact, I quote from his testimony now. ''Federal legislation should eliminate set-asides at State and local levels. Funding formulas for special populations are harmful when they provide an incentive for schools to retain students in these categories because funding depends on it.''

Mr. Cole is not alone. He was simply referencing the National Assessment of Vocational Education, Final Report to Congress, Volume 1, prepared by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement at the U.S. Department of Education. I quoted from this report last week, and I quote again.

> There are two major risks in broad-brush efforts to include more and more special population students in vocational educational, including the special populations that are intended to be served by this 10½ percent set-aside, 10½ percent of the funding that is taken right off the top. The first is that factors other than the student's best interest will become more prominent in placement decisions. For example, recruiting special needs students in order to keep vocational enrollments up and thus maintain staff positions is a familiar practice, and it often complements a desire in comprehensive schools to get hard-to-educate students out of regular classes. In situations such as this, some students will benefit for participation in vocational programs, but others will not.
>
> The second risk with this practice is that vocational programs, especially those in regional schools, will increasingly become special needs programs, separated from the mainstream of secondary education, an outcome that is opposite to the very intent, the original intent behind the Perkins Act.

This is clearly dumping. It is a problem. I go on to quote from the report.

Special population students are an ever-increasing proportion of all vocational students, and the Perkins emphasis on recruiting special population students to vocational education may be among the factors contributing to this tendency.

We have tried to rectify that. We have come up with, I think, a good compromise. We have said in our bill that States and local communities should be allowed to continue to fund these programs at their choice. That is perfectly in keeping with the longstanding American tradition of local control and decentralized decision-making in public education.

Our bill already includes, but it does not mandate, and there is the difference, support for displaced homemakers, single pregnant women, and single parents at all levels of State and local vocational educational programs. We have to take a firm stand against more mandates on local schools. It is time to practice what you preach if in fact you do believe that decisionmaking should be vested at the local level.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against the Mink amendment and to say no to more mandates for local schools.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, as a longtime supporter of programs designed to assist displaced homemakers, I support the intent of the Mink amendment. However, I do have some concerns about the mandate it would impose upon States.

Since coming to Congress, I have supported transferring more authority to State and local governments. Too many times, we have adopted a one size fits all approach when we are establishing new programs or policies. In many instances, the very people that we are trying to assist could have been better served if States had been given the flexibility to create programs designed to address their specific needs.

While I believe that displaced homemakers should have access to vocational training, I want to make sure that we are serving their needs in the most effective way. I believe one way that we can assist displaced homemakers is by providing a tax credit to employers who hire and train these individuals. For over 10 years, I have sponsored such tax credit legislation, and in the 105th Congress, I have reintroduced this legislation as H.R. 402.

Displaced homemakers are primarily women who have been full-time homemakers for a number of years, but who have lost their source of economic support due to divorce, separation, abandonment, or the death or disability of a spouse. Many displaced homemakers are living at or near the poverty level, are younger than 35 and have children.

One of every six American women is a displaced homemaker. In 1990, there were 17.8 million displaced homemakers in the United States. In my own State of Florida, there were over 1.1 million displaced homemakers in 1990—a 55-percent increase since 1980.

My bill, H.R. 402, would allow employers a tax credit for hiring displaced homemakers by establishing them as a targeted group under the Work Opportunity Tax Credit [WOTC] Program. The WOTC Program is intended to combat and lessen the problem of structural unemployment among certain hard-to-employ individuals.

My bill would extend the WOTC to include displaced homemakers. Under the proposal, employers could apply for a tax credit if they hire these individuals who are having difficulty reentering the job market.

I see this approach as cost-effective. By providing prospective employers with the incentive to hire displaced homemakers, we avoid the much more costly alternative of publicly supporting these homemakers and their families.

Mr. Chairman, these are people who are in financial need and want to work. I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 402.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mink amendment.

I often say the 104th Congress was the most antiwoman Congress I can remember.

Well, the 105th is catching up.

For 13 years the Perkins Vocational Technical Education Act has provided funds to ensure that America's women do not miss out on opportunities to better their lives.

For 13 years these programs have worked.

Displaced home-makers, single parents, pregnant women, and some girls in vocational schools have been able to count on help from their government, not to bail them out, but to help them bail themselves out.

It's a fact that vocational education keeps women off welfare.

In Oregon, a recent study documented its long-term success in increasing employment rates from 28 to 71 percent. Wages increased. Fourteen percent of the women on welfare got off.

In Arizona, not only did wages increase, but the number of women in nontraditional jobs increased from 7 to 17 percent.

In Georgia, women benefited from the programs by increasing their salaries from $11,000 to $16,500.

Now, it's not as if the government handed those people $1,500 raises. What it did was allow them to earn those raises in the private sector themselves.

Isn't this why we're here?

Are we not in the business of helping people help themselves?

Is that not what we're trying to do in reforming the Nation's welfare program?

Many States are reporting that higher wages—achieved through the vocational program—are keeping women off welfare.

In Pennsylvania, in 1994, the setaside program saved the State $2.3 million in welfare payments.

In Missouri, $1.4 million in welfare payments were recovered.

If this Congress is truly working to get women and children off welfare, why would it cut a program that helps them do just that?

As my colleagues, Representatives MINK, MORELLA, SANCHEZ, and WOOLSEY point out, this amendment does not ask for an increase.

It only asks that the 10-percent setaside be preserved.

It restores the vocational education equity coordinator position.

And it keeps the Federal policy on track and consistent.

It shows that our effort to achieve gender equity and to help at-risk groups such as displaced homemakers and single parents stay off welfare, get an education, and keep well-paying jobs a priority.

The original intent of this legislation was to make the United States more competitive by developing more fully the academic and occupational skills of our citizens.

Our citizens who most need that help are on the verge of being cut out of the deal.

I urge a vote in support of the Mink amendment.

Mr. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mink amendment. This proposal will encourage young and middle-aged women to receive valuable skills training in occupations that have traditionally been filled by men. It will allow them to get jobs with better pay and better benefits, and make it easier for women to support their families. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this important amendment.

The Mink amendment will do all this by protecting the funds that States currently use for programs that ensure gender equity in vocational education. Make no mistake—without this protection, these programs will disappear. The evidence is clear—before 1984, when State grants were reserved for gender equity programs, only 1 percent of these grants were actually used for gender equity.

Last year, Republicans passed a bill based on a twisted premise—that if you push people off the boat, they will somehow learn to swim. The Republican bill assumed that by shredding the vital social safety net, jobs would magically appear for people. This strategy is not only cruel, it is wrong—without help in learning to swim, many people will drown.

If Congress is really serious about encouraging women to achieve financial independence, then Congress should make sure all women have the opportunity to obtain the tools they need to find a good job and support their families. The Mink amendment would provide these opportunities. I urge all of you to vote yes on the Mink amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, 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 CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KLINK

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. KLINK: Page 30 strike lines 5 through 9, and insert the following:

''(2) INFORMATION DISSEMINATION.—

''(A) STATE REQUIREMENTS.—Each State shall make the information contained in reports described under paragraph (1) available to the general public through publication and other appropriate methods which may include electronic communication.

''(B) SECRETARY REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall make the information contained

in such reports available to the general public through publication and other appropriate methods which may include electronic communication.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, I will not take all the 5 minutes. My understanding is that the majority has agreed to accept this amendment. I am pleased that we are here today to work on this bill reauthorizing the Perkins Vocational Technical Education Act.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the chairmen, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the ranking member, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] are to be commended for maintaining our country's commitment to vocational education.

This amendment is really quite simple. It will require each State to make the report required in the accountability section of this bill available to the public. The bill requires the Secretary of Education to make these reports available to the public. Local grant recipients are required to make the performance information available to the public.

My amendment would ensure that each State will make its report to the Secretary available in that State in the same manner that this legislation requires the Secretary to make these reports available on a national basis. What we are talking about is a bipartisan strive toward openness. That way, information about vocational-technical education program performance will be disseminated in the widest manner possible.

This amendment will provide for further accountability in vocational education. I would urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment. The amendment would require States to make the information contained in their report on how the State is performing in regard to their State benchmarks available to the public. This is consistent with the provisions of the bill which require the Secretary and local districts to make the information available to the public. We do accept the amendment.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. We have no objection to the amendment, and we accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

Page 52, after line 15, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

''(8) providing an on-site workforce development coordinator who will coordinate activities described in this section with an emphasis on developing additional curricula in cooperation with local area businesses;''.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment really gets to the heart of whether or not we are serious about reforming our voc education and really the general practice of whether or not we are going to be encouraging our young people in this country to go on and continue their education.

We hear statistics across America today that tell us if we are really interested in the education of our young people, we ought to recognize that we ought to look at them in terms of the 25 percentile. The top 25 percent of all American children go on to college or even higher education beyond college. They do very very well for themselves.

The next 25 percent struggles to get through high school but gets some sort of additional education. The third 25 percent in fact struggles to just get through high school. And the bottom 25 percent never even finishes high school.

The truth of the matter is, if we are serious about encouraging that bottom 50 percent to do anything more than they are currently doing, and as I just came from a hearing in the Committee on Banking, where chairman Alan Greenspan condemned all of the efforts dealing with job training in this country, it seems to me that it is critically important that we, in fact, take a look at what is really working around America.

What we find is, and I think even the chairman of the committee would agree, that there are a number of innovative and creative programs. For instance, the BIC in the city of Boston that works hand in glove with the local business community to help assist to develop a curriculum with the high schools to make certain that—in fact where I come from, the city of Boston, we have an important high-technology industry—that going to a high school where you are learning reading, arithmetic, and basic languages might be helpful but it might be very discouraging for a poor child from the inner city who does not know what in fact those courses are going to actually have to do with their ability to be able to handle or deal with the real crises and the real issues that they face in their day-to-day lives.

What we found is that by getting a coordinator who actually works with the business community and the high schools to begin to set a curriculum where in fact the high school student knows that if he completes a set of courses outside of the curriculum that the high school itself would set working with the school committee, but works on additional courses that are set by the business community, the business community then agrees to in fact provide after-school opportunities, summer youth jobs, that in fact the kids have an enormously high success rate. We have been able to see children move directly from high schools into jobs after high school and from those particular instances their rate of actually going back and continuing their education, going on to community college and in many instances 4-year schools, have been much, much higher than the population in general.

What this amendment would do is allow for the use of a coordinator, a work force coordinator to work with the business community at the level across our country, using voc educational funds to work with that business community to help set a curriculum with the high schools and through that curriculum to then ask our business community to then provide after-school programs and summer youth jobs for our kids.

It, in fact, is a program that works. And I am surprised that there would be any opposition to the simple use of a coordinator to work with the business communities and the local high schools in order to accomplish what seems to me to be a fairly reasonable and easy goal to deal with.

However, in negotiations with the other side of the aisle, it has come out that in fact the use of the word coordinator somehow gets a yellow flag on the field of the Congress of the United States. If you use anything involving the word coordinator, somehow or another there is a group of people in this country that are going to scream that we are somehow setting the agenda of our high school students and somehow we are going to be teaching them about sex or some other thing that has absolutely nothing do with what this amendment is all about.

What we are trying to accomplish here is dealing with the real needs of real people, the young people of America that are the future of this country. This is not about any kind of ideology. This is just straightforward talk about what works in America today. If we want to stand here and pass a voc-ed bill that continues programs that will not work, we just heard them talking and yacking about the fact that there are going to be mandates.

□ 1815

We mandate that we are not going to hurt women, but we do not do anything to make certain that women, young girls, are going to be encouraged to continue and get better jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the truth of the matter is that what we are trying to accomplish here is a straightforward approach to actually getting our young people of this country educated in the kinds of jobs, not just the kind of jobs that would be good in Boston but the kind

of jobs that would be good in Missouri, the kind of jobs that would be good in Pennsylvania, the kind of jobs that would be good in California or Hawaii or Virginia or any other State. Let the local people decide exactly what kind of jobs that is appropriate for their local high schools to set up. But encourage those young people. If one goes into high schools today and tells all those kids in high schools in the inner city that they can go on to a 4-year college or to community college and then ask them whether or not they intend to go, what they will find is 50 percent or more of the kids say they have no intention of going to college. Ask them why, and they say they do not think they can afford it, they do not think they can attain college. What this program will do is set up a track where these kids will get the kind of job training, get the kind of encouragement from the local business community that I think will make them a success in life.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have to make sure that we understand that this amendment would add support for a work force development coordinator at schools as an allowable use of funds under this bill. As the gentleman from Massachusetts recalled, we had a discussion regarding this issue during the debate on the job training bill earlier this year, at which time I said I would be happy to work with the gentleman when we considered the vocational education bill, and I think that our bill accommodates his concerns without specifically allowing for funding of a work force coordinator.

I understand the gentleman's concern that he is trying to get at it through his amendment, but our bill does not currently list support for any specific staff. The Federal Government should not outline what staff may or may not be hired by a school. However, what this bill does is list a number of activities as allowable uses of funds for vocational technical education programs at the local level that allow for the types of activities that I believe his amendment is trying to achieve.

Under this bill, local school districts and postsecondary institutions may use funds for involving parents, businesses, and representatives of employers in the design and implementation of vocational technical education programs. That is already an allowable use of funds. Allowable use of funds, providing guidance and counseling. Allowable use of funds, providing work-related experience, and business and education partnerships. All of this is in the present bill.

I believe that coordination activities with employers are implicitly included in these allowable activities, but again without specifically mentioning any support personnel that would be employed at local schools. In fact, this legislation does not specifically spell out support for any staff, not teachers, administrators, counselors, or coordinators.

If the gentleman had had the experience, as many of us had, during the last 3 years trying to put together a job training bill, he would understand how those 2 words in a piece of legislation, would as a matter of fact take, I would imagine, 80 votes from his side and 150 votes from my side. We carefully made sure that we did not get caught in the trap that we were caught in for a couple of years on the job training bill and had to work our way through it. If we say that we will have a work force coordinator, that just raises all sorts of problems for both sides of the aisle. I would hope that the gentleman would either withdraw the amendment or I would hope we could defeat the amendment because if we do not, in my estimation we cannot pass the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in the gentleman's opinion a few minutes ago, I thought the number was we were going to lose 40 Democrats, and now I understand the gentleman feels we would lose 80 Democrats, but setting that aside, if we were not going to lose any Democrats, does the gentleman feel substantively that this is the proper way of handling this particular piece of legislation?

Mr. GOODLING. I believe in this legislation we now do much of what the gentleman is trying to do without specifically authorizing a work force development coordinator in a high school or a secondary tech school.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I just would point out that while I recognize and I think that the gentleman has attempted to cover many of the activities that the coordinator would in fact be responsible for, I think that the gentleman has also voiced great concern over mandates without providing the resources that are necessary in order to fulfill those mandates. So by standing there and saying or suggesting that we are going to ask these schools to accomplish all of these goals but then not giving them any staff to actually be able to follow through on those promises, I am very concerned that we end up with simply a hollow bill, and I think that the gentleman and others on his side would voice the same concern, that we are simply sending out signals but we are doing nothing to actually follow through and give people the tools that are necessary to fulfill those goals.

Mr. GOODLING. Again, let me repeat, that when the gentleman mentions a work force development coordinator at schools, the gentleman is asking for the bill, in my estimation, to be defeated. I can only tell the gentleman from 3 years' experience trying to put together a job training bill, it is this kind of language and that will get us in trouble again.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me first say that I appreciate the comments of the chairman of the committee making it clear that he does not have substantive opposition to what this amendment intends to do. He does have concerns apparently with semantics and with the politics of certain code words and all, and I appreciate that. I am not surprised, though, to see him behind what such an important amendment attempts to do.

Maybe we can call it something other than a work force coordinator, but that is exactly what our schools need. I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] offering the amendment, because it is time we stopped just talking and started doing something about this issue.

In the Washington metropolitan area, we have 19,000 jobs related to computers that we cannot fill. The average salary is $47,000. Thousands of these jobs do not require any kind of college education. And what are we doing? We are going to India, we are going to Pakistan, we are going to Ireland—some people might not object to that—but nevertheless we are going every place we can find to find people to fill these jobs at very low wages. Yet they do not require any skills that our high school graduates cannot acquire, it is just that our high school graduates have not acquired those skills because they did not have the benefit of a vocational education curriculum.

We have thousands of young people in this Washington area who are desperate to find jobs. What a disservice that we have done to them. They get out of high school and they have virtually nothing to take with them when they go looking for a job. No skills, minimal education, little work preparation. Why? Because our schools are not geared up in many ways to create a match between the jobs that are available and the kids that can fill them. What a crying shame to have thousands of kids desperate for jobs, desperate for employment, desperate to find a way to support their family and yet also to have thousands of jobs unfilled.

That is what this amendment is all about. It is about trying to get someone who is going to make that match, who is going to work for the kids by working between the schools and the businesses, to consult with businesses, bring them in, tell the kids what jobs are available, what they pay, and then to help put together the kind of curricula that is going to be relevant for the jobs that are available. Unfortunately, what has happened is that many of our vocational education schools have become a dumping ground. In many ways voc ed means a dumping ground, primarily for disruptive students. This is the attitude that this amendment can help change.

In the District of Columbia we have a voc ed school, and it could have become

a good one. What happened was that the other schools started putting their most disruptive students in that school, and now it is virtually a reform school. They are not going to like me to say that, so I will not give the specific name of the school. But it is not serving their needs. What a crying shame. Yet if we had this kind of liaison between the business community and the school system, we could serve a lot of their needs. We desperately need their talents and their skills. We need to develop vocational education as an immediate step to getting a good job, to being able to go to an employer with the kind of skills and basic education and attitude that they are looking for.

So our school system is disserving these kids. Are we really going to pass this kind of bill, the Perkins bill here without addressing this most critical need? I would hope not. I would hope that we would pass this amendment, that we would underscore the need to bring the business community in for its own self-interest, in influencing the curricula, in giving the real opportunity, the real access to the jobs that are available to these kids who desperately need them.

This is an important amendment. I would urge my colleagues' strong support for it. I appreciate the support of the chairman of the committee. I know that the ranking member of the full committee from Missouri is very strongly in support of vocational education. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for introducing it. I would certainly expect and hope that this body would pass it overwhelmingly.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out to the gentleman from Virginia that we had a field hearing just across the Potomac River at Thomas Jefferson High School, which I believe is close to his congressional district, in fact he was good enough to stop in at the hearing briefly. And we saw that at Thomas Jefferson High School—which is one of the most outstanding academic high schools in the country with a long record of national merit semifinalists and a tremendous history of sending kids to the top 4-year colleges and universities in the country—they are doing this already. They are working closely with the private sector. They have extensive private sector involvement in the design of their curriculum. They have the private sector involved in any number of internships, job shadowing opportunities, and mentoring types of activities. This is all done without the need for an on-site work force development coordinator—which is a classic example of how we micromanage Federal legislation.

I do not quarrel that the gentleman is well-intentioned. But I do point out that his amendment does represent micromanagement. It is in fact not necessary because under the bill, if we look at the section of the bill dealing with permissible activities, we will see that we allow and encourage local school districts and postsecondary institutions to use funding for involving parents, businesses and representatives of employers in the design and implementation of vocational-technical education programs, to provide career guidance and academic counseling, to provide work-related experience, as I just mentioned, and to help form business-education partnerships in the local communities.

□ 1830

So the Kennedy amendment is a classic example of overkill and micromanagement.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Did the gentleman say that the outstanding Thomas Jefferson School near our colleague from Virginia's district, is already doing all of these things and the Federal Government did not have to mandate it and did not tell them they had to do that?

Mr. RIGGS. Reclaiming my time, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is so right. In fact we learned from the example of Thomas Jefferson High School. We acted upon the testimony that we heard at our hearing. In our bill, we have said under the section dealing with the permissible uses of funds, that the funding can be used by local institutions—a high school or regional vocational school—to provide, and I quote now from the bill, work-related experience such as internships, cooperative education, school-based enterprises—like we also saw up in Delaware where the kids are running a bank at Wilmington High School—entrepreneurship and job shadowing. They are all related to vocational-technical education programs.

What we do *not* do again is attempt to micromanage, we do not dictate, we do not spell out that local schools should use any of the funding to pay for the salaries and benefits of local personnel. We do not, anywhere in the legislation, talk about support for any staff; not teachers, administrators, counselors, or coordinators.

So I join the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] in urging the gentleman to withdraw his amendment with the understanding that the type of coordination activities that he wants to see, that we all want to see take place between local secondary schools and local employers, are already allowed under our bill for vocational-technical education programs.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], my friend and colleague.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I just want to deal with a couple of the arguments that have been made. As my colleagues know, the idea that there are not innovative and creative vocational educational programs, that there are not young people that are attending those schools that are not going on to do tremendous things has nothing to do with what we are trying to suggest in this amendment. Of course there are, and we should recognize and encourage those activities, and where they are accomplished without the assistance of a coordinator is terrific.

But the vast majority of the kids that we are designing programs to help and assist are the kids that are falling through the cracks. We do not need to have programs for kids that are A students and are doing terrifically. The reason why we are having these programs is to make certain that the kids that are currently not achieving everything they can in this country can have an opportunity to go out and become all they can be.

That is what this is about, and it is trying to suggest that we give them opportunity, if we get them to work with their local businesses and get the businesses to recognize that the young people that are in their communities have all the future of this country in front of them.

As my colleagues know, the fact of the matter is I come from the State of Massachusetts. The State of Massachusetts has more college graduates per capita than any other State in the Nation. That is something we are extremely proud of. I have 60 colleges in my own congressional district, more than 26 other States in one congressional district.

The fact of the matter is that we have a first-rate education system, but within that there are still so many of the kids that end up falling through the cracks. In my district I have some of the poorest Hispanic kids in the United States. I have the minority influence district. Go into the poorer high schools and find out whether they think they can go to Harvard University or whether they can go to MIT. They do not think they can. None of those kids feel that they are going to be participants in the so-called greatness of America's education.

These are the kids that we need to reach out to. They can; in fact 50 percent, despite the fact that Massachusetts is No. 1 in terms of higher education, 50 percent of all the adults in the State of Massachusetts have nothing more than a high school education. Fifty percent of them. We still have dropout rates of 25, 35, and 40 percent in many of our major cities and urban areas of our country. Those are the kids that we need to reach out to. They are not bad kids. We need to reach out and let them know that they count and that they are important and that our businesses will value them because those businesses will one day be employing them. And if we can establish that relationship early on in their lives and make certain that they know that

those companies, those high-technology companies, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] talked about 19,000 here in the Washington area.

The fact is that there are HVAC companies, there are diesel engine companies, there are all sorts of technical skills that our young people are simply not learning, and the companies do not have the access to those local high schools to know and be able to set the kind of curriculum that is going to allow them to learn those skills. Let them have that opportunity. Do not deny them because there is a few Members of either party that are sitting there saying that this is going to be sex education. Do not do that. Do not buckle to that.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues should stand up and say what is right. What is right is that we provide that coordinator. Let them in fact. Do not buckle to some right wing or left wing or anybody else's wing. Stand up for the kids; that is what this bill is supposed to be about. Stand up for the kids, pass this amendment.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make sure that we think this the whole way through. Where do we stop if we want every child to reach their potential? Would it not be a good idea to mandate that we have a military coordinator in every school? It seems to me there is great potential by joining the armed services, even to get a college degree, but certainly to get all sorts of training. So where do we stop? Where do we decide that the Federal Government no longer should mandate?

And I think we make a big mistake when we go down the line of determining for local school districts who it is they should hire.

The program is working well at the present time with the coordination that is available. The activity is allowable in the legislation but we do not mandate any personnel. It does not matter whether it is an administrator or a teacher—we do not mandate personnel. We allow the local level to make that decision.

Again, we need to remember that when we start down this slippery slope, I can see all sorts of wonderful things that a military coordinator could do to help young people reach their potential, but I certainly would not mandate it.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have to tell my colleagues I am now perplexed a little bit about the Kennedy amendment because I am looking at the gentleman's Dear Colleague, and I quote:

> This person, referring to the work force development coordinator, would help develop courses in addition to the core curriculum, and I always thought that the design of that curriculum, that local curriculum, was the responsibility of the locally elected school board. That is certainly in keeping with the longstanding American tradition.
>
> And second, the gentleman talks about this individual again helping familiarize young people with college opportunities or college possibilities and maybe encouraging them to set their sights high and to apply to attend a 4-year institution.

Yet again I read from his Dear Colleague. He says:

> This person would educate our students about career possibilities in their own hometown and help students obtain jobs in the local economy. This acts as a local job placement service run at a local high school, and that is contrary to the idea of encouraging more young people to go to college.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] yield?

Mr. PETRI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. First of all, as my colleagues know, we have heard a lot of talk about mandates. I just like to point out that all this is is a permissible activity. There is no mandate. I mean I think it should be a mandate, but I did not write it because I did not think we could get enough votes if we wrote it as an absolute mandate. So it is just a permissible activity.

And I would just say to the gentleman, through the gentleman from Wisconsin to the gentleman from California, that all we are trying to suggest here is that of course the core curriculum is going to be set by the local school committee. We want to involve the local school committee and everyone else in this activity. But unless we provide them a coordinator who can work with the business community in order to accomplish this, you will get our top tier, the top 10 or 20 or 30 percent that will take care of this anyway. We are talking about the kind of high schools that maybe do not exist in my colleague's district but certainly exist in mine, the kind of high schools that are really struggling, that are having a very hard time. Go to those high schools' principals and ask them whether or not they would like to have a coordinator that can work with the local community and work with their businesses.

Mr. PETRI. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, colleagues, let us apply the commonsense test here for a moment. Will one work force development coordinator, paid through Federal taxpayer funds, be able to do what the locally elected school board cannot?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It can help.

Mr. RIGGS. And a locally elected school board, it seems to me, is accountable to and responsive, we hope responsive, to the local community, not a federally funded work force development coordinator who is not an elected official and therefore really not accountable to the community at all.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I find this debate interesting. I would like to ask the Members here today how many of them would like to have a partner in their business that provides 7 percent of the capital and wants to run the business? We provide about 7 percent of the money in this country for vocational education, and here we sit in Washington and we want to say how it is best to do it in all 50 States, and we provide 7 percent.

We ought to be ashamed of ourselves. If there is one message that I have received from educators as a local leader, as a State house member and a State senator, was get Washington out of our school districts. We get a little bit of money from them, and most of our people are spending the bulk of their time trying to deal with Federal bureaucracies and Federal rules.

And then we get down to this issue, and on page 52 of the bill it says providing career guidance counseling, almost providing work-related experience such as internships, cooperative education, school-based enterprises, entrepreneurship, job shadowing that are related to vocational technical education programs, programs for single parents, displaced homemakers, single pregnant women, local education and business partnerships, vocational student organizations, mentoring and support services.

Now we do not tell them who they have to hire. We just gave some guidelines of directions that the programs ought to cover, and that is all we should do. At the Federal level, we are wrong when we provide. If we were doing 70 percent of the money, I might agree with my colleague. Seven percent of the money, and we want to run the voc-tech schools, and that is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman have an amendment?

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a moment before I go to that if I could.

Mr. Chairman, as I have reviewed the goings on here, I first want to compliment the chairman and the ranking

member for the things that they have done to try to bring some sense to it and some of the amendments; I appreciate that.

Some of my colleagues may not know, but I come from a State that has a lot of diverse situations. I have got some rural area and some urban area, got some rural area that is very sparse, very poor, and I am very concerned about does this really cover the things that are needed, does this really provide those much-needed things?

Some of my colleagues may not be familiar with what we term as the farm crisis that took place in the 1980's, but I can tell my colleagues that a lot of the small schools are very poor but are trying to offer equal opportunity in a State that is known for its education, particularly the K–12. In fact, all of its education.

And so I have some concerns that we look out for these folks. So I have offered an amendment that would in fact add some resources to the process we are doing here today.

□ 1845

But I am told after I have dropped it that maybe this is all being taken care of. I understand that the 10 percent has been divided 5 and 5. What I was trying to do, Mr. Chairman, was to say in a permissive manner that the States could add another 5 percent if they chose to do so. I am informed that this is provided for in the process.

I wonder if I could engage the honorable gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] in a short, wing-it colloquy, if I could.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, as opposed to our normally very carefully scripted colloquies, I would be happy to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman.

First of all, let me point out to him that under the chairman's manager's amendment we were able to reach a bipartisan agreement on probably the most sensitive and delicate issue of all, and that is the intrastate or substate funding formula change.

Under that amendment, States will be allowed to reserve up to 5 percent of their allotment for a rural reserve and up to 5 percent additional for grants to urban areas, or an urban reserve. I have to tell the gentleman that the amendment he intended to offer was perfectly consistent with the creation of the 10-percent reserve under the bill and under the manager's amendment of both a 5-percent rural reserve and a 5-percent urban reserve.

Furthermore, I want to point out to the gentleman that under the bill, the Secretary of Education may grant a waiver to States that can demonstrate they have a better way of distributing funds. In other words, the Secretary can grant a waiver to any State, and I quote now from the bill, ''* * *that demonstrates that a proposed alternative formula more effectively targets funds on the basis of poverty.'' That is virtually verbatim language to the gentleman's amendment, using the definition of poverty as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673, subparagraph 2 of the Community Services Block Grant Act.

So I am glad I have an opportunity to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman, to thank him on his well-intentioned amendment, but also to point out because of the changes that already are incorporated in the bill, I feel that his amendment is not necessary. I hope this colloquy does in fact strengthen those sections of the bill that are compatible with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BOSWELL. I think it has. Mr. Chairman, I just want to want the gentleman, by nodding or even commenting, to assure me that the flexibility is there in what is being offered for the States to do the very thing that I was suggesting in this amendment that is in place, and if they choose to have need to put more into it, they can go through this process the gentleman has outlined and have that opportunity.

Mr. RIGGS. That is correct. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the language in the bill allows, and again, I believe encourages, the States to use up to 10 percent of the money to drive those funds to the areas of greatest economic need and highest poverty, and again, that is very consistent with what the gentleman is proposing.

Mr. BOSWELL. They can add to that, the vehicle that is in place, they can add to that if they go through the process the gentleman has described.

Mr. RIGGS. Under the alternative secondary formula, they can drive all of their money to areas of greatest economic need and high poverty areas, if in fact they can demonstrate that the formula will do just that to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Education.

Mr. BOSWELL. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BOSWELL] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOSWELL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, the last comment made by the chairman of the committee, the alternative formula, the gentleman understands that in a State like his, where his State can prove that the formula difference they come up with is targeted to a higher poverty area than the original formula, in other words, that they are really addressing the population with the greatest need, then that waiver will be given. So the percentage, rather than 5 or 10, or it could be 15, 20, whatever the State would determine its greatest need is.

Mr. BOSWELL. I thank both gentlemen from California for their hard, conscientious work. I think they have met my concern. Therefore, I will not offer the amendment. I thank them for this exchange.

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Chairman, just so I can reinforce the point just made by my good friend and the ranking member of the subcommittee, he is absolutely correct that we have provided in the bill for a waiver in that situation, where the State demonstrates that, and again I quote from the bill, now, ''A proposed alternative formula more effectively targets funds on the basis of poverty.''

So again, the language that is already in the bill would seem to do pretty much what the gentleman would like to do with his amendment. Therefore his amendment, I believe, is unnecessary, but hopefully this colloquy will now not only underscore the gentleman's concerns, but strengthen the intent of the language already included in the bill.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank both Members for their response. I feel reassured, and I will not offer the amendment. I look forward to us pressing on.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no other amendments, pursuant to the order of the House of today, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: amendment No. 5 offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK]; and amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MRS. MINK OF HAWAII

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

Page 21, line 4, strike ''(b)'' and insert ''(c)''.

Page 21, line 6, strike ''(b)'' and insert ''(c)''.

Page 21, line 10, strike the periods and end quotation marks and insert a semicolon.

Page 21, after line 10, insert the following:

(5) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''section 221'' and inserting ''paragraph (3) of section 201(c)''; and

(ii) by striking ''section 222'' and inserting ''paragraph (4) of section 201(c)''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (J).

Page 33, after line 12, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

''(4) sex equity programs;''.

Page 34, after line 5, insert the following:

''(e) HOLD HARMLESS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of this part or section 102(a), to carry out programs described in paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (c), each eligible recipient shall reserve from funds allocated under section 102(a)(1), an amount that is not less than the amount such eligible recipient received in fiscal year 1997 for carrying out programs under sections 221 and 222 of this Act as such sections were in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997''.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 214, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

AYES—207

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—214

Aderholt
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Archer
Dingell
Fattah
Frost
Gonzalez
Kennedy (RI)
McDade
McIntyre
Mollohan
Ney
Schiff
Stabenow
Young (AK)

□ 1911

Mr. GANSKE changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the additional amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 230, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

AYES—189

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—230

Aderholt	Gilchrest	Packard
Archer	Gillmor	Pappas
Armey	Gilman	Paul
Bachus	Goode	Paxon
Baker	Goodlatte	Pease
Ballenger	Goodling	Peterson (PA)
Barr	Goss	Petri
Barrett (NE)	Graham	Pickering
Bartlett	Granger	Pickett
Barton	Greenwood	Pitts
Bass	Gutknecht	Pombo
Bateman	Hansen	Porter
Bereuter	Hastert	Portman
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Quinn
Bliley	Hefley	Radanovich
Blunt	Herger	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hill	Redmond
Boehner	Hilleary	Regula
Bonilla	Hobson	Riggs
Bono	Hoekstra	Riley
Boyd	Horn	Rogan
Brady	Hostettler	Rogers
Bryant	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Hulshof	Ros-Lehtinen
Burr	Hunter	Roukema
Burton	Hutchinson	Royce
Buyer	Hyde	Ryun
Callahan	Inglis	Salmon
Calvert	Istook	Sanford
Camp	Jenkins	Saxton
Campbell	Johnson (CT)	Scarborough
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer, Dan
Cannon	Jones	Schaffer, Bob
Castle	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Kelly	Sessions
Chambliss	Kim	Shadegg
Chenoweth	King (NY)	Shaw
Christensen	Kingston	Shays
Coble	Kleczka	Shimkus
Coburn	Klug	Shuster
Collins	Knollenberg	Sisisky
Combest	Kolbe	Skeen
Condit	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Cook	Largent	Smith (NJ)
Cooksey	Latham	Smith (OR)
Crane	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Crapo	Lazio	Smith, Linda
Cubin	Leach	Snowbarger
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Solomon
Davis (VA)	Lewis (KY)	Souder
Deal	Linder	Spence
DeFazio	Lipinski	Stearns
DeLay	Livingston	Stenholm
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Stump
Dickey	Lucas	Sununu
Dingell	Manzullo	Talent
Doolittle	McCollum	Tauzin
Dreier	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	McHugh	Thornberry
Dunn	McInnis	Thune
Ehlers	McIntosh	Tiahrt
Ehrlich	McIntyre	Traficant
Emerson	McKeon	Upton
English	Metcalf	Walsh
Everett	Mica	Wamp
Ewing	Miller (FL)	Watkins
Fawell	Molinari	Watts (OK)
Foley	Moran (KS)	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	Morella	Weldon (PA)
Fowler	Murtha	Weller
Franks (NJ)	Myrick	White
Frelinghuysen	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Gallegly	Neumann	Wicker
Ganske	Northup	Wolf
Gekas	Norwood	Young (FL)
Gibbons	Nussle	

NOT VOTING—15

Cox	Maloney (CT)	Parker
Frost	McDade	Schiff
Gephardt	Mollohan	Stabenow
Jefferson	Oberstar	Thomas
Kennedy (RI)	Oxley	Young (AK)

□ 1921

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall Nos. 286, and 287, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on recorded vote 286, the Mink amendment and ''no'' on recorded vote 287, the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, over the past 35 years, Congress has constructed a centralized system of vocational education, wasting millions of taxpayer dollars on a system that all-too-often serves more as a ''dumping ground'' for special-needs students than as an effective means of providing noncollege bound students with the knowledge and skills they need to become productive citizens.

Congress is considering prolonging the life of large parts of this system by reauthorizing the Carl Perkins Vocational Education and Applied Technology Act (H.R. 1853). While 1853 does eliminate several Federal programs and State mandates contained in current law, if further legitimizes the unconstitutional notion that the Federal Government has a legitimate role to play in education.

Furthermore, certain language in H.R. 1853 suggests that the purpose of education is to train students to serve the larger needs of society, as determined by Government and business, not to serve the individual.

During the discussion of this bill, the case has been made that constitutionalists should support H.R. 1853 because it reduces the number of Federal mandates on the States; however the 10th amendment does not quantify the extent to which the Federal Government can interfere in areas such as education. Instead, the 10th amendment forbids any and all Federal interference in education, no matter how much flexibility the programs provide the States.

H.R. 1853 represents mandate federalism, where the Federal Government allows States limited flexibility as to the means of complying with Congress mandates. Under this bill, States must submit a vocational education plan to the Department of Education for approval. States must then demonstrate yearly compliance with benchmarks that measure a series of federally set goals. The Secretary of Education has the authority to sanction the States for failure to reach those benchmarks, as if the States were the disobedient children of the Federal Government, not entities whose sovereignty must be constitutionally respected.

Congress has, so far, resisted pressure from the administration to give the Department of Education explicit statutory authority to create model benchmarks, which would then be adopted by every State. However, certain provisions of H.R. 1853 may provide the Department of Education with the opportunity to impose a uniform system of vocational education on every State in the Nation.

Particularly troublesome in this regard is the provision requiring every State to submit their vocational education plan to the Secretary for approval. The Secretary may withhold approval if the application is in violation of the provisions of this act. Ambitious bureaucrats may stretch this language to mean that the Department can reject a State plan if the Department does not feel the plan will be effective in meeting the goals of the bill. For example, a Department of Education official may feel that a State's plan does not adequately prepare vocational-technical education students for opportunities in postsecondary education or entry into high skill, high wage jobs, because the plan fails to adopt the specifications favored by the Education Department. The State plan may thus be rejected unless the State adopts the academic provisions favored by the administration.

H.R. 1853 further opens the door for the establishment of national standards for vocational education through provisions allowing the Secretary to develop a single plan for evaluation and assessment, with regard to the vocational-technical education and provide for an independent evaluation, of vocational-technical education programs, including examining how States and localities have developed, implemented, or improved State and local vocational-technical education programs. Education bureaucrats could very easily use the results of the studies to establish de facto model benchmarks that States would have to follow.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Education may impose national standards on State vocational education programs by requiring that States improve the academic component of vocational education. Integrating academics with vocational education is a noble goal, but Federal education bureaucrats may use this requirement to force vocational education programs to adopt national academic standards, upon pain of having their State plans denied as inconsistent with the provisions of the act mandating instead that States integrate academics into their vocational education programs.

States are also required to distribute their Federal funds according to a predetermined formula that dictates the percentage of funds States must spend on certain federally approved activities without regard for differences between the States. For example, H.R. 1853 singles out certain populations, such as displaced homemakers and single parents, and requires the States to certify to the Federal Government that their programs are serving these groups. These provisions stem from the offensive idea that without orders from the Federal Government, States will systematically deny certain segments of the population access to job training services.

Another Federal mandate contained in this so-called decentralization plan, is one requiring States to spend a certain percentage on updating the technology used in vocational education programs. Technological training can be a useful and necessary part of vocational education, however, under the Constitution it is not the business of the Federal Government to ensure vocational education students receive up-to-date technological training.

The States and the people are quite capable of ensuring that vocational education students receive up-to-date technological training—if the Federal Government stops usurping their legitimate authority to run vocational education programs and if the Government stops draining taxpayers of the resources necessary to run those programs.

H.R. 1853 provides businesses with taxpayer-provided labor in the form of vocational education students engaging in cooperative education. Since businesses benefit by having a trained work force, they should not burden the taxpayers with the costs of training their future employees. Furthermore, the provision allowing students to spend alternating weeks at work rather than in the classroom seems inconsistent with the bill's goals of strengthening the academic component of vocational education.

Work experience can be valuable for students, especially when that experience involves an occupation the student may choose as a future career. However, there is no reason for taxpayers to subsidize the job training of another. Furthermore, if it wasn't for Federal minimum wage and other laws that make hiring inexperienced workers cost prohibitive,

many businesses would gladly provide work apprenticeships to young people out of their own pockets instead of forcing the costs onto the U.S. taxpayer.

Today, employers can be assessed huge fines if they allow their part-time adolescent employees to work, with pay, for 15 minutes beyond the Department of Labor regulations. Yet, those same businesses can receive free, full-time labor from those same adolescents as part of a cooperative education program. Clearly, common sense has been tossed out the window and replaced by the arbitrary and conflicting whims of a Congress attempting to do good.

Further evidence of catering to well-established businesses can be found within the provision of H.R. 1853 wherein teachers are instructed not to meet the needs and expectations of students, but rather the needs, expectations, and methods of industry. All education, including vocational education, should explicitly be tailored to the wishes of the parent or those already funding the costs of education.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1853 continues the Federal education policy of dragooning parents into education as partners in the education process. Parents should control the education process, but they should never be placed in a subordinate role and made to help carry out the agenda of Government bureaucrats.

Concerns have been raised that vocational education programs may be used as a means to force all students into a career track not of their own choosing, and thus change the American education system into one of preparation for a career determined for the students by the Government. Such a system more closely resembles something depicted in a George Orwell novel than the type of education system compatible with a free society. H.R. 1853 attempts to assuage those fears through a section forbidding the use of Federal funds to force an individual into a career path that the individual would not otherwise choose or require any individual to obtain so-called skilled certificates.

However, States and localities that violate this portion of the act are not subject to any loss of Federal funds. Of course, even if the act did contain sanctions for violating an individual's freedom to determine their own career path, those sanctions would have to rely on the willingness of the very Federal bureaucracy which helped originate many of the education reforms which diminish student freedom to enforce this statutory provision.

Mr. Chairman, the Carl D. Perkins Act reauthorization may appear to provide for greater State and individual control over vocational education. However, H.R. 1853 is really another example of mandate federalism, where States, localities, and individuals are given limited autonomy in how they fulfill Federal mandates. As H.R. 1853 places mandates on the States and individuals to perform certain functions in the area of education, an area where Congress has no constitutional authority. It is also in violation of the ninth and tenth amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

Furthermore, H.R. 1853 forces Federal taxpayers to underwrite the wages of students working part-time in the name of cooperative education, another form of corporate welfare. Businesses who benefit from the labor of students should not have the costs of that labor subsidized by the taxpayers.

Certain language in H.R. 1853 suggests that parent's authority to raise their children as they see fit may be undermined by the Government in order to make parents partners in training their children according to Government specifications.

Congress should, therefore, reject H.R. 1853 and instead eliminate all Federal vocational education programs in order to restore authority for those programs to the States, localities, and individual citizens.

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act. The Perkins program provides much-needed vocational and technical education to students around the country.

Federal investment in vocational-technical education is vital for assuring a well-trained work force for the upcoming century. The Perkins Act distributes vocational education funds to the local level to ensure that our students are taught the necessary skills to be productive citizens. Investing more in education and training our work force to better compete is a sensible and farsighted way to spend our Federal funds.

Just last month, I visited Chief Leschi School in Puyallup, WA. My office helped them apply for their first Perkins grant. They won the grant, and they will receive over $370,000 to put toward vocational and technology programs. The grant money will fund computers and equipment for the vocational department, such as the auto, wood, and print shops and the photography lab. When I toured Chief Leschi, I saw how important these grants could be. I met motivated administrators, high-quality teachers and students who were eager to learn. It's critical to provide them with the equipment and facilities they need to be successful, and because of the Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act, Chief Leschi will soon have even stronger vocational and technical programs.

Again, I urge my colleagues' support to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act. The Perkins grant has made an important difference in the quality to our Nation's vocational and technical education, and we should reauthorize the program to ensure it is maintained for the students of tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no other amendments, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. QUINN) having assumed the chair, Mr. EWING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1853) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, pursuant to House Resolution 187, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MRS. MINK OF HAWAII

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 1853) to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith, with the following amendments:

Page 21, line 4, strike ''(b)'' and insert ''(c)''.

Page 21, line 6, strike ''(b)'' and insert ''(c)''.

Page 21, line 10, strike the periods and end quotation marks and insert a semicolon.

Page 21, after line 10, insert the following:

(5) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''section 221'' and inserting ''paragraph (3) of section 201(c); and

(ii) by striking ''section 222'' and inserting ''paragraph (4) of section 201(c)''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (J).

Page 33, after line 12, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

''(4) sex equity programs;''.

Page 34, after line 5, insert the following:

''(e) HOLD HARMLESS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of this part or section 102(a), to carry out programs described in paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (c), each eligible recipient shall reserve from funds allocated under section 102(a)(1), an amount that is not less than the amount such eligible recipient received in fiscal year 1997 for carrying out programs under sections 221 and 222 of this Act as such sections were in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I take this extraordinary measure in order to emphasize the importance of the amendment that was just defeated.

My effort in offering the amendment was simply to hold harmless, to continue a vital program that has been in existence for the past 13 years because Congress recognizes that unless we set aside 10 percent of the funding in the vocational education program, that these individuals, the displaced homemakers, the single parents, the pregnant women, others in that category would simply not be provided for under

the traditional vocational education concepts.

□ 1930

And, so, the Congress agreed and put forth a 10-percent set-aside for these individuals. I understand that the new majority has a new way of looking at funding these education programs. They prefer to allocate the monies to the States, and through guidance called in the bill as benchmarks, attempt to try to suggest that these programs ought to be continued.

My amendment would say dismiss the 10-percent set-aside, we are at a new point, all right, let us dismiss that, forget the targeting; but let us not forget the program. And, so, all I do, under my amendment, is to hold harmless the current programs that are in existence at the current level of funding. That is all that we do. We do not ask for an extra dollar to be allocated to this program, nor do we set aside any particular mandates for new programs. And the reason why this is so important, my colleagues of the House, is that just a year ago, just a few months ago, in August of last year, we passed the welfare reform bill; and in it we mandate that all of the women, single parents be required to go to work as soon as 2 months after getting on welfare.

The justification for this requirement to work was that there would be abundant funds and abundant programs in existence to help these individuals get job training, get an education in order to get a decent job. It was not intended that they should just get a job and earn minimum wage, which we all know is insufficient to sustain a family.

So education is the key. Everyone who got up to speak for the welfare reform bill made reference to education and training. This is our one opportunity to link the two together, the welfare reform, go back to work, get education, together with the job training programs that are implicit in the vocational education concept.

So I ask my colleagues, especially those who voted for the Welfare Reform Act, do not destroy a program that is in existence today that is providing probably the only single effort that this Nation makes to recognize the hardships of single parents. It is very difficult for them. We cannot throw them to the masses.

Before this Congress earmarked 10 percent, let me tell my colleagues that only 0.2 percent of the program money under vocational education went to this target group. And, so, it is extremely important today that we not cut this off. There will be, of course, turmoil in the restructuring of the vocational education program as it is. We do not disagree with the changes that are being made. But we say, at the same time that the changes are made, do not create a turmoil in this program that is so essential, not just for the particular women that are in it, but in order to have a transition into the welfare reform program, which is saying to all single mothers under welfare that they must work and if they must work they need training, because in order to get a good skilled job, in order to earn a decent living, they recognize that they have to have further education. So I plead to this House to accept my motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] insist on his point of order?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, no, I do not insist on my point of order. I rise in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that everybody understands that H.R. 1853 authorizes funding for vocational technical education. It is not a welfare program. It is an education bill. And in this bill, anytime we set aside money for something else, we are taking that money from our local school, our secondary school, their vocational program; we are taking it from the vocational technical school in our area, the secondary vocational technical school.

Now this is a different time. My colleague is talking about ancient history. Why is it different? It is different because we passed several pieces of legislation that take care of special populations. We provide over $2 billion in our Federal job training program that may be used to serve displaced homemakers and other special populations. Most of these programs are geared toward special populations. We have over $3 billion in our welfare-to-work program, again geared to special populations. It is a different time we are talking about. Do not mandate things to local school districts. Let them determine what is in the best interest of their local area.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] to say what we do in this legislation already, to protect special populations, over and over and over again. We protect them without mandating anything.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and must say that I know my colleagues are saying that it is not often that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] stands up on something that is a woman's issue and says a no vote.

But I have got to say that we have put every enforcement mechanism here in this legislation. This is plain and simply a set-aside proposal that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] has advanced. It goes contradictory to the whole reform effort that we had on a bipartisan basis in the committee, the reform effort, which was to give authority back to the local schools so that they can make their decision based on the local population needs.

I want to assure my colleagues who are as concerned as I am about the special needs of populations such as displaced homemakers, single parents, and single pregnant women that the enforcement mechanisms are here. They are very explicit throughout the legislation and put the authority on both the Department of Education and Health and Human Services to monitor and require compliance.

I do not have time to go through all of this, but page 29 and the accountability standards of section 115 and section 201 amply protect those special populations. I would simply urge that we not take 10 steps backward when we are trying to reform this most essential program.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to close by merely saying do not take money from your local school districts, do not take money from your area vocational technical school, do not take money for your vocational programs in your secondary schools in your district in order to feed a State bureaucracy and a Federal bureaucracy. Let them make those decisions at the local level.

All the special populations are well protected in this legislation. And as I indicated in other legislation that we passed this year, we have emphasized those special populations, particularly displaced homemakers, in programs where it should be done. This is an education bill that we are dealing with today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDed vote

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces he may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 220, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

AYES—207

Abercrombie	Borski	Costello
Ackerman	Boswell	Coyne
Allen	Boucher	Cramer
Andrews	Boyd	Cummings
Baesler	Brown (CA)	Danner
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Davis (FL)
Barcia	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Barrett (WI)	Capps	DeFazio
Becerra	Cardin	DeGette
Bentsen	Carson	Delahunt
Berman	Clay	DeLauro
Berry	Clayton	Dellums
Bishop	Clement	Deutsch
Blagojevich	Clyburn	Dicks
Blumenauer	Condit	Dingell
Bonior	Conyers	Dixon

Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—220

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Frost
Gephardt
Kennedy (RI)
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Schiff
Young (AK)

□ 1957

Mr. CAMP changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members that this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 12, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney

Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)

NAYS—12

Bonior
Campbell
Dickey
McDermott
Mink
Olver
Owens
Paul
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sensenbrenner
Stark

NOT VOTING—8

Frost
Gephardt
Kennedy (RI)
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Schiff
Young (AK)

□ 2006

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1853.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1853, CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1997

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1853, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2003, BALANCED BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1997

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–195) on the resolution (H. Res. 192) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2003) to reform the budget process and enforce the bipartisan balanced budget agreement of 1997, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 765, de novo;, H.R. 1944, do novo; H.R. 1663, de novo; H.R. 1661, de novo; House Concurrent Resolution 81, de novo; House Concurrent Resolution 88, de novo; House Resolution 175, de novo; House Concurrent Resolution 99, de novo; House Resolution 191, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 1585, de novo.

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

SHACKLEFORD BANKS WILD HORSES PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 765.

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. 765.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 416, noes 6, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

AYES—416

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—6

Campbell
Carson
Paul
Sanford
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—12

Cubin	Kennedy (RI)	Schiff
Frost	McDade	Thornberry
Gephardt	Mollohan	Yates
John	Parker	Young (AK)

□ 2027

Mr. SCARBOROUGH changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 290, I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my home State of Rhode Island today and missed the following votes:

On rollcall No. 286, the Mink amendment to H.R. 1853 Vocational-Technical Education Act, I would have voted ''yea''; on rollcall No. 287, the Kennedy of Massachusetts amendment, I would have voted ''yea''; on rollcall No. 288, Mrs. MINK's motion to recommit H.R. 1853 with instructions, I would have voted ''yea''; on rollcall No. 289, final passage on H.R. 1853, I would have voted ''yea''; and on rollcall No. 290, H.R. 765 the Shakelford Banks Wild Horses Protection Act, I would have voted ''yea.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

WARNER CANYON SKI HILL LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1944.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1944.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 423, noes 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

AYES—423

Abercrombie	Deutsch	John
Ackerman	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (CT)
Aderholt	Dickey	Johnson (WI)
Allen	Dicks	Johnson, E. B.
Andrews	Dingell	Johnson, Sam
Archer	Dixon	Jones
Armey	Doggett	Kanjorski
Bachus	Dooley	Kaptur
Baesler	Doolittle	Kasich
Baker	Doyle	Kelly
Baldacci	Dreier	Kennedy (MA)
Ballenger	Duncan	Kennedy (RI)
Barcia	Dunn	Kennelly
Barr	Edwards	Kildee
Barrett (NE)	Ehlers	Kilpatrick
Barrett (WI)	Ehrlich	Kim
Bartlett	Emerson	Kind (WI)
Barton	Engel	King (NY)
Bass	English	Kingston
Bateman	Ensign	Kleczka
Becerra	Eshoo	Klink
Bentsen	Etheridge	Klug
Bereuter	Evans	Knollenberg
Berman	Everett	Kolbe
Berry	Ewing	Kucinich
Bilbray	Farr	LaFalce
Bilirakis	Fattah	LaHood
Bishop	Fawell	Lampson
Blagojevich	Fazio	Lantos
Bliley	Filner	Largent
Blumenauer	Flake	Latham
Blunt	Foley	LaTourette
Boehlert	Forbes	Lazio
Boehner	Ford	Leach
Bonilla	Fowler	Levin
Bonior	Fox	Lewis (CA)
Bono	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
Borski	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (KY)
Boswell	Frelinghuysen	Linder
Boucher	Furse	Lipinski
Boyd	Gallegly	Livingston
Brady	Ganske	LoBiondo
Brown (CA)	Gejdenson	Lofgren
Brown (FL)	Gekas	Lowey
Brown (OH)	Gibbons	Lucas
Bryant	Gilchrest	Luther
Bunning	Gillmor	Maloney (CT)
Burr	Gilman	Maloney (NY)
Burton	Gonzalez	Manton
Buyer	Goode	Manzullo
Callahan	Goodlatte	Markey
Calvert	Goodling	Martinez
Camp	Gordon	Mascara
Campbell	Goss	Matsui
Canady	Graham	McCarthy (MO)
Cannon	Granger	McCarthy (NY)
Capps	Green	McCollum
Cardin	Greenwood	McCrery
Carson	Gutierrez	McDermott
Castle	Gutknecht	McGovern
Chabot	Hall (OH)	McHale
Chambliss	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Chenoweth	Hamilton	McInnis
Christensen	Hansen	McIntosh
Clay	Harman	McIntyre
Clayton	Hastert	McKeon
Clement	Hastings (FL)	McNulty
Clyburn	Hastings (WA)	Meehan
Coble	Hayworth	Meek
Coburn	Hefley	Menendez
Collins	Hefner	Metcalf
Combest	Herger	Mica
Condit	Hill	Millender-McDonald
Conyers	Hilleary	Miller (CA)
Cook	Hilliard	Miller (FL)
Cooksey	Hinchey	Minge
Costello	Hinojosa	Mink
Cox	Hobson	Moakley
Coyne	Hoekstra	Molinari
Cramer	Holden	Moran (KS)
Crane	Hooley	Moran (VA)
Crapo	Horn	Morella
Cubin	Hostettler	Murtha
Cummings	Houghton	Myrick
Cunningham	Hoyer	Nadler
Danner	Hulshof	Neal
Davis (FL)	Hunter	Nethercutt
Davis (IL)	Hutchinson	Neumann
Davis (VA)	Hyde	Ney
Deal	Inglis	Northup
DeFazio	Istook	Norwood
DeGette	Jackson (IL)	Nussle
Delahunt	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Oberstar
DeLauro	Jefferson	Obey
DeLay	Jenkins	Olver
Dellums		

Ortiz	Royce	Strickland
Owens	Ryun	Stump
Oxley	Sabo	Stupak
Packard	Salmon	Sununu
Pallone	Sanchez	Talent
Pappas	Sanders	Tanner
Pascrell	Sandlin	Tauscher
Pastor	Sanford	Tauzin
Paul	Sawyer	Taylor (MS)
Paxon	Saxton	Taylor (NC)
Payne	Scarborough	Thomas
Pease	Schaefer, Dan	Thompson
Pelosi	Schaffer, Bob	Thornberry
Peterson (MN)	Schumer	Thune
Peterson (PA)	Scott	Thurman
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Tiahrt
Pickering	Serrano	Tierney
Pickett	Sessions	Torres
Pitts	Shadegg	Towns
Pombo	Shaw	Traficant
Pomeroy	Shays	Turner
Porter	Sherman	Upton
Portman	Shimkus	Velazquez
Poshard	Shuster	Vento
Price (NC)	Sisisky	Visclosky
Pryce (OH)	Skaggs	Walsh
Quinn	Skeen	Wamp
Radanovich	Skelton	Waters
Rahall	Slaughter	Watkins
Ramstad	Smith (MI)	Watt (NC)
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Watts (OK)
Redmond	Smith (OR)	Waxman
Regula	Smith (TX)	Weldon (FL)
Reyes	Smith, Adam	Weldon (PA)
Riggs	Smith, Linda	Weller
Riley	Snowbarger	Wexler
Rivers	Snyder	Weygand
Rodriguez	Solomon	White
Roemer	Souder	Whitfield
Rogan	Spence	Wicker
Rogers	Spratt	Wise
Rohrabacher	Stabenow	Wolf
Ros-Lehtinen	Stark	Woolsey
Rothman	Stearns	Wynn
Roukema	Stenholm	Young (FL)
Roybal-Allard	Stokes	

NOT VOTING—11

Foglietta	McKinney	Schiff
Frost	Mollohan	Yates
Gephardt	Parker	Young (AK)
McDade	Rush	

□ 2036

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 2209, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–196) on the bill (H.R. 2209) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

PROVIDING FOR MAINTENANCE OF DAMS IN EMIGRANT WILDERNESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1663, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs.

CHENOWETH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1633, as amended.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 2, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

AYES—424

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—2

Paul
Stump

NOT VOTING—8

Foglietta
Gephardt
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Schiff
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2045

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRADEMARK LAW TREATY IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1661, 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 North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1661, as amended.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 425, noes 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—425

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)

Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Foglietta
Gephardt
Johnson (WI)
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Schiff
Yates
Young (AK)

☐ 2054

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALLING FOR UNITED STATES INITIATIVE SEEKING JUST AND PEACEFUL RESOLUTION OF SITUATION ON CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 81, as amended.

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, House Concurrent Resolution 81, as amended.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 417, noes 4, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—417

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—4

Barr
Collins
Deal
Paul

NOT VOTING—13

Emerson
Foglietta
Gephardt
Goodling
Hutchinson
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Schiff
Waters
Waxman
Yates
Young (AK)

☐ 2102

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

CONGRATULATING EL SALVADOR ON SUCCESSFUL ELECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 88.

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, House Concurrent Resolution 88.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 419, noes 3, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—419

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—3

Bryant
Kucinich
Paul

NOT VOTING—12

Foglietta
Hutchinson
Johnson, Sam
McCollum
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Roukema
Schiff
Waters
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2111

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 upon the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 295, I strongly supported the resolution praising El Salvador, but inadvertantly missed the vote. There is no country in Central America more representative of democracy and an inspiration to others than El Salvador. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE CONGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 175, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the 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 resolution, House Resolution 175, as amended.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 279, noes 147, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

AYES—279

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Calvert
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)

Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snyder
Solomon
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thomas
Thompson
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
White
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—147

Aderholt
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Boswell
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Lewis (KY)
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
Moran (KS)
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Packard
Pappas
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Pickering
Ramstad
Redmond
Rogers
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Snowbarger
Souder
Spence
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Foglietta
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Roukema
Schiff
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2128

Messrs. GUTKNECHT, SALMON, HILLEARY, GOODLING, BURTON of Indiana, SHUSTER, BUYER, COBURN, GRAHAM, LAHOOD, PICKERING, and DUNCAN, Mrs. EMERSON, and Messrs. TIAHRT, ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, PEASE, JONES, HERGER, PAXON, TAYLOR of North Carolina, WICKER, CAMP, BACHUS, LIVINGSTON, LATHAM, LOBIONDO, ISTOOK, DICKEY, WELLER, MCCOLLUM, MCKEON, WAMP, PAPPAS, RYUN, MORAN of Kansas, KOLBE, GREENWOOD, FOX of Pennsylvania, and WELDON of Florida, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GOSS, Ms. GRANGER, and Messrs. GANSKE, CUNNINGHAM, ADERHOLT, NUSSLE, KASICH, WATKINS, and GALLEGLY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 2130

EXPRESSING CONCERN OVER RECENT EVENTS IN SIERRA LEONE IN WAKE OF RECENT MILITARY COUP D'ETAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 99.

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, House Concurrent Resolution 99.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 1, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

AYES—418

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)

Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—1

Paul

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Barr

NOT VOTING—14

Armey
Berman
Foglietta
Hefner
McDade
Mollohan
Parker
Roukema
Royce
Schiff
Slaughter
Solomon
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2136

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.

REGARDING INTERFERENCE OF EUROPEAN COMMISSION IN MERGER OF BOEING CO. AND McDONNELL DOUGLAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 191.

The Clerk read the title of the 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 resolution, House Resolution 191, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 2, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Oberstar
Stark

NOT VOTING—16

Ballenger
Berman
Foglietta
Hefner
Hunter
McDade
Mollohan
Nethercutt
Parker
Portman
Roukema
Royce
Schiff
Weldon (PA)
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2144

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAMP OUT BREAST CANCER ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The pending business is the question de novo of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1585, 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 New York [Mr. MCHUGH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1585, as amended.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 422, noes 3, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

AYES—422

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)

Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—3

Paul
Sanford
Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—9

Ballenger
Berman
Foglietta
McDade
Mollohan
Royce
Schiff
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2200

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 allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2003

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2003.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2160, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2160), making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. Skeen).

The motion was agreed to.

□ 2202

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2160, with Mr. PEASE, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Thursday, July 17, 1997, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 13, line 24.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to carry out research related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products.

NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

For establishment of a Native American institutions endowment fund, as authorized by Public Law 103–382 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), $4,600,000.

EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

Payments to States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa: For payments for cooperative extension work under the Smith-Lever Act, as amended, to be distributed under sections 3(b) and 3(c) of said Act, and under section 208(c) of Public Law 93–471, for retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents and for costs of penalty mail for cooperative extension agents and State extension directors, $268,493,000; payments for extension work at the 1994 Institutions under the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(b)(3)), $2,000,000; payments for the nutrition and family education program for low-income areas under section 3(d) of the Act, $58,695,000; payments for the pest management program under section 3(d) of the Act, $10,783,000; payments for the farm safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, $2,855,000; payments for the pesticide impact assessment program under section 3(d) of the Act, $3,214,000; payments to upgrade 1890 land-grant college research, extension, and teaching facilities as authorized by section 1447 of Public Law 95–113, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3222b), $7,549,000, to remain available until expended; payments for the rural development centers under section 3(d) of the Act, $908,000; payments for a groundwater quality program under section 3(d) of the Act, $9,061,000; payments for youth-at-risk programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $9,554,000; payments for a food safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, $2,365,000; payments for carrying out the provisions of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978, $3,192,000; payments for Indian reservation agents under section 3(d) of the Act, $1,672,000; payments for sustainable agriculture programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $3,309,000; payments for cooperative extension work by the colleges receiving the benefits of the second Morrill Act (7 U.S.C. 321–326, 328) and Tuskegee University, $25,090,000; and for Federal administration and coordination including administration of

the Smith-Lever Act, as amended, and the Act of September 29, 1977 (7 U.S.C. 341–349), as amended, and section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), and to coordinate and provide program leadership for the extension work of the Department and the several States and insular possessions, $6,370,000; in all, $415,110,000: *Provided,* That funds hereby appropriated pursuant to section 3(c) of the Act of June 26, 1953, and section 506 of the Act of June 23, 1972, as amended, shall not be paid to any State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa prior to availability of an equal sum from non-Federal sources for expenditure during the current fiscal year.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the Agricultural Marketing Service, and the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, $618,000.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, including those pursuant to the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended (21 U.S.C. 114b–c), necessary to prevent, control, and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases; to carry out inspection, quarantine, and regulatory activities; to discharge the authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Act of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1468; 7 U.S.C. 426–426b); and to protect the environment, as authorized by law, $424,244,000, of which $4,443,000 shall be available for the control of outbreaks of insects, plant diseases, animal diseases and for control of pest animals and birds to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions: *Provided,* That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for the current fiscal year that does not require minimum matching by the States of at least 40 percent: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed four, of which two shall be for replacement only: *Provided further,* That, in addition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agricultural production industry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in such emergencies for the arrest and eradication of contagious or infectious disease or pests of animals, poultry, or plants, and for expenses in accordance with the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, and section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944, as amended, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred for such emergency purposes in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided further,* That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the repair and alteration of leased buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

In fiscal year 1998 the agency is authorized to collect fees to cover the total costs of providing technical assistance, goods, or services requested by States, other political subdivisions, domestic and international organizations, foreign governments, or individuals, provided that such fees are structured such that any entity's liability for such fees is reasonably based on the technical assistance, goods, or services provided to the entity by the agency, and such fees shall be credited to this account, to remain available until expended, without further appropriation, for providing such assistance, goods, or services.

Of the total amount available under this heading in fiscal year 1998, $88,000,000 shall be derived from user fees deposited in the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection User Fee Account.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, preventive maintenance, environmental support, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2250, and acquisition of land as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 428a, $3,200,000, to remain available until expended.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

MARKETING SERVICES

For necessary expenses to carry on services related to consumer protection, agricultural marketing and distribution, transportation, and regulatory programs, as authorized by law, and for administration and coordination of payments to States; including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $90,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $45,592,000, including funds for the wholesale market development program for the design and development of wholesale and farmer market facilities for the major metropolitan areas of the country: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

Fees may be collected for the cost of standardization activities, as established by regulation pursuant to law (31 U.S.C. 9701).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $59,521,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses: *Provided,* That if crop size is understated and/or other uncontrollable events occur, the agency may exceed this limitation by up to 10 percent with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY (SECTION 32)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c) shall be used only for commodity program expenses as authorized therein, and other related operating expenses, except for: (1) transfers to the Department of Commerce as authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Act of August 8, 1956; (2) transfers otherwise provided in this Act; and (3) not more than $10,690,000 for formulation and administration of marketing agreements and orders pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1961.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

For payments to departments of agriculture, bureaus and departments of markets, and similar agencies for marketing activities under section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1623(b)), $1,200,000.

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act, as amended, for the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, for certifying procedures used to protect purchasers of farm products, and the standardization activities related to grain under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as amended, including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $25,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $23,928,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES

LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $43,092,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for inspection and weighing services: *Provided,* That if grain export activities require additional supervision and oversight, or other uncontrollable factors occur, this limitation may be exceeded by up to 10 percent with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD SAFETY

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, $446,000.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For necessary expenses to carry on services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, as amended, and the Egg Products Inspection Act, as amended, $589,263,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be available for obligation only after a final rule to implement the provisions of subsection (e) of section 5 of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1034(e)), as amended, is implemented, and in addition, $1,000,000 may be credited to this account from fees collected for the cost of laboratory accreditation as authorized by section 1017 of Public Law 102–237: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall not be available for shell egg surveillance under section 5(d) of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1034(d)): *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FARM AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services to administer the laws enacted by Congress for the Farm Service Agency, the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Risk Management Agency, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, $572,000.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for carrying out the administration and implementation of programs administered by the Farm Service Agency, $702,203,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities (but not the funds) of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make program payments for all programs administered by the Agency: *Provided further,* That other funds made available to the Agency for authorized activities may be advanced to and merged with this account: *Provided further,* That these funds shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 502(b) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987, as amended (7 U.S.C. 5101–5106), $2,000,000.

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses involved in making indemnity payments to dairy farmers for milk or cows producing such milk and manufacturers of dairy products who have been directed to remove their milk or dairy products from commercial markets because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government, and in making indemnity payments for milk, or cows producing such milk, at a fair market value to any dairy farmer who is directed to remove his milk from commercial markets because of (1) the presence of products of nuclear radiation or fallout if such contamination is not due to the fault of the farmer, or (2) residues of chemicals or toxic substances not included under the first sentence of the Act of August 13, 1968, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450j), if such chemicals or toxic substances were not used in a manner contrary to applicable regulations or labeling instructions provided at the time of use and the contamination is not due to the fault of the farmer, $350,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided,* That none of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to make indemnity payments to any farmer whose milk was removed from commercial markets as a result of his willful failure to follow procedures prescribed by the Federal Government: *Provided further,* That this amount shall be transferred to the Commodity Credit Corporation: *Provided further,* That the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of making dairy indemnity disbursements.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928–1929, to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, as follows: farm ownership loans, $430,828,000 of which $400,000,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, $2,341,701,000 of which $1,700,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and $191,701,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, $500,000; for emergency insured loans, $25,000,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters; for boll weevil eradication program loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1989, $34,653,000; and for credit sales of acquired property, $19,432,000.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: farm ownership loans, $19,460,000 of which $15,440,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, $67,255,000 of which $19,210,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and $18,480,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, $66,000; for emergency insured loans, $6,008,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters; for boll weevil eradication program loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1989, $500,000; and for credit sales of acquired property, $2,530,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $218,446,000 of which $208,446,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the ''Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses'' account.

RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY

For administrative and operating expenses, as authorized by the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 6933), $65,000,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $700 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1506(i). In addition, for sales commissions of agents, as authorized by section 516 (7 U.S.C. 1516) $188,571,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

On page 27, line 23, strike ''$188,571,000'' and insert ''$152,571,000''.

On page 48, line 11, strike ''$3,924,000,000'' insert ''(increased by $23,700,000'').

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does any Member raise a point of order under clause 2(f) of rule XXI against provisions of the bill addressed by the amendment but not yet reached in the reading (to wit: page 48, line 6, through page 49, line 18)?

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago this Congress had a major fight because the majority wanted to cut school lunches. Last year the majority tried to cut the WIC program, which is a nutrition program for infants and young mothers. In this bill they are again falling some $30 million short in the WIC Program of what would be required to maintain our existing case load.

What happens in this bill is that the committee is attempting to bring the carryover funds down to around 3 percent or less. That creates a problem because this program needs a certain amount of carryover funds in order to pay the reimbursements that come in after the end of the fiscal year.

OMB and USDA both estimate that without this amendment that I am offering tonight that we run the risk of seeing 55,000 women, children, and infants bounced out of the WIC Program. Basically what we do is to restore that funding and pay for it by reducing the increase in this bill, which the committee provided above the administration request for commissions for crop insurance.

Before anybody has a heart attack and says, oh, do not hurt our farmers, I want to make quite clear, this amendment will in no way hurt farmers. The GAO reported that under the crop insurance program we had a number of fiscal failures. The General Accounting Office said that they found in the crop insurance program expenses for above average commissions paid to agents by one large company, corporate aircraft and excessive automobile charges, country club memberships and various entertainment activities for agents and employees such as skybox rentals at professional sporting events. The GAO went on to indicate that the problem could best be addressed by reducing the commission that is provided to insurance agents under the program.

Now, we have some scare tactics being followed by some people who would like to see this amendment not passed. Members are being told, for instance, in a letter circulated by the American Association of Crop Insurers that this is going to hurt farmers. That is absolutely not true. There are four separate assertions in this letter which are dead wrong.

First of all, they say that the cuts that I am proposing will occur in addition to the Meehan amendment. That is in fact wrong. If my amendment is passed, the Meehan amendment cannot even be offered on the House floor.

Second, they say that a 10.5-percent commission is insufficient and would cause cancellation of policies. We are not talking about a 10-percent commission. We are talking about limiting these commissions to 24.5 percent rather than the 28 percent in the bill.

Third, they claim that the Obey amendment is an attack on farmers. That is absolute nonsense. What is an attack on farmers is the ridiculous farm policy that we have had under both Democratic and Republican administrations for the past 12 years which have driven prices down and driven many farmers off the farm. This proposal or this assertion that this cut in insurance rates or insurance commissions will hurt farmers is, as Mo Udall used to say, straight gumwah, absolute gumwah. All this does is to say that we want farmers and taxpayers to get the best possible deal for the money. This proposal does absolutely nothing to change the crop insurance program. It does absolutely nothing to raise the cost of this program for farmers. What it does do is to stop the rip-off that this program has had to endure from some of the people who have been trying to sell this insurance to farmers, and so it is a simple choice. If you want to continue to support the kind of rip-offs that some of these agents had provided, then you vote against the amendment.

If you want to, on the other hand, ensure that we do not knock 55,000 to 60,000 women and infants and children off the WIC Program, then vote for the amendment. That is the sound thing to do.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a fair and balanced bill. It takes care of the needs of farmers and ranchers, research related to agriculture, nutrition and food safety, rural development and housing for low-income people, the safety of our food, drugs, and medical devices, and the stoppage of gumwah. We have worked very hard to present the House with a well-balanced bill. The bill includes $3.924 billion for WIC, an increase of $118 million above last year, so no one is taking anybody off of WIC. I ask to defeat this amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey amendment. As I recall what happened in the committee, when we were working through this issue, it was quite well discussed in the committee; the administration had asked for $154 million for the actual sales commissions. This is money, $154 million, that goes to agents who are brokering crop insurance in our country and their commissions.

□ 2215

It is $154 million. It is not an insignificant amount of money. And, in fact, at that level we estimated every sales agent would receive a 24.5 percent commission. Now, that is a pretty healthy commission, even at 24.5 percent.

What happened once the bill came out of the subcommittee and moved to the full committee, at that point in the manager's amendment the proposal was to increase the sales commissions to $188 million, which would raise the amount of commission back to the level of about 27 percent. So we are really talking about whether somebody who is selling insurance out there is making a 27-percent commission or if they are making a 24.5-percent commission.

And if the GAO study had not been so clear on abuses in the program, I think that people who hold my opinion on this would not feel so strongly. We really do not believe, and we have taken the advice of the Department of Agriculture on this, we do not believe this is going to in any way diminish the amount of crop insurance available to farmers but, in fact, will put in the kind of regimen that we need in that program to make sure we counter abuses.

Mr. Chairman, I do not really know why the proponents of the higher level of commission were able to prevail at the full committee level, but it seems to me we are being responsible in this amendment. We are trying to cut back on the abuses that the GAO identified.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman talked about a 27.5-percent commission, and I think in all due fairness to the insurance agents, the average commission for Federal crop insurance is about 10 percent to the agent. The other money goes to cover the administrative costs of running this program through the private sector.

Now, if we do not pay those costs and all of that falls back on the Government, we will spend a lot more than that in beefing up our personnel at all the farm service agencies to handle this thing. We should be fair with the insurance agent. They are not getting 24.5 percent, they are not getting 27.5 percent. The average is about 10 percent.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if I might reclaim my time, I think the GAO was very clear in the analysis that they did on an objective basis, and there are serious questions about who is making money.

I think the taxpayers of our country would be pretty upset if they knew that they were paying for commissions to the private sector. That is not quite the way they think it is supposed to work. They do not understand a lot of the details about what crop insurance is all about, but the point is that it is not a program that has a terrific reputation and, therefore, we were trying to be fair.

We did meet the requirements of the Department of Agriculture. They asked for $154 million. We passed that at the subcommittee level. When it went to the full committee, all of a sudden some of the powers that be, the ones that like making those bigger commissions, made their weight felt.

I think the gentleman from Wisconsin has a responsible amendment. He represents a very agricultural State, as do I. We have seen abuses in this program, and this is a way of sending a very strong message that we are not going to overly reward those who are performing this service.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, she mentioned two things: No. 1 that they are getting this large commission, which is not the case; and, No. 2, the public does not think that people who sell Federal crop insurance earn a commission? That is what I understood the gentlewoman to say. I would think that they would not do it for nothing.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman understands my point that the taxpayers, if they really understood this, would be outraged that they are paying commissions to private sector insurance agents to sell this insurance.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin. It is understandable that he would attempt to move money to the WIC Program, but I want to point out to my colleagues why this is irresponsible to do it at this point and at this time.

As has been mentioned, the WIC Program is already a $3.9 billion program. It has been increased this year $118 million, and this is an attempt to put $23 million, a dribble compared to the total, by decimating the crop insurance program in this country. The $23 million transfer amounts to a 20-percent reduction in crop insurance.

Now, if we want to debate the question of crop insurance and should those insurers receive 24.5 percent or 27 percent, or 34 percent which they received last year, down to 28 percent, the bill funds it at 27 percent, why do we not follow what is going on right now?

The Department of Agriculture, as we speak, is negotiating with the crop insurers to determine at what level crop insurance will be funded. Now, if we eliminate the opportunity for crop insurance insurers to negotiate with the Department of Agriculture by passing this bill, we have already ended the negotiation. Now, that is foolishness. That is irresponsible.

We are trusting the Secretary of Agriculture and the crop insurers to enter into a negotiation, which has always been the case. They will determine at what level crop insurers will be paid for. I am sure the Secretary of Agriculture will protect the taxpayers, as he has in the past, when they have negotiated.

I add again, in the past crop insurers have received 34 percent. We are now down, if the gentleman's amendment is passed, down to 24 percent. That is to cover 54 agricultural programs in America. I suggest there will not be crop insurance available for 54 commodities across the United States.

And for someone to say this does not hurt farmers is preposterous. For someone to say this does not change crop insurance is preposterous. Of course it affects farmers, because it eliminates crop insurance. If we do not want to eliminate crop insurance, defeat this amendment and allow the Secretary to negotiate properly.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would just take a second to point out that we are taking the Secretary's advice in the original mark of the committee, which was at $154 million, and we agree that there should be negotiations. In fact, the proposal was the administration's Department of Agriculture's request. So I do not think we need to add to it.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, that was the Secretary's offer. That was before the negotiation ever started. The negotiation has not been completed or culminated. The Secretary makes an offer, the crop insurers make an offer. That is the way negotiations are supposed to be conducted.

So again I say to my colleagues, this hurts farmers across the country. Defeat this amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, that this does not reduce crop insurance but it reduces crop insurance commissions. Let us be clear about that.

I rise in strong support of the Obey amendment to increase funding for the Women, Infants, and Children Program, a program which provides nutrition assistance to pregnant women and to young children. Last year the congressional majority went after the school lunch program; earlier this year it was the milk and cereal for women and infants.

If my colleagues recall, it was not long ago this year that the Congress debated the merits of the WIC Program during the disaster relief bill. Threats of reduction in the program. It was wrong then and it is wrong now.

These reductions in the WIC Program, I might add, were met with an outcry across the country and, in fact, in a number of places we already saw people who were being thrown off of the program, women and children who were being let go from the program. But I will say that Congress rightly responded by providing the dollars that WIC needed to continue helping to provide nutritious food to women who are expecting children, to infants, and to young children.

Fact is, is that our experience with the WIC Program shows that it is a wise investment. Each dollar invested in WIC saves more than $3 in other Government spending on programs such as Medicaid. It is a wise investment in the health and development of our youngest children, and each day we learn more and more about the critical elements of early childhood development. So supporting WIC helps kids get off on the right foot.

For years we have been steadily progressing toward the goal of providing nutrition assistance to 7.5 million people through the WIC Program. At the very least, we need to hold the line and continue helping 7.4 million women and children as WIC now does.

The funding level in this bill threatens to backtrack on WIC, help fewer people who depend on it. It includes unrealistic assumptions that could end up costing our kids plenty. It is important to note that WIC is funded at $180 million below what the President's request is.

The Obey amendment will address the danger that women and children who need help will be left without healthy food. The Obey amendment will add $23.7 million, enough to provide WIC benefits for 45,000 people, and the amendment prevents knocking off the 55,000 people off of the WIC Program.

The Obey amendment offsets this amount by reducing the $36 million in excessive payments to crop insurance agents contained in the bill. One more time: It is crop insurance commissions and not crop insurance. The Secretary of Agriculture said the insurance agents do not need this extra money.

The GAO has revealed that the taxpayer money is used for outrageous, unreasonable expenses, such as sky boxes at athletic events, country club membership fees, and corporate aircraft. This does not hurt farmers.

The choice before us is to fund efforts to provide healthy food to pregnant women, to young children; or to pay insurance agents to buy sky boxes and to join country clubs. I urge my colleagues, really, to make the choice that is right; to deal with our values and priorities in this country. Let us help those who need the funds, women, infants, and children, and I urge my colleagues to support the Obey amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that we are not even asking that we meet the administration's request for funding level for WIC. This bill funds WIC at $184 million below the President's request. We are adding only a tiny portion back. That is hardly excessive.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not quite sure where to start here, because I think everyone should be informed, I guess, in their statements. And the fact of the matter is, on the WIC Program the administration says we need about a 2½ percent carryover. The bill, with the current funding, has over 3 percent carryover funds. There is more than enough money in the WIC Program to take care of any needs, any emergencies at all.

I think the real debate here is what we are doing to farmers. And I can tell my colleagues, as a farmer myself, that the idea of tying the hands of farmers trying to protect their risk, and agriculture is probably the most volatile business one can be in. A farmer takes more risk than any other business on a year-to-year basis, and they are at the mercy of Mother Nature for hail, wind, rain. We flooded out at home this year.

But the idea of taking away this tool from farmers, insurance, and under the farm bill last year, Mr. Chairman, we made a commitment to farmers out there. We said that they would have the freedom to make choices themselves but they would have with that freedom the responsibility to take care of the risks they have in agriculture. We assured them that there would be insurance available for them; that there would be revenue insurance plans, new innovative plans out there.

Farmers are in the middle of a transition today, of going from the old 60 years of Government control, which has caused the demise of the small family farmer, now to the opportunity to finally make decisions for themselves, to insure their own risk, to create opportunities, to keep their family farms together.

□ 2230

This gutting amendment to crop insurance cuts at the heart of opportunity for farmers and anyone involved in agriculture today.

We are not asking for much. We are asking for the opportunity to work inside the system. And a reduction like that, a 6, almost 7 percent reduction in the current bill from what insurance was last year, is harmful enough, let alone to take it down to a level where we are going to have insurance companies no longer offering crop insurance to real farmers out there.

I am surprised that people who are from farm States would be offering this type of amendment, which is going to decimate the insurance business, going to hurt farmers out there, take away the opportunities to protect their own risk.

Apparently, what we want to do is go back to a system where the Government comes in and helps out with disaster payments. And if we want to look at the trend in agriculture in farm bills, 10 years ago we were spending about $26 billion a year directly to farmers. This year it is about $5 billion. We are at 20 percent where we were 10 years ago support for agriculture and for farmers. And I think it is really a low blow to anyone who cares about agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Agriculture, for 7 of the last 11 years, has taken the biggest hit on reductions. I would like to convince my colleagues over on the left that we have now stopped and are phasing out subsidies for agriculture. I helped write the risk management language in the farm bill. They now have to pay for this insurance. No more disaster relief for agriculture.

If we cannot phase in this kind of risk management insurance for farmers, we are going to be very hard-pressed. As we phase out the subsidy programs and do not pay the farmers that direct payment anymore, now we are simply saying farmers have to dig into their own pocket to start covering their risk, no more disaster insurance, no more subsidy payments. I think it is very important that we not cut way down on the phasing in of this risk management and insurance.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me say in closing, anyone who likes to eat, who likes to eat food, good quality food, at a reasonable price, produced by family farms who care about agriculture should oppose this amendment, understanding there is way more money than necessary in the WIC program already, but you are cutting the heart out of the family farmers when you do this, and anyone who votes for this amendment is cutting out the family

farmer; and let them all remember that.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

For those of my colleagues who are prolife, as I am, I urge them to vote yes on the Obey amendment. This is one of the most positive prolife votes my colleagues will be called upon to cast. This program, we all know, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] knows, and the gentleman votes for WIC, this program helps pregnant women and nursing women and their children, their children both born and unborn.

If one is truly prolife, it is not enough to be only anti-abortion. Prolife is a very positive position and not just a negative position. I am anti-abortion, but I am prolife. And there is a fundamental distinction in that.

Many of my colleagues were elected to this Congress on a prolife platform. They campaigned on a prolife platform. They asked the National Right to Life for their endorsement. They asked their own State Right to Life for endorsement. They ran on a prolife platform, and many of them got elected because they ran on that prolife platform.

I do not think any of them ran on a crop insurance commission platform. Now this is a chance for them to stand on that prolife platform. This is an essential vote for prolife. Be positive. Be for life. Vote for this amendment. My colleagues talk about food, feeding people. Pregnant women are hungry. Remember those words uttered about 2,000 years ago: ''I was hungry, and you gave me to eat.'' Prolife, vote for this amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I am prolife, and I certainly agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] that one of the strongest things one can do as a Member of the Congress who is prolife is to support people who are hungry. And that is why I am going to vote against the WIC bureaucrat increase and vote for the farmers.

The farmers are the ones who produce foods, not Washington bureaucrats. It appears that our well-intended friends on the other side of the aisle are once again feeding bureaucrats, and this time they are taking the food away from the families by hitting the farmers right between the eyes on it.

Mr. Speaker, the agriculture bill is always kind of a convoluted maze of price supports, import-export quotas, allotments, all kinds of different jargon that is unique to the ag committees and ag laws. But the results of it are spectacular. Two percent of the American population feeds 100 percent of the population plus millions of people throughout the world.

Americans, on an average, pay 11 cents on a dollar earned for food. That is less than what they pay for recreation, on an average. That is why we have so many of these farm programs. Some of them are very hard to explain. But the results, when you are paying 11 cents on the dollar for food and 2 percent of the population is feeding 100 percent, it works.

In this bill of $49 billion, $37 billion goes to food and nutrition programs. Just in May, 2 months ago, we increased WIC $76 million. And I quote from the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], my friend, May 1, 1997, ''the $76 million figure is based on numbers submitted from the States to the U.S. Department of Agriculture in early April of this year. These numbers are, in fact, only a few weeks old.''

We increased in response to that $76 million. Now we have increased it again a mere 2 months later $118 million. Now, it is always nice to say, hey, we have got starving women. But according to the numbers of our colleagues on the left, that $76 million increase was full funded. Now we are going another 118. According to our figures, USDA figures, this is full participation of WIC at 7.4 million people.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to note that WIC, as we speak, has a $200 million carry-over. That is a surplus in the WIC fund. We are not talking about children versus commission agents. We are talking about farmers versus bureaucrats. I know there are a lot of people who like bureaucrats and a lot of people who want to see government grow. But as for me, I am going to go with the farmers. Because it is the farmers who grow the food, it is the farmers who feed the children, it is the farmers who feed the families, it is the farmers who feed the babies. It is not Washington bureaucrats. The only thing that this thing does is take money away from farmers and give it to the bureaucrats. I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I think that what happens is we are taking the taxpayers' money and giving the sales commissions to the insurance agents. That is who is getting the money.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, it would be great if we were privately funding the whole bill. But, unfortunately, the taxpayers are paying all $49 billion of this bill; $37 billion of it is going into food and nutrition programs for children, but that is not enough.

What appears to be happening is that some folks want to take more away from the farmers and give more to Washington bureaucrats. The farmers are the ones feeding the families.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, I agree with the gentleman. We had a freedom to farm bill and we said to the farmers of America, compete in the global marketplace. Why do we not say the same to the insurance agents?

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, I know there are a lot of people who do not like the private sector, and I know the private sector is anathema to many Members on my colleague's side. But the fact is the private sector is delivering the insurance program cheaper than some of his friends over at USDA. It is saving taxpayer dollars. It is shrinking the size of Government. And it is more efficiently penetrating the marketplace so we do not have to have these disaster relief bills that are a big government expenditure year after year.

I think, finally, the USDA has moved in a very smart, efficient, commonsense direction. But now again, Mr. Speaker, people want to take money away from the farmers and give it to the bureaucrats. Their amendment is bureaucrat and it is anti-food and anti-farmers. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

I would like to get a little more direct in the conversation and try to have a little less demagoguery back and forth on either side here. Frankly, this is no way the type of bill it can be construed to be, the farmers versus the bureaucrats. We are talking about commissions here.

Farmers, as far as I know, do not make insurance commissions. But we are talking about a WIC program that is generally perceived to be probably one of the most successful programs we have had in the social programs of this country. We are talking about a program that deals with low birth weights, deals with infant mortality, deals with child anemia, saves money in Medicaid in the future, and reduces the number of infants that need costly medical care in the future.

Basically, what we are trying to do, as I think the Members on that side of the aisle well know, is make sure that we forward fund enough so that there is not a lapse going from one year to the next year and that we do not leave some 45 to 55 thousand women, infants, and children without the kind of nutritional work and without the kind of food that they need to be sustained in this successful program. And we are pitting that against, I guess you would say, the insurance people, the ones that are earning that commission, not against the farmers.

Certainly, nobody has the intention of harming the farmers here. And few people in my district or many other districts, I would suggest, are going to believe that this is a thing against farmers and bureaucrats. It is commissions being earned by insurance people, and it is people that are women, children, and infants receiving nutrition that they need to make sure that they do not fall between the cracks as we go from one year to another.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIERNEY] for yielding.

I simply want to say that I find a couple of the last statements bordering on jokes. Just because one repeats a mistake 50 times does not make it a fact. And the fact is that this does not do anything to cut crop insurance. It cuts crop insurance commissions.

Now when they passed a freedom to farm act, I would say to our friends on the other side of the aisle, they did not pass a freedom to milk the farmers act. And neither did they pass a bill that allowed salesmen to milk the taxpayers.

What we are trying to do is to simply meet our primary responsibility to farmers to see to it that programs which we have on the books for their assistance are defensible so that demagogs do not rip them up. And the fact is that when insurance agents are going around charging skyboxes at baseball and football stadiums to the taxpayer, that discredits the entire program. And that kind of nonsense has to stop, and that is what we are attempting to do.

It so happens to be that the USDA and the OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Agriculture Department both agree with the Obey amendment because they know that in the long run nothing protects farmers more than protecting the integrity of programs that are supposed to serve farmers. When we have insurance agents ripping this program off, it does not do diddly for farmers, despite the propaganda mantra that is being repeated this evening, and it certainly does not do diddly for the taxpayers.

If my colleagues are on the side of farmers and not on the side of women and infants and children who need WIC funding, they support this amendment; they do not listen to the propaganda of the insurance agents who are ripping off the country in this case.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I obviously associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and I close by saying that we have to take a chance, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to take a chance that 45 to 55 thousand women, infants, and children are going to be at risk at the end of this year. I will take the chance that some insurance agency does not make all of the commission that they might otherwise be entitled to under this bill.

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

□ 2245

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman when he says let us not demagog this. Let us be perfectly up front of what is happening. We did away with subsidies for farmers in the freedom to farm bill last year. Risk management is a new type of insurance. It is insurance that not only is sunshine insurance on the weather, but it is also insurance on what happens to those crop prices in the new revolution of world trade where other countries can affect now the price as much as production in this country.

So we are moving into a new area of insurance called risk management insurance. The amount of money that we call commissions is a subsidy to farmers, because if that commission is not paid by taxpayers in this transition to this new type of insurance program, then it is going to be paid by the farmers. That money is going to be charged to somebody.

Right now the Secretary of Agriculture is negotiating to the best of his ability to get those commissions as low as possible. So I would suggest with great respect for the people that made this amendment's feeling of need for the WIC Program is that it is not a good policy judgment to take it out of a new risk management program as we try to move farmers into their decisionmaking of deciding how much of what crop to plant instead of Government doing it, as we put the burden on farmers for the risk of disaster and the risk of their success in farming, as we take away the deficiency programs that taxpayers have paid to farmers for the last 50 years.

So in an effort to make this transition, I think it is very important that we move farmers into reaching into their own pocket, which they are doing with this insurance program, and satisfying their risk management needs. But it is a new area. Let us not cut down or cut back on the transition to this new era where agriculture and farmers and ranchers are moving into the private sector and the real marketplace.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey amendment. I would like to address it from two basic areas. One is the credibility and the importance of the WIC Program. The second will be about the difference between our argument over here about insurance commissions versus the good will and the kind of product that we get out of the WIC Program.

Members will hear me on this floor talk many times about early childhood development. Let me give my colleagues some statistics about what early childhood development really means to us as taxpayers on both sides of the aisle.

It is estimated by national nonpartisan groups that we as taxpayers pay approximately $800,000 per child where we have to pay for nutrition programs, remedial education, sometimes incarceration and all kinds of other social programs later on in life. We pay that. Instead of investing merely 10 percent of that money early on, we can prevent those kinds of problems. In the age group 0 to 6, which is where the WIC Program really focuses its effort, if we put our money into that area, we will save taxpayers on both sides of the aisle a great deal of money.

In my State of Rhode Island just recently, a pregnant woman on the WIC Program gave birth to a daughter, Mindy, but after only 27 weeks of pregnancy. When Mindy was born, she was merely 1 pound 5 ounces, with her head barely the size of a small peach. But thanks to special formula and the follow-up visits because of the WIC Program we have put into place, nutritionists helped Mindy and her mother, and now after a year and a half she is as active as any toddler that we would know.

Mindy's mom could never have afforded her continual visits and the nutrition she received as a result of WIC. The assistance WIC has given to her is exactly how we can save taxpayers money later on. Medical research has found that WIC reduces infant mortality, improves diet and has been linked to improving development among children. For every dollar that we put into the WIC Program, we save $3.50 later on in Medicaid and other costs.

The validity and the importance of WIC is undeniable. So the real question is why would we take $23.7 million out of the crop insurance fund for this? Let me tell my colleagues, if they were on this side and arguing this, they would say any program that has overhead and commission of 27 percent should be looked at and changed. They would say privatization is the cure to that. And if any company was operating on an overhead and a commission of 27 percent, they should be looked into as a part of the Government. We are saying, quite frankly, that overhead and commission is far too much. To knock it down to 24.5 percent is barely reasonable, to knock it down even more than that is more than reasonable for the taxpayers. What we are saying is do not hurt the farmers, but do not hurt the women, infants and children. Realize that there should be a reduction in this overhead and this commission and it should go to helping women, infants and children.

If Members are for insurance rates and are for paying that outrageous fee for overhead and commission, do not vote for the Obey amendment. But if Members truly are concerned about saving taxpayers money and helping women, infants and children, vote for the Obey amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for the Obey amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill. This amendment, as my colleagues have

heard, is going to add $23.7 million for the special supplemental food program for women, infants and children. Under that amendment, $23.7 million would be taken from funding for crop insurance sales commissions. The Committee on Appropriations raised the funding for crop insurance sales commissions above the level that was approved by the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations. The Department of Agriculture has indicated that the level approved by the subcommittee is sufficient for the crop insurance sales commissions. The offset appears to be appropriate and reasonable.

The Committee on Appropriations funding level for WIC is $30 million short of what is needed to maintain the current caseload in fiscal year 1998, and it would result in a reduction in participation of 55,000 to 60,000 women, infants and children next year.

Mr. Chairman, WIC is an effective prevention program that saves on future health care costs. WIC provides food, education, and child care to poor women, infants and children. It is estimated that 1 in 5 children in our country is living in poverty and 5 million children under the age of 12 go to bed hungry each month. No child in our country should go to bed hungry. Only well-nourished children reach their potential and become productive contributing members of society.

Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, the pain and violence of hunger can be reduced by appropriating additional money to the WIC Program. This increase would provide supplemental food and nutrition education for at least 45,000 women, infants and children per month in the coming fiscal year. Without this additional money, these eligible participants will be part of the growing childhood hunger epidemic that plagues us.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a yes vote on the amendment.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment that I was going to offer, but I am going to withdraw that amendment and rise in support of the Obey amendment. The one difference in my amendment and his amendment is he is asking for $23 million and I was asking for $184 million for the 1998 fiscal year. Actually I was asking to bring WIC up to the request that the President had asked for. Again, another difference is rather than take it from the crop insurance, I had asked for a cut across the board which would represent 37 percent of all discretionary accounts in that program.

The choice between whether we ask for the crop insurance or ask for WIC, that is a hard issue obviously. But in the final analysis, it is really not a hard issue if we are going to raise children. If the difference is between having kids to eat, having kids to be healthy, that is no question at all. My preference is that we do not take it from the crop insurance, because I personally know the crop insurance is needed.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for that amendment if she puts it in, but let us not take it out of crop insurance that farmers are going to suffer from.

Mrs. CLAYTON. The gentleman will vote for $184 million for WIC?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the gentlewoman takes it out as a pro rata reduction across the board. But do not take it out of crop insurance that is so important in the transition of the Freedom to Farm bill.

Mrs. CLAYTON. The gentleman has concurrence on his side that he will vote for the $185 million?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will vote for it.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Did the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] hear the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] say that he would be willing to move from $23 million to $184 million that I had offered? I was just wondering and that seemed like a bargain to me, but I do not know if he has concurrence on his side of the aisle.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentlewoman will yield, with all due respect, I think we have the proper amendment before us. The gentleman is suggesting that he would add what?

Mrs. CLAYTON. That he would raise it from $23 million to $184 million.

Mr. OBEY. Where does the money come from?

Mrs. CLAYTON. My amendment would have it coming from across the board.

Mr. OBEY. I understand the gentlewoman's would, but where is he suggesting?

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, where is the gentleman from Michigan suggesting?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Pro rata across the board like she is suggesting.

Mr. OBEY. I do not think that is the proper way to do business.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, the point is that trying to raise the level of children to be healthy indeed is not a hard decision.

I think the preferable way would be across the board. That is what my amendment would do. But if we are not going to raise it $23 million, I can ill expect that we are going to raise it $184 million, what the President asked for.

We have a bill before Congress called Hunger Has a Cure. It simply means that those of us who care about children and care about starving people or care about their health, we feel it ought to be raised to an issue. I personally have a preference that it should come across the board. But if I am not going to get that opportunity, I am going to withdraw that amendment. If the Obey amendment goes down, maybe I will offer it, but if it does not go down, we will indeed be supportive of it.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think there has been a healthy debate here. I certainly have not agreed with all of the theories put out, particularly on the other side, but I think there are some points that need to be made.

No. 1, the Federal crop insurance program costs are being reduced. It is a fact that if we expect USDA to carry this program all on their own without the private sector, the Government would cost 147 percent more than the private sector. So it is not a good investment for us to be cutting a program that is cost effective.

There has been a lot of talk over here about skyboxes. But let me tell my colleagues that the Federal Crop Insurance Program makes a contract with the insurers and at a set rate reimburses them. If an insurance company or anyone else chooses to have a skybox, that is something else and it is not charged to the Federal Government. They enter into a contract, the Federal Government, with the crop insurance agency.

Let me also say that farmers will suffer because of the Obey amendment. Under this amendment, service will be cut, farmers will have to wait longer for an adjuster to come, they will wait longer to get a claim settled, and the range of products which are offered to America's farmers will very likely change.

□ 2300

So it does have a detrimental effect.

Finally, all the criticism about the Federal crop insurance program and how it operates and all the talk about WIC. Well, while WIC is a fine program, I am sure, there are many who claim that there is waste and fraud in the WIC Program, and I believe that is substantiated by GAO, and yet we hear nothing about that as if there were no problems in that. There are problems in probably every Federal program, so throwing more money at it is certainly not the answer.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EWING. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, and the gentleman is on the Specialty Commodities Committee. Now on these programs, to make sure, is WIC fully funded?

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding.

Mr. KINGSTON. According to our calculations it is funded at 7.4 million participants and that it is fully funded.

Now does WIC have any leftover money, or are they scraping the bottom right now?

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I think they had $200 million, was it left in their account?

Mr. KINGSTON. They have a $200 million carryover, and so the discussion of saying that there are children starving and because of this we have got to give the benefit of the doubt is totally specious, totally emotional, total demagoguery. The children are not starving. The only thing we are going to do here is increase the bureaucracy on the backs of the American farmer. That is what we are talking about.

Mr. EWING. Did we not just increase WIC funding a couple months ago?

Mr. KINGSTON. We increased it in May by $76 million. We increase it in this bill $118 million.

Mr. EWING. That is almost $200 million.

Mr. KINGSTON. Exactly. And 2 months ago we were told the $76 million increase would bring us up to the full participation level, and we did not have a dialog or a debate about this in committee. It was everybody was happy.

Mr. EWING. In the appropriation process, has the gentleman found that just large expenditures and new money make a program better?

Mr. KINGSTON. No; I have not.

That is a very good point because there seems to be something here that WIC is good, pay more money into it. It can be good at adequately funded levels right now, and I am not sure why people are trying to run away from that. It is possible that the program is good as is. I think, and the gentleman has already suggested, we should try to increase the efficiency of it. I think that there is some waste in it. Twenty-five percent of the money goes to administration. I think we could do a better job and feed more children from that, and less bureaucrats. But to add money to a program that has a $200 million carryover, a $200 million surplus, if the gentleman will, and a program that is already completely fully funded is ridiculous, and to take it away from American farmers is even worse.

Mr. EWING. Reclaiming the balance of my time, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Georgia, I appreciate the hard work he has done on this bill, and I think we should defeat this amendment.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my very strong support for the Obey amendment. We all experienced the debate that we had to restore the $76 million just a few months ago when there was reported to be a shortfall that would severely impact on all of our districts, and so here again we are now confronted by a committee deliberation, which, as I understand it, will be shortfalling again a full funding as recommended by the Department of Agriculture, some $30 million short. The Obey amendment will provide $23.7 million of this shortfall.

The issue is we have to base our funding upon reliable statistics from either OMB or the Department of Agriculture. It makes no sense for us to discuss what the estimated number of participants will be in this program. We have to trust the estimates provided us by the Department, and by their statistics and their analysis there will be some 50,000 individuals left out if this additional money were not provided.

So I support that. It seems to me that if we could support this program with a sense that if there are eligible people that meet the criteria that we have set by our legislation, then they ought not to be left without support under the program. It should be as simple as that. If my colleagues do not like the eligibility standards or because they think too many people are being allowed in, then change the standards. But as long as we have the standards there that say 185 percent of poverty, they qualify; if they have children younger than 1 year of age and so forth, if they meet these qualifications, it seems to me it is perfectly right that the Government appropriate the moneys necessary to meet this obligation. I consider this an obligation.

The program has provided tremendous benefits to all of us, not only the children and the mothers involved, but because with the early support and the early nutritional information and the foods that are supplied, we have been able to cut down the costs of Medicaid and other health benefits which they might have an entitlement to receive. So it is a very, very cost-benefit, cost-efficient program.

So it seems to me that it is very logical that if my colleagues support the women, infants children program, that they would do everything they can to fully fund it to make sure that every child that is eligible, every expectant mother who is eligible would have the necessary program support.

Now we have heard tonight about this $200 million, moneys that have not been called for. I had the opportunity to attend a WIC conference in San Francisco not too long ago, and there was a discussion there as to why this additional moneys seem to have a carryover at the end of the year. The reason is simple. All of us run our offices. We incur obligations, we pay bills, we send our vouchers to the finance office here for payment. But the payments are not forthcoming. It may take a month, it may take 2 months to have our bills paid. But that does not mean because we have these funds on reserve in our committee account that they are not obligated. That $200 million is obligated.

The people who I talked to from the WIC Program tell me these are unpaid vouchers that have been submitted but have not been paid to that. This is not extra money that we can use to balance the budget or reduce the deficit. These are moneys that have been committed to the program up to the end of the fiscal year. They have been vouchers submitted to the Government but not paid. Let us not steal from this money just because it seems to be a carryover balance. These are moneys that are committed.

If we are going to budget for the next fiscal year, let us be real, let us count the number of families, number of women and children that we believe are going to be eligible, estimate what the costs are going to be; costs are rising, the price of the commodities is going up; and let us appropriate sufficient amounts of money so that we do not have to come here in the spring next year and worry about a supplemental allocation. It seems to me that that is the least we can do to support this program which so many people say is so beneficial to our families.

We all run on a family first kind of agenda. This is truly a family first amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] answered the very important question about any suggestions of a $200 million slush fund for the WIC Program. It is very obvious accounting principles that those are attributable to unpaid invoices that have to be paid.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think the real question to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is whether or not they will opt for luxury skyboxes or whether or not they will opt to feed women, infants and children. I think it is appalling that even though we are $184 million short, we cannot find enough humanity to allow a mere $23 million increase.

I join the honorable gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] in supporting the $184 million increase. Recognizing that the amendment on the floor is the amendment by the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], I support the $23 million because I want to ensure that we get some relief for the 55,000 women who would not be covered but for this amendment.

It just, if my colleagues will, causes me great consternation that the Republicans cannot see the logic in this particular amendment. No one is talking about crop insurance per se as much as they are talking about the commissions attributable to such.

Let me give my colleagues just a few statistics. One, it is interesting that this country, one of the most developed and sophisticated countries in the world, has a high infant mortality rate. We can go to any place in this Nation, urban centers, rural communities, and find a high infant mortality rate. In fact, we will go to various WIC centers around the Nation and find that at the certification process some 43 percent of the women who come in that are pregnant have three or more nutrition risk factors. That means that women who come into the WIC centers to secure the kind of nutritious treatment that they should get in order to ensure that

they have a long-term pregnancy, they go to full term, that they do not have premature birth, those women, if they were not in the program, would suffer through three nutrition risks, and that means they would be subject to the very tragic potential of infant mortality, sometimes a premature birth, low birth rate in their babies.

It seems to be without any sort of real thinking that one would have to dwell on whether I choose luxury skyboxes or whether I choose the program that feeds women, infants and children.

Interestingly enough, if we just take the statistics in my own community in Harris County, we will find that there are at least 12,000 women who are on the WIC Program during the month. There are more that need to be on the program. Five thousand breast-feeding women receive WIC services per month. There are more that need to be on the program. Nine thousand postpartum women receive WIC services per month. More need to be on the program. Twenty-nine thousand infants benefited from WIC services per month. More need to be on the program. And 51,000 preschool children benefited by the WIC Program. More need to be on the program.

This $23 million, a mere drop in the bucket, will help 55,000 women across this Nation, women, infants and children to be served as they should be served. The question is what are the services? Well, it is what we take for granted. How many of us in this Congress take for granted eggs, peanut butter, cheese, juices, beans? And how many of us take for granted that those that we know, our family members and friends, have a ready access to infant formula? Do my colleagues realize there are Americans in this country, there are people living in this Nation, that do not have access to eggs and peanut butter, cheese, juices, infant formula? It seems incredulous, but it seems incredulous to me again that we can stand on this floor and talk about skyboxes and talk about golfing trips and various other substitutes while $23 million that would help the children, would help the women and would help the infants.

Again it is interesting. As my colleagues stood on the floor, I am delighted that this is a combination of those of us who have come together who believe in the quality of life. I heard my colleague mentioning his pro-life posture. He rises. I happen to believe in another aspect of choice. I rise. It would seem that if we can come together around this very important issue, I do not see why this is not a bipartisan amendment, I do not see why there are not more voices rising and saying that we can support a $23 million addition that will help children, will help women, and will help our infants and decrease infant mortality in this Nation.

I support the Obey amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Obey amendment because it increases funding for the WIC Program by $23.7 million.

I have been told that we measure the humaneness of a society by how well it treats its young, how well it treats its old, and how well it treats those who cannot take care of themselves, and so when we increase funding for this program, we are looking out for those who have the most difficulty in looking out for themselves. And even the $23.7 million is still less than the $30 million that is really needed.

Now I have heard those argue that we really do not need the additional money because there may be some shortfall that can be overcome by surpluses. The reality is that when we look at those projections, we are taking a gamble. I do not want to gamble with the lives of 45 to 50,000 women and children who could, in fact, benefit for certain.

□ 2315

There has been a great deal of talk about family values, about the development of people. Yet, when there is an opportunity to put our monies where the conversations are, we find that providing insurance protection, providing commissions is more important than providing milk and butter and eggs and cheese.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the little bit of money we are talking about right now for WIC, in my area in Chicago and Cook County there are well over 100,000 women and children who benefit from this program. As a matter of fact, many of the large urban centers throughout the country could have solved the 45,000 to 50,000 alone, by themselves; when we really go into the crevices and cracks of our society, we find those who are untouchable and unreachable.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for giving this House an opportunity to demonstrate its humaneness. I urge support for the Obey amendment.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will try to be brief. I think it is safe to say I have a long history in support of the women and children program, that program and others of that nature, in my other life, in another place.

I also would like to take the Members for a little walk, if I could, about some of the things I think we ought to be thinking about. I wonder if we have forgotten that in many places of the world, in the modern world, that nearly all of disposable income is spent for the food and fiber we subsist on. In this Nation we enjoy like 14 percent or 15 percent of our disposable income being used for that purpose.

I have no quarrel with the WIC program. I support it. But I do suggest to the Members that to take it from this area is wrong. The spin on that is not something that we would anticipate. We do not want to do this. Yes, a bill was passed before I got here, the Family Farm Act. I would have supported it if I had been here. I think the time had come. But for that to work we have to have the opportunity for them to have some coverage, some insurance to stay in business.

I come from a farm community. That is what I do. I have been known to have had a lot of dirt under my fingernails, as some of the other Members. But I can tell the Members, why, I know of nobody, I never been invited to any sky box, and I do not know anybody who has. I do not think that is the issue. I think that horse has been ridden to death this evening.

I think it is OK to try to increase the WIC program, but not from this source. I would guess in this great House of Representatives here, that if we really care about those things that have been talked about, that we can bring our minds together and do something to enhance that. I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], I do not think this is the place to get it.

I regret to have to go against the gentleman on this, but I must do that, because I feel that at least I come from the sense that we have to work together if we are going to produce the food and fiber that this country needs, and not be dependent on it from somewhere else. So I oppose it, and I hope that we can find some other source to address this problem.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman, we are hearing limits on debates on this matter and other matters. I was wondering if the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations could shed some light on this.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, Mr. Chairman. Let me simply say that as the gentleman knows, trying to figure out what is happening at any point in this House on any subject, the way it is being run these days, is extremely difficult, to say the least.

Let me simply say that for the last 2 days this House has been at a procedural impasse because the majority party in the Committee on Rules arrogantly disregarded the rights of minority managers of the bills. It arbitrarily denied the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] the right to offer a major amendment on the foreign operations bill, a bill which she is supposed to manage on this side of the aisle. It did the same thing to the gentlewoman

from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] several weeks ago on a previous bill. It did the same thing to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] on the Interior appropriations bill.

The majority party determined to bring the agriculture bill to the floor without a rule. The procedural protest which this side has been engaging in on the other problems is apparently now being responded to by attempts to go to the Committee on Rules and draft what we understand is going to be a draconian rule which will allow virtually a meaningless 5 minutes of debate on serious amendments, which will apparently eliminate the right to strike items in this bill, which goes to the heart of the congressional prerogative to protect the power of the purse.

I would simply say that if that is indeed the case, then it makes the debate which we are having on this amendment at this point tonight useless, because it apparently is simply a time-filler until the majority party responds in exactly the wrong way to our concerns.

Mr. Chairman, this is exactly opposite the actions which would be taken by a party that wanted to promote bipartisanship, that wanted to promote collegiality. And in my view, if they do intend to proceed down that road, it will certainly lead to more acrimonious days on the floor of the House.

It apparently is not enough that they are cannibalizing themselves in their own caucus. Apparently the legislative process itself is to be cannibalized. I would simply urge the majority party, if they are planning to do that, that they think about it overnight, because that would be a most destructive way to proceed. It would not be a fair outcome. It would be a total misreading of their responsibilities, given the already acrimonious feelings in this House. I would hope that in their own interests, as well as the interests of this House, they would reconsider their apparent plans.

Mr. MEEHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, what is of concern to me is not only the discussion that we have had tonight that would basically be a discussion that would be wasted, but I have an amendment that is a fundamentally important amendment to the future of this country regarding tobacco use in America and protecting America's children from tobacco.

What I am hearing is we are going to have a rule that is going to limit debate on that amendment to a mere 5 minutes per side, which I find an absolute outrage. At 11:25 in the evening, I am getting word that a bill that fundamentally affects the ability of this country to regulate tobacco use among children is going to be limited to 5 minutes, an absolute outrage. If that is what is going on at the Committee on Rules right now, I would suggest that the Members of the majority party get their act together.

Because if we have a 5-minute debate on a rule that would limit debate on amendments that affect tobacco use specifically, an amendment that I have that would allow the FDA to enforce rules and regulations that are on the books all over this country, if we are going to limit debate after waiting all day for this amendment to be offered, then I think the majority party better think and act very, very cautiously. Because I as one Member would be outraged if we get a rule and this Congress is asked to pass that rule tomorrow and limit debate on fundamentally important issues of tobacco use.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleagues in strongly protesting the proposed rule, and I have not seen the rule as yet, but I would hope that this misguided rule is just a rumor, and not reality.

I have an amendment with the gentlewoman from Colorado [Ms. DEGETTE] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], and many other Members join us in support of this amendment, that would also deal with the tobacco subsidy and would try to bring some consistency to this policy, to make sure that our health policy is consistent with our subsidy policy. It just does not make any sense at all.

And to think that we are going to limit this debate on this very important issue to 15 minutes a side, and we hear about this at 11:25 at night when we have been waiting all day and all night to debate this issue, this just does not make any sense at all.

I would appeal to my colleagues, our distinguished chairman on the other side of the aisle, to protest this rule, because limiting this important discussion to either 5 minutes a side on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] or 15 minutes a side on our amendment just does not make any sense at all.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I would also add to the words of my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York, to point out that our tobacco policy in this country is inconsistent. Last year we spent nearly $200 million to prevent tobacco use, and we spent $80 million on tobacco crop insurance subsidies. That is why the Lowey-DeGette-Hansen-Meehan amendment enjoys broad bipartisan support on both sides of the aisle. That is why it would be a real crime if we limited the debate on this issue to just a few minutes per side.

There are many voices on both sides of the aisle that have a lot to say about the tobacco policy in this country, about a policy that is killing millions of Americans and causing millions of young people to begin smoking every year. That is why I would hope that this rule would not be limited, and I would also join my colleagues in urging the Committee on Rules to rethink any such proposed rule.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MEEHAN. What is really concerning about this, Mr. Chairman, is if we look at the fact that 44 attorneys general from all across America have spent months and months negotiating on this issue of tobacco and FDA regulations, when we look at the fact that there have been literally millions of pages of newspapers all across America debating the issue of tobacco in America and what we are going to do about it, to think that we are going to limit, in the people's House, we are going to limit the debate on this major, fundamentally important issue to 5 minutes here or 15 minutes here is an outrage. America is waiting for a discussion about how we are going to protect the next generation of Americans from the leading preventable cause of death in America.

We are saying that we do not want to debate this, we are going to limit debate, because it is 11:30 at night and some Members may be tired. It makes us wonder how the tobacco companies really work and when they are working and where they are working.

We ought to have a substantive discussion, it seems to me, about tobacco in this country, and it seems that the majority has been running away from this discussion. Let us have this discussion and have a rule, maintain the rule, and let us get up and debate this. I just want to say that I, too, am outraged that they, the majority party, could even contemplate such a ridiculous move.

Mrs. LOWEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, consistent with the arguments of my colleague, it just does not make sense at all to know that we are spending $200 million to prevent our youngsters from using tobacco, and yet we are going to limit our debate to make our policy on crop insurance consistent with our health policy to 15 minutes a side.

And we are not talking about the billions of dollars that are being spent in Medicaid and Medicare. Many of my colleagues have a lot to say on this issue. Tobacco is on the minds of thousands and thousands of our constituents.

I would ask my colleagues, and I know I am joined by colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to reconsider any rule that would limit the discussion to 10 minutes on either side, or even 15 minutes on either side. This is an important issue and we should give it fair time.

□ 2330

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe what I am hearing, honestly. We worked in a

bipartisan way on this agriculture bill. We brought it to the floor without a rule so that we could have unlimited debate on these issues. And what we find when we come to the floor is everybody wants to talk about everything but agriculture.

And the fact is, when we brought this bill up last week, the dilatory tactics that were undertaken by the minority precluded any substantive debate on agriculture. It was all about, we got one after another after another, motion to rise, motion to rise, motion to rise.

We could have been debating the gentleman from Massachusetts's amendment. We could have been debating the gentlewoman from Ohio's amendment and the gentlewoman from New York's and the gentleman from Wisconsin's, but we could not get a vote. We could not have any debate because of the dilatory tactics.

Now we come in today. We are prepared to debate the agriculture bill again, and we have a series of suspension votes, which normally means that we just voice vote them because everyone basically agrees to them. We are forced to vote on every single issue, rollcall votes that tie everybody up in knots, that preclude us from doing our committee work, that preclude us from having a substantive debate on agriculture. And now we propose, if we cannot have a substantive debate, we will have to limit the rule so that we can get back to the issues at hand and the minority complains.

You reap what you sow on the agriculture bill and every other bill. If we cannot work in a bipartisan way, then we have to have a rule.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I will not yield to the gentleman. He has had all night.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful that the Appropriations Committee has reported continued funding for the Agricultural Development in the American Pacific [ADAP] project and the Tropical and Subtropical Agricultural Research Programs, both conducted by the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service within the USDA.

With committee provisions reporting ADAP funding at $564,000, as in previous years, the American Government demonstrates its continuing commitment to provide funds and grants to its communities in the Asia-Pacific region. These include not only Guam, but also Hawaii, the Northern Marianas Islands, American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Freely Associated States.

ADAP funds a number of activities for the Asia-Pacific communities. These include financing research of regional agricultural problems common to members of the five land-grant institutions in the American-affiliated Pacific, strengthening market information systems, producing instructional materials development and distribution, and providing scholarships for land-grant faculty and staff.

I commend the committee's continued support for ADAP, however, I am disappointed with the decreased funding it has reported for the Tropical and Subtropical Agricultural Research Programs. Not only does this program impact Guam, it also affects Hawaii, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. For the people of Guam, the Tropical and Subtropical Research Programs fund numerous activities. These include financing research contributing to the establishment of energy and labor efficient irrigation and fertigator systems, watermelon disease control, modeling crop production systems, market surveys, and the biological control of pests in order to increase productivity.

Although I have stressed the benefits Guam receives from these programs, I also point to the implications the Tropical and Subtropical Research Programs have on the neighboring regions. Knowledge and expertise culled from these studies not only improve Guam's local agricultural industry, they are disseminated throughout Micronesia, Asia, and Africa.

American tropical and subtropical regions face agricultural needs unique to other areas. Continued support for the Tropical and Subtropical Research Programs are necessary steps to improving not only the livelihood of the people of Guam, but also other tropical regions of the world.

I will continue to actively support funding for ADAP and the Tropical and Subtropical Agricultural Research Programs. These programs are fundamental vehicles for improving standards of living not only on Guam, but also other tropical regions of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2160) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

A DOUBLE STANDARD

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk recently in Washington about the influence of foreign money on Members of Congress and on the administration. The most recent media reports indicate that there may have been complicity between the government of the People's Republic of China and Mr. John Huang to influence our elections and certain Federal officials of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may have missed a recent report in The Hill newspaper which reported that as much as $86 million was spent by foreign governments to lobby and conduct public relations with both private and public officials of our Government. It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that it is perfectly legal for foreign governments to spend over $86 million to lobby the Congress and the White House, but no one ever questions the ethical aspects of the process.

So while we are pointing fingers at China for alleged misconduct to lobby and influence our policymakers, there appears to be a standard that is confusing to me and I am sure to the American people. I call it a double standard.

[From The Hill, June 25, 1997]

FOREIGN STATES SPENT $86 M TO LOBBY U.S.

(By Robert Schlesinger)

Foreign governments, led by Japan, reported spending in excess of $86 million on activities including lobbying and public relations in the United States during the first six months of 1996, according to filings made to the Department of Justice under the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA).

Overall, foreign interests, working through more than 330 separate registered entities, reported $430,867,734 in activities reportable under the FARA in the first half of last year, according to an analysis by The Hill of the attorney general's report to Congress on FARA filings.

Individuals or groups must register as foreign agents if they perform certain activities, ranging from lobbying to trade promotion, on behalf of a foreign entity, such as a government or corporation.

''The U.S. is definitely uniquely open and user friendly to official foreign lobbyists from all over the world,'' said Alan Tonelson of the U.S. Business and Industrial Council Educational Foundation (USBICEF). ''This situation is not even close to being reciprocated anywhere.''

The government of Japan, mostly through entities like the Japan External Trade Organization (JETRO), reported spending at least $17,840,878—more than twice as much as any other government.

JETRO reported $14,117,208 during the first six months of 1996. Their activities are typically along the lines of ''research in matters concerning foreign trade between Japan and the U.S.,'' as a filing for JETRO states.

Other countries spent their resources on lobbying or ''monitoring and analysis'' of issues of interest to them. Mexico, the sixth-largest spending government at $3,576,368, paid Burson-Marsteller $563,000 for public relations on the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which will be up for expansion in the near future. Mexico, which has been wracked recently by charges of corruption and narcotics problems, also spent a great deal of money on broader PR efforts to burnish its suffering image.

Burson, which made slightly over $1.2 million over all from foreign entities, ranked only 11th in line in the 13 law/lobby/PR firms to gross more than $1 million from foreign clients.

Most of the other top-spending governments devoted at least some of their expenditures to tourism-related activities. For example, the Bahamas and the Cayman Islands, the second and third largest spending governments at roughly $8 million each, spent virtually all of their money promoting tourism, as did Ireland, the number four country.

New York City-based advertising agency DDB Needham Worldwide pulled in more than $18 million, most of it from the National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia, which paid them $13,965,723.68.

New York ad firms O'Leary Clarke & Partners and FCB/Leber Katz Partners Inc. were second and third respectively, making slightly over $5 million each from the Cayman Islands (O'Leary) and Jamaica and the British Virgin Islands (FCB).

Washington law/lobbying firms also fared well. Patton Boggs, home of super lobbyist and name-partner Hale ''Tommy'' Boggs, pulled in more than $3.5 million from such clients as Oman, Qatar, the Philippines and Pakistan. Other Patton Boggs clients who did not pay them during the six month time period include Hong Kong, Italy, the United Arab Emirates, France, Germany and Taiwan.

Other law/lobby/PR firms grossing over $1 million with numerous active foreign clients were Fleishman-Hillard (including clients from Canada, France, Angola, Turkey, Northern Ireland and Japan), Cassidy & Associates (France, Australia, Japan, Saudi Arabia and Taiwan), the Bozell Sawyer Miller Group (Canada, the Bahamas, Bolivia, Japan and Indonesia), Arnold & Porter (Canada, Israel, Panama, Turkey and Venezuela), Burson-Marsteller (Hong Kong, Great Britain, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Turkey and Portugal), Washington & Christian (Antigua & Barbuda, Gabon, Guinea and Nigeria) and Hogan & Hartson (Canada, France, Panama, Russia, the Bahamas, Haiti, Japan, Great Britain and Taiwan).

Registerable activities include engaging in lobbying, ''political activities,'' or public relations in the United States. A foreign agent must also register if he or she ''solicits, collects, disburses or dispenses contributions, loans, money or other things of value . . .'' This includes the promotion of trade and tourism.

Furthermore, ostensibly domestic entities don't have to register with the Department of Justice.

USBICEF's Tonelson noted that many domestic companies have become almost proxy foreign agents. ''The China trade debate is a perfect example . . . ''said Tonelson.

He added that, ''the positions that they're lobbying for hard have become almost indistinguishable from the Chinese government, and in fact they've become the most effective voice for the Chinese government.''

So, for example, while the Chinese Embassy paid a paltry $18,750 to the law and lobbying firm of Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue for keeping up on issues like Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) trade status, groups like the U.S.-China Business Council and large multinational corporations lobby the U.S. government in favor of the MFN renewal.

As of June 30, 1996, 595 active registrants (totaling 2,825 individuals) were registered to represent 871 foreign principals.

Lobbying, law and P.R. firms grossing over $1 million from foreign clients

DDB Needham Worldwide	$18,343,333
O'Leary & Clarke & Partners	5,139,405
FCB/Leber Katz Partners	5,131,928
International Registries Inc	4,709,640
Merkley Newman Harty	3,670,489
Patton Boggs	3,574,939
Fleishman-Hillard Inc	2,619,152
Cassidy & Associates	2,060,465
Bozell Sawyer Miller Group	1,786,831
Arnold & Porter	1,614,937

Foreign governments spending over $1 million

Japan	$17,840,878.31
Bahamas	8,722,043.54
Cayman Islands	8,212,662.99
Ireland	5,546,970.00
Marshall Islands	4,376,538.87
Mexico	3,576,368.31

Foreign governments spending over $1 million—Continued

Canada	2,716,742.50
Hong Kong	2,569,187.99
Bermuda	2,473,473.71
India	2,273,449.09

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

CHAOS IN MAJORITY AFFECTS FLOOR SCHEDULE

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to take this time to correct the impression left by the previous speaker, the gentleman from New York, about what happened on the House floor tonight.

The fact is, the votes on suspensions which occurred tonight, to which the gentleman from New York objected, occurred at the insistence of the majority party, not at our insistence. In fact, we suggested five different propositions which would have enabled the Republican leadership of this House to close debate on measures in an orderly manner and at a reasonable hour tonight, and all five of those suggestions were rejected by the majority party leadership.

We, in fact, specifically asked and our party leadership specifically asked that the majority party consider not having the votes on suspension until tomorrow, and that was also turned down by the majority party leadership.

So lest the gentleman from New York be under the impression that this protracted session tonight occurred at the wish of the minority party in the House, that is specifically not the case. My staff tried. The staff of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] tried. The staff of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] tried suggestions which would have avoided this meaningless extension of debate tonight. All of them were turned down by the majority party leadership.

I regret the chaos which has afflicted the House on the latter part of this day. It seems to be simply an extension of the chaos which is occurring within the majority party caucus.

I would note that I find it strange indeed that the Committee on Appropriations seems to be able to do its work in committee on an almost totally bipartisan basis on bill after bill after bill. But then when those bills come to the House floor, they are in fact first taken to the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Rules establishes a set of rules under which the bills can be debated which systematically denies to the minority member who has the responsibility for carrying the bill the right to participate in any meaningful way in the debate on the House floor.

As the gentlewoman from California said the other night in discussing this, almost without exception the amendments that were allowed the minority party by the Committee on Rules on appropriation bill after appropriation bill are only those amendments which everyone understands will lose. Any time there appears to be an amendment that we want to offer that has a chance of winning, the Committee on Rules rules it out. That is what has caused the problems around here.

I would suggest if you want the House to work, the majority party and the Committee on Rules needs to work out the same kind of working relationship with the minority that we have been able to work out on the Committee on Appropriations between the majority and minority.

We manage within our committee to get our work done. And then every time it is frustrated by the overt and undue partisanship that permeates the way the Committee on Rules handles its business. That is the reason why I was told by a member of the majority party in the Committee on Appropriations that the reason the agriculture appropriation subcommittee came to the floor without a rule was to avoid the chaos in the Committee on Rules.

I would suggest we have a fundamental problem with the leadership of the majority party in this House which is apparently in chaos. That chaos is spilling over into an incredible exhibition of arrogance on the part of the majority party in the Committee on Rules. Until that chaos is eliminated, until that arrogance is eliminated, we are not going to be able to proceed apparently in any orderly fashion to deal with the House's business. I regret that, but that is in fact the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

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

As ranking member on the agriculture subcommittee, I have to say what a true tragedy it is that a subcommittee that has labored hard to bring a bill to the floor that can pass has now been handcuffed under this rule, and tomorrow it is almost laughable that key amendments will be limited to 5 minutes on each side, not even enough time to explain to our colleagues what the content of these amendments are and to fully appreciate the debate on both sides.

Whether we are talking about crop insurance, peanuts, whether we are talking about the WIC Program, our Members will be handcuffed and it is wrong. It is wrong for the Committee on Rules to do this to the Committee on Appropriations.

FAIRNESS TO DAIRY FARMERS

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to also address an issue of agriculture, one that I think is of utmost importance to dairy farmers not only in northeast Wisconsin where I come from but all across this country, an agriculture issue that we are familiar with from some innovative television and prints ads that promote milk and dairy products, not only from Wisconsin but across this great land of ours.

One ad campaign asks, Got milk? Well, we have got milk in Wisconsin. And the question is, have we got fairness? It is another issue.

Right now the dairy farmers in northeast Wisconsin, indeed across the country, every one of them hard working farm families, pay 15 cents for every 100 pounds of milk that they sell. It goes into a fund. It promotes and advertises milk and dairy products. All of these ads are a great boost for dairy products in general. The program is helping dairy farmers everywhere, everywhere sell their milk.

However, there are some dairy producers who benefit from these ads but they do not pay into this promotion fund. They are not farmers from my home district in Wisconsin. They are not farmers in the Northeast or in California.

They are foreign dairy producers, places like Australia and New Zealand, and they in fact reap the rewards of dairy promotion. I think dairy farmers think it is time we shared the cost with all dairy farmers.

I have introduced a bill, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, my first bill to try and level the playing field between American dairy farmers and foreign dairy producers when it comes to promotion, which benefits everybody who looks to advertise their product. It is the Dairy Promotion Fairness Act. I urge my colleagues to sign onto the measure and support it in this Congress.

I think this issue of fairness goes beyond the fact that dairy importers are not paying the same fees as dairy farmers. The importers of other commodities, beef, pork, and cotton, are currently paying into their respective promotion programs, yet dairy importers in America do not.

Also our dairy farmers are required to pay into dairy promotion programs in other countries where we do sell our milk. We are exporters. But those agreements unfortunately at this point are not reciprocal.

This past weekend I had a chance to meet with Reuel Robertson, a dairy producer from Oneida, Wisconsin. He pays as much as $450 a month from his monthly dairy check into a dairy promotion fund to help the industry sell, in effect, milk, cheese, ice cream and other products to Americans. It is for Reuel Robertson and for farmers everywhere, not just in northeast Wisconsin, but everywhere in this land that I am working to require foreign dairy producers to pay for dairy promotion. We will not be establishing a new program. We are already marketing milk.

□ 2345

We will be sharing the cost with every producer that sells dairy products in this country. Assessing importers, we will add approximately $10 million to the resources that pay for milk promotion. That is $10 million that promotes dairy products all across the country. It is no added extra revenue to dairy farmers in this country, and yet it is added revenue to help promote a product that we do best. Dairy products.

Mr. Speaker, when we ask the question, got milk? The answer should be yes. Got fairness? Unfortunately, for now, the answer is no, but I hope we can change that.

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

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

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

[Mr. JEFFERSON 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 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 Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE TOBACCO LOBBY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. LINDA SMITH, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I feel like I am running a rerun. Three years in a row, this is my third year in Congress, I have come to the floor and discussed what seems to be a subsidy that makes no sense.

At first, when I saw that we were subsidizing insurance for tobacco, I thought it was a mistake, because I had arrived with a group of people saying they were going to balance the budget and get rid of things that were not important, not only were not important but unnecessary, and that we were going to clean house.

So I was assured that when we brought that amendment to the floor, a bipartisan group from the oldest Members to the newest Members, that surely it would be gone by the end of the day. The bill was stalled, took a while, seemed to take a few days. I thought it would be one day and it moved to the next. Lost by 13 votes. It seemed a little intriguing until the next year we found the tobacco lobby had cut 165 checks within 48 hours of that vote. Unfortunately, some of them had been passed out here, very close to the vote, very close to where we were voting.

The next year, I thought, well, surely people with the disgust at what the tobacco industry is doing, marketing to our children, we will win this vote on a crop subsidy, targeted to children, intended to harm. But no, lost by two votes, just two votes, as even people did not vote, walking from the floor.

Why is that happening? I could not quite understand it. And I still do not understand it. But today, actually now later in the day, or I guess tomorrow now, we will have the vote again and some will say, as we are voting, well, the small tobacco companies need it, or the farmers. The reality is they are not the ones passing out checks here to keep that. It is the large tobacco companies wanting to keep a hold on what they believe is their position here in Congress, making sure that they still have their insurance subsidized.

I heard the argument that, well, it is only right, they are a crop. Then I realized that we have thousands of crops. Only a few dozen have subsidies, and only a few are insured by the Federal Government. Now, I can understand sugar, although I do not understand why we are subsidizing that. I could maybe understand peanuts, because like sugar, at least it feeds children. But tobacco? Subsidizing the insurance? Charging it to those same children that it is aimed to harm?

No, tomorrow I think this Congress is going to have a chance to show whether we believe in balancing the budget and whether we believe in going to those things that are unnecessary first, and also it will show a little bit about what happens here when money flows from large corporations to campaigns and to parties.

Earlier today it was disclosed that hundreds of thousands of dollars in the last few days had been given to both parties from the tobacco industry in what is called soft money, the soft money being given to the party because, see, if that was given to a candidate or used against a candidate in a TV ad, how would taxpayers feel about seeing that R.J. Reynolds paid for this ad at the bottom of the ad, which is the law. They have to show who pays for the ad, so, instead, they give it to the parties. They launder it through and it

comes out as paid for by the Republican or Democratic Party. Soft money.

See, the tobacco companies are smart. They know they are not popular, but they still want to control. So they give their money, as one of the most lucrative groups in the Nation, to keep their control, to keep their hands around our political system by giving it to the two major parties. The same soft money system that funneled the money that went through the White House to the Democrat Party from mainland China.

Tonight we can surmise, or I will surmise two things: Tomorrow we will see just how much power money has over American politics. Even that power that has to be hidden. And tomorrow we will see whether or not we can say no to those that give the hundreds of thousands, no, actually the millions of dollars to this political system, for something that costs billions. The American people only get 30 minutes because we do not want them to watch law, but they can see tomorrow.

CONGRATULATIONS ON PASSAGE OF STAMP OUT BREAST CANCER ACT; AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF FORMATION OF WASHINGTON WASTE WATCH CAUCUS

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to address my colleagues on two subjects. First, to congratulate the bipartisan fashion the passage of H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act, which will authorize a 2-year demonstration project to offer the public a new way to fund research for breast cancer by raising money through especially designed U.S. postage stamps.

This is an idea whose time has certainly arrived, Mr. Speaker. With the increased funding needs at NIH, and working with the important breast cancer groups across this country, we need all we can put together when it comes to detection, treatment, and cure for breast cancer in this country. I congratulate all the groups that were a part of moving this legislation forward. I know that the Senate is also moving forward on the bill and I look forward to the President's signature.

I also want to announce a formation of the Washington Waste Watch Caucus, one that will zero in on the waste, fraud and abuse here in the Federal Government. I worked today with Thomas Schatz, the president of the Citizens Against Government Waste, which is an outgrowth of the Grace Commission, and together with Tom and other taxpayers groups and chamber groups we will work in a bipartisan fashion here in the House and in the Senate to make sure we identify those kinds of projects which are wasteful, which duplicate what States already do or local governments already do, and that cost too much for the Federal Government and costing, more importantly, too much for the taxpayers.

We want to make sure the taxpayers get their moneys worth, and that is why I am pleased to be working with those who want to see the sugar and peanut subsidies eliminated. Artificially inflated prices for our consumers is not the right way to move America forward.

Certainly as the gentlewoman from Washington, [Mrs. LINDA SMITH] just discussed, to move forward with again adding a tobacco subsidy when in this country we already have a policy that says the surgeon general has determined that smoking can be dangerous to our health, causes lung cancer, emphysema, we should certainly not have the same government saying from a health care point of view that we should though be smoking yet we have tobacco subsidies. Certainly this is the kind of project when it comes to the Washington Waste Watch we will be looking forward to seeing some positive changes in.

We also have legislation calling for sunset review of Federal agencies, to make sure that where we should privatize, downsize, consolidate or eliminate, we will be looking at each agency over a time period to make sure we report back to Congress with our findings.

So for my colleagues who are here tonight and those who may be looking from their offices, at their monitor, I would ask that they get in touch with me through the Washington Waste Watch Caucus, 435 Cannon Building, Washington, DC, with their suggestions, or call me at 202–225–6111.

I am looking forward to making sure that we make the government more responsive and that Congress leads the way working with the American people to make sure that we save money, spend wisely and make sure we look to the future in a fiscally responsible manner.

□ 2355

THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 1997

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are going to have before the floor of the House of Representatives an historic piece of legislation, H.R. 2003, which is the Bipartisan Budget Enforcement Act of 1997. This piece of legislation is dedicated to the premise that whatever the budget agreement ultimately turns out to be, it has to have enforcement to actually result in a balanced budget by the year 2002.

If we look back 25 years ago to 1975, we can see that the blue area in this pie chart shows that well over 55 percent of the Federal budget was discretionary. That means that it was controlled by the Congress on an annual basis by the appropriators in both the House and Senate. We had about 7 percent interest on the debt, which was the red part of this pie chart. And then mandatory or entitlement spending was the balance, which was about 38 percent.

If we fast forward to the year that we are in now, fiscal year 1997, we can see that 51 percent is entitlement spending, we have 15 percent that is interest on the debt, and the discretionary part of the budget is now down to around 34 percent. If we go to the last year of the budget agreement, which is 5 years from now, fiscal year 2002, the picture is even worse. The interest on the debt is up to 14 percent. Entitlement spending is at 58 percent. So we are at 74 percent uncontrollable spending.

We cannot have a budget agreement that actually results in a balanced budget if three-fourths of the budget is uncontrollable. So what we have done on a bipartisan basis is come up with a piece of legislation that says let us take the numbers that are agreed to by the President and the Congress and enforce them on the spending.

On the spending side, every program would have a cap. Under current law, only discretionary spending has a cap. So we apply the caps to the entitlement portion of the budget. On the revenue side, we take the revenue numbers that are in the budget for tax revenues and make those goals. After the first year of the agreement, in fiscal year 1998, if the revenue numbers are not up to what they are supposed to be, under the agreement we would delay on a contingent basis next year's tax cut.

If spending goes beyond caps, we give the President and Congress three options. They can vote to waive the cap. They can vote to change the program so that it actually comes within the cap. Or if they vote to do nothing; instead of the deficit going up, there is sequestration by program that brings the spending back under control.

If you look at the ratio in the current budget agreement, entitlement spending, which is the blue bar, versus the tax cuts in the bill, which is the red bar, it is a ratio of about 50-to-1. About $900 billion in entitlement spending the first year of the agreement, and we have about $10 billion in tax cuts. We can see each year the tax cuts get marginally larger, $12 million, $15 billion, $20 billion. But the entitlement spending continues to go up. So it is over a trillion dollars fiscal year 2001.

So by putting $85 billion over 5 years on a net basis in tax cuts on the table, we get entitlement caps on $5 trillion of entitlement spending. That is a 50-to-1 trade-off. We think that is a tremendous agreement. If we look at what the entitlement programs are, these are the top 11 entitlement programs, they have grown at an average of over 9 percent in the last 6 years. Some of

them, like the Medicaid program, has grown 16 percent. In the budget agreement, they grow at an average of over 7 percent. Medicaid continues to grow at over 9 percent.

So we are letting the entitlement programs grow. We are talking the numbers that the President and congressional leadership have agreed but we simply say those are caps and you cannot go over those numbers unless the Congress votes to waive the cap.

So I would hope that tomorrow, on a bipartisan basis, with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER] on the Democratic side leading the effort, myself, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] on the Republican side, that we would vote to include enforcement in the budget agreement that is pending before the House and the Senate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0021

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SOLOMON] at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2160, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–197) on the resolution (H. Res. 193) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2160) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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. KILDEE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JEFFERSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEJDENSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OBEY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, on July 23.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes each day, on July 23 and 24.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THUNE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. BARR of Georgia.

Mr. MANZULLO.

Mr. OXLEY, in two instances.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. COBLE.

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Ms. DUNN.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. HANSEN.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. RADANOVICH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KILDEE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PASCRELL.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. DELLUMS.

Mr. GEJDENSON.

Mr. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. ETHERIDGE.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

Ms. HARMAN.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, July 23, 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:

4254. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Limited Ports; Dayton, OH [Docket No. 96–094–2] received July 22, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4255. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the FY 1998 appropriations requests for the Department of Labor, the Department of State, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(b); (H. Doc. No. 105–109); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4256. A letter from the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled ''Alternative Live Fire Test and Evaluation Plan for the F/A–18E/F Aircraft''; to the Committee on National Security.

4257. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Certification of Requests for Equitable Adjustment [DFARS Case 97–D302] received July 9, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

4258. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Designation of Hong Kong [DFARS Case 97–D023] received July 9, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

4259. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report entitled, ''FINANCIAL AUDIT: Federal Family Education Loan Program's Financial Statements for Fiscal Years 1996 and 1995'' (GAO/AIMD–97–111), pursuant to Public Law 101–576, section 305 (104 Stat. 2853); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4260. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to extend the Act, authorize appropriations, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4261. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Disclosure of Premium-Related Information (RIN: 1212–AA66) received July 22, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4262. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of the Subscriber Carrier Selection Changes Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Policies and Rules Concerning Unauthorized Changes of Consumers' Long Distance Carriers [CC Docket No. 94–129] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4263. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Thorndale, Texas) [MM Docket No. 97–5, RM–8954] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4264. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Midwest, Wyoming) [MM Docket No. 97–24, RM–8973] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4265. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Cordele, Dawson, Montezuma, Nashville, Hawkinsville, Cusseta, Cuthbert, and Leary, Georgia) [MM Docket No. 93–270, RM–8323, RM–8339, RM–8428, RM–8429, RM–8430] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4266. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Beatty, Nevada) [MM Docket No. 97–6, RM–8944] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4267. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Riley, Kansas) [MM Docket No. 97–108, RM–9024] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4268. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Hope, North Dakota) [MM Docket No. 97–57, RM–9016] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4269. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Hardinsburg, Indiana) [MM Docket No. 97–93, RM–9013] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4270. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Mendota, California) [MM Docket No. 97–36, RM–8991] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4271. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Weston, Idaho) [MM Docket No. 97–38, RM–8971] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4272. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Orofino, Idaho) [MM Docket No. 97–62, RM–9008] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4273. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Williams, California) [MM Docket No. 97–19, RM–8978] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4274. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Snow Hill, Maryland, and Chincoteague, Virginia) [MM Docket No. 97–73, RM–9012, RM–9063] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4275. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Portsmouth, Ohio) [MM Docket No. 96–216, RM–8895] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4276. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Bend, Oregon) [MM Docket No. 97–3, RM–8945] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4277. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Durango and Dolores, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 97–18, RM–8943, RM–9053] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4278. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Glendo, Wyoming) [MM Docket No. 97–23, RM–8972] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4279. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Manistique, Michigan) [MM Docket No. 97–89, RM–9029] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4280. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Huntsville, Utah) [MM Docket No. 97–4, RM–8923] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4281. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Randolph, Utah) [MM Docket No. 97–58, RM–8998] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4282. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Steamboat Springs, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 97–17, RM–8942] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4283. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Lexington, Illinois) [MM Docket No. 97–64, RM–9001] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4284. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Greenwood, Arkansas) [MM Docket No. 97–63, RM–9000] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4285. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Kingfisher, Oklahoma) [MM Docket No. 96–251, RM–8956] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4286. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Gillette, Wyoming) [MM Docket No. 96–252, RM–8959] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4287. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Superior, Montana) [MM Docket No. 97–61, RM–9010] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4288. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Cooperstown, Pennsylvania) [MM Docket No. 97–49, RM–8993] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4289. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Mahnomen, Minnesota) [MM Docket No. 97–101, RM–9051] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4290. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Medical Devices; Humanitarian Use Devices; Lift of Stay of Effective Date [Docket No. 91N–0404] (RIN: 0910–AA09) received July 22, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4291. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance About Portable Gauge Licenses [NUREG–1556, Vol. 1] received July 8, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4292. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services (Transmittal No.

97–25), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4293. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 97–27), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4294. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DTC–96–97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

4295. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a copy of a report entitled ''Certification of the Fiscal Year 1997 Revised General Fund Revenue Estimates in Support of the District of Columbia General Obligation Bonds (Series 1997A),'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 47–117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4296. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a copy of a report entitled ''Certification of the Water and Sewer Authority's Fiscal Year 1997 Revenue Estimate in Support of a $25,000,000 Revolving Line of Credit,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 47–117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4297. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's fiscal year 1996 financial report on the Treasury Forfeiture Fund, pursuant to Public Law 102–393, section 638(b)(1) (106 Stat. 1783); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4298. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a list of all reports issued or released in June 1997, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4299. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 1996, through March 31, 1997, and the Secretary's semiannual report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4300. A letter from the Congressional Affairs Officer, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, ''Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 on the Administration of Elections for Federal Office, 1995–1996,'' pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1973gg–7; to the Committee on House Oversight.

4301. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting a report on the hurricane and storm damage reduction, and environmental restoration project for the Santa Monica Pier, Santa Monica, California; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4302. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revisions to Digital Flight Data Recorder Rules (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28109; Amdt. No. 121–266, 125–30, 129–27, 135–69] (RIN: 2120–AF76) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4303. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757 and 767 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–122–AD; Amdt. 39–10083; AD 97–15–09] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4304. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–600–2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 and 200) Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–136–AD; Amdt. 39–10082; AD 97–14–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4305. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor Incorporated Models AT–301, AT–302, AT–400, AT–400A, AT–401, AT–402, AT–501, and AT–502 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–CE–47–AD; Amdt. 39–10063; AD 97–14–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4306. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737, 747, 757, and 767 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–123–AD; Amdt. 39–10079; AD 97–15–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4307. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Model 214B, 214B–1, and 214ST Helicopters (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 94–SW–26–AD; Amdt. 39–10077; AD 97–15–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4308. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace (Jetstream) Model 4101 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–131–AD; Amdt. 39–10078; AD 97–15–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4309. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Aerospatiale Model ATR42 and ATR72 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 95–NM–84–AD; Amdt 39–10075, AD 97–15–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4310. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of the Legal Description of the Dallas/Fort Worth Class B Airspace Area; TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–11] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4311. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Brinkley, AR (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 96–ASW–25] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4312. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Longview, TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 96–ASW–26] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4313. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Athens, TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 96–ASW–27] received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4314. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Chesapeake Bay Offshore Powerboat Challenge, Chesapeake Bay, Kent Island, Maryland (Coast Guard) [CGD 05–97–055] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4315. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone Regulation; Elliott Bay, Seattle, WA (Coast Guard) [CGD13–97–015] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4316. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Isle of Wight, Bay Ocean City, Maryland (Coast Guard) [CGD05–97–013] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4317. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Seattle Seafair Unlimited Hydroplane Race, Lake Washington, Seattle, WA (Coast Guard) [CGD13–97–016] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4318. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Delaware Bay, Delaware River (Coast Guard) [CGD 05–97–058] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4319. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone Regulations; St. Andrew Bay, Panama City Florida, Hathaway Landing Marina (Coast Guard) [COTP Mobile, AL 97–16] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received July 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4320. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Miscellaneous Sections Affected by the Taxpayer Bill of Rights 2 and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 [TD 8725] (RIN: 1545–AU64) received July 22, 1997, 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. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 192. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2003) to reform

the budget process and enforce the bipartisan balanced budget agreement of 1997 (Rept. 105–195). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALSH: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2209. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. 105–196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 193. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2160) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes. (Rept. 105–197). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 2205. A bill to reform the statutes relating to Amtrak, to authorize appropriations for Amtrak, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 2206. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs for homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 2207. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act concerning a proposal to construct a deep ocean outfall off the coast of Mayaguez, Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FROST, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 2208. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize food claims which relate a nutrient to a disease or health-related condition; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH:

H.R. 2209. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

H.R. 2210. A bill for the relief of certain aliens residing at 37–54 93d Street, Jackson Heights, NY and 104–15 34th Avenue, Corona, NY; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONIOR (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. OLVER):

H.R. 2211. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the Federal minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 2212. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a program regarding sterile hypodermic needles in order to reduce the incidence of the transmission of HIV; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mrs. KELLY):

H.R. 2213. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish incentives to increase the demand for and supply of quality child care, to provide incentives to States that improve the quality of child care, to expand clearinghouses and electronic networks for the distribution of child care information, to improve the quality of child care provided through Federal facilities and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, House Oversight, the Judiciary, Education and the Workforce, and Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

H.R. 2214. A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to ensure that certain information regarding prisoners is reported to the Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2215. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to restrict employers in obtaining, disclosing, and using of genetic information; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

H.R. 2216. A bill to establish limitation with respect to the disclosure and use of genetic information by life and disability insurers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCINNIS:

H.R. 2217. A bill to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of FERC Project No. 9248 in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NORWOOD:

H.R. 2218. A bill to redesignate the Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Center located in Augusta, GA, as the A. James Dyess Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Center; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. SANDLIN:

H.R. 2219. A bill to prevent Members of Congress from receiving the 1998 pay adjustment; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 2220. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reinstate eligibility for dependency and indemnity compensation for certain surviving spouses of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2221. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to take no further action on a proposed regulation relating to the use of chlorofluorocarbons in metered-dose inhalers; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. HARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding proliferation of missile technology from Russia to Iran; to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

154. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 34 urging Congress to ensure that the core principles outlined in the resolution are implemented in any restructuring of workforce programs, whether through legislation or regulatory and administrative modifications; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

155. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Indiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 30 urging the President of the United States and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to evaluate both the potential incremental health effects and economic consequences of the proposed revisions to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards; to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 23: Mrs. MALONEY of New York and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 51: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 96: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 146: Mr. LAZIO of New York.

H.R. 192: Mr. TORRES and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 198: Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 228: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 230: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 301: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 306: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. COOK, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 414: Mr. TORRES and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 521: Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.R. 553: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 611: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 633: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 695: Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 712: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 754: Mr. BAESLER and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 755: Mr. VENTO and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 789: Mr. TURNER and Mr. REDMOND.

H.R. 815: Mr. MINGE and Mrs. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 925: Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 952: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 961: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. EWING.

H.R. 979: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 983: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1026: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1051: Mr. REDMOND.

H.R. 1114: Mr. SABO and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1126: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. STARK, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1147: Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 1156: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1159: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1173: Mr. LUTHER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MINGE, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1178: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1189: Mr. HAYWORTH and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 1194: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1195: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1232: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1260: Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. COBURN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1300: Ms. FURSE.
H.R. 1323: Mr. LUTHER.
H.R. 1371: Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1382: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1398: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
H.R. 1401: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1415: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BERRY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CRAPO.
H.R. 1426: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 1450: Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 1456: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 1492: Mr. WICKER.
H.R. 1519: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
H.R. 1521: Mr. METCALF, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.R. 1534: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. COX of California, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. CHENOWETH.
H.R. 1542: Mr. BLILEY.
H.R. 1585: Mr. WELLER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. KELLY, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 1670: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1679: Mr. MCCOLLUM and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1689: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1712: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 1719: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. NEY.
H.R. 1733: Ms. RIVERS and Mr. STABENOW.
H.R. 1748: Mr. CAPPS, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 1788: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1839: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. COBURN.
H.R. 1843: Mr. CRAPO.
H.R. 1846: Mr. SAM JOHNSON and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1861: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FROST, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. STARK, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. YATES.
H.R. 1864: Ms. FURSE.
H.R. 1883: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1912: Mr. ROGAN.
H.R. 1968: Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 1991: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. DICKEY.
H.R. 2001: Mrs. CHENOWETH.
H.R. 2003: Mr. COOK, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. HORN.
H.R. 2004: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. HILLIARD.
H.R. 2005: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 2006: Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. HEFNER.
H.R. 2064: Mr. DICKS and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2120: Mr. HAMILTON.
H.R. 2121: Mr. FROST, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 2122: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2139: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. OBEY, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2143: Mr. FILNER and Mr. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 2163: Mr. BOB SCHAFFER.
H.R. 2196: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2198: Mr. LUTHER and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 2200: Mr. FROST, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. GILMAN.
H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. FILNER, Mr. LEWIS OF GEORGIA, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. FROST, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. COLLINS.
H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. GOODE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TALENT, Mr. YATES, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WEYGAND, and Mr. NADLER.
H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.
H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H. Res. 166: Mr. YATES.
H. Res. 173: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
H. Res. 191: Mr. HERGER, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. HULSHOF.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2003: Mr. BERRY and Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2003

OFFERED BY: MR. BARTON OF TEXAS

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Balanced Budget Assurance Act of 1997''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.
Title I—Ensure That the Bipartisan Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997 Achieves Its Goal
Sec. 101. Timetable.
Sec. 102. Procedures to avoid sequestration or delay of new revenue reductions.
Sec. 103. Effect on Presidents' budget submissions; point of order.
Sec. 104. Deficit and revenue targets.
Sec. 105. Direct spending caps.
Sec. 106. Economic assumptions.
Sec. 107. Revisions to deficit and revenue targets and to the caps for entitlements and other mandatory spending.
Title II—Enforcement Provisions
Sec. 201. Reporting excess spending.
Sec. 202. Enforcing direct spending caps.
Sec. 203. Sequestration rules.
Sec. 204. Enforcing revenue targets.
Sec. 205. Exempt programs and activities.
Sec. 206. Special rules.
Sec. 207. The current law baseline.
Sec. 208. Limitations on emergency spending.
Title III—Use of Budget Surplus to Preserve Social Security Trust Fund
Sec. 301. Ending use of receipts of Social Security Trust Fund for other programs and activities.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) ELIGIBLE POPULATION.—The term ''eligible population'' shall mean those individuals to whom the United States is obligated to make a payment under the provisions of a law creating entitlement authority. Such term shall not include States, localities, corporations or other nonliving entities.

(2) SEQUESTER AND SEQUESTRATION.—The terms ''sequester'' and ''sequestration'' refer to or mean the cancellation of budgetary resources provided by discretionary appropriations or direct spending law.

(3) BREACH.—The term ''breach'' means, for any fiscal year, the amount (if any) by which outlays for that year (within a category of direct spending) is above that category's direct spending cap for that year.

(4) BASELINE.—The term ''baseline'' means the projection (described in section 207) of current levels of new budget authority, outlays, receipts, and the surplus or deficit into the budget year and the outyears.

(5) BUDGETARY RESOURCES.—The term ''budgetary resources'' means new budget authority, unobligated balances, direct spending authority, and obligation limitations.

(6) DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS.—The term ''discretionary appropriations'' means budgetary resources (except to fund direct spending programs) provided in appropriation Acts. If an appropriation Act alters the level of direct spending or offsetting collections, that effect shall be treated as direct spending. Classifications of new accounts or activities and changes in classifications shall be made in consultation with the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate and with CBO and OMB.

(7) DIRECT SPENDING.—The term ''direct spending'' means—

(A) budget authority provided by law other than appropriation Acts, including entitlement authority;

(B) entitlement authority; and

(C) the food stamp program.

If a law other than an appropriation Act alters the level of discretionary appropriations or offsetting collections, that effect shall be treated as direct spending.

(8) ENTITLEMENT AUTHORITY.—The term ''entitlement authority'' means authority (whether temporary or permanent) to make payments (including loans and grants), the budget authority for which is not provided for in advance by appropriation Acts, to any person or government if, under the provisions of the law containing such authority, the United States is obligated to make such payments to persons or governments who meet the requirements established by such law.

(9) CURRENT.—The term ''current'' means, with respect to OMB estimates included with a budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31 U.S.C., the estimates consistent with the economic and technical assumptions underlying that budget.

(10) ACCOUNT.—The term ''account'' means an item for which there is a designated budget account designation number in the President's budget.

(11) BUDGET YEAR.—The term ''budget year'' means the fiscal year of the Government that starts on the next October 1.

(12) CURRENT YEAR.—The term ''current year'' means, with respect to a budget year, the fiscal year that immediately precedes that budget year.

(13) OUTYEAR.—The term ''outyear'' means, with respect to a budget year, any of the fiscal years that follow the budget year.

(14) OMB.—The term ''OMB'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(15) CBO.—The term ''CBO'' means the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

(16) BUDGET OUTLAYS AND OUTLAYS.—The terms ''budget outlays'' and ''outlays'' mean,

with respect to any fiscal year, expenditures of funds under budget authority during such year.

(17) BUDGET AUTHORITY AND NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—The terms ''budget authority'' and ''new budget authority'' have the meanings given to them in section 3 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

(18) APPROPRIATION ACT.—The term ''appropriation Act'' means an Act referred to in section 105 of title 1 of the United States Code.

(19) CONSOLIDATED DEFICIT.—The term ''consolidated deficit'' means, with respect to a fiscal year, the amount by which total outlays exceed total receipts during that year.

(20) SURPLUS.—The term ''surplus'' means, with respect to a fiscal year, the amount by which total receipts exceed total outlays during that year.

(21) DIRECT SPENDING CAPS.—The term ''direct spending caps'' means the nominal dollar limits for entitlements and other mandatory spending pursuant to section 105 (as modified by any revisions provided for in this Act).

TITLE I—ENSURE THAT THE BIPARTISAN BALANCED BUDGET AGREEMENT OF 1997 ACHIEVES ITS GOAL

SEC. 101. TIMETABLE.

On or before:	Action to be completed:
January 15	CBO economic and budget update.
First Monday in February.	President's budget update based on new assumptions.
August 1	CBO and OMB updates.
August 15	Preview report.
Not later than November 1 (and as soon as practical after the end of the fiscal).	OMB and CBO Analyses of Deficits, Revenues and Spending Levels and Projections for the Upcoming Year.
November 1–December 15	Congressional action to avoid sequestration.
December 15	OMB issues final (look back) report for prior year and preview for current year.
December 15	Presidential sequester order or order delaying new/additional revenues reductions scheduled to take effect pursuant to reconciliation legislation enacted in calendar year 1997.

SEC. 102. PROCEDURES TO AVOID SEQUESTRATION OR DELAY OF NEW REVENUE REDUCTIONS.

(a) SPECIAL MESSAGE.—If the OMB Analysis of Actual Spending Levels and Projections for the Upcoming Year indicates that—

(1) deficits in the most recently completed fiscal year exceeded, or the deficits in the budget year are projected to exceed, the deficit targets in section 104, as adjusted pursuant to section 107;

(2) revenues in the most recently completed fiscal year were less than, or revenues in the current year are projected to be less than, the revenue targets in section 104, as adjusted pursuant to section 107; or

(3) outlays in the most recently completed fiscal year exceeded, or outlays in the current year are projected to exceed, the caps in section 104, as adjusted pursuant to section 107;

the President shall submit to Congress with the OMB Analysis of Actual Spending Levels and Projections for the Upcoming Year a special message that includes proposed legislative changes to—

(A) offset all or part of net deficit or outlay excess;

(B) offset all or part of any revenue shortfall; or

(C) revise the deficit or revenue targets or the outlay caps contained in this Act;

through any combination of—

(i) reductions in outlays;

(ii) increases in revenues; or

(iii) increases in the deficit targets or expenditure caps, or reductions in the revenue targets, if the President submits a written determination that, because of economic or programmatic reasons, less than the entire amount of the variances from the balanced budget plan should be offset.

(b) INTRODUCTION OF THE PRESIDENT'S PACKAGE.—Not later than November 15, the message from the President required pursuant to subsection (a) shall be introduced as a joint resolution in the House of Representatives or the Senate by the chairman of its Committee on the Budget. If the chairman fails to do so, after November 15, the joint resolution may be introduced by any Member of that House of Congress and shall be referred to the Committee on the Budget of that House.

(c) HOUSE COMMITTEE ACTION.—The Committee on the Budget, in consultation with the committees of jurisdiction, or, in the case of revenue shortfalls, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall, by November 15, report a joint resolution containing—

(1) the recommendations in the President's message, or different policies and proposed legislative changes than those contained in the message of the President, to ameliorate or eliminate any excess deficits or expenditures or any revenue shortfalls, or

(2) any changes to the deficit or revenue targets or expenditure caps contained in this Act, except that any changes to the deficit or revenue targets or expenditure caps cannot be greater than the changes recommended in the message submitted by the President.

(d) PROCEDURE IF THE APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FAILS TO REPORT REQUIRED RESOLUTION.—

(1) AUTOMATIC DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEES ON THE BUDGET OF THE HOUSE.—If the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives fails, by November 20, to report a resolution meeting the requirements of subsection (c), the committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution reflecting the President's recommendations introduced pursuant to subsection (a), and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF DISCHARGE RESOLUTION IN THE HOUSE.—If the Committee has been discharged under paragraph (1) above, any Member may move that the House of Representatives consider the resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and not debatable. It shall not be in order to consider any amendment to the resolution except amendments which are germane and which do not change the net deficit impact of the resolution.

(e) CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS IN THE HOUSE.—Consideration of resolutions reported pursuant to subsection (c) or (d) shall be pursuant to the procedures set forth in section 305 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and subsection (d). Notwithstanding subsection (d) and any other rule or order of the House of Representatives or the Senate, it shall be in order to consider amendments to ameliorate any excess spending or revenue shortfalls through different policies and proposed legislation and which do not change the net deficit impact of the resolution.

(f) TRANSMITTAL TO SENATE.—If a joint resolution passes the House of Representatives pursuant to subsection (e), the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall cause the resolution to be engrossed, certified, and transmitted to the Senate within 1 calendar day of the day on which the resolution is passed. The resolution shall be referred to the Senate Committee on the Budget.

(g) REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIAL JOINT RESOLUTION IN THE SENATE.—The Committee on the Budget, in consultation with the committees of jurisdiction, or, in the case of revenue shortfalls, the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report not later than December 1—

(1) a joint resolution reflecting the message of the President; or

(2) the joint resolution passed by the House of Representatives, with or without amendment; or

(3) a joint resolution containing different policies and proposed legislative changes than those contained in either the message of the President or the resolution passed by the House of Representatives, to eliminate all or part of any excess deficits or expenditures or any revenue shortfalls, or

(4) any changes to the deficit or revenue targets, or to the expenditure caps, contained in this Act, except that any changes to the deficit or revenue targets or expenditure caps cannot be greater than the changes recommended in the message submitted by the President.

(h) PROCEDURE IF THE APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE FAILS TO REPORT REQUIRED RESOLUTION.—(1) In the event that the Committee on the Budget of the Senate fails, by December 1, to report a resolution meeting the requirements of subsection (g), the committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution reflecting the President's recommendations introduced pursuant to subsection (a) and of the resolution passed by the House of Representatives, and both joint resolutions shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(2) Any member may move that the Senate consider the resolution passed by the House of Representatives or the resolution introduced pursuant to subsection (b).

(i) CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTION IN THE SENATE.—Consideration of resolutions reported pursuant to subsections (c) or (d) shall be pursuant to the procedures set forth in section 305 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and subsection (d).

(j) PROCEDURE IF JOINT RESOLUTION DOES NOT ELIMINATE DEFICIT EXCESS.—If the joint resolution reported by the Committee on the Budget, Way and Means, or Finance pursuant to subsection (c) or (g) or a joint resolution discharged in the House of Representatives or the Senate pursuant to subsection (d)(1) or (h) would eliminate less than—

(1) the entire amount by which actual or projected deficits exceed, or revenues fall short of, the targets in this Act; or

(2) the entire amount by which actual or projected outlays exceed the caps contained in this Act;

then the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report a joint resolution, raising the deficit targets or outlay caps, or reducing the revenue targets for any year in which actual or projected spending, revenues or deficits would not conform to the deficit and revenue targets or expenditure caps in this Act.

(k) CONFERENCE REPORTS SHALL FULLY ADDRESS DEFICIT EXCESS.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider a conference report on a joint resolution to eliminate all or part of any excess deficits or outlays or to eliminate all or part of any revenue shortfall compared to the deficit and revenue targets and the expenditure caps contained in this Act, unless—

(1) the joint resolution offsets the entire amount of any overage or shortfall; or

(2) the House of Representatives and Senate both pass the joint resolution reported pursuant to subsection (j)(2).

The vote on any resolution reported pursuant to subsection (j)(2) shall be solely on the subject of changing the deficit or revenue targets or the expenditure limits in this Act.

SEC. 103. EFFECT ON PRESIDENTS' BUDGET SUBMISSIONS; POINT OF ORDER.

(a) BUDGET SUBMISSION.—Any budget submitted by the President pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 shall be consistent with the spending, revenue, and deficit levels established in sections 104 and 105, as adjusted pursuant to section 107, or it shall recommend changes to those levels

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget unless it is consistent with the spending, revenue, and deficit levels established in sections 104 and 105, as adjusted pursuant to section 107.

SEC. 104. DEFICIT AND REVENUE TARGETS.

(a) CONSOLIDATED DEFICIT (OR SURPLUS) TARGETS.—For purposes of sections 102 and 107, the consolidated deficit targets shall be—

(1) for fiscal year 1998, $90,500,000,000;
(2) for fiscal year 1999, $89,700,000,000;
(3) for fiscal year 2000, $83,000,000,000;
(4) for fiscal year 2001, $53,300,000,000; and
(5) for fiscal year 2002, there shall be a surplus of not less than $1,400,000,000.

(b) CONSOLIDATED REVENUE TARGETS.—For purposes of sections 102, 107, 201, and 204, the consolidated revenue targets shall be—

(1) for fiscal year 1998, $1,601,800,000,000;
(2) for fiscal year 1999, $1,664,200,000,000;
(3) for fiscal year 2000, $1,728,100,000,000;
(4) for fiscal year 2001, $1,805,100,000,000; and
(5) for fiscal year 2002, $1,890,400,000,000.

SEC. 105. DIRECT SPENDING CAPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective upon submission of the report by OMB pursuant to subsection (c), direct spending caps shall apply to all entitlement authority except for undistributed offsetting receipts and net interest outlays, subject to adjustments for changes in eligible populations and inflation pursuant to section 107. For purposes of enforcing direct spending caps under this Act, each separate program shown in the table set forth in subsection (d) shall be deemed to be a category.

(b) BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORTS.—Within 30 days after enactment of this Act, the Budget Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate shall file with their respective Houses identical reports containing account numbers and spending levels for each specific category.

(c) REPORT BY OMB.—Within 30 days after enactment of this Act, OMB shall submit to the President and each House of Congress a report containing account numbers and spending limits for each specific category.

(d) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—All direct spending accounts not included in these reports under separate categories shall be included under the heading ''Other Entitlements and Mandatory Spending''. These reports may include adjustments among the caps set forth in this Act as required below, however the aggregate amount available under the ''Total Entitlements and Other Mandatory Spending'' cap shall be identical in each such report and in this Act and shall be deemed to have been adopted as part of this Act. Each such report shall include the actual amounts of the caps for each year of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 consistent with the concurrent resolution on the budget for FY 1998 for each of the following categories:

Earned Income Tax Credit,
Family Support,
Civilian and other Federal retirement:
Military retirement,
Food stamps,
Medicaid,
Medicare,
Social security,
Supplemental security income,
Unemployment compensation,
Veterans' benefits,
Other entitlements and mandatory spending, and
Aggregate entitlements and other mandatory spending.

(e) ADDITIONAL SPENDING LIMITS.—Legislation enacted subsequent to this Act may include additional caps to limit spending for specific programs, activities, or accounts with these categories. Those additional caps (if any) shall be enforced in the same manner as the limits set forth in such joint explanatory statement.

SEC. 106. ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS.

Subject to periodic reestimation based on changed economic conditions or changes in eligible population, determinations of the direct spending caps under section 105, any breaches of such caps, and actions necessary to remedy such breaches shall be based upon the economic assumptions set forth in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 (House Concurrent Resolution 84, 105th Congress). At the same time as the submission of the report by OMB pursuant to section 104(c), OMB shall submit to the President and Congress a report setting forth the economic assumptions in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 and the assumptions regarding eligible populations used in preparing the report submitted pursuant to section 104(c).

SEC. 107. REVISIONS TO DEFICIT AND REVENUE TARGETS AND TO THE CAPS FOR ENTITLEMENTS AND OTHER MANDATORY SPENDING.

(a) AUTOMATIC ADJUSTMENTS TO DEFICIT AND REVENUE TARGETS AND TO CAPS FOR ENTITLEMENTS AND OTHER MANDATORY SPENDING.—When the President submits the budget under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, and upon submission of the OMB report pursuant to section 201(a) for any year, OMB shall calculate (in the order set forth below), and the budget and reports shall include, adjustments to the deficit and revenue targets, and to the direct spending caps (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the current year, the budget year, and each outyear, to reflect the following:

(1) CHANGES TO REVENUE TARGETS.—

(A) CHANGES IN GROWTH.—For Federal revenues and deficits under laws and policies enacted or effective before July 1, 1997, growth adjustment factors shall equal the ratio between the level of year-over-year Gross Domestic Product, as adjusted by the chain-weighted GDP deflator measured for the fiscal year most recently completed and the applicable estimated level for that year as described in section 106.

(B) CHANGES IN INFLATION.—For Federal revenues and deficits under laws and policies enacted or effective before July 1, 1997, inflation adjustment factors shall equal the ratio between the level of year-over-year change in the Consumer Price Index measured for the fiscal year most recently completed and the applicable estimated level for that year as described in section 106.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS TO DIRECT SPENDING CAPS.—

(A) CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.—The adjustments produced by changes in concepts and definitions shall equal the baseline levels of new budget authority and outlays using up-to-date concepts and definitions minus those levels using the concepts and definitions in effect before such changes. Such changes in concepts and definitions may only be made in consultation with the Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, and Government Reform and Oversight and Governmental Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(B) CHANGES IN NET OUTLAYS.—Changes in net outlays for all programs and activities exempt from sequestration under section 204.

(C) CHANGES IN INFLATION.—For direct spending under laws and policies enacted or effective on or before July 1, 1997, inflation adjustment factors shall equal the ratio between the level of year-over-year change in the Consumer Price Index measured for the fiscal year most recently completed and the applicable estimated level for that year as described in section 106 (relating to economic assumptions). For direct spending under laws and policies enacted or effective after July 1, 1997, there shall be no adjustment to the direct spending caps (for changes in economic conditions including inflation, nor for changes in numbers of eligible beneficiaries) unless—

(i) the Act or the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying such Act providing new direct spending includes economic projections and projections of numbers of beneficiaries; and

(ii) such Act specifically provides for automatic adjustments to the direct spending caps in section 105 based on those projections.

(D) CHANGES IN ELIGIBLE POPULATIONS.—For direct spending under laws and policies enacted or effective on or before July 1, 1997, the direct spending caps shall be adjusted to reflect changes in eligible populations, based on the assumptions set forth in the OMB report submitted pursuant to section 106. In making such adjustments, OMB shall estimate the changes in spending resulting from the change in eligible populations. For direct spending under laws and policies enacted or effective after July 1, 1997, there shall be no adjustment to the direct spending caps for changes in numbers of eligible beneficiaries unless—

(i) the Act or the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying such Act providing new direct spending includes economic projections and projections of numbers of beneficiaries; and

(ii) such Act specifically provides for automatic adjustments to the direct spending caps in section 105 based on those projections.

(E) INTRA-BUDGETARY PAYMENTS.—From discretionary accounts to mandatory accounts. The baseline and the discretionary spending caps shall be adjusted to reflect those changes.

(b) CHANGES TO DEFICIT TARGETS.—The deficit targets in section 104 shall be adjusted to reflect changes to the revenue targets or changes to the caps for entitlements and other mandatory spending pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) PERMISSIBLE REVISIONS TO DEFICIT AND REVENUE TARGETS AND DIRECT SPENDING CAPS.—Deficit and revenue targets and direct spending caps as enacted pursuant to sections 104 and 105 may be revised as follows: Except as required pursuant to subsection (a) and (b), deficit, revenue, and direct spending caps may only be adjusted by recorded vote. It shall be a matter of highest privilege in the House of Representatives and the Senate for a Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate to insist on a recorded vote solely on the question of amending such caps. It shall not be in order for the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives to report a resolution waiving the provisions of this subsection. This subsection may be waived in the Senate

only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members duly chosen and sworn.

TITLE II—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. REPORTING EXCESS SPENDING.

(a) ANALYSIS OF ACTUAL DEFICIT, REVENUE, AND SPENDING LEVELS.—As soon as practicable after any fiscal year, OMB shall compile a statement of actual and projected deficits, revenues, and direct spending for that year and the current fiscal year. The statement shall identify such spending by categories contained in section 105.

(b) ESTIMATE OF NECESSARY SPENDING REDUCTION.—Based on the statement provided under subsection (a), the OMB shall issue a report to the President and the Congress on December 15 of any year in which such statement identifies actual or projected deficits, revenues, or spending in the current or immediately preceding fiscal years in violation of the revenue targets or direct spending caps in section 104 or 105, as adjusted pursuant to section 107, by more than one-tenth of one percent of the applicable total revenues or direct spending for such year. The report shall include:

(1) The amount, if any, that total direct spending exceeded, or is projected to exceed, the aggregate direct spending cap in section 105, as adjusted pursuant to section 107.

(2) All instances in which actual direct spending has exceeded the applicable direct spending cap.

(3) The difference between the amount of spending available under the direct spending caps for the current year and estimated actual spending for the categories associated with such caps.

(4) The amounts by which direct spending shall be reduced in the current fiscal year to offset the net amount that actual direct spending in the preceding fiscal year and projected direct spending in the current fiscal year exceeds the amounts available for each cap category.

SEC. 202. ENFORCING DIRECT SPENDING CAPS.

(a) PURPOSE.—This subtitle provides enforcement of the direct spending caps on categories of spending established pursuant to section 105. This section shall apply for any fiscal year in which the statement provided under section 201 identifies actual direct spending in the preceding fiscal year or projected direct spending in the current year in excess of the aggregate direct spending cap, as adjusted pursuant to section 107.

(b) GENERAL RULES.—

(1) ELIMINATING A BREACH.—Each non-exempt account within a category shall be reduced by a dollar amount calculated by multiplying the baseline level of sequestrable budgetary resources in that account at that time by the uniform percentage necessary to eliminate a breach within that category.

(2) PROGRAMS, PROJECTS, OR ACTIVITIES.—Except as otherwise provided, the same percentage sequestration shall apply to all programs, projects and activities within a budget account.

(3) INDEFINITE AUTHORITY.—Except as otherwise provided, sequestration in accounts for which obligations are indefinite shall be taken in a manner to ensure that obligations in the fiscal year of a sequestration and succeeding fiscal years are reduced, from the level that would actually have occurred, by the applicable sequestration percentage or percentages.

(4) CANCELLATION OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.—Budgetary resources sequestered from any account other than an trust, special or revolving fund shall revert to the Treasury and be permanently canceled.

(5) IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, administrative rules or similar actions implementing any sequestration shall take effect within 30 days after that sequestration.

SEC. 203. SEQUESTRATION RULES.

(a) GENERAL RULES.—For programs subject to direct spending caps:

(1) TRIGGERING OF SEQUESTRATION.—Sequestration is triggered if total direct spending subject to the caps in the preceding fiscal year and projected direct spending subject to the caps in the current fiscal year exceeds the total of aggregate caps for direct spending for the current and immediately preceding fiscal year.

(2) CALCULATION OF REDUCTIONS.—The amount to be sequestered from direct spending programs under each separate cap shall be determined by multiplying the total amount that direct spending in that category exceeded or is projected to exceed the direct spending cap for that category by—

(A) the net amount that total direct spending exceeded, or is projected to exceed, the aggregate spending caps, as identified pursuant to paragraph 201(b)(1); multiplied by

(B) the net amount that direct spending by which the category exceeded and is projected to exceed the direct spending cap for that category, divided by the net amount that total spending exceeded and is projected to exceed the applicable direct spending cap for all categories in which spending exceeds the applicable direct spending caps.

(3) UNIFORM PERCENTAGES.—In calculating the uniform percentage applicable to the sequestration of all spending programs or activities within each category, or the uniform percentage applicable to the sequestration of nonexempt direct spending programs or activities, the sequestrable base for direct spending programs and activities is the total level of outlays for the fiscal year for those programs or activities in the current law baseline.

(4) PERMANENT SEQUESTRATION OF DIRECT SPENDING.—Obligations in sequestered direct spending accounts shall be reduced in the fiscal year in which a sequestration occurs and in all succeeding fiscal years. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, after the first direct spending sequestration, any later sequestration shall reduce direct spending by an amount in addition to, rather than in lieu of, the reduction in direct spending in place under the existing sequestration or sequestrations.

(5) SPECIAL RULE.—For any direct spending program in which—

(A) outlays pay for entitlement benefits;

(B) a current-year sequestration takes effect after the 1st day of the budget year;

(C) that delay reduces the amount of entitlement authority that is subject to sequestration in the budget; and

(D) the uniform percentage otherwise applicable to the budget-year sequestration of a program or activity is increased due to the delay;

then the uniform percentage shall revert to the uniform percentage calculated under paragraph (3) when the budget year is completed.

(6) INDEXED BENEFIT PAYMENTS.—If, under any entitlement program—

(A) benefit payments are made to persons or governments more frequently than once a year; and

(B) the amount of entitlement authority is periodically adjusted under existing law to reflect changes in a price index (commonly called ''cost of living adjustments'');

sequestration shall first be applied to the cost of living adjustment before reductions are made to the base benefit. For the first fiscal year to which a sequestration applies, the benefit payment reductions in such programs accomplished by the order shall take effect starting with the payment made at the beginning of January following a final sequester. For the purposes of this subsection, veterans' compensation shall be considered a program that meets the conditions of the preceding sentence.

(7) LOAN PROGRAMS.—For all loans made, extended, or otherwise modified on or after any sequestration under loan programs subject to direct spending caps—

(A) the sequestrable base shall be total fees associated with all loans made extended or otherwise modified on or after the date of sequestration; and

(B) the fees paid by borrowers shall be increased by a uniform percentage sufficient to produce the dollar savings in such loan programs for the fiscal year or years of the sequestrations required by this section.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any year in which a sequestration is in effect, all subsequent fees shall be increased by the uniform percentage and all proceeds from such fees shall be paid into the general fund of the Treasury.

(8) INSURANCE PROGRAMS.—Any sequestration of a Federal program that sells insurance contracts to the public (including the Federal Crop Insurance Fund, the National Insurance Development Fund, the National Flood Insurance fund, insurance activities of the Overseas Private Insurance Corporation, and Veterans' Life insurance programs) shall be accomplished by increasing premiums on contracts entered into extended or otherwise modified, after the date a sequestration order takes effect by the uniform sequestration percentage. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for any year in which a sequestration affecting such programs is in effect, subsequent premiums shall be increased by the uniform percentage and all proceeds from the premium increase shall be paid from the insurance fund or account to the general fund of the Treasury.

(9) STATE GRANT FORMULAS.—For all State grant programs subject to direct spending caps—

(A) the total amount of funds available for all States shall be reduced by the amount required to be sequestered; and

(B) if States are projected to receive increased funding in the budget year compared to the immediately preceding fiscal year, sequestration shall first be applied to the estimated increases before reductions are made compared to actual payments to States in the previous year—

(i) the reductions shall be applied first to the total estimated increases for all States; then

(ii) the uniform reduction shall be made from each State's grant; and

(iii) the uniform reduction shall apply to the base funding levels available to states in the immediately preceding fiscal year only to the extent necessary to eliminate any remaining excess over the applicable direct spending cap.

(10) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—Except matters exempted under section 205 and programs subject to special rules set forth under section 206 and notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any sequestration required under this Act shall reduce benefit levels by an amount sufficient to eliminate all excess spending identified in the report issued pursuant to section 201, while maintaining the same uniform percentage reduction in the monetary value of benefits subject to reduction under this subsection.

(b) WITHIN-SESSION SEQUESTER.—If a bill or resolution providing direct spending for the current year is enacted before July 1 of that fiscal year and causes a breach within any direct spending cap for that fiscal year, 15 days later there shall be a sequestration to eliminate that breach within that cap.

SEC. 204. ENFORCING REVENUE TARGETS.

(a) PURPOSE.—This section enforces the revenue targets established pursuant to section 104. This section shall apply for any year in which actual revenues in the preceding fiscal year or projected revenues in the current year are less than the applicable revenue target, as adjusted pursuant to section 107.

(b) ESTIMATE OF NECESSITY TO SUSPEND NEW REVENUE REDUCTIONS.—Based on the statement provided under section 201(a), OMB shall issue a report to the President and the Congress on December 15 of any year in which such statement identifies actual or projected revenues in the current or immediately preceding fiscal years lower than the applicable revenue target in section 104, as adjusted pursuant to section 107, by more than 0.1 percent of the applicable total revenue target for such year. The report shall include—

(1) all laws and policies described in subsection (c) which would cause revenues to decline in the calendar year which begins January 1 compared to the provisions of law in effect on December 15;

(2) the amounts by which revenues would be reduced by implementation of the provisions of law described in paragraph (1) compared to provisions of law in effect on December 15; and

(3) whether delaying implementation of the provisions of law described in paragraph (1) would cause the total for revenues in the current fiscal year and actual revenues in the immediately preceding fiscal year to equal or exceed the total of the targets for the applicable years.

(c) NO CREDITS, DEDUCTIONS, EXCLUSIONS, PREFERENTIAL RATE OF TAX, ETC.—(1) If any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 added by the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1997 establishing or increasing any credit, deduction, exclusion, or eligibility limit or reducing any rate would (but for this section) first take effect in a tax benefit suspension year, and would reduce revenues over the 5-year period beginning with the tax benefit suspension year, such provision shall not take effect until the first calendar year which is not a tax benefit suspension year.

(2) SUSPENSION OF INDEXATION.—No new adjustment for inflation shall be made to any credit, deduction, or exclusion enacted as part of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1997 in a tax benefit suspension year.

(d) END OF SESSION.—If the OMB report issued under subsection (a) indicates that the total revenues projected in the current year and actual revenues in the immediately preceding year will equal or exceed the applicable targets, the President shall sign an order ending the delayed phase-in of new tax cuts effective January 1. Such order shall provide that the new tax cuts and adjustments for inflation shall take effect as if the provisions of this section had not taken effect.

(e) SUSPENSION OF NEW BENEFITS BEING PHASED IN.—If, under any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 added by the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1997, there is an increase in any benefit which would (but for this section) take effect with respect to a tax benefit suspension year, in lieu of applying subsection (c)—

(1) any increase in the benefit under such section with respect to such year and each subsequent calendar year shall be delayed 1 calendar year, and

(2) the level of benefit under such section with respect to the prior calendar year shall apply to such tax benefit suspension year.

(f) PERCENTAGE SUSPENSION WHERE FULL SUSPENSION UNNECESSARY TO ACHIEVE REVENUE TARGET.—If the application of subsections (c), (d), and (e) to any tax benefit suspension year would result in total revenues in the current year to equal or exceed the targets described in section 104 such that the amount of each benefit which is denied is only the percentage of such benefit which is necessary to result in revenues equal to such target. Such percentage shall be determined by OMB, and the same percentage shall apply to such benefits.

(g) TAX BENEFIT SUSPENSION YEAR.—For purposes of this section, the term ''tax benefit suspension year'' means any calendar year if the statement issued under subsection (b) during the preceding calendar year indicates that—

(1) for the fiscal year ending in such preceding calendar year, actual revenues were lower than the applicable revenue target in section 104, as adjusted pursuant to section 106, for such fiscal year by more than 1 percent of such target, or

(2) for the fiscal year beginning in such preceding calendar year, projected revenues (determined without regard to this section) are estimated to be lower than the applicable revenue target in section 104, as adjusted pursuant to section 106, for such fiscal year by more than 0.1 percent of such target.

SEC. 205. EXEMPT PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.

The following budget accounts, activities within accounts, or income shall be exempt from sequestration—

(1) net interest;

(2) all payments to trust funds from excise taxes or other receipts or collections properly creditable to those trust funds;

(3) offsetting receipts and collections;

(4) all payments from one Federal direct spending budget account to another Federal budget account;

(5) all intragovernmental funds including those from which funding is derived primarily from other Government accounts;

(6) expenses to the extent they result from private donations, bequests, or voluntary contributions to the Government;

(7) nonbudgetary activities, including but not limited to—

(A) credit liquidating and financing accounts;

(B) the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation Trust Funds;

(C) the Thrift Savings Fund;

(D) the Federal Reserve System; and

(E) appropriations for the District of Columbia to the extent they are appropriations of locally raised funds;

(8) payments resulting from Government insurance, Government guarantees, or any other form of contingent liability, to the extent those payments result from contractual or other legally binding commitments of the Government at the time of any sequestration;

(9) the following accounts, which largely fulfill requirements of the Constitution or otherwise make payments to which the Government is committed—

Bureau of Indian Affairs, miscellaneous trust funds, tribal trust funds (14–9973–0–7–999);

Claims, defense;

Claims, judgments and relief act (20–1895–0–1–806);

Compact of Free Association, economic assistance pursuant to Public Law 99-658 (14–0415–0–1–806);

Compensation of the President (11–0001–0–1–802);

Customs Service, miscellaneous permanent appropriations (20–9992–0–2–852);

Eastern Indian land claims settlement fund (14–2202–0–1–806);

Farm Credit System Financial Assistance Corporation, interest payments (20–1850–0–1–351);

Internal Revenue collections of Puerto Rico (20–5737–0–2–852);

Payments of Vietnam and USS Pueblo prisoner-of-war claims (15–0104–0–1–153):

Payments to copyright owners (03–5175–0–2–376);

Salaries of Article III judges (not including cost of living adjustments);

Soldier's and Airman's Home, payment of claims (84–8930–0–7–705);

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, interest payments (46–0300–0–1–401);

(10) the following noncredit special, revolving, or trust-revolving funds—

Exchange Stabilization Fund (20–4444–0–3–155); and

Foreign Military Sales trust fund (11–82232–0–7–155).

SEC. 206. SPECIAL RULES.

(a) CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM.—Any sequestration order shall accomplish the full amount of any required reduction in payments under sections 455 and 458 of the Social Security Act by reducing the Federal matching rate for State administrative costs under the program, as specified (for the fiscal year involved) in section 455(a) of such Act, to the extent necessary to reduce such expenditures by that amount.

(b) COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—For the Commodity Credit Corporation, the date on which a sequestration order takes effect in a fiscal year shall vary for each crop of a commodity. In general, the sequestration order shall take effect when issued, but for each crop of a commodity for which 1-year contracts are issued as an entitlement, the sequestration order shall take effect with the start of the sign-up period for that crop that begins after the sequestration order is issued. Payments for each contract in such a crop shall be reduced under the same terms and conditions.

(2) DAIRY PROGRAM.—

(A) As the sole means of achieving any reduction in outlays under the milk price-support program, the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide for a reduction to be made in the price received by producers for all milk in the United States and marketed by producers for commercial use.

(B) That price reduction (measured in cents per hundred-weight of milk marketed) shall occur under subparagraph (A) of section 201(d)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1446(d)(2)(A)), shall begin on the day any sequestration order is issued, and shall not exceed the aggregate amount of the reduction in outlays under the milk price-support program, that otherwise would have been achieved by reducing payments made for the purchase of milk or the products of milk under this subsection during that fiscal year.

(3) CERTAIN AUTHORITY NOT TO BE LIMITED.—Nothing in this Act shall restrict the Corporation in the discharge of its authority and responsibility as a corporation to buy and sell commodities in international trade, or limit or reduce in any way any appropriation that provides the Corporation with funds to cover its realized losses.

(c) EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.—

(1) The sequestrable base for earned income tax credit program is the dollar value of all current year benefits to the entire eligible population.

(2) In the event sequestration is triggered to reduce earned income tax credits, all earned income tax credits shall be reduced, whether or not such credits otherwise would result in cash payments to beneficiaries, by a uniform percentage sufficient to produce the dollar savings required by the sequestration.

(d) REGULAR AND EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

(1) A State may reduce each weekly benefit payment made under the regular and extended unemployment benefit programs for

any week of unemployment occurring during any period with respect to which payments are reduced under any sequestration order by a percentage not to exceed the percentage by which the Federal payment to the State is to be reduced for such week as a result of such order.

(2) A reduction by a State in accordance with paragraph (1) shall not be considered as a failure to fulfill the requirements of section 3304(a)(11) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(e) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND.— For the Federal Employees Health Benefits Fund, a sequestration order shall take effect with the next open season. The sequestration shall be accomplished by annual payments from that Fund to the General Fund of the Treasury. Those annual payments shall be financed solely by charging higher premiums. The sequestrable base for the Fund is the current-year level of gross outlays resulting from claims paid after the sequestration order takes effect.

(f) FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD.— Any sequestration of the Federal Housing Board shall be accomplished by annual payments (by the end of each fiscal year) from that Board to the general fund of the Treasury, in amounts equal to the uniform sequestration percentage for that year times the gross obligations of the Board in that year.

(g) FEDERAL PAY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.— New budget authority to pay Federal personnel from direct spending accounts shall be reduced by the uniform percentage calculated under section 203(c)(3), as applicable, but no sequestration order may reduce or have the effect of reducing the rate of pay to which any individual is entitled under any statutory pay system as increased by any amount payable under section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, or any increase in rates of pay which is scheduled to take effect under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, section 1109 of title 37, United States Code, or any other provision of law.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) the term ''statutory pay system'' shall have the meaning given that term in section 5302(1) of title 5, United States Code;

term ''elements of military pay'' means—

(i) the elements of compensation of members of the uniformed services specified in section 1009 of title 37, United States Code;

(ii) allowances provided members of the uniformed services under sections 403(a) and 405 of such title; and

(iii) cadet pay and midshipman pay under section 203(c) of such title; and

(C) the term ''uniformed services'' shall have the same meaning given that term in section 101(3) of title 37, United States Code.

(h) MEDICARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any sequestration shall accomplish 90 percent of the required reduction by reductions in payments for services under title XVIII of the Social Security Act and 10 percent of the required reduction through increases in beneficiary premiums under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act.

(2) TIMING OF APPLICATION OF REDUCTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.— Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if a reduction is made in payment amounts pursuant to sequestration order, the reduction shall be applied to payment for services furnished after the effective date of the order. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of inpatient services furnished for an individual, the services shall be considered to be furnished on the date of the individual's discharge from the inpatient facility.

(B) PAYMENT ON THE BASIS OF COST REPORTING PERIODS.— In the case in which payment for services of a provider of services is made under title XVIII of the Social Security Act on a basis relating to the reasonable cost incurred for the services during a cost reporting period of the provider, if a reduction is made in payment amounts pursuant to a sequestration order, the reduction shall be applied to payment for costs for such services incurred at any time during each cost reporting period of the provider any part of which occurs after the effective date of order, but only (for each such cost reporting period) in the same proportion as the fraction of the cost reporting period that occurs after the effective date of the order.

(3) NO INCREASE IN BENEFICIARY CHARGES IN ASSIGNMENT-RELATED CASES.—If a reduction in payment amounts is made pursuant to a sequestration order for services for which payment under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act is made on the basis of an assignment described in section 1842(b)(3)(B)(ii), in accordance with section 1842(b)(6)(B), or under the procedure described in section 1870(f)(1) of such Act, the person furnishing the services shall be considered to have accepted payment of the reasonable charge for the services, less any reduction in payment amount made pursuant to a sequestration order, as payment in full.

(4) PART B PREMIUMS.—In computing the amount and method, part B premiums shall be increased by a percentage to be determined by dividing 10 percent of the amount that medicare spending exceeds the applicable cap by the total amount of all premium collections. All beneficiary premiums shall be increased by the percentage calculated pursuant to the preceding sentence, except that no increase in the premium shall result in a reduction in social security benefit payments to any beneficiary.

(5) NO EFFECT ON COMPUTATION OF AAPCC.— In computing the adjusted average per capita cost for purposes of section 1876(a)(4) of the Social Security Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall not take into account any reductions in payment amounts which have been or may be effected under this part.

(i) POSTAL SERVICE FUND.— Any sequestration of the Postal Service Fund shall be accomplished by annual payments from that Fund to the General Fund of the Treasury, and the Postmaster General of the United States and shall have the duty to make those payments during the first fiscal year to which the sequestration order applies and each succeeding fiscal year. The amount of each annual payment shall be—

(1) the uniform sequestration percentage, times

(2) the estimated gross obligations of the Postal Service Fund in that year other than those obligations financed with an appropriation for revenue forgone that year.

Any such payment for a fiscal year shall be made as soon as possible during the fiscal year, except that it may be made in installments within that year if the payment schedule is approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. Within 30 days after the sequestration order is issued, the Postmaster General shall submit to the Postal Rate Commission a plan for financing the annual payment for that fiscal year and publish that plan in the Federal Register. The plan may assume efficiencies in the operation of the Postal Service, reductions in capital expenditures, increases in the prices of services, or any combination, but may not assume a lower Fund surplus or higher Fund deficit and shall follow the requirements of existing law governing the Postal Service in all other respects. Within 30 days of the receipt of that plan, the Postal Rate Commission shall approve the plan or modify it in the manner that modifications are allowed under current law. If the Postal Rate Commission does not respond to the plan within 30 days, the plan submitted by the Postmaster General shall go into effect. Any plan may be later revised by the submission of a new plan to the Postal Rate Commission, which may approve or modify it.

(j) POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS AND T.V.A.— Any sequestration of the Department of Energy power marketing administration funds or the Tennessee Valley Authority fund shall be accomplished by annual payments from those funds to the General Fund of the Treasury, and the administrators of those funds shall have the duty to make those payments during the fiscal year to which the sequestration order applies and each succeeding fiscal year. The amount of each payment by a fund shall be—

(1) the direct spending uniform sequestration percentage, times

(2) the estimated gross obligations of the fund in that year other than those obligations financed from discretionary appropriations for that year.

Any such payment for a fiscal year shall be made as soon as possible during the fiscal year, except that it may be made in installments within that year if the payment schedule is approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. Annual payments by a fund may be financed by reductions in costs required to produce the pre-sequester amount of power (but those reductions shall not include reductions in the amount of power supplied by the fund), by reductions in capital expenditures, by increases in tax rates, or by any combination, but may not be financed by a lower fund surplus, a higher fund deficit, additional borrowing, delay in repayment of principal on outstanding debt and shall follow the requirements of existing law governing the fund in all other respects. The administrator of a fund or the TVA Board is authorized to take the actions specified in this subsection in order to make the annual payments to the Treasury.

(k) BUSINESS-LIKE TRANSACTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for programs which provide a business-like service in exchange for a fee, sequestration shall be accomplished through a uniform increase in fees (sufficient to produce the dollar savings in such programs for the fiscal year of the sequestration required by section 201(a)(2), all subsequent fees shall be increased by the same percentage, and all proceeds from such fees shall be paid into the general fund of the Treasury, in any year for which a sequester affecting such programs are in effect.

SEC. 207. THE CURRENT LAW BASELINE.

(a) SUBMISSION OF REPORTS.—CBO and OMB shall submit to the President and the Congress reports setting forth the budget baselines for the budget year and the next nine fiscal years. The CBO report shall be submitted on or before January 15. The OMB report shall accompany the President's budget.

(b) DETERMINATION OF THE BUDGET BASELINE.—(1) The budget baseline shall be based on the common economic assumptions set forth in section 106, adjusted to reflect revisions pursuant to subsection (c).

(2) The budget baseline shall consist of a projection of current year levels of budget authority, outlays, revenues and the surplus or deficit into the budget year and the relevant outyears based on current enacted laws as of the date of the projection.

(3) For discretionary spending items, the baseline shall be the spending caps in effect pursuant to section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. For years for which there are no caps, the baseline for discretionary spending shall be the same as the

last year for which there were statutory caps.

(4) For all other expenditures and for revenues, the baseline shall be adjusted by comparing unemployment, inflation, interest rates, growth and eligible population for the most recent period for which actual data are available, compared to the assumptions contained in section 107.

(c) REVISIONS TO THE BASELINE.—The baseline shall be adjusted for up-to-date economic assumptions for all reports issued pursuant to section 107 of this Act and section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 208. LIMITATIONS ON EMERGENCY SPENDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Within the discretionary caps for each fiscal year contained in this Act, an amount shall be withheld from allocation to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and reserved for natural disasters and other emergency purposes.

(2) Such amount for each such fiscal year shall not be less than 1 percent of total budget authority and outlays available within those caps for that fiscal year.

(3) No adjustments shall be made to the discretionary spending limits under section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 unless the amount appropriated for discretionary accounts that have been designated as emergency requirements exceed the amount reserved pursuant to paragraph (1). Any adjustment shall be limited to the amount that total appropriations designated as emergency requirements for the fiscal year exceeds the amount reserved pursuant to paragraph (1).

(4) The amounts reserved pursuant to this subsection shall be made available for allocation to such committees only if—

(A) the President has made a request for such disaster funds;

(B) the programs to be funded are included in such request; and

(C) the projected obligations for unforeseen emergency needs exceed the 10-year rolling average annual expenditures for existing programs included in the Presidential request for the applicable fiscal year.

(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(A) States and localities shall be required to maintain effort and ensure that Federal assistance payments do not replace, subvert or otherwise have the effect of reducing regularly budgeted State and local expenditures for law enforcement, firefighting, road construction and maintenance, building construction and maintenance or any other category of regular government expenditure (to ensure that Federal disaster payments are made only for incremental costs directly attributable to unforeseen disasters, and do not replace or reduce regular State and local expenditures for the same purposes);

(B) the President may not take administrative action to waive any requirement for States or localities to make minimum matching payments as a condition or receiving Federal disaster assistance or take administrative action to waive all or part of any repayment of Federal loans for the State or local matching share required as a condition of receiving Federal disaster assistance. This clause shall apply to all matching share requirements and loans to meet matching share requirements under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) and any other Acts pursuant to which the President may declare a disaster or disasters and States and localities otherwise qualify for Federal disaster assistance; and

(C) a two-thirds vote in each House of Congress shall be required for each emergency to reduce or waive the State matching requirement or to forgive all or part of loans for the State matching share as required under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.

(b) EFFECT BUDGET RESOLUTIONS.—(1) All concurrent resolutions on the budget (including revisions) shall specify the amount of new budget authority and outlays within the discretionary spending cap that shall be withheld from allocation to the committees and reserved for natural disasters, and a procedure for releasing such funds for allocation to the appropriate committee. The amount withheld shall be equal to 1 percent of the total discretionary spending cap for fiscal year covered by the resolution, unless additional amounts are specified.

(2) The procedure for allocation of the amounts pursuant to paragraph (1) shall ensure that the funds are released for allocation only pursuant to the conditions contained in subsection (a)(3)(A) through (C).

(c) RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amount reserved pursuant to subsection (a) shall not be available for other than emergency funding requirements for particular natural disasters or national security emergencies so designated by Acts of Congress.

(d) NEW POINT OF ORDER.—(1) Title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''POINT OF ORDER REGARDING EMERGENCIES

''SEC. 408. It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, containing an emergency designation for purposes of section 251(b)(2)(D) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or of section 208 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1997 if it also provides an appropriation or direct spending for any other item or contains any other matter, but that bill or joint resolution, amendment, or conference report may contain rescissions of budget authority or reductions of direct spending, or that amendment may reduce amounts for that emergency.''.

(2) The table of contents set forth in section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 407 the following new item:

''Sec. 408. Point of order regarding emergencies.''.

TITLE III—USE OF BUDGET SURPLUS TO PRESERVE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

SEC. 301. ENDING USE OF RECEIPTS OF SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND FOR OTHER PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

(a) If, in any year, revenues are higher than the targets in section 104, as adjusted pursuant to section 107, or spending is lower than the caps in section 105, as adjusted, and the deficits are lower than the targets in section 105, as adjusted pursuant to section 107, those amounts shall be applied pursuant to subsection (b).

(b) All funds described in subsection (a) up to $100 billion shall be used to reduce the consolidated budget deficit and, to the extent that funds are available to eliminate the consolidated budget deficit, to retire the outstanding debt of the United States Government held by the public.

(c) Any use of funds described in subsection (a) for any purpose other than provided in subsection (b) shall be subject to the requirements of section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and any reduction in the amounts described in subsection (a) shall be considered as an increase in the deficit.

(d) When the President submits the budget under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for any year, OMB shall adjust the Social Security Trust Fund surpluses for each year under this section, based on the most recent estimates of such surpluses to be provided to OMB by the Secretary of the Treasury.

H.R. 2003

OFFERED BY: MR. EVANS

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 17, strike line 2.

Page 36, after line 15, insert the following (and redesignate the succeeding paragraph accordingly):

(10) payments and expenses under programs, benefits, and activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs and, insofar as they relate to veterans, of the Department of Labor;

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE IN INDIA

SEC. 572. Not more than $51,180,000 of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act under the heading ''Development Assistance'' may be made available for assistance in India.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 38: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE IN INDIA

SEC. 572. Not more than $41,775,000 of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act under the heading ''Development Assistance'' may be made available for assistance in India.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 39: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR INDIA

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act under the heading ''Development Assistance'' may be made available for assistance to the Government of India.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 40: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR INDIA

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act under the heading ''Development Assistance'' may be made available for assistance in India unless such funds are provided to nongovernmental organizations.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. FOX OF PENNSYLVANIA

AMENDMENT NO. 41: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following:

SEC. 572. None of the funds made available under the heading ''DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'' may be used to directly support or promote trophy hunting or the international commercial trade in elephant ivory, elephant hides, or rhinoceros horns.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MS. HARMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 42: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING PROLIFERATION OF MISSILE TECHNOLOGY FROM RUSSIA TO IRAN

SEC. 572. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress find the following:

(1) There is substantial evidence that missile technology and technical advice have been provided from Russia to Iran, in violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime.

(2) These violations include providing assistance to Iran in developing ballistic missiles, including the transfer of wind tunnel and rocket engine testing equipment.

(3) These technologies give Iran the capability to deploy a missile of sufficient range to threaten United States military installation in the Middle East and Persian Gulf, as well as the territory of Israel, and our North Atlantic Treaty Organization ally Turkey.

(4) President Clinton has raised with Russian President Boris Yeltsin United States concerns about these activities and the Russian response has to date been inadequate.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President should demand that the Government of Russia take concrete actions to stop governmental and nongovernmental entities in the Russian Federation from providing missile technology and technical advice to Iran, in violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime;

(2) if the Russian response is inadequate, the United States should impose sanctions on the responsible Russian entities in accordance with Executive Order 12938 on the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, and reassess cooperative activities with Russia;

(3) the threshold under current law allowing for the waiver of the prohibition on the release of foreign assistance to Russia should be raised; and

(4) our European allies should be encouraged to take steps in accordance with their own laws to stop such proliferation.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. LAZIO

AMENDMENT NO. 43: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR EGYPT

SEC. 572. Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act under the heading ''ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND'' not more than $615,000,000 may be made available for Egypt.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. MENENDEZ

AMENDMENT NO. 44: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the heading ''INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS'' that are made available for the International Atomic Energy Agency shall be made available for programs or projects of such Agency in Cuba.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. MICA

AMENDMENT NO. 45: Page 6, line 3, after ''$650,000,000'' insert ''(increased by $19,400,000)''.

Page 12, line 9, after ''$468,750,000'' insert ''(decreased by $19,400,000)''.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. SAXTON

AMENDMENT NO. 46: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE P.L.O., THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY, AND RELATED OR SUCCESSOR ENTITIES

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be provided directly to the Palestine Liberation Organization (P.L.O.), the Palestinian Authority, or related or successor entities.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. SAXTON

AMENDMENT NO. 47: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE P.L.O. OR THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be provided directly to the Palestine Liberation Organization (P.L.O.), or the Palestinian Authority.

H.R. 2159,

OFFERED BY: MR. TAYLOR

AMENDMENT NO. 48: Page 22, after line 10, add the following:

(o) Funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to establish and carry out a pilot program to provide affordable housing in the Russian Federation. Provided, that none of the funds appropriated may be used for the purposes of providing Russian military housing.

H.R. 2159,

OFFERED BY: MR. YATES

AMENDMENT NO. 49: At the end of the bill, insert the following after the last section (preceding the short title):

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CROATIA

SEC. 572. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by Title II of this Act may be made available to the Government of Croatia if that government relocates the remains of Croatian Ustashe soldiers, who participated during the Holocaust in the mass murder of Jews, Serbs, and Gypsies, at the site of the World War II concentration camp at Jasenovac, Croatia.

(b) NATIONAL INTEREST EXCEPTION.—Assisatnce restricted by subsection (a) may be furnished if the President determines that furnishing such assistance is important to the national interests of the United States.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Whenever the President makes a determination under subsection (b), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report with respect to the furnishing of assistance pursuant to the determination. Any such report shall include a detailed explanation of the assistance and how it furthers United States national interests.

H.R. 2159,

OFFERED BY: MR. YATES

AMENDMENT NO. 50: At the end of the bill, insert the following after the last section (preceding the short title):

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CROATIA

SEC. 572. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by Title II of this Act may be made available to the Government of Croatia if that government relocates the remains of Croatian Ustashe soldiers, who participated during the Holocaust in the mass murder of Jews, Serbs, and Gypsies, at the site of the World War II concentration camp at Jasenovac, Croatia.

(b) TERMINATION OF PROHIBITION.—The prohibition under subsection (a) with respect to the Government of Croatia shall terminate after the Government of Croatia provides the Secretary of State with compelling proof that the historical symbolism of Jasenovac, and the remains of those who were murdered by the Nazis and their collaborators, will remain undisturbed and that no other remains will ever be added to the remains of the victims of Nazi tyranny buried at Jasenovac, Croatia.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. YATES

AMENDMENT NO. 51: At the end of the bill, insert the following after the last section (preceding the short title):

LIMITATION OF ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CROATIA

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by title II of this Act may be made available to the Government of Croatia if that government relocates the remains of Croatian Ustashe soldiers, who participated during the Holocaust in the mass murder of Jews, Serbs, and Gypsies, at the site of the World War II concentration camp at Jasenovac, Croatia.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. YATES

AMENDMENT NO. 52: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 572. Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the heading ''DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'', not more than $2,900,000 may be made available to the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development for the Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) in Zimbabwe: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to such Agency under the heading ''DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'' may be used to directly finance the trophy hunting of elephants or other endangered species as defined in the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Flora and Fauna (CITES) or the Endangered Species Act: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to such Agency under the heading ''DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'' that are provided under the CAMPFIRE program may not be used for activities with the express intent to lobby or otherwise influence international conventions or treaties, or United States government decisionmakers: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to such Agency under the heading ''DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'' that are made available for the CAMPFIRE program may be used only in Zimbabwe for the purpose of maximizing benefits to rural people while strengthening natural resources management institutions: *Provided further,* That not later than March 1, 1998, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the steps taken to implement the CAMPFIRE program, the impact of the program on the people and wildlife of CAMPFIRE districts, alternatives to trophy hunting as a means of generating income for CAMPFIRE districts, and a description of how funds made available for CAMPFIRE in fiscal year 1998 are to be used.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 21: Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to the Department of Agriculture shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who issue, under section 156 of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7272), any nonrecourse loans to sugar beet or sugar cane processors.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. CHABOT

AMENDMENT NO. 22: Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623) or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who carry out a market program under such section.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. POMBO

AMENDMENT NO. 23: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 728. None of the funds made available in title III of this Act may be used to provide any assistance (other than the servicing of loans made on or before September 30, 1997) under any program under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating to any housing or project located, or to be located, in the City of Galt, California.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 24: Page 54, after line 13, insert the following:

In addition, for the Food for Progress Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1736o), in addition to the amounts and commodities made available in fiscal year 1997 under subsections (f)(3), (g), and (l)(1) of that Act, $50,000,000 shall be available to furnish dairy products on a grant basis, to be derived by transfer from fiscal year 1997 unexpended balances for the Dairy Export Incentive Program. Products furnished under this provision shall not be subject to the existing commodity ceiling and funds made available under this provision shall not be subject to the caps under subsections (f)(3) and (l)(1).

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 25: On page 67, line 6, after the dollar amount insert: ''(reduced by $155,000,000)''.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 26: On page 67, line 6, after the dollar amount insert: ''(reduced by $105,000,000)''.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 27: On page 67, line 6, after the dollar amount insert: ''(reduced by $80,000,000)''.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 28: On page 67, line 6, after the dollar amount insert: ''(reduced by $55,000,000)''.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 29: On page 67, line 6, after the dollar amount insert: ''(reduced by $30,000,000)''.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 30: On page 67, line 6, after the dollar amount insert: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 31: On page 67, strike lines 7 through 13.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 32: On page 67, strike lines 14 through 19.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 33: On page 67, strike lines 20 through 24.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

AMENDMENT NO. 34: On page 68, strike lines 8 through 11.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY MR. WYNN

AMENDMENT NO. 35: On page 68, after line 16, add the following new section:

''SEC. For an additional amount for the purposes provided for under the heading 'Departmental Administration' in Title I of this Act, $1,500,000, and the amount provided under 'National Agricultural Statistics Service' is hereby reduced by $1,500,000.' ''

H.R. 2203

OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 502. None of the funds made available in this Act may be provided by contract or by grant (including a grant of funds to be available for student aid) to any institution of higher education, or subelement thereof, that is currently ineligible for contracts and grants pursuant to section 514 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–270).

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 22, 1997 No. 104

Senate

The Senate met at 9:45 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

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

We can know the One who knows. Father, the very idea gives us inspiration and enthusiasm as we begin the work of this day. Our work has to do with thinking clearly about the issues before us. We feel fresh excitement about the day ahead when we contemplate the amazing fact that You who know everything and always will what is best for us, are willing to think through our thinking brains so we can discover truly creative solutions to our perplexities.

Form in our minds the mental picture of a successful agreement on the budget between the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the President. Now we thank You in advance that You will help us achieve this image of oneness and progress for Your glory.

We also are moved by the fact that You are Sovereign over the minds of people with whom we may have differed in the past. We open our minds to the possibility that You may choose to expand our understanding of issues through the insights You give them. We all are humbled by the fact that we all need knowledge from You, the One who knows and affirms our effort for oneness. We join with one another in confessing our need for You to guide our thinking and lead us to solutions that are maximum. Through our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able acting majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Colorado, is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, today the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1023, the Treasury, general Government appropriations bill, with 10 minutes of debate remaining on the bill. At 10 a.m., a series of votes, possibly three, will occur on the remaining pending amendments to the Treasury, general Government appropriations bill, including a vote on final passage of S. 1023. Following the disposition of S. 1023, the Senate will resume consideration of the VA–HUD appropriations bill. Therefore additional votes will occur during today's session of the Senate.

As a reminder, the Senate will recess from the hours of 12:30 to 2:15 today for the weekly policy luncheons to meet.

On behalf of the leader, I thank my colleagues for their attention.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1023, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1023) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Campbell (for DeWine) amendment No. 936, to prohibit the use of funds to pay for an abortion or pay for the administrative expenses in connection with certain health plans that provide coverage for abortions.

Kohl (for Bingaman) amendment No. 937, to strike provisions prohibiting the use of appropriated funds for the sole source procurement of energy conservation measures.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to each of the votes in this series.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, Senator BINGAMAN and Senator STEVENS have not yet arrived at the floor so, until they do, 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. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sam Rikkers, who is an intern with me, be granted the privilege of the floor during today's session of the Senate.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Chair and 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. BINGAMAN. 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. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask the floor manager, I have one amendment that is going to be voted on in about 15 or 20 minutes, I understand. Is it appropriate to speak on that at this point?

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

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

Mr. CAMPBELL. I ask the Senator, is this the Bingaman amendment he had offered, amendment No. 937.

Mr. BINGAMAN. This is the Bingaman-Murkowski amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 937

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now consider amendment No. 937, offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN].

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

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me just speak briefly on this amendment. We are still in morning business, as I understand it; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not correct. The Chair advises the Senator from New Mexico we are now in consideration of S. 1023.

Mr. BINGAMAN. OK. Let me speak for a few minutes about this amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, if I could ask for just a moment?

Mr. BINGAMAN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the Chair tell us the pending business and the division of the time on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has 4 minutes 39 seconds; the Senator from New Mexico 3 minutes 25 seconds.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Was there a unanimous-consent request dividing the time, 2 minutes equally divided?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, there were 10 minutes equally divided. This is the time remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes. I thank the Chair and thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me briefly describe what the amendment is. The amendment which I am offering along with Senator MURKOWSKI, the chairman of the Energy Committee, would strike section 630 out of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill which is pending before the Senate. The reason we are trying to strike section 630 is that it would impede Federal agencies from using energy conservation programs that are now being offered to all customers by electric utility companies. This section would override both the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the National Defense Authorization Act of 1993. There is nothing anticompetitive about eliminating section 630. Many energy conservation measures, such as agreements to use certain amounts of energy at certain times of the day, can only be made—those types of agreements can only be made with the local utility.

We are in a period where we are moving toward a restructured electric utility industry, but we are not there yet. In most parts of this country today, customers still deal with one electric utility. So the opportunity to enter into these energy conservation measures is with that one electric utility. If there is only one source offering a particular service—in this case the providing of electricity—there is no point in outlawing a sole-source procurement, as section 630 would do.

Existing law tells Federal agencies to use energy conservation services offered by local utilities if those same services are offered to other customers in that same location. This amendment overrides section 630 of the bill, which we are dealing with here and which we are trying to eliminate. It would override these mandates and would have the following negative consequences.

First of all, there are 58 existing contracts between the General Services Administration and utilities that will be adversely affected by this provision, according to the Department of Energy. Second, the Department of Defense will be forced to scrap its model energy conservation agreement that it has with members of the utility industry.

Since the law allows sole-source contracts, and since the sole source is sometimes the only option for the Government, section 630 is not about making agencies comply with the law; it is about the Senate intervening on one side of an electric industry dispute without having all of the facts. Energy conservation law is obviously complex. We should not be trying to change this law in an appropriations bill. Before we change the law, we need to hear from all of the affected parties.

The chairman of the Energy Committee, who is cosponsoring my amendment, has agreed to hold hearings on the concerns raised by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Given that good-faith offer to investigate and resolve these concerns, I believe the Senate should support our amendment and take out section 630 until we have all the facts.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment from the Senator from New Mexico to strike section 630 of this legislation. Section 630 addresses substantive issues regarding the energy efficiency requirements for Federal agencies under the Energy Policy Act of 1992. That act had many provisions designed to improve the energy efficiency of Federal facilities. Two are at issue here. First, there are so-called energy savings performance contracts [ESPC's]. These are a mechanism for use of private sector funds to finance Federal energy efficiency improvements. These are competitively bid. In addition, there are utility programs. EPAct also provided for Federal participation in utility demand management programs that are authorized by the State regulators.

The ESPC's haven't been used as much as they could be. The ESPC's required new regulations, which DOE took a long time to issue. The contracting process was complicated and cumbersome. However, DOE is now entering into regional contracts for all Federal facilities, which is expected to speed up the contracting process. In the meantime, Federal agencies have been participating in utility demand management programs to reduce energy use.

The language of section 630 is very broad—it prohibits participation in all utility demand management programs. Even more troublesome, it prohibits payment under existing contracts. This, despite the fact that there may be some services that only utilities can provide—an example is a meeting system that provides real-time pricing information. But today, I do not wish to debate whether or not this is the right thing to do. This change in a law that is within the jurisdiction of the Energy Committee.

The promoters of the amendment have claimed that obtaining energy efficiency measures through sole source contracting—through utility demand management programs—is already against the law. This is not so. Section 152 of EPAct amended section 545 of National Energy Conservation Act to include the following language:

(c) UTILITY INCENTIVE PROGRAMS.—(1) Agencies are authorized and encouraged to participate in programs to increase energy efficiency and for water conservation or the management of electricity demand conducted by gas, water, or electric utilities and generally available to customers of such utilities.

(2) Each agency may accept any financial incentive, goods, or services generally available from any such utility, to increase energy efficiency or to conserve water or manage electric demand.

(3) Each agency is encouraged to enter into negotiations with electric, water, and gas utilities to design cost-effective demand management and conservation incentive programs to address the unique needs of facilities utilized by such agency.

According to a letter I have received from the Department of Defense, the ''Department uses a combination of contracting authorities to achieve energy efficiency. It is [the Department's belief that [the Department's] current approach provides better results for the U.S. Government than would be the case'' if section 630 were enacted into law. The Department concludes that ''this provision would have the effect of reducing the amount of work defense installations are able to contract to all sectors of the energy community, and therefore, significantly reducing the savings we achieve.

There are many issues raised by the Government's implementation of the provision of EPAct. However, these provisions are the jurisdiction of the Energy Committee. The concerns that the Department of Defense, and others, have raised with section 630 show that this is a complex issue that should be the subject of a hearing and deliberate legislative by the authorizing committee. An appropriations bill is not the appropriate forum to address these concerns.

I ask my colleagues support for the Bingaman amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter I received from Defense Deputy Under Secretary Goodman be printed in the RECORD.

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

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC.

Subject: Section 630, Senate Treasury and Postal Service appropriations bill.

Senator FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

This is in response to the telephone request from a member of your staff for a Defense position on the proposed section 630 to the Senate Treasury and Postal Appropriation bill. Section 630 would preclude any Federal agency from obtaining energy conservation services on a sole source basis.

The Department of Defense is concerned that this provision would have the effect of reducing the amount of work defense installations are able to contract to all sectors of the energy community, and therefore, significantly reducing the savings we achieve.

The Department of Defense is the single largest energy user in the country and is committed to achieving the energy efficiency improvement goals of the Energy Policy Act and President Clinton's Executive Order 12902. If those goals are achieved, we will realize a billion dollar reduction in our annual energy bill by 2005 and implement the most cost-effective environmental improvement result possible through pollution prevention.

The Department uses a combination of contracting authorities to achieve energy efficiency. These authorities allow us either competitively to contract or sole-source for the technical and capital resources we need. There are two important cases in which the Department may want to contract sole-source for energy conservation services, both in the interest of achieving best value for the United States Government. In the first case, we may contract sole source if the firm has proprietary information or a significant technological innovation—for instance, if a company has produced a new type of fuel cell or control system that is unique or proprietary. In the second case, under the recent agreement with the Edison Electric Institute, we can access a franchised utility company's energy conservation service program (which must be a sole-source contract because these are State-sanctioned sole-source programs). Under our agreement with the Edison Electric Institute, the franchise utility companies are required to subcontract competitively the actual conservation work. The Department therefore derives the benefits of competition even though the prime contract was not competitive.

It is our belief that our current approach provides better results for the United States Government than would be the case if our current authority to contract sole-source, where justified, were eliminated. Our current system allows more work to be done by the energy savings performance contractor and Architect/Engineer communities. Because this system allows us to take advantage of situations where the greatest savings derive from a sole source provider, it also increases our ability to undertake energy conservation efforts and therefore achieve greater savings.

We recommend that section 630 be deleted from the Treasury and Postal Service Appropriation Bill.

We have not had an opportunity to have the Office of Management and Budget review this to make sure that it comports with Administration policy.

JOHN B. GOODMAN,
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, my colleague is not yet here, so I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that no time be charged against Senator STEVENS during that quorum call.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, the provision in this bill requires compliance with existing law. Our information is that the cost of modernization of these facilities to the Federal Government is approximately $4 billion. Unless existing law is complied with, it will cost us $1 billion more than it would if we had true competition. The figures show it would cost $3 billion if they complied with the law; it would cost $4 billion if they continue to flout and ignore the law.

The Bingaman amendment would take out of the bill the requirement no funds can be spent except in compliance with existing law. I do not understand a refusal to accept the fact that that is the law. If the committee of jurisdiction doesn't like the law, they should come to the floor with suggestions to amend it. But we should, supporting expenditures of Federal funds, require compliance with the law that mandates competition in this area.

I move to table the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask, is there additional time preserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Was there 2 minutes before each vote that was provided for in the unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from New Mexico that there was. However, we have already had 10 minutes on this debate, so the Chair declares the time has expired.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced, yeas 35, nays 64, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 189 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Abraham	Glenn	McConnell
Allard	Gorton	Murray
Bennett	Gramm	Roberts
Campbell	Grassley	Roth
Chafee	Gregg	Santorum
Cleland	Hutchison	Sessions
Coats	Kohl	Shelby
Collins	Kyl	Snowe
Coverdell	Lautenberg	Stevens
D'Amato	Lieberman	Thompson
Feingold	Mack	Wellstone
Frist	McCain	

NAYS—64

Akaka	Enzi	Levin
Ashcroft	Faircloth	Lott
Baucus	Feinstein	Lugar
Biden	Ford	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Grams	Moynihan
Boxer	Hagel	Murkowski
Breaux	Harkin	Nickles
Brownback	Hatch	Reed
Bryan	Helms	Reid
Bumpers	Hollings	Robb
Burns	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Byrd	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Inouye	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Jeffords	Specter
Craig	Johnson	Thomas
Daschle	Kempthorne	Thurmond
DeWine	Kennedy	Torricelli
Dodd	Kerrey	Warner
Domenici	Kerry	Wyden
Dorgan	Landrieu	
Durbin	Leahy	

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 937) was rejected.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays on the Bingaman amendment be vitiated.

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

The question is on agreeing to the Bingaman amendment.

The amendment (No. 937) was agreed to.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. FORD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 936

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs now on amendment No. 936.

The Senator from Ohio has 1 minute.

Mr. DEWINE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, let me take just 1 minute to explain this amendment.

This amendment is a very simple one. A ''yes'' vote means that we continue the current law. A ''yes'' vote on the amendment would continue in force the current prohibition on the taxpayer subsidy of abortions for Federal workers. It would permit Federal

employee health plans to cover abortion only in the cases of rape, incest and threats to the life of the mother.

This has been the law for most of the last 14 years, from 1984 to 1993, and from 1995 until the present. A ''yes'' vote continues current law.

Mr. President, in 1996 the Federal Government paid an average of 74 percent of the cost of a Federal employee's health premium. That is taxpayer money. And the Senate has twice voted to be sure tax dollars were not used to fund abortions.

In 1995, this body endorsed this policy by a vote of 50 to 44. In 1996, we approved it again by a vote of 53 to 45. It is good policy. It ought to remain in force, consistent with the well-being of the American people.

I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise in opposition to the amendment which is aimed at curbing the legal rights of women who work for the Federal Government to obtain abortion services through their health insurance. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment offered by Senator DEWINE.

Who is impacted by the DeWine amendment? There are 1.2 million women of reproductive age who rely on the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program for their medical coverage. They will be stopped from using their own insurance to exercise their right to obtain a perfectly legal abortion.

Women who are employed by the Federal Government work hard. They personally pay for their health premiums out of their own pockets. And, when it comes to health care coverage, they deserve the same health benefits as women who work in the private sector.

To me the question is clear: Should women Federal employees or their dependents be treated the same as other women in the work force or should they be singled out, punished, have their rights taken away from them and be treated differently?

In 1993, a majority of the Senate voted to restore the coverage of abortion services, and Federal employees were once again given equality with other women. Unfortunately, this Republican Congress overturned those rights. The Senate Appropriations Committee bill now before us provides funding for the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. We should ensure that this funding remains in the bill.

Anti-choice forces are chipping away at the right of women in this country to obtain safe, legal abortions by making a women's ability to exercise that choice dependent upon the amount of her paycheck and the employer who signs it.

If there were an amendment to stop a man who happens to work for the Federal Government from getting a perfectly legal medical procedure, one that might protect his health, there would be an uproar on this floor. People would say, how dare you do that to the men of this country? Why not treat the men who work for the Federal Government the same way we treat men who work in the private sector?

The bottom line is—this is a tough personal, private matter, and I really think it is time we trusted women to make that choice. Who are we to say that a woman who happens to work for the Federal Government or her dependents should not have this right?

Let's ensure that all Federal employees have the rights, the protections, and the health care coverage they deserve.

The DeWine amendment singles out female Federal employees and denies them a medical benefit available to all other working women. It is wrong.

I yield the remainder of my time to Senator MURRAY.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to the DeWine amendment (No. 936) to the Treasury, Postal Service appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998. This amendment is nothing more than another attempt to attack basic reproductive health services for Federal employees and their dependents. This has become an annual tradition during consideration of appropriations bills.

What always surprises me about this amendment is the arguments used in defense of denying Federal employees access to the same reproductive health and choices afforded most private sector employees. We are told that this is a matter of not allowing for the use of Federal funds for abortion related services. But, this is not argument does not make sense when one considers that most Federal employees contribute to their own health insurance through premiums, deductibles, and copayments. In addition, health insurance benefits are a form of compensation for services rendered. They are not viewed as a direct Federal payment, but rather a cost of labor. If we believe that Federal health insurance benefits are not a form of compensation, but rather a direct Federal payment to employees, then we should be looking to refund women who selected health insurance based on the reproductive services provided. If it was a direct Federal payment, why would the insurance companies be reluctant to reimburse all female Federal employees the cost of these services?

If one were to take this argument to the next level, then supporters of this amendment should be looking to forbid any Federal employee from using their salary to pay for abortion related services. Maybe we should have whole list of things that Federal employees cannot use their own salaries to support. But, we know that offering this type of amendment would expose the true motivation behind this continued attack on a woman's right to a safe and legal abortion.

That is what we should be discussing; the continued erosion of access to safe and legal abortion services. Instead of these piecemeal attempts, perhaps we should have a full and open debate on banning a woman's right to chose. That is what this amendment is all about. It is not Federal funding, but rather another attempt to further restrict and control access to safe reproductive health services. Using Federal funding simply allows those who oppose a woman's right to chose the chance to hide behind a baseless argument.

I feel confident that few Members in the U.S. Senate would be comfortable telling all women that they are no longer protected and can no longer be guaranteed access to a safe, affordable abortion regardless of the circumstances. Few Senators would want to tell their constituents that the issue is not for them to decide, but rather the decision has been made by the U.S. Senate. So instead, the strategy is to hide behind issues like the use of Federal funds, or Federal facilities.

Putting aside the issue of abortion for a moment, as guardians of the FEHBP and Federal employees, we must ask if it is right to deny a Federal employee access to a safe and affordable abortion. Currently, there are approximately 1.2 million women of reproductive age who rely on the FEHBP for their medical care. These women, by simply choosing a career in public service, agree to be discriminated against every day when it comes to health insurance coverage.

Approximately, two thirds of private fee-for-service plans and 70 percent of HMO's provide abortion coverage. Many of these same plans participate in the FEHBP and must offer a different level of benefits for Federal employees. They are legally allowed to discriminate against women who are also Federal employees. In no other situation would Congress stand for this form of discrimination within a plan that participates in the FEHBP. But, today we are voting to do just that.

I am always surprised by the lack of understanding of the real problems facing real people, shown by some of my colleagues. Supporters of this amendment state that a woman can still get an abortion, but she simply cannot receive health insurance coverage for this care. This may sound reasonable until one considers that costs for this type of care can be anywhere from $400 to several thousand dollars depending upon the severity of the problem. For many female Federal employees, who are in most cases the lowest paid, this is a lot of money. It might as well be $10,000. In addition, what guarantee is there that the care will be adequate and meet the standard of care for all FEHBP participants? Unfortunately, there are no guarantees.

This could also create additional costs and problems for insurance plans. We all know that an unsafe abortion can be life threatening. We can also assume that there is followup care required to ensure the overall health of the woman. Who is responsible for this care? Who is financially responsible for the effects of unsafe abortion or in a situation where the woman could not afford the followup care required? Some of my colleagues seem to think that an abortion is a decision made with little or no thought, they must also assume that the procedure is done with little or no thought. I can assure you, no woman makes this decision lightly and like all surgical procedures there is always some risk.

I strongly oppose this discriminatory attempt to deny 1.2 million Federal employees and their dependents access to safe, affordable health care coverage and urge my colleagues to think very carefully about voting to continue this discrimination.

This is not about the use of Federal funds. We all know that not one Federal employee received a refund when Congress acted to eliminate this coverage. For most insurance plans, abortion related services are a part of a package of reproductive health benefits—they do not single out abortion. This amendment is simply about denying some women access to safe, affordable and comprehensive reproductive health care benefits.

Mr. President, time and again, Members come to the floor to talk about how they support women's health. Once again, we are going to take reproductive health of women away from women.

This is about the health of women. It is denying Federal employees the ability to make choices about their own reproductive health.

I urge you to vote ''no'' on the DeWine amendment.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Very briefly, this is a gratuitous slap at women's citizen rights. We are equal citizens. We should not be singled out for this kind of treatment.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, from 1984 through 1993, language was included as part of the Treasury/Postal Service appropriations bills which prohibited taxpayer money from going to fund abortions through Federal employee health benefits plans. In 1993, President Clinton pushed a change in that policy through Congress. For 2 years, people who were unalterably opposed to abortion were forced to pay for an estimated 17,000 abortions each year for any reason. In 1995, Congress restored the policy of restricting abortion funding and has continued to maintain that policy. The narrow question before us today is whether Americans who stand in defense of life should be forced to pay for its destruction with their taxes. I do not believe they should and thus strongly support my colleague from Ohio's amendment.

Whether they choose to call themselves pro-choice or pro-life, the American people overwhelmingly reject public financing of abortion. A CBS/New York Times poll conducted in April 1993, about health care reform issues asked adults what should be included in a basic, Government-subsidized health care plan. Only 23 percent thought abortion should be covered. Some 72 percent said abortion should not be included a benefit in a Government-sponsored health plan.

A Wirthlin poll conducted in May 1992, found that 55 percent of Americans opposed using tax dollars to pay for abortions for women who cannot afford to pay for them. I would speculated that the number would be even higher if the question reflected the issue we are considering here, which is Government-subsidized abortions for women who can afford them.

Employers determine the benefits employees get. Taxpayers are the employers of Federal employees and a large majority of taxpayers do not want their tax dollars to pay for abortions. In 1995 the Federal Government contributed, on average, 72 percent of the money toward the purchase of health insurance for its employees. Thus, taxpayers provided a majority share of the funds to purchase health insurance for the Federal civilian work force.

The abortion funding restriction in this amendment addresses the same core issue as the Hyde amendments: Should the Federal Government be in the business of funding abortion? Should taxpayers be forced to underwrite the cost of abortions for Federal employees?

This amendment does not in any way hinder an individual's free exercise of their choice in regard to abortion services. What it does do is prevent such an individual's choice from being subsidized by funds taken from taxpayers who object to an unfettered exercise of the choice to abort an unborn child.

No matter what private arrangements individuals wish to make regarding abortion and insurance. Most American do not wish to see abortion services included among a federally guaranteed package of health care benefits. Despite its articulation of a constitutional right to privacy regarding abortion, the Supreme Court ruled in 1980 that abortion funding restrictions are constitutionally permissible. There is a clear distinction between supporting the private choice of abortion and requiring citizens through their tax dollars or federally mandated health premiums, to pay for such a service.

I hope that this overwhelming evidence will lead my colleagues to understand the imperative nature of this issue, and I urge them to vote in favor of this necessary amendment.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by Senator DEWINE.

The bill reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee would enable Federal employees, whose health insurance is provided under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan, to receive coverage for abortion services.

The DeWine amendment would prohibit coverage for abortion, except in cases of life endangerment, rape, or incest. It would continue a ban which has prevented Federal employees from receiving a health care service which is widely available for private sector employees.

I oppose this amendment for two reasons. First of all, it is it is an assault on the earned benefits of Federal employees. Second, it is part of a continuing assault on women's reproductive rights and would endanger women's health.

In the 104th Congress we saw vote after vote designed to roll back the clock on women's reproductive rights. In the last Congress, there were 53 votes in both the House and Senate on abortion-related issues. It's clear that this unprecedented assault on a woman's right to decide for herself whether or not to have a child is continuing in this Congress.

Well, I support the right to choose. And I support Federal employees. And that is why I strenuously oppose this amendment.

Let me speak first about our Federal employees. Some 280,000 Federal employees live in the State of Maryland. I am proud to represent them. They are the people who make sure that the Social Security checks go out on time. They make sure that our Nation's veterans receive their disability checks. At NIH, they are doing vital research on finding cures and better treatments for diseases like cancer, Parkinson's and Alzheimers. There is no American whose life is not touched in some way by the hard work of a Federal employee. They deserve our thanks and our support.

Instead, Federal employees have suffered one assault after another in the last year or two. They have faced tremendous employment insecurity, as Government has downsized, and eliminated over 200,000 Federal jobs. Their COLA's and their retirement benefits have been threatened. They have faced the indignity and economic hardship of three Government shutdowns. Federal employees have been vilified as what is wrong with Government, when they should be thanked and valued for the tremendous service they provide to our country and to all Americans.

I view this amendment as yet another assault on these faithful public servants. It goes directly after the earned benefits of Federal employees. Health insurance is part of the compensation package to which all Federal employees are entitled. The costs of insurance coverage are shared by the Federal Government and the employee.

I know that proponents of continuing the ban on abortion coverage for Federal employees say that they are only trying to prevent taxpayer funding of abortion. But that is not what this debate is about.

This is about prohibiting the compensation package of Federal employees from being used for a legal and sometimes vital medical service. Health insurance is part of the Federal employees pay.

If we were to extend the logic of the argument of those who favor the ban, we would prohibit Federal employees from obtaining abortions using their own paychecks. After all, those funds also come from the taxpayers.

But no one is seriously suggesting that Federal employees ought not to have the right to do whatever they want with their own paychecks. And we should not be placing unfair restrictions on the type of health insurance Federal employees can purchase under the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan.

About 1.2 million women of reproductive age depend on the FEHBP for their medical care. We know that access to reproductive health services is essential to women's health. We know that restrictions that make it more difficult for women to obtain early abortions increase the likelihood that women will put their health at risk by being forced to continue a high-risk pregnancy.

If we continue the ban on abortion services, and provide exemptions only in cases of life endangerment, rape, or incest, the 1.2 million women of reproductive health age who depend on the FEHBP will not have access to abortion even when their health is seriously threatened. We will be replacing the informed judgment of medical care givers with that of politicians.

Decisions on abortion should be made by the woman in close consultation with her physician. These decisions should be made on the basis of medical judgment, not on the basis of political judgments. Only a woman and her physician can weigh her unique circumstances and make the decision that is right for that particular woman's life and health.

It is wrong for the Congress to try to issue a blanket prohibition on insuring a legal medical procedure with no allowance for the particular set of circumstances that an individual woman may face. I deeply believe that women's health will suffer if we do so.

I believe it is time to quit attacking Federal employees and their benefits. I believe we need to quit treating Federal employees as second class citizens. I believe Federal employees should be able to receive the same quality and range of health care services as their private sector counterparts.

Because I believe in the right to choose and because I support Federal employees, I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating the DeWine amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 936. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 190 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Abraham	Enzi	Lugar
Allard	Faircloth	Mack
Ashcroft	Ford	McCain
Bennett	Frist	McConnell
Biden	Gorton	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Nickles
Breaux	Grams	Reid
Brownback	Grassley	Roberts
Burns	Gregg	Roth
Coats	Hagel	Santorum
Cochran	Hatch	Sessions
Conrad	Helms	Shelby
Coverdell	Hutchinson	Smith (NH)
Craig	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
D'Amato	Inhofe	Thomas
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thompson
Domenici	Kyl	Thurmond
Dorgan	Lott	Warner

NAYS—45

Akaka	Feinstein	Levin
Baucus	Glenn	Lieberman
Bingaman	Graham	Mikulski
Boxer	Harkin	Moseley-Braun
Bryan	Hollings	Moynihan
Bumpers	Inouye	Murray
Byrd	Jeffords	Reed
Campbell	Johnson	Robb
Chafee	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Cleland	Kerrey	Snowe
Collins	Kerry	Specter
Daschle	Kohl	Stevens
Dodd	Landrieu	Torricelli
Durbin	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Feingold	Leahy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The amendment (No. 936) was agreed to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KOHL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

IRS MODERNIZATION

Mr. BYRD. As my colleagues will recall, the IRS has a large computer facility in my home State, in the city of Martinsburg. This facility should be an integral part of future IRS modernization efforts. Therefore, I have a question for the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee about this matter.

In its report, the committee supported the IRS' modernization blueprint. With respect to private sector involvement, the committee said:

> In 1997, Congress directed the IRS to turn over a majority of its tax systems modernization work to the private sector. The committee is pleased that the IRS is planning to develop and implement the modernization plan through new partnerships with the private sector.

Having said this, however, the committee included no funds in the bill for this purpose. My question is this: does the subcommittee chairman intend to recommend funding for the modernization program when a contract is let?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his interest in this important program. While the committee chose not to fund modernization for fiscal year 1998, I support appropriation of funds at that time in the future when the contract is awarded. I am pleased to put this on the record. Otherwise, those in the private sector spending extensive funds helping develop the concept of performance—based contracts, reviewing the ''Request for Comment,'' and lending their expertise to the IRS so that the ''Request for Proposal,'' when issued, is in the best possible shape, may stop doing so because of uncertainties about Congress' commitment to fund the procurement.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 1023, the fiscal year 1998 Treasury and general Government appropriation bill, and commend the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee, Senator CAMPBELL and Senator KOHL, for their very fine efforts in managing this bill. This is the first year that these distinguished Members have had an opportunity to manage this important bill which provides over $25 billion for the operation of the Department of Treasury and general Government activities.

The bill is $456 million less than the amount requested in the President's budget. The Members are to be commended for their efforts to keep a tight rein on funding and trim back wherever possible. The bill is consistent with the 602(b) allocations for both budget authority and outlays for the subcommittee.

Again, I congratulate Senators CAMPBELL and KOHL for their effective work. I also commend the work of the subcommittee staff: Barbara Retzlaff and Liz Blevins for the minority and Pat Raymond, Tammy Perrin, Lula Edwards for the majority.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, are there any further amendments to S. 1023?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Colorado that there are no further amendments.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1023 not be engrossed and that it remain at the desk pending receipt of the House companion measure.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CAMPBELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, the staff and Senator KOHL have worked

very hard on this bill. We have tried to accommodate all of the Members' suggestions. It is probably not a perfect bill, but we think it is a good bill. We ask that Senators support its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on passage of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 191 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Abraham	Faircloth	Lieberman
Akaka	Feingold	Lott
Allard	Feinstein	Lugar
Ashcroft	Ford	Mack
Baucus	Frist	McCain
Bennett	Glenn	McConnell
Biden	Gorton	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Gramm	Moynihan
Boxer	Grams	Murkowski
Breaux	Grassley	Murray
Brownback	Gregg	Nickles
Bryan	Hagel	Reed
Bumpers	Harkin	Reid
Burns	Hatch	Robb
Byrd	Helms	Roberts
Campbell	Hollings	Roth
Chafee	Hutchinson	Santorum
Cleland	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Inouye	Shelby
Collins	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Conrad	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Snowe
Craig	Kennedy	Specter
D'Amato	Kerrey	Stevens
Daschle	Kerry	Thomas
DeWine	Kohl	Thompson
Dodd	Kyl	Thurmond
Domenici	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Warner
Durbin	Leahy	Wellstone
Enzi	Levin	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The bill (S. 1023), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 1023

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Departmental Offices including operation and maintenance of the Treasury Building and Annex; hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance, repairs, and improvements of, and purchase of commercial insurance policies for, real properties leased or owned overseas, when necessary for the performance of official business; not to exceed $2,900,000 for official travel expenses; not to exceed $150,000 for official reception and representation expenses; not to exceed $258,000 for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and to be accounted for solely on his certificate; $114,794,000: *Provided,* That section 113(2) of the Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, Public Law 104–208 (110 Stat. 3009–22) is amended by striking ''12 months'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''2 years'': *Provided further,* That the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall be funded at no less than $6,745,000: *Provided further,* That chapter 9 of the fiscal year 1997 Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery from Natural Disasters, and for Overseas Peacekeeping Efforts, including those in Bosnia, Public Law 105–18 (111 Stat. 195–96) is amended by inserting after the ''County of Denver'' in each instance ''the County of Arapahoe''.

OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Professional Responsibility, including purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $1,250,000.

AUTOMATION ENHANCEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the development and acquisition of automatic data processing equipment, software, and services for the Department of the Treasury, $29,389,000, of which $15,000,000 shall be available to the United States Customs Service for the Automated Commercial Environment project, of which $5,600,000 shall be available to Departmental Offices for the International Trade Data System, and of which $8,789,000 shall be available to Departmental Offices to modernize its information technology infrastructure and for business solution software: *Provided,* That these funds shall remain available until September 30, 1999: *Provided further,* That these funds shall be transferred to accounts and in amounts as necessary to satisfy the requirements of the Department's offices, bureaus, and other organizations: *Provided further,* That this transfer authority shall be in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act: *Provided further,* That none of the funds shall be used to support or supplement Internal Revenue Service appropriations for Information Systems: *Provided further,* That of the $27,000,000 provided under this heading in Public Law 104–208, $12,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1999: *Provided further,* That none of the funds for the International Trade Data System may be obligated until the Department has submitted a report on their system development plan to the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further,* That the funds appropriated for the Automated Commercial Environment project may not be obligated prior to September 1, 1998: *Provided further,* That the funds appropriated for the Automated Commercial Environment project may not be obligated until the Commissioner of Customs has submitted, and the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate have approved, a systems architecture plan and a milestone schedule for the development and implementation of all projects included in the systems architecture plan.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, not to exceed $2,000,000 for official travel expenses; including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $100,000 for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Inspector General of the Treasury; $29,719,000, of which $16,695 shall be transferred to the ''Departmental Offices'' appropriation for the reimbursement of Secret Service personnel in accordance with section 116 of this Act.

TREASURY BUILDING AND ANNEX REPAIR AND RESTORATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the repair, alteration, and improvement of the Treasury Building and Annex, $10,484,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999.

FINANCIAL CRIMES ENFORCEMENT NETWORK

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel expenses of non-Federal law enforcement personnel to attend meetings concerned with financial intelligence activities, law enforcement, and financial regulation; not to exceed $14,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for assistance to Federal law enforcement agencies, with or without reimbursement; $22,835,000: *Provided,* That funds appropriated in this account may be used to procure personal services contracts.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For activities authorized by Public Law 103–322, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, as follows:

(a) As authorized by section 190001(e), $119,995,000; of which $24,023,000 shall be available to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, including $3,000,000 for administering the Gang Resistance Education and Training program, $6,000,000 for firearms trafficking initiatives (including the Youth Crime Gun Initiative, Project LEAD, and the National Tracing Center), $5,200,000 for CEASEFIRE/IBIS, $8,215,000 for vehicles, and $1,608,000 for collection of information on arson and explosives; of which $18,619,000 shall be available for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for construction of additional facilities; of which $3,000,000 shall be available to the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, including $2,000,000 for the money laundering threat initiative and $1,000,000 for the Secure Outreach/Encrypted Transmission Program; of which $21,178,000 shall be available to the United States Secret Service, including $15,664,000 for expenses related to White House Security, $3,000,000 for investigations of counterfeiting, and $2,514,000 for forensic and related support of investigations of missing and exploited children; of which $44,635,000 shall be available for the United States Customs Service, including $15,000,000 for high energy container x-ray systems and automated targeting systems, $5,735,000 for laboratory modernization, $10,000,000 for vehicle replacement, $7,800,000 for automated license plate readers, $1,100,000 for construction of canopies for inspection of outbound vehicles along the Southwest border, and $5,000,000 to acquire vehicle and container inspection systems; and of which $8,500,000 shall be available to funds appropriated to the President, including $5,500,000 to the Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center for a program to transfer technology to State and local law enforcement agencies, and $3,000,000 for the Rocky Mountain HIDTA;

(b) As authorized by section 32401, $10,000,000 to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms for disbursement through grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts to local governments for Gang Resistance Education and Training: *Provided,* That notwithstanding sections 32401 and 310001, such

funds shall be allocated to State and local law enforcement and prevention organizations;

(c) As authorized by section 180103, $1,000,000 to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for specialized training for rural law enforcement officers.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, as a bureau of the Department of the Treasury, including materials and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training; purchase (not to exceed 52 for police-type use, without regard to the general purchase price limitation) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; for expenses for student athletic and related activities; uniforms without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; the conducting of and participating in firearms matches and presentation of awards; for public awareness and enhancing community support of law enforcement training; not to exceed $9,500 for official reception and representation expenses; room and board for student interns; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; $64,663,000, of which $2,819,000 shall be available for fiber optics replacement; of which up to $13,034,000 for materials and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training shall remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided*, That the Center is authorized to accept and use gifts of property, both real and personal, and to accept services, for authorized purposes, including funding of a gift of intrinsic value which shall be awarded annually by the Director of the Center to the outstanding student who graduated from a basic training program at the Center during the previous fiscal year, which shall be funded only by gifts received through the Center's gift authority: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, students attending training at any Federal Law Enforcement Training Center site shall reside in on-Center or Center-provided housing, insofar as available and in accordance with Center policy: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this account shall be available, at the discretion of the Director, for: training United States Postal Service law enforcement personnel and Postal police officers; State and local government law enforcement training on a space-available basis; training of foreign law enforcement officials on a space-available basis with reimbursement of actual costs to this appropriation; training of private sector security officials on a space-available basis with reimbursement of actual costs to this appropriation; and travel expenses of non-Federal personnel to attend course development meetings and training at the Center: *Provided further*, That the Center is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from agencies receiving training at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available at the end of the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is authorized to provide short term medical services for students undergoing training at the Center.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

For expansion of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, for ongoing maintenance, facility improvements, and related expenses, $13,930,000, to remain available until expended.

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

INTERAGENCY CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT

For expenses necessary for the detection and investigation of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking, including cooperative efforts with State and local law enforcement, $73,794,000, of which $7,827,000 shall remain available until expended.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Financial Management Service, $202,490,000, of which not to exceed $13,235,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2000 for information systems modernization initiatives. Beginning in fiscal year 1998 and thereafter, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse Federal Reserve Banks in their capacity as depositaries and fiscal agents for the United States for all services required or directed by the Secretary of the Treasury to be performed by such banks on behalf of the Treasury or other Federal agencies.

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND FIREARMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, including purchase of not to exceed 650 vehicles for police-type use for replacement only and hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire of aircraft; services of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Director; for payment of per diem and/or subsistence allowances to employees where an assignment to the National Response Team during the investigation of a bombing or arson incident requires an employee to work 16 hours or more per day or to remain overnight at his or her post of duty; not to exceed $12,500 for official reception and representation expenses; for training of State and local law enforcement agencies with or without reimbursement, including training in connection with the training and acquisition of canines for explosives and fire accelerants detection; and provision of laboratory assistance to State and local agencies, with or without reimbursement; $473,490,000; of which $1,000,000 may be used for the Youth Gun Crime Initiative; of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for the payment of attorneys' fees as provided by 18 U.S.C. 924(d)(2); and of which $1,000,000 shall be available for the equipping of any vessel, vehicle, equipment, or aircraft available for official use by a State or local law enforcement agency if the conveyance will be used in drug-related joint law enforcement operations with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and for the payment of overtime salaries, travel, fuel, training, equipment, and other similar costs of State and local law enforcement officers that are incurred in joint operations with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms: *Provided*, That no funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to transfer the functions, missions, or activities of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms to other agencies or Departments in the fiscal year ending on September 30, 1998: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated herein shall be available for salaries or administrative expenses in connection with consolidating or centralizing, within the Department of the Treasury, the records, or any portion thereof, of acquisition and disposition of firearms maintained by Federal firearms licensees: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay administrative expenses or the compensation of any officer or employee of the United States to implement an amendment or amendments to 27 CFR 178.118 or to change the definition of ''Curios or relics'' in 27 CFR 178.11 or remove any item from ATF Publication 5300.11 as it existed on January 1, 1994: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be available to investigate or act upon applications for relief from Federal firearms disabilities under 18 U.S.C. 925(c): *Provided further*, That such funds shall be available to investigate and act upon applications filed by corporations for relief from Federal firearms disabilities under 18 U.S.C. 925(c): *Provided further*, That no funds in this Act may be used to provide ballistics imaging equipment to any State or local authority who has obtained similar equipment through a Federal grant or subsidy unless the State or local authority agrees to return that equipment or to repay that grant or subsidy to the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That prior to implementation of separation plans as authorized by section 663 of Public Law 104–863, approval will be sought from the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs: *Provided further*, That no funds under this Act may be used to electronically retrieve information gathered pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 923(g)(4) by name or any personal identification code.

LABORATORY FACILITIES

For necessary expenses for construction of a new facility or facilities to house the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms National Laboratory Center and the Fire Investigation Research and Development Center, not to exceed 185,000 occupiable square feet, $55,022,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That these funds shall not be available until an authorized prospectus for the Laboratory Facilities is approved by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Customs Service, including purchase of up to 1,050 motor vehicles of which 985 are for replacement only and of which 1,030 are for police-type use and commercial operations; hire of motor vehicles; contracting with individuals for personal services abroad; not to exceed $30,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and awards of compensation to informers, as authorized by any Act enforced by the United States Customs Service; $1,551,028,000, of which such sums as become available in the Customs User Fee Account, except sums subject to section 13031(f)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1985, as amended (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(3)), shall be derived from that Account; of the total, not to exceed $150,000 shall be available for payment for rental space in connection with preclearance operations, and not to exceed $4,000,000 shall be available until expended for research, not to exceed $1,500,000 shall be available until expended for conducting special operations pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2081, and up to $6,000,000 shall be available until expended for the procurement of automation infrastructure items, including hardware, software, and installation: *Provided*, That uniforms may be purchased without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That prior to implementation of separation plans as authorized by section 663 of Public Law 104–863, approval will be sought from the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs: *Provided further*, That $2,500,000 shall be available to fund the Globe Trade and Research Program at the Montana World Trade Center: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the fiscal year aggregate overtime limitation prescribed in subsection 5(c)(1) of the Act of February 13, 1911 (19 U.S.C. 261 and 267) shall be $30,000.

OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE AND PROCUREMENT, AIR AND MARINE INTERDICTION PROGRAMS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of marine vessels, aircraft, and other related equipment of the Air and Marine Programs, including operational training and mission-related travel, and rental payments for facilities occupied by the air or marine interdiction and demand reduction programs, the operations of which include: the interdiction of narcotics and other goods; the provision of support to Customs and other Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of laws enforced by the Customs Service; and, at the discretion of the Commissioner of Customs, the provision of assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in other law enforcement and emergency humanitarian efforts; $92,758,000, which shall remain available until expended: *Provided,* That no aircraft or other related equipment, with the exception of aircraft which is one of a kind and has been identified as excess to Customs requirements and aircraft which has been damaged beyond repair, shall be transferred to any other Federal agency, Department, or office outside of the Department of the Treasury, during fiscal year 1998 without the prior approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

CUSTOMS SERVICES AT SMALL AIRPORTS

(TO BE DERIVED FROM FEES COLLECTED)

Such sums as may be necessary for expenses for the provision of Customs services at certain small airports or other facilities when authorized by law and designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, including expenditures for the salary and expenses of individuals employed to provide such services, to be derived from fees collected by the Secretary pursuant to section 236 of Public Law 98–573 for each of these airports or other facilities when authorized by law and designated by the Secretary, and to remain available until expended.

HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE COLLECTION

For administrative expenses related to the collection of the Harbor Maintenance Fee, pursuant to Public Law 103–182, $3,000,000, to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and to be transferred to and merged with the Customs ''Salaries and Expenses'' account for such purposes.

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For necessary expenses connected with any public-debt issues of the United States, $173,826,000, of which not to exceed $2,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, and of which $2,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2000 for information systems modernization initiatives: *Provided,* That the sum appropriated herein from the General Fund for fiscal year 1998 shall be reduced by not more than $4,400,000 as definitive security issue fees and Treasury Direct Investor Account Maintenance fees are collected, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1998 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at $169,426,000, and in addition, $20,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to reimburse the Bureau for administrative and personnel expenses for financial management of the Fund, as authorized by section 102 of Public Law 101–380: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, effective upon enactment, the Bureau of the Public Debt shall be fully and directly reimbursed by the funds described in Public Law 101–136, title I, section 104, 103 Stat. 789 for costs and services performed by the Bureau in the administration of such funds.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

PROCESSING, ASSISTANCE, AND MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service, not otherwise provided for; including processing tax returns; revenue accounting; providing tax law and account assistance to taxpayers by telephone and correspondence; matching information returns and tax returns; management services; rent and utilities; and inspection; including purchase (not to exceed 150 for replacement only for police-type use) and hire of passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)); and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner; $2,943,174,000, of which up to $3,700,000 shall be for the Tax Counseling for the Elderly Program, and of which not to exceed $25,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

TAX LAW ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service for determining and establishing tax liabilities; tax and enforcement litigation; technical rulings; examining employee plans and exempt organizations; investigation and enforcement activities; securing unfiled tax returns; collecting unpaid accounts; statistics of income and compliance research; the purchase (for police-type use, not to exceed 850) and hire of passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)); and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner, $3,153,722,000. Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 104–208, $26,000,000 and in addition, $6,000,000 in Public Law 104–52 are available in fiscal year 1998 for the Year 2000 Century Date Change.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS

For necessary expenses for data processing and telecommunications support for Internal Revenue Service activities, including developmental information systems and operational information systems; the hire of passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)); and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner, $1,272,487,000, which shall be available until September 30, 1999: *Provided,* That under the heading ''Information Systems'' in Public Law 104–208 (110 Stat. 3009), the following is deleted: ''of which no less than $130,075,000 shall be available for Tax Systems Modernization (TSM) development and deployment'': *Provided further,* That the IRS will submit a reprogramming request, of which no less than $102,500,000 is available for Year 2000 conversion.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS

For necessary expenses for the capital asset acquisition of information technology systems as they relate to the century date change and data center consolidation; $325,000,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided,* That none of the funds are available for obligation until September 1, 1998: *Provided further,* That the systems acquired are in compliance with acquisition rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the Federal Government.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

SEC. 101. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available in this Act to the Internal Revenue Service may be transferred to any other Internal Revenue Service appropriation upon the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 102. The Internal Revenue Service shall maintain a training program to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are trained in taxpayers' rights, in dealing courteously with the taxpayers, and in cross-cultural relations.

SEC. 103. The funds provided in this Act for the Internal Revenue Service shall be used to provide, as a minimum, the fiscal year 1995 level of service, staffing, and funding for Taxpayer Services.

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated by this title shall be used in connection with the collection of any underpayment of any tax imposed by the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 unless the conduct of officers and employees of the Internal Revenue Service in connection with such collection, including any private sector employees under contract to the Internal Revenue Service, complies with subsection (a) of section 805 (relating to communications in connection with debt collection), and section 806 (relating to harassment or abuse), of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 1692.)

SEC. 105. The Internal Revenue Service shall institute and enforce policies and procedures which will safeguard the confidentiality of taxpayer information.

SEC. 106. Funds made available by this or any other Act to the Internal Revenue Service shall be available for improved facilities and increased manpower to provide sufficient and effective 1–800 help line for taxpayers. The Commissioner shall continue to make the improvement of the IRS 1–800 help line service a priority and allocate resources necessary to increase phone lines and staff to improve the IRS 1–800 help line service.

SEC. 107. Hereafter, no field support reorganization of the Internal Revenue Service shall be undertaken in Aberdeen, South Dakota until the Internal Revenue Service toll-free help phone line assistance program reaches at least an 80 percent service level. The Commissioner shall submit to Congress a report and the GAO shall certify to Congress that the 80 percent service level has been met.

SEC. 108. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no reorganization of the field office structure of the Internal Revenue Service Criminal Investigation division will result in a reduction of criminal investigators in Wisconsin from the 1996 level.

SEC. 109. None of the funds appropriated under this Act or any Act hereinafter enacted may be used by the Secretary of the Treasury to collect a tax liability by levy upon a limited entry commercial fishing permit issued by a State unless the Secretary first determines in writing and by clear and convincing evidence that such levy will facilitate the full collection of such tax liability.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Secret Service, including purchase (not to exceed 705 vehicles for police-type use, of which 675 shall be for replacement only), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire of aircraft; training and assistance requested by State and local governments, which may be provided without reimbursement; services of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Director; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia, and fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control, as may be necessary to perform protective functions; for payment of per diem and/or subsistence allowances to employees where a protective assignment during the actual day or days of the visit of a protectee require an employee to work 16 hours per day or to remain overnight at his or her post of duty; the conducting of and participating in firearms matches; presentation of awards; for

travel of Secret Service employees on protective missions without regard to the limitations on such expenditures in this or any other Act if approval is obtained in advance from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations; for repairs, alterations, and minor construction at the James J. Rowley Secret Service Training Center; for research and development; for making grants to conduct behavioral research in support of protective research and operations; not to exceed $20,000 for official reception and representation expenses; for sponsorship of a conference for the Women in Federal Law Enforcement, to be held during fiscal year 1998; not to exceed $50,000 to provide technical assistance and equipment to foreign law enforcement organizations in counterfeit investigations; for payment in advance for commercial accommodations as may be necessary to perform protective functions; and for uniforms without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; not to exceed $6,568,000 for continued White House security enhancements; not to exceed $1,623,000 for fixed site and security maintenance; not to exceed $2,830,000 for LAN replacement; not to exceed $1,000,000 for year 2000 date conversion; not to exceed $6,100,000 for FLEWUG/SNET which shall remain available until expended; not to exceed $6,700,000 for vehicle replacement; and not to exceed $1,460,000 to provide technical assistance and to assess the effectiveness of new technology intended to combat identity-based crimes; $570,809,000.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENT, AND RELATED EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of construction, repair, alteration, and improvement of facilities, $9,176,000, to remain available until expended for the Secret Service's Headquarters Building and the James J. Rowley Training Center.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

SEC. 111. Any obligation or expenditure by the Secretary in connection with law enforcement activities of a Federal agency or a Department of the Treasury law enforcement organization in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 9703(g)(4)(B) from unobligated balances remaining in the Fund on September 30, 1998, shall be made in compliance with the reprogramming guidelines contained in the Senate report accompanying this Act.

SEC. 112. Appropriations to the Treasury Department in this Act shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901), including maintenance, repairs, and cleaning; purchase of insurance for official motor vehicles operated in foreign countries; purchase of motor vehicles without regard to the general purchase price limitations for vehicles purchased and used overseas for the current fiscal year; entering into contracts with the Department of State for the furnishing of health and medical services to employees and their dependents serving in foreign countries; and services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 113. The funds provided to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms for fiscal year 1998 in this Act for the enforcement of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act shall be expended in a manner so as not to diminish enforcement efforts with respect to section 105 of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act.

SEC. 114. Not to exceed 2 percent of any appropriations in this Act made available to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, U.S. Customs Service, and U.S. Secret Service may be transferred between such appropriations. No transfer may increase or decrease any such appropriation by more than 2 percent and notice of any such transfer shall be approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

SEC. 115. Not to exceed 2 percent of any appropriations in this Act made available to the Departmental Offices, Office of Inspector General, Financial Management Service, and Bureau of the Public Debt, may be transferred between such appropriations. No transfer may increase or decrease any such appropriation by more than 2 percent and notice of any such transfer shall be transmitted in advance to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

SEC. 116. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay from amounts transferred to the ''Departmental Offices'' appropriation, up to $16,695 to reimburse Secret Service personnel for any attorney fees and costs they incurred with respect to investigation by the Department of the Treasury Inspector General concerning testimony provided to Congress: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay an individual in full upon submission by the individual of documentation verifying the attorney fees and costs: *Provided further*, That the liability of the United States shall not be inferred from enactment of or payment under this provision: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall not pay any claim filed under this section that is filed later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That payment under this provision, when accepted, shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of, or on behalf of, the individual Secret Service agent who was the subject of said investigation.

SEC. 117. (a)(1) Effective beginning on the date determined under paragraph (2), the compensation and other emoluments attached to the Office of Secretary of the Treasury shall be those that would then apply if Public Law 103–2 (107 Stat. 4; 31 U.S.C. 301 note) had never been enacted.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall become effective on the later of—

(A) the day after the date on which the individual holding the Office of Secretary of the Treasury on January 1, 1997, ceases to hold that office; or

(B) the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be considered to affect the compensation or emoluments due to any individual in connection with any period preceding the date determined under paragraph (2).

(b) Subsection (b) of the first section of the public law referred to in subsection (a)(1) of this section shall not apply in the case of any appointment the consent of the Senate to which occurs on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) This section shall not be limited (for purposes of determining whether a provision of this section applies or continues to apply) to fiscal year 1998.

RATES OF BASIC PAY FOR THE UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE UNIFORMED DIVISION.

SEC. 118. (a) NEW RATES OF BASIC PAY.—Section 501 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, (District of Columbia Code, section 4–416), is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''Interior'' and all that follows through ''Treasury,'' and inserting ''Interior'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b)(3);

(3) in subsection (b)(3) (as redesignated)—

(A) by striking ''or to officers and members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division''; and

(B) by striking ''subsection (b) of this section'' and inserting ''this subsection''; and

(4) by adding after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c)(1) The annual rates of basic compensation of officers and members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division, serving in classes corresponding or similar to those in the salary schedule in section 101 (District of Columbia Code, section 4–406), shall be fixed in accordance with the following schedule of rates:

''SALARY SCHEDULE

Salary class and title	Service steps								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 1: Private	29,215	30,088	31,559	33,009	35,331	37,681	39,128	40,593	42,052
Class 4: Sergeant	39,769	41,747	43,728	45,718	47,715	49,713			
Class 5: Lieutenant	45,148	47,411	49,663	51,924	54,180				
Class 7: Captain	52,523	55,155	57,788	60,388					
Class 8: Inspector	60,886	63,918	66,977	70,029					
Class 9: Deputy Chief	71,433	76,260	81,113	85,950					
Class 10: Assistant Chief	84,694	90,324	95,967						
Class 11: Chief of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division	98,383	104,923							

''(2) Effective at the beginning of the first applicable pay period commencing on or after the first day of the month in which an adjustment takes effect under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code (or any subsequent similar provision of law), in the rates of pay under the General Schedule (or any pay system that may supersede such schedule), the annual rates of basic compensation of officers and members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division shall be adjusted by the Secretary of the Treasury by an amount equal to the percentage of such annual rate of pay which corresponds to the overall percentage of the adjustment made in the rates of pay under the General Schedule.

''(3) Locality-based comparability payments authorized under section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, shall be applicable to the basic pay under this section, except locality-based comparability payments may not be paid at a rate which, when added to the rate of basic pay otherwise payable to the officer or member, would cause the total

to exceed the rate of basic pay payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule.

''(4) Pay may not be paid, by reason of any provision of this subsection (disregarding any comparability payment payable under Federal law), at a rate in excess of the rate of basic pay payable for level V of the Executive Schedule contained in subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code.

''(5) Any reference in any law to the salary schedule in section 101 (District of Columbia Code, section 4–406) with respect to officers and members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division shall be considered to be a reference to the salary schedule in paragraph (1) of this subsection as adjusted in accordance with this subsection.

''(6)(A) Except as otherwise permitted by or under law, no allowance, differential, bonus, award, or other similar cash payment under this title or under title 5, United States Code, may be paid to an officer or member of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division in a calendar year if, or to the extent that, when added to the total basic pay paid or payable to such officer or member for service performed in such calendar year as an officer or member, such payment would cause the total to exceed the annual rate of basic pay payable for level I of the Executive Schedule, as of the end of such calendar year.

''(B) This paragraph shall not apply to any payment under the following provisions of title 5, United States Code:

''(i) Subchapter III or VII of chapter 55, or section 5596.

''(ii) Chapter 57 (other than section 5753, 5754, or 5755).

''(iii) Chapter 59 (other than section 5928).

''(7)(A) Any amount which is not paid to an officer or member of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division in a calendar year because of the limitation under paragraph (6) shall be paid to such officer or member in a lump sum at the beginning of the following calendar year.

''(B) Any amount paid under this paragraph in a calendar year shall be taken into account for purposes of applying the limitations under paragraph (6) with respect to such calendar year.

''(8) The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe regulations as may be necessary (consistent with section 5582 of title 5, United States Code) concerning how a lump-sum payment under paragraph (7) shall be made with respect to any employee who dies before an amount payable to such employee under paragraph (7) is made.''.

(b) CONVERSION TO NEW SALARY SCHEDULE.—

(1)(A) Effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall fix the rates of basic pay for members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division in accordance with this paragraph.

(B) Subject to subparagraph (C), each officer and member receiving basic compensation, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, at one of the scheduled rates in the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as adjusted by law and as in effect prior to the effective date of this section, shall be placed in and receive basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled service step of the salary schedule under subsection (a)(4).

(C)(i) The Assistant Chief and the Chief of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division shall be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 10 and salary class 11, respectively, in the appropriate service step in the new salary class in accordance with section 304 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act 1958 (District of Columbia Code, section 4–413).

(ii) Each member whose position is to be converted to the salary schedule under section 501(c) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (District of Columbia Code, section 4–416(c)) as amended by this section, in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, and who, prior to the effective date of this section has earned, but has not been credited with, an increase in his or her rate of pay shall be afforded that increase before such member is placed in the corresponding service step in the salary schedule under section 501(c).

(2) Except in the cases of the Assistant Chief and the Chief of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division, the conversion of positions and individuals to appropriate classes of the salary schedule under section 501(c) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (District of Columbia Code, section 4–416(c)) as amended by this section, and the initial adjustments of rates of basic pay of those positions and individuals, in accordance with paragraph (1) of this subsection, shall not be considered to be transfers or promotions within the meaning of section 304 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (District of Columbia Code, section 4–413).

(3) Each member whose position is converted to the salary schedule under section 501(c) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (District of Columbia Code, section 4–416(c)) as amended by this section, in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, shall be granted credit for purposes of such member's first service step adjustment under the salary schedule in such section 510(c) for all satisfactory service performed by the member since the member's last increase in basic pay prior to the adjustment under that section.

(c) LIMITATION ON PAY PERIOD EARNINGS.—The Act of August 15, 1950 (64 Stat. 477), (District of Columbia Code, section 4–1104), is amended—

(1) in subsection (h), by striking ''any officer or member'' each place it appears and inserting ''an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, or of the United States Park Police'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (h)(3) as subsection (i); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3)(A) no premium pay provided by this section shall be paid to, and no compensatory time is authorized for, any officer or member of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division whose rate of basic pay, combined with any applicable locality-based comparability payment, equals or exceeds the lesser of—

''(i) 150 percent of the minimum rate payable for grade GS–15 of the General Schedule (including any applicable locality-based comparability payment under section 5304 of title 5, United States Code or any similar provision of law, and any applicable special rate of pay under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code or any similar provision of law); or

''(ii) the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule contained in subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code.

''(B) In the case of any officer or member of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division whose rate of basic pay, combined with any applicable locality-based comparability payment, is less than the lesser of—

''(i) 150 percent of the minimum rate payable for grade GS–15 of the General Schedule (including any applicable locality-based comparability payment under section 5304 of title 5, United States Code or any similar provision of law, and any applicable special rate of pay under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code or any similar provision of law); or

''(ii) the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule contained in subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code,

such premium pay may be paid only to the extent that such payment would not cause such officer or member's aggregate rate of compensation to exceed such lesser amount with respect to any pay period.''.

(d) SAVINGS PROVISION.—On the effective date of this section, any existing special salary rates authorized for members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code (or any previous similar provision of law) and any special rates of pay or special pay adjustments under section 403, 404, or 405 of the Federal Law Enforcement Pay Reform Act of 1990 applicable to members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division shall be rendered inapplicable.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The Federal Law Enforcement Pay Reform Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 1466) is amended by striking subsections (b)(1) and (c)(1) of section 405.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 119. Section 117 of the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1997 (as contained in section 101(f) of division A of Public Law 104–208) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Treasury shall establish the port of Kodiak, Alaska as a port of entry and United States Customs Service personnel in Anchorage, Alaska shall serve such port of entry. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as necessary to cover the costs associated with the performance of customs functions using such United States Customs Service personnel.

SEC. 121. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Inspector General to contract for advisory and assistance services that has the meaning given such term in section 1105(g) of title 31, United States Code.

TITLE II—POSTAL SERVICE

PAYMENTS TO THE POSTAL SERVICE FUND

PAYMENT TO THE POSTAL SERVICE FUND

For payment to the Postal Service Fund for revenue forgone on free and reduced rate mail, pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of section 2401 of title 39, United States Code, $86,274,000: *Provided,* That mail for overseas voting and mail for the blind shall continue to be free: *Provided further,* That 6-day delivery and rural delivery of mail shall continue at not less than the 1983 level: *Provided further,* That none of the funds made available to the Postal Service by this Act shall be used to implement any rule, regulation, or policy of charging any officer or employee of any State or local child support enforcement agency, or any individual participating in a State or local program of child support enforcement, a fee for information requested or provided concerning an address of a postal customer: *Provided further,* That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be used to consolidate or close small rural and other small post offices in the fiscal year ending on September 30, 1998.

PAYMENT TO THE POSTAL SERVICE FUND FOR NONFUNDED LIABILITIES

For payment to the Postal Service Fund for meeting the liabilities of the former Post

Office Department to the Employees' Compensation Fund pursuant to 39 United States Code 2004, $34,850,000.

TITLE III—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

For compensation of the President, including an expense allowance at the rate of $50,000 per annum as authorized by 3 U.S.C. 102; $250,000: *Provided,* That none of the funds made available for official expenses shall be expended for any other purpose and any unused amount shall revert to the Treasury pursuant to section 1552 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further,* That none of the funds made available for official expenses shall be considered as taxable to the President.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the White House as authorized by law, including not to exceed $3,850,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 105; including subsistence expenses as authorized by 3 U.S.C. 105, which shall be expended and accounted for as provided in that section; hire of passenger motor vehicles, newspapers, periodicals, teletype news service, and travel (not to exceed $100,000 to be expended and accounted for as provided by 3 U.S.C. 103); not to exceed $19,000 for official entertainment expenses, to be available for allocation within the Executive Office of the President; $51,199,000: *Provided,* That $873,000 of the funds appropriated may not be obligated until the Director of the Office of Administration has submitted, and the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate have approved, a systems architecture plan, a milestone schedule for the development and implementation of all projects included in the systems architecture plan, and an estimate of the funds required to support the fiscal year 1998 capital investments associated with that plan: *Provided further,* That $9,800,000 of the funds appropriated shall be available for reimbursements to the White House Communications Agency in accordance with Public Law 104–201.

EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE

OPERATING EXPENSES

For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refurnishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Residence at the White House and official entertainment expenses of the President, $8,045,000, to be expended and accounted for as provided by 3 U.S.C. 105, 109–110, 112–114.

WHITE HOUSE REPAIR AND RESTORATION

For the repair, alteration, and improvement of the Executive Residence at the White House, $200,000, to remain available until expended for renovation and relocation of the White House laundry, to be expended and accounted for as provided by 3 U.S.C. 105, 109–110, 112–114.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE OFFICIAL RESIDENCE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to enable the Vice President to provide assistance to the President in connection with specially assigned functions, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 106, including subsistence expenses as authorized by 3 U.S.C. 106, which shall be expended and accounted for as provided in that section; and hire of passenger motor vehicles; $3,378,000: *Provided,* That $69,800 of the funds appropriated may not be obligated until the Director of the Office of Administration has submitted, and the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate have approved, a systems architecture plan, a milestone schedule for the development and implementation of all projects included in the systems architecture plan, and an estimate of the funds required to support the fiscal year 1998 capital investments associated with that plan.

OPERATING EXPENSES

For the care, operation, refurnishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the official residence of the Vice President, the hire of passenger motor vehicles, and not to exceed $90,000 for official entertainment expenses of the Vice President, to be accounted for solely on his certificate; $334,000: *Provided,* That advances or repayments or transfers from this appropriation may be made to any department or agency for expenses of carrying out such activities.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Council in carrying out its functions under the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1021), $3,542,000.

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Policy Development, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and 3 U.S.C. 107; $3,983,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Security Council, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $6,648,000.

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Administration, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 107, and hire of passenger motor vehicles $28,883,000, of which $2,000,000 shall remain available until expended for a capital investment plan which provides for the modernization of the information technology infrastructure: *Provided,* That $2,000,000 of the funds appropriated may not be obligated until the Director of the Office of Administration has submitted, and the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate have approved, a systems architecture plan, a milestone schedule for the development and implementation of all projects included in the system architecture plan, and an estimate of the funds required to support the fiscal year 1998 capital investments associated with that plan.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Management and Budget, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $57,240,000, of which not to exceed $5,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of 44 U.S.C. chapter 35: *Provided,* That, as provided in 31 U.S.C. 1301(a), appropriations shall be applied only to the objects for which appropriations were made except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided further,* That none of the funds made available for the Office of Management and Budget by this Act may be expended for the altering of the transcript of actual testimony of witnesses, except for testimony of officials of the Office of Management and Budget, before the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations or the House and Senate Committees on Veterans' Affairs or their subcommittees.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of National Drug Control Policy; for research activities pursuant to title I of Public Law 100–690; not to exceed $8,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for participation in joint projects or in the provision of services on matters of mutual interest with nonprofit, research, or public organizations or agencies, with or without reimbursement; $36,016,000, of which $18,000,000 shall remain available until expended, consisting of $1,000,000 for policy research and evaluation and $17,000,000 for the Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center for counternarcotics research and development projects of which $1,000,000 shall be obligated for state conferences on model State drug laws: *Provided,* That the $17,000,000 for the Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center shall be available for transfer to other Federal departments or agencies: *Provided further,* That the Office is authorized to accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts, both real and personal, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Office.

FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS

HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of National Drug Control Policy's High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, $140,207,000 for drug control activities consistent with the approved strategy for each of the designated High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas, of which no less than $71,000,000 shall be transferred to State and local entities for drug control activities, which shall be obligated within 120 days of the date of enactment of this Act and up to $69,207,000 may be transferred to Federal agencies and departments at a rate to be determined by the Director: *Provided,* That funding shall be provided for existing High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas at no less than the fiscal year 1997 level.

SPECIAL FORFEITURE FUND

For activities to support a national media campaign for youth, and other purposes, authorized by Public Law 100–690, as amended, $145,300,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That such funds may be transferred to other Federal departments and agencies to carry out such activities: *Provided further,* That of the amount provided, $110,000,000 shall be to support a national media campaign, to reduce and prevent drug use among young Americans: *Provided further,* That none of the funds provided for the national media campaign may be obligated until the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, submits a strategy to the Committees on Appropriations and the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate that includes (1) a certification, and guidelines to ensure that funds will supplement and not supplant current anti-drug community based coalitions; (2) a certification, and guidelines to ensure that none of the funds will be used for partisan political purposes; (3) a certification, and guidelines to ensure that no media campaigns to be funded pursuant to this campaign shall feature any elected officials, persons seeking elected office, cabinet-level officials, or other Federal officials employed pursuant to Schedule C of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, section 213, absent notice to the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Judiciary; (4) a detailed implementation plan to be submitted to the

Chairmen and Ranking Members of the Committees on Appropriations and the Judiciary for securing private sector contributions including but not limited to in-kind contributions; (5) a detailed implementation plan to be submitted to the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the Committees on Appropriations and the Judiciary of the qualifications necessary for any organization, entity, or individual to receive funding for or otherwise provided broadcast media time: *Provided further,* That the Director shall (1) report to Congress quarterly on the obligation of funds as well as the specific parameters of the national media campaign and (2) report to Congress within two years on the effectiveness of the national media campaign based upon the measurable outcomes provided to Congress previously: *Provided further,* That of the amount provided, $10,000,000 shall be to initiate a program of matching grants to drug-free communities, as authorized in the Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997: *Provided further,* That of the amount provided, $10,000,000 shall be used to continue and expand the methamphetamine reduction efforts: *Provided further,* That of the amount provided, $6,000,000 shall be used to establish a Federal Drug-Free Prison demonstration project: *Provided further,* That of the amount provided $9,300,000 shall be used to continue the reduction of drug use program for those involved in the criminal justice system.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled established by the Act of June 23, 1971, Public Law 92–28, $1,940,000.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, $29,000,000, of which no less than $2,500,000 shall be available for internal automated data processing systems, and of which not to exceed $5,000 shall be available for reception and representation expenses: *Provided,* That the General Accounting Office shall conduct a management review, and technology and performance audit, of the Federal Election Commission.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978, and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, including hire of experts and consultants, hire of passenger motor vehicles, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; $22,039,000: *Provided,* That public members of the Federal Service Impasses Panel may be paid travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons employed intermittently in the Government service, and compensation as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, funds received from fees charged to non-Federal participants at labor-management relations conferences shall be credited to and merged with this account, to be available without further appropriation for the costs of carrying out these conferences.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND

LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF REVENUE

To carry out the purpose of the Fund established pursuant to section 210(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 490(f)), the revenues and collections deposited into the Fund shall be available for necessary expenses of real property management and related activities not otherwise provided for, including operation, maintenance, and protection of federally owned and leased buildings; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving governmental agencies (including space adjustments and telecommunications relocation expenses) in connection with the assignment, allocation and transfer of space; contractual services incident to cleaning or servicing buildings, and moving; repair and alteration of federally owned buildings including grounds, approaches and appurtenances; care and safeguarding of sites; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment; acquisition of buildings and sites by purchase, condemnation, or as otherwise authorized by law; acquisition of options to purchase buildings and sites; conversion and extension of federally owned buildings; preliminary planning and design of projects by contract or otherwise; construction of new buildings (including equipment for such buildings); and payment of principal, interest, and any other obligations for public buildings acquired by installment purchase and purchase contract, in the aggregate amount of $4,885,934,000, of which (1) $350,000,000 shall remain available until expended, for repairs and alterations which includes associated design and construction services:

Repairs and alterations;

Chlorofluorocarbons Program, $50,000,000; and

Basic Repairs and Alterations, $300,000,000: *Provided,* That additional projects for which prospectuses have been fully approved may be funded under this category only if advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate: *Provided further,* That the amounts provided in this or any prior Act for Repairs and Alterations may be used to fund costs associated with implementing security improvements to buildings necessary to meet the minimum standards for security in accordance with current law and in compliance with the reprogramming guidelines of the appropriate Committees of the House and Senate: *Provided further,* That funds made available in this Act or any previous Act for Repairs and Alterations shall, for prospectus projects, be limited to the amount originally made available, except each project may be increased by an amount not to exceed 10 percent when advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate of a greater amount: *Provided further,* That the difference between the funds appropriated and expended on any projects in this or any prior Act, under the heading ''Repairs and Alterations'', may be transferred to Basic Repairs and Alterations or used to fund authorized increases in prospectus projects: *Provided further,* That all funds for repairs and alterations prospectus projects shall expire on September 30, 2000 and remain in the Federal Building Fund except funds for projects as to which funds for design or other funds have been obligated in whole or in part prior to such date: *Provided further,* That the amount provided in this or any prior Act for Basic Repairs and Alterations may be used to pay claims against the Government arising from any projects under the heading ''Repairs and Alterations'' or used to fund authorized increases in prospectus projects; (2) $142,542,000 for installment acquisition payments including payments on purchase contracts which shall remain available until expended; (3) $2,275,340,000 for rental of space which shall remain available until expended; (4) $1,331,789,000 for building operations which shall remain available until expended; and (5) $680,543,000 which shall remain available until expended for projects and activities previously approved under this heading in prior fiscal years: *Provided further,* That for the purposes of this authorization, buildings constructed pursuant to the purchase contract authority of the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972 (40 U.S.C. 602a), buildings occupied pursuant to installment purchase contracts, and buildings under the control of another department or agency where alterations of such buildings are required in connection with the moving of such other department or agency from buildings then, or thereafter to be, under the control of the General Services Administration shall be considered to be federally owned buildings: *Provided further,* That funds available in the Federal Buildings Fund may be expended for emergency repairs when advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate: *Provided further,* That amounts necessary to provide reimbursable special services to other agencies under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 490(f)(6)) and amounts to provide such reimbursable fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control as may be appropriate to enable the United States Secret Service to perform its protective functions pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3056, as amended, shall be available from such revenues and collections: *Provided further,* That revenues and collections and any other sums accruing to this Fund during fiscal year 1998, excluding reimbursements under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)(6)) in excess of $4,885,934,000 shall remain in the Fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

POLICY AND OPERATIONS

For expenses authorized by law, not otherwise provided for, for Government-wide policy and oversight activities associated with asset management activities; utilization and donation of surplus personal property; transportation; procurement and supply; Government-wide and internal responsibilities relating to automated data management, telecommunications, information resources management, and related technology activities; utilization survey, deed compliance inspection, appraisal, environmental and cultural analysis, and land use planning functions pertaining to excess and surplus real property; agency-wide policy direction; Board of Contract Appeals; accounting, records management, and other support services incident to adjudication of Indian Tribal Claims by the United States Court of Federal Claims; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and not to exceed $5,000 for official reception and representation expenses; $104,487,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General and services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $33,870,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $10,000 shall be available for payment for information and detection of fraud against the Government, including payment for recovery of stolen Government property: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $2,500 shall be available for awards to employees of other Federal agencies and private citizens in recognition of efforts and initiatives resulting in enhanced Office of Inspector General effectiveness.

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE STAFF FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958, as amended (3 U.S.C. 102 note), and Public Law 95–138, $2,208,000: *Provided,* That the Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of such Acts.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 401. The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the General Services Administration shall be credited with the cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair, and improvement, included as part of rentals received from Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129).

SEC. 402. Funds available to the General Services Administration shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 403. Funds in the Federal Buildings Fund made available for fiscal year 1998 for Federal Buildings Fund activities may be transferred between such activities only to the extent necessary to meet program requirements: *Provided,* That any proposed transfers shall be approved in advance by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

SEC. 404. No funds made available by this Act shall be used to transmit a fiscal year 1999 request for United States Courthouse construction that (1) does not meet the design guide standards for construction as established and approved by the General Services Administration, the Judicial Conference of the United States, and the Office of Management and Budget; and (2) does not reflect the priorities of the Judicial Conference of the United States as set out in its approved 5-year construction plan: *Provided,* That the fiscal year 1999 request must be accompanied by a standardized courtroom utilization study of each facility to be constructed, replaced, or expanded.

SEC. 405. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to increase the amount of occupiable square feet, provide cleaning services, security enhancements, or any other service usually provided through the Federal Buildings Fund, to any agency which does not pay the rate per square foot assessment for space and services as determined by the General Services Administration in compliance with the Public Buildings Amendments Act of 1972 (Public Law 92–313).

SEC. 406. Section 10 of the General Services Administration General Provisions, Public Law 100–440, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 407. Funds provided to other Government agencies by the Information Technology Fund, GSA, under 40 U.S.C. 757 and sections 5124(b) and 5128 of Public Law 104–106, Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996, for performance of pilot information technology projects which have potential for Government-wide benefits and savings, may be repaid to this Fund from any savings actually incurred by these projects or other funding, to the extent feasible.

SEC. 408. The Administrator of the General Services is directed to ensure that the materials used for the facade on the United States Courthouse Annex, Savannah, Georgia project are compatible with the existing Savannah Federal Building-U.S. Courthouse facade, in order to ensure compatibility of this new facility with the Savannah historic district and to ensure that the Annex will not endanger the National Landmark status of the Savannah historic district.

SEC. 409. (a) The Act approved August 25, 1958, as amended (Public Law 85–745; 3 U.S.C. 102 note), is amended by striking section 2.

(b) Section 3214 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking ''(a) Subject to subsection (b), a'' and inserting ''A''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 410. Section 201(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 481) as amended to read as follows:

''(b) The Administrator shall as far as practicable provide any of the services specified in subsection (a) of this section to any other Federal agency, mixed ownership corporation (as defined in chapter 91 of title 31, United States Code), or the District of Columbia, upon its request.''.

JOHN F. KENNEDY ASSASSINATION RECORDS REVIEW BOARD

For the necessary expenses to carry out the John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992, $1,600,000: *Provided,* That $100,000 shall be available only for the purposes of the prompt and orderly termination of the John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Review Board, to be concluded no later than September 30, 1998.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Merit Systems Protection Board pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978 and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and direct procurement of survey printing, $24,810,000, together with not to exceed $2,430,000 for administrative expenses to adjudicate retirement appeals to be transferred from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund in amounts determined by the Merit Systems Protection Board.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in connection with the administration of the National Archives (including the Information Security Oversight Office) and records and related activities, as provided by law, and for expenses necessary for the review and declassification of documents, and for the hire of passenger motor vehicles, $206,479,000: *Provided,* That the Archivist of the United States is authorized to use any excess funds available from the amount borrowed for construction of the National Archives facility, for expenses necessary to provide adequate storage for holdings.

ARCHIVES FACILITIES AND PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES REPAIRS AND RESTORATION

For the repair, alteration, and improvement of archives facilities and presidential libraries, and to provide adequate storage for holdings, $13,650,000, to remain available until expended, of which $4,000,000 is for repairs and restoration of the Truman Library in Independence, Missouri, and of which $3,000,000 is for internal repairs to the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library located at the University of Texas at Austin.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION

GRANTS PROGRAM

For necessary expenses for allocations and grants for historical publications and records as authorized by 44 U.S.C. 2504, as amended, $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Government Ethics pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, as amended by Public Law 100–598, and the Ethics Reform Act of 1989, Public Law 101–194, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and not to exceed $1,500 for official reception and representation expenses; $8,265,000.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF TRUST FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Personnel Management pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978 and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; advances for reimbursements to applicable funds of the Office of Personnel Management and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred under Executive Order 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended; and payment of per diem and/or subsistence allowances to employees where Voting Rights Act activities require an employee to remain overnight at his or her post of duty; $85,350,000; and in addition $91,236,000 for administrative expenses, to be transferred from the appropriate trust funds of the Office of Personnel Management without regard to other statutes, including direct procurement of printed materials for the retirement and insurance programs: *Provided,* That the provisions of this appropriation shall not affect the authority to use applicable trust funds as provided by section 8348(a)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code: *Provided further,* That, except as may be consistent with 5 U.S.C. 8902a(f)(1) and (i), no payment may be made from the Employees Health Benefits Fund to any physician, hospital, or other provider of health care services or supplies who is, at the time such services or supplies are provided to an individual covered under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, excluded, pursuant to section 1128 or 1128A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a-7–1320a-7a), from participation in any program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.): *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit of the Office of Personnel Management established pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943, or any successor unit of like purpose: *Provided further,* That the President's Commission on White House Fellows, established by Executive Order 11183 of October 3, 1964, may, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, accept donations of money, property, and personal services in connection with the development of a publicity brochure to provide information about the White House Fellows, except that no such donations shall be accepted for travel or reimbursement of travel expenses, or for the salaries of employees of such Commission.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF TRUST FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act, as amended, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, hire of passenger motor vehicles, $960,000; and in addition, not to exceed $8,645,000 for administrative expenses to audit the Office of Personnel Management's retirement and insurance programs, to be

transferred from the appropriate trust funds of the Office of Personnel Management, as determined by the Inspector General: *Provided*, That the Inspector General is authorized to rent conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

For payment of Government contributions with respect to retired employees, as authorized by chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, and the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 849), as amended, such sums as may be necessary.

GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEE LIFE INSURANCE

For payment of Government contributions with respect to employees retiring after December 31, 1989, as required by chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, such sums as may be necessary.

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For financing the unfunded liability of new and increased annuity benefits becoming effective on or after October 20, 1969, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 8348, and annuities under special Acts to be credited to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, such sums as may be necessary: *Provided*, That annuities authorized by the Act of May 29, 1944, as amended, and the Act of August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771–75), may hereafter be paid out of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Special Counsel pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978, the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–454), the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 (Public Law 101–12), Public Law 103–424, and the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–353), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, payment of fees and expenses for witnesses, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; $8,450,000.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including contract reporting and other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $34,293,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses of the judges shall be paid upon the written certificate of the judge.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

THIS ACT

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 502. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available for any activity or for paying the salary of any Government employee where funding an activity or paying a salary to a Government employee would result in a decision, determination, rule, regulation, or policy that would prohibit the enforcement of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

SEC. 504. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available in fiscal year 1998, for the purpose of transferring control over the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center located at Glynco, Georgia, and Artesia, New Mexico, out of the Treasury Department.

SEC. 505. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not heretofore authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 506. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for the payment of the salary of any officer or employee of the United States Postal Service, who—

(1) prohibits or prevents, or attempts or threatens to prohibit or prevent, any other officer or employee of the United States Postal Service from having any direct oral or written communication or contact with any Member, committee, or subcommittee of the Congress in connection with any matter pertaining to the employment of such other officer or employee or pertaining to the United States Postal Service of such other officer or employee in any way, irrespective of whether such communication or contact is at the initiative of such other officer or employee or in response to the request or inquiry of such Member, committee, or subcommittee; or

(2) removes, suspends from duty without pay, demotes, reduces in rank, seniority, status, pay, or performance of efficiency rating, denies promotion to, relocates, reassigns, transfers, disciplines, or discriminates in regard to any employment right, entitlement, or benefit, or any term or condition of employment of, any other officer or employee of the United States Postal Service, or attempts or threatens to commit any of the foregoing actions with respect to such other officer or employee, by reason of any communication or contact of such other officer or employee with any Member, committee, or subcommittee of the Congress as described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 507. The Office of Personnel Management may, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and hereafter, accept donations of supplies, services, land, and equipment for the Federal Executive Institute and Management Development Centers to assist in enhancing the quality of Federal management.

SEC. 508. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to pay the salary for any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service and has within 90 days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Office of Personnel Management as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 509. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

SEC. 510. (a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 511. If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 512. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 1998 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 1998 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 1999, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with the reprogramming guidelines contained in the House and Senate reports accompanying this Act.

SEC. 513. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Executive Office of the President to request from the Federal Bureau of Investigation any official background investigation report on any individual, except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) such individual has given his or her express written consent for such request not more than 6 months prior to the date of such request and during the same presidential administration; or

(2) such request is required due to extraordinary circumstances involving national security.

SEC. 514. Section 1 under the subheading ''General Provision'' under the heading ''Office of Personnel Management'' under title IV of the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations Act, 1992 (Public Law 102–141; 105 Stat. 861; 5 U.S.C. 5941 note), as amended by section 532 of the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations Act, 1995 (Public Law 103–329; 108 Stat. 2413), and by section 5 under the heading ''General Provisions—Office of Personnel Management'' under title IV of the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1996 (Public Law 104–52; 109 Stat. 490), is further amended by striking ''1998'' both places it appears and inserting ''2000''.

SEC. 515. Notwithstanding any provision of chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, the Office of Personnel Management shall enter into a contract with the National Association of Postmasters of the United States (hereafter referred to as the ''Association'') under section 8902 of such title, if—

(1) the Association fulfills all terms and conditions (not related to such withdrawal from participation) of a qualified carrier under such chapter;

(2) the plan offered by the Association fulfills all terms and conditions (not related to such withdrawal from participation) of an approved health benefits plan;

(3) prior to May 31, 1998, the Association submits a plan to the Office of Personnel Management for approval as an approved health benefits plan; and

(4) the Association enters into an agreement with an underwriting subcontractor licensed to issue group health insurance.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

SEC. 601. Funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to pay travel to the United States for the immediate family of employees serving abroad in cases of death or life threatening illness of said employee.

SEC. 602. No department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States receiving appropriated funds under this or any other Act for fiscal year 1998 shall obligate or expend any such funds, unless such department, agency, or instrumentality has in place, and will continue to administer in good faith, a written policy designed to ensure that all of its workplaces are free from the illegal use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances (as defined in the Controlled Substances Act) by the officers and employees of such department, agency, or instrumentality.

SEC. 603. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1345, any agency, department, or instrumentality of the United States which provides or proposes to provide child care services for Federal employees may reimburse any Federal employee or any person employed to provide such services for travel, transportation, and subsistence expenses incurred for training classes, conferences, or other meetings in connection with the provision of such services: *Provided,* That any per diem allowance made pursuant to this section shall not exceed the rate specified in regulations prescribed pursuant to section 5707 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 604. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of buses, ambulances, law enforcement, and undercover surveillance vehicles), is hereby fixed at $8,100 except station wagons for which the maximum shall be $9,100: *Provided,* That these limits may be exceeded by not to exceed $3,700 for police-type vehicles, and by not to exceed $4,000 for special heavy-duty vehicles: *Provided further,* That the limits set forth in this section may not be exceeded by more than 5 percent for electric or hybrid vehicles purchased for demonstration under the provisions of the Electric and Hybrid Vehicle Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1976: *Provided further,* That the limits set forth in this section may be exceeded by the incremental cost of clean alternative fuels vehicles acquired pursuant to Public Law 101–549 over the cost of comparable conventionally fueled vehicles.

SEC. 605. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year available for expenses of travel, or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 5922–24.

SEC. 606. Unless otherwise specified during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in the continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act who, being eligible for citizenship, has filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date and is actually residing in the United States, (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States, (4) is an alien from Cuba, Poland, South Vietnam, the countries of the former Soviet Union, or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, (5) is a South Vietnamese, Cambodian, or Laotian refugee paroled in the United States after January 1, 1975, or (6) is a national of the People's Republic of China who qualifies for adjustment of status pursuant to the Chinese Student Protection Act of 1992: *Provided,* That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his or her status have been complied with: *Provided further,* That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined no more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further,* That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of Ireland, Israel, or the Republic of the Philippines, or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in a current defense effort, or to international broadcasters employed by the United States Information Agency, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed 60 days) as a result of emergencies.

SEC. 607. Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available for payment to the General Services Administration for charges for space and services and those expenses of renovation and alteration of buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 749), the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972 (87 Stat. 216), or other applicable law.

SEC. 608. In addition to funds provided in this or any other Act, all Federal agencies are authorized to receive and use funds resulting from the sale of materials, including Federal records disposed of pursuant to a records schedule recovered through recycling or waste prevention programs. Such funds shall be available until expended for the following purposes:

(1) Acquisition, waste reduction and prevention, and recycling programs as described in Executive Order 12873 (October 20, 1993), including any such programs adopted prior to the effective date of the Executive Order.

(2) Other Federal agency environmental management programs, including, but not limited to, the development and implementation of hazardous waste management and pollution prevention programs.

(3) Other employee programs as authorized by law or as deemed appropriate by the head of the Federal agency.

SEC. 609. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to chapter 91 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia; services in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 3109; and the objects specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided,* That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 610. No part of any appropriation for the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve the nomination of said person.

SEC. 611. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be available for interagency financing of boards (except Federal Executive Boards), commissions, councils, committees, or similar groups (whether or not they are interagency entities) which do not have a prior and specific statutory approval to receive financial support from more than one agency or instrumentality.

SEC. 612. Funds made available by this or any other Act to the Postal Service Fund (39 U.S.C. 2003) shall be available for employment of guards for all buildings and areas owned or occupied by the Postal Service and under the charge and control of the Postal Service, and such guards shall have, with respect to such property, the powers of special policemen provided by the first section of the Act of June 1, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 281; 40 U.S.C. 318), and, as to property owned or occupied by the Postal Service, the Postmaster General may take the same actions as the Administrator of General Services may take under the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of the Act of June 1, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 281; 40 U.S.C. 318a, 318b), attaching thereto penal consequences under the authority and within the limits provided in section 4 of the Act of June 1, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 281; 40 U.S.C. 318c).

SEC. 613. None of the funds made available pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be used to implement, administer, or enforce any regulation which has been disapproved pursuant to a resolution of disapproval duly adopted in accordance with the applicable law of the United States.

SEC. 614. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as otherwise provided in this section, no part of any of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending on September 30, 1998, by this or any other Act, may be used to pay any prevailing rate employee described in section 5342(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code—

(1) during the period from the date of expiration of the limitation imposed by section 616 of the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations Act, 1997, until the normal effective date of the applicable wage survey adjustment that is to take effect in fiscal year 1998, in an amount that exceeds the rate payable for the applicable grade and step of the applicable wage schedule in accordance with such section 616; and

(2) during the period consisting of the remainder of fiscal year 1998, in an amount that exceeds, as a result of a wage survey adjustment, the rate payable under paragraph (1) by more than the sum of—

(A) the percentage adjustment taking effect in fiscal year 1998 under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of pay under the General Schedule; and

(B) the difference between the overall average percentage of the locality-based comparability payments taking effect in fiscal year 1998 under section 5304 of such title (whether by adjustment or otherwise), and the overall average percentage of such payments which was effective in fiscal year 1997 under such section.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no prevailing rate employee described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 5342(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, and no employee covered by section 5348 of such title, may be paid during the periods for which

subsection (a) is in effect at a rate that exceeds the rates that would be payable under subsection (a) were subsection (a) applicable to such employee.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the rates payable to an employee who is covered by this section and who is paid from a schedule not in existence on September 30, 1997, shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rates of premium pay for employees subject to this section may not be changed from the rates in effect on September 30, 1997, except to the extent determined by the Office of Personnel Management to be consistent with the purpose of this section.

(e) This section shall apply with respect to pay for service performed after September 30, 1997.

(f) For the purpose of administering any provision of law (including section 8431 of title 5, United States Code, and any rule or regulation that provides premium pay, retirement, life insurance, or any other employee benefit) that requires any deduction or contribution, or that imposes any requirement or limitation on the basis of a rate of salary or basic pay, the rate of salary or basic pay payable after the application of this section shall be treated as the rate of salary or basic pay.

(g) Nothing in this section shall be considered to permit or require the payment to any employee covered by this section at a rate in excess of the rate that would be payable were this section not in effect.

(h) The Office of Personnel Management may provide for exceptions to the limitations imposed by this section if the Office determines that such exceptions are necessary to ensure the recruitment or retention of qualified employees.

SEC. 615. During the period in which the head of any department or agency, or any other officer or civilian employee of the Government appointed by the President of the United States, holds office, no funds may be obligated or expended in excess of $5,000 to furnish or redecorate the office of such department head, agency head, officer, or employee, or to purchase furniture or make improvements for any such office, unless advance notice of such furnishing or redecoration is expressly approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate. For the purposes of this section, the word ''office'' shall include the entire suite of offices assigned to the individual, as well as any other space used primarily by the individual or the use of which is directly controlled by the individual.

SEC. 616. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no executive branch agency shall purchase, construct, and/or lease any additional facilities, except within or contiguous to existing locations, to be used for the purpose of conducting Federal law enforcement training without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 617. Notwithstanding section 1346 of title 31, United States Code, or section 611 of this Act, funds made available for fiscal year 1998 by this or any other Act shall be available for the interagency funding of national security and emergency preparedness telecommunications initiatives which benefit multiple Federal departments, agencies, or entities, as provided by Executive Order Numbered 12472 (April 3, 1984).

SEC. 618. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act may be obligated or expended by any Federal department, agency, or other instrumentality for the salaries or expenses of any employee appointed to a position of a confidential or policy-determining character excepted from the competitive service pursuant to section 3302 of title 5, United States Code, without a certification to the Office of Personnel Management from the head of the Federal department, agency, or other instrumentality employing the Schedule C appointee that the Schedule C position was not created solely or primarily in order to detail the employee to the White House.

(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to Federal employees or members of the armed services detailed to or from—

(1) the Central Intelligence Agency;

(2) the National Security Agency;

(3) the Defense Intelligence Agency;

(4) the offices within the Department of Defense for the collection of specialized national foreign intelligence through reconnaissance programs;

(5) the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State;

(6) any agency, office, or unit of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Drug Enforcement Administration of the Department of Justice, the Department of Transportation, the Department of the Treasury, and the Department of Energy performing intelligence functions; and

(7) the Director of Central Intelligence.

SEC. 619. No department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States receiving appropriated funds under this or any other Act for fiscal year 1998 shall obligate or expend any such funds, unless such department, agency, or instrumentality has in place, and will continue to administer in good faith, a written policy designed to ensure that all of its workplaces are free from discrimination and sexual harassment and that all of its workplaces are not in violation of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

SEC. 620. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act may be used to pay for the expenses of travel of employees, including employees of the Executive Office of the President, not directly responsible for the discharge of official governmental tasks and duties: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply to the family of the President, Members of Congress or their spouses, Heads of State of a foreign country or their designees, persons providing assistance to the President for official purposes, or other individuals so designated by the President.

SEC. 621. Notwithstanding any provision of law, the President, or his designee, must certify to Congress, annually, that no person or persons with direct or indirect responsibility for administering the Executive Office of the President's Drug-Free Workplace Plan are themselves subject to a program of individual random drug testing.

SEC. 622. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that such employee training—

(1) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties;

(2) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants;

(3) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluation;

(4) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or ''new age'' belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N–915.022, dated September 2, 1988;

(5) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants' personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace; or

(6) includes content related to human immunodeficiency virus/acquired immune deficiency syndrome (HIV/AIDS) other than that necessary to make employees more aware of the medical ramifications of HIV/AIDS and the workplace rights of HIV-positive employees.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict, or otherwise preclude an agency from conducting training bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.

SEC. 623. No funds appropriated in this or any other Act for fiscal year 1998 may be used to implement or enforce the agreements in Standard Forms 312 and 4355 of the Government or any other nondisclosure policy, form, or agreement if such policy, form, or agreement does not contain the following provisions: ''These restrictions are consistent with and do not supersede, conflict with, or otherwise alter the employee obligations, rights, or liabilities created by Executive Order 12356; section 7211 of title 5, United States Code (governing disclosures to Congress); section 1034 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by the Military Whistleblower Protection Act (governing disclosure to Congress by members of the military); section 2302(b)(8) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by the Whistleblower Protection Act (governing disclosures of illegality, waste, fraud, abuse or public health or safety threats); the Intelligence Identities Protection Act of 1982 (50 U.S.C. 421 et seq.) (governing disclosures that could expose confidential Government agents); and the statutes which protect against disclosure that may compromise the national security, including sections 641, 793, 794, 798, and 952 of title 18, United States Code, and section 4(b) of the Subversive Activities Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. section 783(b)). The definitions, requirements, obligations, rights, sanctions, and liabilities created by said Executive Order and listed statutes are incorporated into this agreement and are controlling.'': *Provided*, That notwithstanding the preceding paragraph, a nondisclosure policy form or agreement that is to be executed by a person connected with the conduct of an intelligence or intelligence-related activity, other than an employee or officer of the United States Government, may contain provisions appropriate to the particular activity for which such document is to be used. Such form or agreement shall, at a minimum, require that the person will not disclose any classified information received in the course of such activity unless specifically authorized to do so by the United States Government. Such nondisclosure forms shall also make it clear that they do not bar disclosures to Congress or to an authorized official of an executive agency or the Department of Justice that are essential to reporting a substantial violation of law.

SEC. 624. No part of any funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used by an agency of the executive branch, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, and for the preparation, distribution or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress, except in presentation to the Congress itself.

SEC. 625. (a) IN GENERAL.—No later than September 30, 1998, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the Congress a report that provides—

(1) estimates of the total annual costs and benefits of Federal regulatory programs, including quantitative and nonquantitative measures of regulatory costs and benefits;

(2) estimates of the costs and benefits (including quantitative and nonquantitative measures) of each rule that is likely to have a gross annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more in increased costs;

(3) an assessment of the direct and indirect impacts of Federal rules on the private sector, State and local government, and the Federal Government; and

(4) recommendations from the Director and a description of significant public comments to reform or eliminate any Federal regulatory program or program element that is inefficient, ineffective, or is not a sound use of the Nation's resources.

(b) NOTICE.—The Director shall provide public notice and an opportunity to comment on the report under subsection (a) before the report is issued in final form.

SEC. 626. None of the funds appropriated by this Act or any other Act, may be used by an agency to provide a Federal employee's home address to any labor organization except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the employee has authorized such disclosure or that such disclosure has been ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 627. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to provide any non-public information such as mailing or telephone lists to any person or any organization outside of the Federal Government without the approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 628. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not heretofore authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 629. None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used to acquire information technologies which do not comply with part 39.106 (Year 2000 compliance) of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless an agency's Chief Information Officer determines that non-compliance with part 39.106 is necessary to the function and operation of the requesting agency or the acquisition is required by a signed contract with the agency in effect before the date of enactment of this Act. Any waiver granted by the Chief Information Officer shall be reported to the Office of Management and Budget, and copies shall be provided to Congress.

SEC. 630. Section 5118(d)(2) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking ''This paragraph shall'' and all that follows through the end of the paragraph.

SEC. 631. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall create and implement no later than October 1, 1997 a budget object classification which shall record obligations for the expenses of employee relocation. All obligations incident to an employee's relocation authorized under either chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, or section 901, title I, Public Law 96–465, as amended, shall be classified to such object classification.

SEC. 632. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act for any fiscal year shall be available for paying Sunday premium pay to any employee unless such employee actually performed work during the time corresponding to such premium pay.

SEC. 633. (a) SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMPS.—In order to afford the public a convenient way to contribute to funding for breast-cancer research, the United States Postal Service shall establish a special rate of postage for first-class mail under this section.

(b) HIGHER RATE.—The rate of postage established under this section—

(1) shall be 1 cent higher than the rate that would otherwise apply;

(2) may be established without regard to any procedures under chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, and notwithstanding any other provision of law; and

(3) shall be offered as an alternative to the rate that would otherwise apply.

The use of the rate of postage established under this section shall be voluntary on the part of postal patrons.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) PAYMENTS.—The amounts attributable to the 1-cent differential established under this section shall be paid by the United States Postal Service to the Department of Health and Human Services.

(B) USE.—Amounts paid under subparagraph (A) shall be used for breast-cancer research and related activities to carry out the purposes of this section.

(C) FREQUENCY OF PAYMENTS.—Payments under subparagraph (A) shall be paid to the Department of Health and Human Services no less than twice in each calendar year.

(2) AMOUNTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE 1-CENT DIFFERENTIAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''amounts attributable to the 1-cent differential established under this section'' means, as determined by the United States Postal Service under regulations that it shall prescribe—

(A) the total amount of revenues received by the United States Postal Service that it would not have received but for the enactment of this section, reduced by

(B) an amount sufficient to cover reasonable administrative and other costs of the United States Postal Service attributable to carrying out this section.

(d) SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMPS.—The United States Postal Service may provide for the design and sale of special postage stamps to carry out this section.

(e) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) nothing in this section should directly or indirectly cause a net decrease in total funds received by the Department of Health and Human Services or any other agency or instrumentality of the Government (or any component or other aspect thereof) below the level that would otherwise have been anticipated absent this section; and

(2) nothing in this section should affect regular first-class rates or any other regular rate of postage.

(f) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Postmaster General shall include in each annual report rendered under section 2402 of title 39, United States Code, information concerning the operation of this section.

SEC. 634. JUDICIAL SALARIES. (a) JUDICIAL COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS.—Section 461(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(a) Effective on the same date that the rates of basic pay under the General Schedule are adjusted pursuant to section 5303 of title 5, each salary rate which is subject to adjustment under this section shall be adjusted by the same percentage amount as provided for under section 5303 of title 5, rounded to the nearest multiple of $100 (or if midway between multiples of $100, to the next higher multiple of $100).''.

(b) AUTOMATIC ADJUSTMENTS WITHOUT CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.—Section 140 of the resolution entitled ''A Joint Resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1982, and for other purposes.'', approved December 15, 1981 (Public Law 97–92; 95 Stat. 1200; 28 U.S.C. 461 note) is repealed.

SEC. 635. LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS TO PROVIDE FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES TO FURNISH COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE PROPERTY OR SERVICES TO OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act may be used by the Office of Management and Budget, or any other agency, to publish, promulgate, or enforce any policy, regulation, or circular, or any rule or authority in any other form, that would permit any Federal agency to provide a commercially available property or service to any other department or agency of Government unless the policy, regulation, circular, or other rule or authority meets the requirements prescribed under subsection (b).

(b)(1) Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall prescribe regulations applicable to any policy regulation, circular, or other rule or authority referred to in subsection (a).

(2) the requirements prescribed under paragraph (1) shall include the following—

(A) a requirement for a comparison between the cost of providing the property or service concerned through the agency concerned and the cost of providing such property or service through the private sector;

(B) a requirement for cost and performance benchmarks relating to the property or service provided relative to comparable services provided by other Government agencies and contractors in order to permit effective oversight of the cost and provision of such property or service by the agency concerned or the Office of Management and Budget;

(C) the regulation would not apply to contingency operations associated with national security or a national emergency; and

(D) the regulation would not apply if the goods are to be produced or services are to be performed by a private sector source at a Government-owned facility that is operated by the private sector source.

SEC. 636. Section 302(g)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 432(g)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' after ''Senator,''; and

(2) by inserting after ''candidate,'' the following: ''and by the Republican and Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committees''.

SEC. 637. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no adjustment shall be made under section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31) (relating to cost-of-living adjustments for Members of Congress) during fiscal year 1998.

SEC. 638. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING IMPORTS OF FISH TAKEN OR RETAINED IN A MANNER INCONSISTENT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF ATLANTIC TUNAS. (a) It is the sense of the Senate that the United States, as a signatory to the International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, should implement as fully as possible the recommendations of the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT).

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that fish taken and retained in a manner and under circumstances that are inconsistent with the recommendations of the ICCAT made pursuant to article VIII of the Convention and adopted by the Secretary of Commerce should be prohibited entry into the United States.

SEC. 639. PROHIBITION OF COMPUTER GAME PROGRAMS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, ''agency'' means agency as defined under section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) REMOVAL OF EXISTING COMPUTER GAME PROGRAMS.—Not later 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency shall take such actions as necessary to remove any computer game program not required for the official business of the agency from any agency computer equipment.

(3) PROHIBITION OF INSTALLATION OF COMPUTER GAME PROGRAMS.—The head of each

agency shall prohibit the installation of any computer game program not required for the official business of the agency into any agency computer equipment.

(4) PROHIBITION OF AGENCY ACCEPTANCE OF COMPUTER EQUIPMENT WITH COMPUTER GAME PROGRAMS.—

(A) Title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 317. RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

''(a) DEFINITION.—In this section the term 'information technology' has the meaning given such term under section 5002(3) of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401).

''(b) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency may not accept delivery of information technology that is loaded with game programs not required for an official purpose under the terms of the contract under which information technology is delivered.

''(c) WAIVER.—The head of an executive agency may waive the application of this section with respect to any particular procurement of information technology, if the head of the agency—

''(1) conducts a cost-benefit analysis and determines that the costs of compliance with this section outweighs the benefits of compliance; and

''(2) submits a certification of such determination, with supporting documentation to the Congress.''.

(B) The table of contents in section 2(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 316 the following:

''Sec. 317. Restrictions on certain information technology.''.

(C) The amendments made by this section shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 640. (a) The congressional ethics committees shall provide for voluntary reporting by Members of Congress on the financial disclosure reports filed under title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) on such Members' participation in—

(1) the Civil Service Retirement System under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) the Federal Employees Retirement System under chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) In this section, the terms ''congressional ethics committees'' and ''Members of Congress'' have the meanings given such terms under section 109 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(c) This section shall apply to fiscal year 1998 and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 641. (a) A Federal employee shall be separated from service and barred from reemployment in the Federal service, if—

(1) the employee is convicted of a violation or attempted violation of section 201 of title 18, United States Code; and

(2) such violation or attempted violation related to conduct prohibited under section 1010(a) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960(a)).

(b) This section shall apply during fiscal year 1998 and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 642. (a) COORDINATION OF COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE CENTERS AND ACTIVITIES.—(1) Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a plan to improve coordination, and eliminate unnecessary duplication, among the counterdrug intelligence centers and counterdrug activities of the Federal Government, including the centers and activities of the following departments and agencies:

(A) The Department of Defense, including the Defense Intelligence Agency.

(B) The Department of the Treasury, including the United States Customs Service.

(C) The Central Intelligence Agency.

(D) The Coast Guard.

(E) The Drug Enforcement Administration.

(F) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(2) The purpose of the plan under paragraph (1) is to maximize the effectiveness of the centers and activities referred to in that paragraph in achieving the objectives of the national drug control strategy. In order to maximize such effectiveness, the plan shall—

(A) articulate clear and specific mission statements for each counterdrug intelligence center and activity, including the manner in which responsibility for counterdrug intelligence activities will be allocated among the counterdrug intelligence centers;

(B) specify the relationship between such centers;

(C) specify the means by which proper oversight of such centers will be assured;

(D) specify the means by which counterdrug intelligence will be forwarded effectively to all levels of officials responsible for United States counterdrug policy; and

(E) specify mechanisms to ensure that State and local law enforcement agencies are apprised of counterdrug intelligence in a manner which—

(i) facilitates effective counterdrug activities by such agencies; and

(ii) provides such agencies with the information necessary to ensure the safety of officials of such agencies in their counterdrug activities.

(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the following:

(1) The Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 643. PERSONAL ALLOWANCE PARITY AMONG NAFTA PARTIES. (a) IN GENERAL.—The United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall initiate discussions with officials of the Governments of Mexico and Canada to achieve parity in the duty-free personal allowance structure of the United States, Mexico, and Canada.

(b) REPORT.—The United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to Congress within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the progress that is being made to correct any disparity between the United States, Mexico, and Canada with respect to duty-free personal allowances.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS.—If parity with respect to duty-free personal allowances between the United States, Mexico, and Canada is not achieved within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit recommendations to Congress for appropriate legislation and action.

SEC. 644. No funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to pay for an abortion, or the administrative expenses in connection with any health plan under the Federal employees health benefit program which provides any benefits or coverage for abortions.

SEC. 645. The provision of section 644 shall not apply where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

This Act may be cited as the ''Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1998''.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, before yielding the floor, I wanted to thank our hard working staff: Barbara Retzlaff, Tammy Perrin, Lula Edwards, Frank Larkin, and Pat Raymond. And in particular I wanted to thank our ranking member, Senator KOHL, for his advice and his leadership on this bill.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. BOND. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business currently is S. 1034.

Mr. BOND. This is the Veterans Affairs, HUD, independent agencies appropriations measure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1034) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I see that our colleague from Arkansas is present. He has a very important amendment. I invite the attention of all Members. We are planning on moving on this bill. There are a number of amendments, and we look forward to dealing with them expeditiously today. So we are open and ready to do business. We appreciate having the matters brought to our attention. As I said yesterday, we hope, if there are amendments or proposed colloquies, they will be brought to the ranking member and me so that we can give them our personal attention and continue the progress that

this body has been making on the appropriations measures.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 944

(Purpose: To reduce the appropriation for the implementation of the space station program for the purpose of terminating the program)

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], for himself, Mr. KOHL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. FEINGOLD proposes an amendment numbered 944.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 70, strike lines 17 through 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following: ''sion and administrative aircraft, $3,826,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999. Provided, that of the funds made available in this bill, no funds shall be expended on the space station program, except for termination costs.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, this is the sixth year that I have stood at this desk and lamented the fact that we have become inured to projects which have massive cost overruns if it means a few jobs in our State or if it means you can cast a cheap vote and not pay a price for it back home.

Now, I have been here for 22½ years, and I have watched this body time and time again proceed continuously to vote for such things as the space station whereas if it were a secret ballot it would not get 25 votes. The facts and the evidence are absolutely overwhelming against going forward with the space station, and yet because of the issue of jobs back home, it is very seldom that anyone casts a vote against it.

Also, there is no political price to pay, even if you do not have jobs back home, hinging on going forward with the space station. There is no political price to be exacted against you for voting for something that people know very little about and have never honed in on.

My wife, Betty Bumpers, a woman I admire very much for her courage, started a peace organization in 1981, and I said, ''What you have done is just assured your husband's defeat in the next election.'' She said, ''Yes, and you men are going to get my children killed.'' And so I had to dance around that issue until I ran the next time fully expecting to be confronted by my opponent about my wife's activities in the peace movement.

Now, isn't it a strange dichotomy in America, that one has to be defensive about being for all the things that would promote peace. That is how strange this place is at times.

Of course, Betty has been active in childhood immunizations all of her life, and all of my political life—she had started a program in 1972 to immunize all the children in my State, which had one of the lowest immunization levels of any State in the country. We immunized 300,000 children one Saturday. She was known then and is still known as the one of the foremost leaders in immunization programs in this country. I remember one day in 1973 some smart reporter said, ''Senator, do you think your wife's activities''—he was referring to peace, of course—''Do you think your wife's activities are going to be a big detriment to you in your campaign?'' I said, ''Well, it will be among all those people who favor war and not immunizing children.'' And I never got asked another question about it.

I do not mean to sound arrogant about being willing to stand up occasionally for something I strongly believe in, but occasionally I chastise some of my colleagues who could save the taxpayers billions of dollars and hasten the day we balance the budget, but who refuse to do it because there is no political accounting for voting for the space station, particularly now when the rover is roving around on Mars. As a matter of fact, I know this is pure coincidence, but if you want to go over to the Dirksen Building, it just so happens that, at the same time we are considering the space station and the entire space budget in the Chamber, NASA has a thrilling show in the Dirksen Building for all the Senators to see of the rover roving around on Mars sniffing rocks.

Let me say—and I have said this for 6 straight years—I favor the space program. I have never once lamented the fact that we have a shuttle program and that we have the ability to place all kinds of scientific and communications satellites in orbit. And in sending the rover to Mars, NASA is doing exactly what it should do, because that proves another point. We do not need a manned mission to do science on Mars.

Mr. President, almost all the scientists in the country, virtually every Nobel physicist, virtually every scientific group in America, opposes the space station. Unfortunately, they don't have enough political clout to fill a thimble. I admire them, I respect them, but the truth of the matter is, they have very little impact on this body or the House of Representatives on what they favor or don't favor.

One day on this floor, I said even Carl Sagan was opposed to the space station. Carl Sagan, whom I had known for several years—we weren't close friends, but I had been thrown in contact with him a few times—called to say that I had misstated what he believed. What he said was, ''I believe the space station is a legitimate thing, a highly desirable thing, as a way station to get to Mars. But,'' he said, to follow that up, something that I have always strongly believed, ''it is not—it is not a wise expenditure of money if you are talking about scientific experiments to be conducted on the space station.'' That is one of the reasons the American Physical Society and so many other groups oppose the space station.

People around here are sometimes influenced by how somebody feels about it. I will tell you who strongly opposes going forward with the space station: The Concord Coalition, which was headed up by our now deceased, highly respected colleague, Paul Tsongas and by Warren Rudman, also our former colleague from New Hampshire. The Concord Coalition, Citizens Against Government Waste, the Cato Institute, the Progressive Policy Institute, the National Taxpayers' Union, and Citizens for a Sound Economy.

Then, in the scientific community, listen to this: the American Physiological Society, the American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, the American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, the American Society for Investigative Pathology, the American Institute of Nutrition, American Association of Immunologists, American Society of Cell Biology, the Biophysical Society, the American Association of Anatomists.

Who comprises the American Physical Society? It is 41,000 physicists. Dr. Robert Park, a professor of physics at the University of Maryland at College Park, has testified time and again here about the folly of justifying the space station by alluding to the kind of scientific experiments they are going to do on it.

Mr. President, my amendment says we will terminate the space station at a cost of $600 million and we will save $1.5 billion to put on the deficit. Sometimes my staff presents me with some alternatives. ''Why don't we say we are going to put this $1.5 billion in savings into some other popular program?'' I said, ''I have been there and done that.'' I remember when I first got into trying to torpedo the space station, I would have transferred the money over to Veterans Affairs. That is usually an item that causes Senators to jump under their desks. If you are going to give it to the veterans, most people around here will look very cautiously before they vote no. But I didn't get any more votes than I have been getting since.

We have become so inured to cost overruns, we just simply cannot stop a big project once it is started. Only two things that come to mind that we finally did stop. One was the Clinch River breeder reactor, which incidentally was also my amendment. Howard Baker was majority leader. Maybe you think that wasn't an uphill battle. But the American scientific community began to rise up in arms, and the environmentalists threw a fit. So, finally we decided that we did not want to follow the breeder reactor method of generating electricity in this country and

we finally killed it after I spent 4 years standing at this desk, talking about the folly of that project. We had already started digging ground down in Clinch River to build it.

The other thing we terminated was the super collider. That's another one of my amendments. I guess the reason they happen to come to mind is that I happen to be the architect of killing both of them. The super collider, this massive hole in the ground in Texas, nobody really talked much about the science of the super collider. All they talked about was all the jobs it was going to create in Texas, which indeed it would have.

Let me just, while I am on the subject of jobs, point something out. The space station—if you want to make it a jobs program go home and tell the chamber of commerce that it costs $140,000 for every job it creates. Take the same proposition to General Motors or anybody else: You come into our community and we will give you $140,000 for every job you create. They will be standing on line from here to New York to try to take you up on that offer.

You think about the fact it costs $10,000 to $12,000 a pound for every pound of material we send to the space station. And now there is an estimate, if you have four astronauts on board, they can only devote 4 hours a day each to research-related activities. So, if you have four American astronauts, that's 16 hours a day that they could put into science. Do you want to know how expensive that is? Well, NASA says it will cost $1,300,000,000 a year to operate the station. So, it will only cost the taxpayers $230,000 for each hour the astronauts put in actually working on scientific experiments on the space station. Do you want to hear one better than that? The space station is to have a 10-year life and it will cost all-told about $100 billion. Figure that one out: $25 million a day is going to be the cost of keeping the space station up there.

Do you have any idea, when we sit in the Agriculture Committee talking about research, how we have to grovel and fight and scratch and claw for every dime we get for research? Do you have any idea what $25 million will do? Do you know the National Institutes of Health can only fund one out of every four good scientific projects that are brought to them? And we are talking about honest to God research. Research on cancer, on AIDS, on arthritis—every conceivable kind of disease that afflicts mankind is handled through the National Institutes of Health, to which we give about $13 to $14 billion a year. And they can only fund one out of every four experiments. That is real science. You can book it. Do you know what real medical research could be done if we simply gave them the cost of one space shuttle flight? They could fund one out of every three proposals.

Last week I conducted a hearing on immunizations. There is going to be a big to-do over at the White House tomorrow on the remarkable success we have had on immunizations. In a hearing last week it was revealed by some pharmaceutical companies, and the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, that we now face the possibility of eliminating measles worldwide, as we are about to eradicate polio worldwide. We now have new vaccines, even for children's earaches; even for dysentery. Last year we had 50,000 hospitalizations last year of children with dysentery, and 20 children died—but worldwide those figures are nothing. Worldwide, dysentery kills so many children—but not as many as measles. Does that shock you? Measles is still the biggest killer of children in the world; 1 million children a year die of measles.

At the hearing they told us about all these new vaccines. For example, for infants—put a little something in each nostril of the nose and they will never get flu. You can also use that in combination with another vaccine which, as I say, will keep them from getting dysentery.

I'll tell you what I'll do, I'll stand on my head on the top of this Capitol if you ever get anything even remotely close to those kinds of advances after you spend $100 billion. For 6 years I have listened to Senators come over here, they are my friends and colleagues and I don't denigrate their feelings about it, but when you start asking, ''What are the scientific experiments we are going to conduct?'' ''Well, we don't know. We have to get up there and find out what we are looking for.''

It was Dr. Nicolaas Bloembergen, of Harvard, who made the best statement I ever heard about research on the space station. Incidentally, he is adamantly opposed to it. I'll come back to that. I'm going to take about 20 minutes just reading quotes from the top physicists, medical doctors, you name it, about the space station, before I sit down. Do you know what he said about microgravity research, which is the big thing everybody talks about; that is research you do in weightlessness? He said, ''microgravity is of microimportance.'' That says it all. Why else would we be sending a station up there to do scientific experiments except it is a weightless situation?

Another great physicist whom I will quote in a moment said, ''It is the worst place to do microgravity research with men on board or women on board.'' That is because, if you are looking for an experiment that requires weightlessness and you have people tromping around in the station and vibrating it, you lose the benefit. You would expect a 6-year-old to understand that.

Mr. President, let me just bring you up to date. In 1996, the General Accounting Office to do a report on the space station. It was not the most devastating report I ever read in my life, and of course I was looking for something that I might hang my hat on that just might jar this place into action. But there were really no bombs in the 1996 GAO report, except they predicted that unless certain things happened certain other very undesirable things were going to happen, namely unless the Russians came through with their part of this project the cost was going to skyrocket.

One Senator came to me in 1994 and said: ''DALE, I think this cooperation with Russia is a tremendous idea. We can keep their space scientists busy and they won't be off in Iraq and Iran, building missiles for some of the rogue nations.'' And he said, ''You know, we have to help the Russians all we can. They have big problems.''

I said: ''That's right. But if we are going to send them $200 million for openers, just to say they will be a part of the international space station, I say send it to them in economic aid or food. That is what they need. They do not need to be participating in one of the biggest boondoggles ever conceived. What they need is something to help their people with their infrastructure, build industry, feed their people.''

So what has happened, as predictable as night following day, is Russia has reneged. We gave them close to $200 million for openers to build the first section of the work they were supposed to do. We gave them that money.

They were supposed to build the service module. There are nine modules on this space station. They were supposed to build the third one, but a very important one, called the service module, and they have not been able to come up with all the money, nor are they likely to. I will return in a moment to some of the consequences of that.

But back to the GAO report. Congressman DINGELL and I asked the GAO to update their 1996 report. Here is the update, which we received last night and which anybody else who wants it can get this morning. Here is what the GAO update says. If there is anything people around here detest, it is somebody going around telling them, ''I told you so,'' so I won't say it.

Listen to this:

> The prime contractor's—

That is Boeing's——

> cost and schedule performance on the space station, which showed signs of deterioration last year, has continued to decline virtually unabated. Since April 1996, the cost overrun has more than tripled.

Let me repeat that:

> Since April 1996—

A little over a year ago—

> the cost overrun has more than tripled and the schedule slippage has increased by almost 50 percent.

Does it not take nerve to come in here asking us to go forward with a $100 billion project in the light of that?

> Financial reserves are dwindling with up to 6 years remaining until on-orbit assembly of the space station is completed.

That is what we are looking at now. We still have 6 years to go before we

even get that sucker assembled in space:

. . . with up to 6 years remaining until on-orbit assembly of the space station is completed. NASA has already identified actual and potential resource demands that exceed the station's remaining financial reserves.

As the French say, here comes the piece de resistance:

NASA transferred $462 million from its science budget to the space station development budget in fiscal years 1996 through 1998.

Why did NASA transfer $462 million from its science account to the manufacturing of the space station? To cover the cost overruns. And the $462 million comes out of the science budget. Either you are going to reduce the scientific experiments on this thing by $462 million, or NASA is going to come back to Congress and say we need $462 million more. Which do you think that is going to be? We all know what it is going to be, and this is just the beginning:

It is also planning to transfer another $70 million in fiscal 1999 from the science fund to the station development budget.

Mr. President, NASA says that to assemble and build the space station, the cost will be $17.4 billion, and within that are these scientific funds. They are taking money from Peter to pay Paul, but they are taking money out of the account that they say is absolutely essential to justify the space station, namely, the science that we are going to get. You can't have it both ways, or you can, too, in the U.S. Senate.

Congress approved the transfer of $200 million this year. We approved a $200 million transfer from the space shuttle. I just told you that they have transferred $462 million from their science account over to the space station account. Now we are giving them authority to transfer money from the shuttle account, the manned space program that most people around here applaud, and are putting it into the space station. Why? To cover the cost overruns on the space station. It is the most traditional, time-honored shell game that any of us know anything about, and that is to cover the cost incurred because the Russians have been so late in coming up with their money.

There is another $100 million pending in Congress for the year 1998. That is in the House bill; that is not in the Senate bill. But, in addition to allowing them to take $200 million out of the shuttle fund and put it into the space station, now the House has said, ''We will give you another $100 million to transfer to the space station.'' This is actually outside the $17.4 billion. The $462 million in science funds is inside the $17.4 billion and can only be classified as a whopping cost overrun.

This is one of the most interesting things that the GAO report said:

When NASA redesigned the space station in 1993. . . .

You remember, President Clinton looked at a whole list of them and finally came up with what was finally called International Space Station Alpha:

When NASA redesigned the station in 1993, it estimated that Russia, as a partner, would reduce program costs by $1.6 billion because the station's assembly would be completed sooner.

It would be finished in June 2002 instead of September 2003, the proposition being that if the Russians came through, we would build it faster and, therefore, save $1.6 billion.

Mr. President, those are not my figures, those are NASA's figures, those are NASA's statements. And this is what GAO said about it:

NASA has recently acknowledged that completion of the station's assembly would indeed slip to 2003. . . .

Fifteen months later than we have been told since time immemorial this thing would be finished.

While NASA has not acknowledged the 2003 date, they have yet to tell us what the new milestone will be. And the GAO says:

Consequently, most, if not all, of the reduced costs claimed by accelerating the schedule by 15 months would be lost by slipping the schedule by a similar amount.

In short, now we are back to the old time schedule, and the $1.6 billion that NASA said they would save by bringing Russia into the program and, therefore, building it 15 months sooner than we would otherwise have built won't be saved.

NASA has not told us yet precisely when they expect to have this thing finished, nor precisely what a 15-month slippage at this point is going to cost, though I can tell you, based on the conversations I had with people who know more about this program than anybody else, it is $2 billion.

Mr. President, I tried to torpedo the space station since the memory of man runneth not. I have tried in almost more times than there have been design changes, new partners, and new promises by NASA, and until this very moment, NASA is trying to con the Senate by showing this magnificent film about Mars over in the Dirksen Building and still smoothly promising that everything is running on target, on schedule, and the only reason we know that isn't true is because GAO has done two studies that contradict NASA 180 degrees.

We don't need a space station. The Mir is the seventh Russian space station. The Mir has been in orbit, how long? Eleven years. The Mir has been up there 11 years, and now it is in big trouble. I am not saying that is predictable. I will say this, and this is not to bash Russia—I believe in doing everything we can to help their economy and keep them viable—but their space program is not as sophisticated as ours. While I understand all the arguments for bringing Russia into this, I am not sure scientifically and from a safety standpoint it is good to do it.

But the point I wanted to make is, again, I have stood on this floor for 6 long years and said show me, tell me what are the scientific achievements Russia has achieved in 20 years of having a space station in orbit. And I have been met by a deafening roar of silence. There are none. The only justification for a space station is as a way station to Mars.

Mr. President, look at this chart, and I will say that in 1984, Ronald Reagan, I think it was in a State of the Union Address, said we were going to build a space station—that was in 1984; that has now been 13-plus years—we were going to build a space station for $8 billion and deploy it and operate it. That was the initial promise of the President. At that time, here were the justifications. Look at them.

It was going to be a staging base, presumably to go to Mars.

It was going to be a manufacturing facility. We were going to manufacture a new kind of sophisticated crystal in a microgravity atmosphere.

It was going to be a space-based observatory.

It was going to be a transportation node.

It was going to be a servicing facility, presumably for people on their way to Mars.

It was going to be an assembly facility, again, to assemble the parts of a space station to go to Mars.

It was going to be a storage facility.

And, finally, it was going to be a research laboratory.

You can see from my chart how many of those exist today. Seven of them have been torpedoed, and only one remains standing.

Go back to the original $8 billion that President Reagan said it was going to cost. Here is an update on that. I tell you, I cannot keep the grin off my face as I go through these things. You just cannot believe it, you cannot believe it, and yet Senators will come in here and vote for this thing.

The President said $8 billion. Here is what we spent on the Reagan plan—$11.2 billion. That is gone. What we got out of that is so infinitesimal you might as well have thrown the money off the Washington Monument. It would have helped a few poor people.

So when Bill Clinton became President, he said this thing is out of control, we have to have another look at it. So we have a big design—a design-off I guess you would call it. And they look at dozens of plans over at the White House about what kind of a space station it ought to be.

Obviously, the first one was much too grandiose, going to be much too costly. So they come up with the International Space Station Alpha. And we are going to participate with Europe and Canada and Japan, and now of course Russia.

And here is what the construction cost was going to be between 1994 and 2002—$17.4 billion. I have alluded to that figure several times already.

Now, anybody who believes that the construction and development of the international space station is going to be $17.4 billion, you go ahead and vote for it. You have my permission. You

certainly will not lose my friendship, if you actually believe that. But if you actually believe that, you haven't got enough you-know-what to be a Member of Congress. But if you believe that, go ahead and vote for it.

The GAO had just gotten through issuing a report this morning saying that is nonsense. And here is the operating costs for 10 years, $13 billion.

Mr. President, do you know the cost of this program and the cost of all the 83 shuttles it is going to take to get it up there and supply it? The cost is going to be staggering. You know, the cost of gold is $325 an ounce today. That is peanuts compared to what a pound of water will cost to supply these astronauts, just peanuts. It is like 33 times more to send a pound of water. Maybe not that much. I do not want to exaggerate too far. So here is your operating cost, $13 billion.

Here are the shuttle flights needed to launch, service and use the station in space—$50.5 billion. Mr. President, let me tell you something about that. At present, that is 83 launches that are going to be necessary to deploy it and supply it for 10 years after it is deployed—$50.5 billion. That is calculated I think on the basis of the space shuttle, the flights running around $475 million each.

I can remember when I used to get teary-eyed seeing that shuttle take off when they first developed it. Such a magnificent thing to see. One day somebody told me each launch cost almost $500 million, and my eyes dried up almost immediately.

Here are just the related costs of the space station—$1.9 billion on these shuttle flights. Let me tell you, if you believe that 83 shuttles will leave within a 5 to 7 minute launch window without a hitch over the next 15, 16 years, you vote for it, if you believe that every shuttle is going to go up without a hitch, rendezvous with the space station without a hitch, take the needed supplies to the astronauts, all of that, and every launch launched within a 5 to 7 minute timeframe, which is absolutely necessary. And if you do not make it within that 5 to 7 minute envelope, you delay the launch and the costs soar.

I have a chart here, Mr. President, about the cost of gold. I guess we can all relate to gold. Here it is. The present cost of the space station is estimated by GAO—incidentally, this is not DALE BUMPERS; this is GAO—$94 billion. That is 25 times its weight in gold. And, as I said earlier, that is $25 million per day of operation.

It is a jobs program. I said 140,000 jobs. Each job costs $147,000. Three States—California, Texas, and Alabama—they get about 78 percent of all the money. The other 22 to 24 percent goes to virtually every other State. There are only a handful of States that do not have a little piece of the action. NASA is not stupid. They took a leaf out of the Pentagon's book. And they put those contracts into almost every State. I think there is a little $50,000 contract in Arkansas on the space station. That is just not quite enough to influence me. It provides no commercial value. And it costs $12,880 to transport one pound of material to the station.

Mr. President, let me now go to what some of the scientists say about this project.

Before I do that, here is another little overrun. You cannot compute the cost on this—this is manhours—but I want you to think about this. In 1993, NASA said that the assembling of the space station would require about 311 hours of EVA—extravehicular activity. It is space walking. In 1993, they said it would take 311 hours of space walks to assemble it. Then they decided they miscalculated, and they moved it up to 434 hours. And then they decided they miscalculated it again, and in 1996 they said, ''We miscalculated, and it's going to take 1,104 hours of space walking to assemble the station.'' And now, just very recently, believe it or not, 1 year from the time the first launch is supposed to occur, they say it is going to take 1,519 hours. NASA has only miscalculated by 500 percent the number of hours it will take to assemble the space station. And their calculations on everything else are running pretty close.

Mr. President, let me tell you what people who know a lot more about the science than I do are saying.

Incidentally, I watched Senator GLENN yesterday. He is not just one of my very dearest friends, he came to the Senate with me in 1975. He is one of the finest men—I think just the finest, most decent man I have ever known. We do not disagree very often, but we disagree strongly on this. We battle back and forth in the cloakroom about it.

He has circulated a brochure that ties the space station to research on aging. God knows, I ought to be interested in that. Well, ironically one space shuttle flight to the space station will cost almost as much as the entire $454 million budget of the National Institute on Aging. One space shuttle flight would finance the National Institute on Aging for 1 year.

Now, you ask yourself, do you think you are really going to get anything about aging out of the space shuttle? What you are going to get is an expensive $450 million, and you are going to get nothing. If you gave it to the National Institute on Aging, you at least have an outside chance of something happening.

Here are the editors of Discovery Magazine from May 1997, 2 months ago. Listen to this:

> There is no use belaboring the point. Only the naive or the vested still maintain that there is any good pragmatic reason to spend the tens of billions of dollars it will take to complete what started out in the early 1980s as Freedom and now endures as the International Space Station. . . . Is it possible to imagine a technological undertaking so enormous that could garner less respect from the scientific community?

That says it all, but I am not going to quit.

Here is what Marsha Smith, who was interviewed in Aerospace America in June 1995, said I visited with her in my office yesterday. She is the brightest person in this country on this subject. She does not try to tint it one way or another. She just calls it like it is. She is not unalterably opposed to the space station, for that matter. But I say this simply to demonstrate publicly my intense and high regard for her.

> I don't know of any breakthroughs that have come out of [Russian] space station programs in terms of new or cheaper-to-produce materials or scientific discoveries . . . . Mostly they have learned how to operate a space station for long periods of time.

Now, Mr. President, I again issue the call. What have the Russians got for 20 years of having the space station in orbit that is worthy of the name ''scientific''?

Listen to what Tim Beardsley of Scientific American said in June 1996, a little over 1 year ago.

> The value of biological and health research in orbit has been challenged by Elliott C. Levinthal, a former program director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [that is called DARPA over at the Defense Department] . . . Levinthal, who has been a professor of genetics and mechanical engineering at Stanford University, asserts that no neutral committee handing out funds for basic research in biology would support microgravity studies.

And that is all the scientific justification you can find for the space station—microgravity research. Anything else obviously you can do here on Earth. As a matter of fact, you can do this in the shuttle. You can even do it in unmanned flights.

James Ferris of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, in Scientific American:

> Nothing has come out of microgravity research to convince me that a material can be fabricated in orbit that is going to be better than what you can make on Earth.

Why do we want to spend $100 billion to manufacture something we can do just as well on Earth, and for a fraction of the cost?

Here is what the German Physical Society said. And incidentally, Germany is involved in paying for some of the costs.

> Except for investigations carried out on humans themselves, all experiments in this area of research can be carried out unmanned, without loss of precision. This also applies to microgravity. Therefore it is improper [it is improper] to use microgravity as an effective argument in favor of manned spaceflight.

That statement was endorsed by the European Physical Society, all the physicists in Europe, the Physical Society of Japan—our physicists' counterpart in Japan—the Canadian Association of Physicists and the American Physical Society.

So, Mr. President, there you have it. International space station *Freedom*, partly being paid for by the Japanese, by the European Space Agency, by

Canada—forget Russia for the time being. And how do their physicists feel about it? There is the European Physical Society, the Japanese Physical Society, the Canadian Physical Society and the American Physical Society, and that takes just about every physicist in America, who says this is improbable nonsense. It reminds me of going to a doctor and saying, ''Doctor, I have this hurting in my chest,'' and he x-rays me and says, ''It looks to me like you have cancer.'' And I say, ''Well, it may be, but I will go find a Senator to validate this. I'm not taking your word for it; I want to take the word of the U.S. Senate and see if I have cancer of the lung.'' That is not far off. The scientists all oppose the space station. Yet, as I said in my opening remarks, it is so impossible to convince the Senate.

Incidentally, when it comes to the American Physical Society, its spokesman in the past, as I said a moment ago, has been Dr. Park. Dr. Park said, in July 1993:

> It is the view of the American Physical Society that scientific justification is lacking for a permanently manned space station in Earth orbit. We are concerned that the potential contribution of a manned space station to the physical scientist has been greatly overstated and that many of the scientific objectives currently planned for the space station can be accomplished more effectively and at a much lower cost on Earth.

Unmanned robotic platforms or on the shuttle. All he represents is 41,000 physicists in this country. He goes on to say, quoting Professor Nicolaas Bloembergen of Harvard—and I said earlier I thought he was a Nobel laureate, and he is, in physics—Dr. Bloembergen of Harvard, a Nobel laureate and physicist, summed it up bluntly in testimony before a Senate committee 2 years ago: ''Microgravity is of microimportance.''

How is it we know so much more here? After all, we are throwing $2.1 billion of the taxpayers' money at this project every year, and you saw the figures and where we are headed— $94 billion today, Lord knows how many billions ultimately.

I think there is an assumption, says one physicist, that any program that spends $15 billion per year is bound to produce something that society can use, but few of NASA's claims stand up. Indeed, an interim NASA study of technology transfer which became public in January acknowledged that NASA spinoff claims were exaggerated. That is an in-house memo that NASA's claims were exaggerated, including such famous examples as Velcro, Tang, and Teflon. Contrary to popular belief, the study found NASA created none of these. They merely publicized them.

Here is what Carl Sagan said: ''A space station is far from an optimum platform for doing science.'' And the Space Sciences Board said it ''sees no scientific need for this space station during the next 20 years,'' and went ahead to say, ''Continued development of Space Station Freedom . . . cannot be supported on scientific grounds.''

Mr. President, I have two or three other scientists I will quote and then I will turn it back to the managers of the bill. Incidentally, I listened yesterday and I listened again today to all these gigantic, frankly, highly specious, spurious claims about how we will find a cure for this and a cure for that. If the doctors in the scientific community say that is hogwash, who are we to question them? Somebody to keep a few jobs in our State.

Here is what Dr. Rosenthal said on cancer research:

> Statements have been made and published to the effect that vital cancer research would be done in space, and that is cited as a reason for supporting space station funding. We cannot find valid scientific justification for these claims and believe it is unrealistic to base a decision on funding the space station on that information . . . Based on the information we have seen thus far, we do not agree that a strong case has been made for choosing to do cancer research in space over critically needed cancer research here on earth.

That was David Rosenthal, Harvard Medical School, testifying on behalf of the American Cancer Society.

Dr. Shaun Ruddy, on behalf of the Arthritis Foundation:

> Space station proponents have indicated that the Space Station . . . will provide a ''first class'' laboratory . . . We used to have ''first class'' laboratories in universities and medical schools across the country . . . Reports by the National Institutes of Health and National Science Foundation have indicated that over 51 percent of the biological laboratory research is deemed inadequate for the conduct of research . . . Furthermore, the National Science Foundation report estimated that the capital construction backlog is approximately $12 billion . . . Should our priorities now be a ''first class'' laboratory in space, or correction of a longstanding deficiency in laboratories throughout this Nation?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUMPERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I bring to the Senator's attention that it is 12:10.

Mr. BUMPERS. I appreciate the Senator.

Ms. MIKULSKI. My question is, does the Senator wish to continue before we adjourn at 12:30?

Mr. BUMPERS. I apologize for going longer than I intended. I was having such a good time. As I told the Senator earlier, I do have a little thing I need to tend to during the noon hour. Let me just suggest I be permitted to leave while people on your side speak on the other side of this issue, and then perhaps we can rejoin the issue around 2:30 after the caucuses.

However, I understand there may be something else coming up.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I bring to the Senator's attention that at 2:15, the Senate will go to consideration of military construction. Upon completion of that, we will return to the bill.

Perhaps before the Senator leaves for his other Senate commitment, you and I can talk about that.

Mr. BUMPERS. I am delighted to do that. I am sure we can reach an agreement on a time certain to vote and even a wrap-up time for each side, if that is possible.

Ms. MIKULSKI. We would like very much to be able to do that for the Senator. We go to MilCon at 2:15 for 30 minutes, and from there we will first have a vote on MilCon. Then we resume consideration of the bill. At such time, I believe Senator WELLSTONE wishes to talk about compelling needs of veterans, and you have to be in an agricultural markup. We wonder if then around 4 o'clock, you could go to wrap-up and we could have a vote?

Mr. BUMPERS. Let me suggest we agree on this without getting a formal agreement. That we start on this again at 4 o'clock, and I promise, say, 15 minutes would do me to wrap it up, maybe 15 minutes on your side, and we could vote at 4:30.

Mr. BOND. If my colleagues will yield, first, let me enter into the RECORD a unanimous consent to go to the MilCon measure, so we will get that, and we can have that taken care of, and then I will speak with the proponent of the amendment, my ranking member, and I hope we can work out an accommodation acceptable to him.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2016

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 today the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 117, H.R. 2016, the military construction appropriations bill. I further ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments and the manager's amendment be agreed to, no other amendments be in order to the bill, there be 20 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form, with an additional 10 minutes under the control of Senator MCCAIN. I finally ask unanimous consent that at the expiration or yielding back of time, the bill be read the third time, and the Senate proceed to a vote on passage of H.R. 2016.

I further ask unanimous consent that immediately following passage, the Senate then insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BOND. I further ask unanimous consent that Floyd DesChamps, a detailee from the Department of Energy, with the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, be given access to the floor during the Senate discussions on the VA-HUD-independent agencies appropriations bill.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 944

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, if the ranking member will accommodate me, I will make just a few remarks in opposition to the amendment and then we

will attempt to establish a timeframe for further proceedings on this bill.

Mr. President, we have had a very eloquent statement by the Senator from Arkansas about questions that have been raised about the international space station. Needless to say, this question has been addressed time and time again on this floor. There are those scientists who have questions and objections. Nevertheless, the vast body, I think, of scientific knowledge and scientific expertise indicates that the space station is a tremendous opportunity for us to expand our knowledge not only about space but to develop new processes, new pharmaceuticals, medical advancements, and items that can be of tremendous benefit for us here on Earth.

Yesterday, for example, I note that the distinguished Senator from Ohio, our only space astronaut-Senator, talked at some length about the tremendous number of advances in scientific knowledge that have come from exploration in space. The bioreactor produces artificial human tissue potentially useful in treating colon and prostate cancer, production of kidney tissue and the cartilage tissue for implants. Fluid physics, which can be observed in space, help us understand the processes on Earth, such as how the soil behaves during earthquakes. There is research in microgravity to develop new pharmaceuticals and neurological research, important to patients with multiple sclerosis. The list goes on and on, and I will not go into that here because there are a number of other Senators who have expertise in this area who wish to be heard on the measure.

Let me say that the international space station will be a world-class scientific laboratory, with the unique feature of a near-zero gravity environment. While it is impossible for us to know in advance, all of the results of this scientific research, I think the vast body of scientific expertise believes that microgravity research will lead to new and pure pharmaceuticals, medical advancements, and the production of new materials for use here on Earth.

With the imminent demise of Russia's Mir space station, the international space station will be the only facility where these types of research can be permitted.

The international space station will also provide operational experience necessary for operating lunar outposts on Mars bases if and when the Nation should decide to proceed with such bold plans.

Moreover, Mr. President, the international space station is a hallmark of international cooperation between the United States and other countries. Europe, Japan, and Canada have been involved with the program since its inception, and the addition of Russia in 1993 enhanced the international participation. There is no greater symbol of the end of the cold war than the United States and Russia—arch rivals in space for decades—working together to build a space station for the 21st century.

Despite the challenges the program has had to overcome in the past year—particularly the schedule delays resulting from Russia's failure to complete the service module on time—the space station partnership remains intact.

Russia has faced great financial troubles and uncertainties, and it is impossible to say that all these troubles are in the past. But this spring the Russian Government, though strapped financially, fulfilled its promise to provide 800 billion rubles, and NASA reports that work is progressing on the service module.

American taxpayers have invested significantly—$19 billion—in the space station. We are now within a year of the first launch, which will provide the benefits and the scientific advancements into that research. Certainly, this is no time to give up on an experiment that offers such potential.

The shuttle-Mir program, the first phase of the international space station, is successfully underway. The experiments have led to improvements in the design of the international space station, and we have trained the crews. We are ready for tremendous scientific leaps, and I trust that a significant majority of our colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, will agree that the money we have invested has been a wise investment, not only for science, technology, and the exploration of the universe now, but for the developments in the scientific advances that will come tomorrow for our children and our grandchildren, who are fascinated by the opportunities of space. The exploration of this frontier can deliver tremendous benefits. This is not the time to abort the mission and say that we have gone nineteen-twentieths, or 95 percent, of the way toward the discovery of a new world and we are going to turn back now.

Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will once again overwhelmingly support the continuation of the space station.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this is, once again, a bipartisan agreement that we should continue to fund the space station *Freedom*. This dazzling scientific endeavor was created under the Reagan administration, sustained under the Bush administration, and maintained under the Clinton administration.

Now, why have three Presidents of the United States all supported space station *Freedom*? They have done it for several reasons. One, because it accomplished significant science in space. Second, it is a model for what the new world order will look like in which no one nation dominates space, but each nation is best at what it best can do. The United States of America, Canada, Japan, Europe, and now the Russian involvement does show what the space program of the future will be. It will be multilateral, multinational cooperation for multiple gains.

Mr. President, I would like to speak more on why I support the space station *Freedom*, but I note that on the floor is the Senator from Arizona. It had been our agreement to let him speak before the conference.

I want to say, before we break for the party conferences, that there is no break in bipartisan support for the space station. We are going to ensure that the space station does produce sound science, have maximum international cooperation and, once again, make both our Nation and the world proud of what we do. I will have more to say about the space station and why I am an enthusiastic, unabashed, and unrelenting sponsor of this later on this afternoon.

In the meantime, as a courtesy and collegiality to move our bill, I yield the floor now and look forward to resuming my comments on the space station later this afternoon.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the Senate is making unprecedented progress in considering the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1998. We have completed action on five spending bills, with the expectation that we will finish at least five more prior to the August recess. I must congratulate Chairman STEVENS and Senator INOUYE, as well as the subcommittee managers of the bills, on their efficient management of these measures on the floor. On this bill, I want to congratulate my colleagues from Missouri and Maryland, Senators BOND and MIKULSKI, for the outstanding job they have done on this legislation.

I don't intend to unduly delay the Senate in completing consideration of the pending appropriations measures. But I want to ensure that, in our haste to act on these important spending bills, my colleagues are fully aware of the funding recommendations that are contained in this bill.

I don't enjoy returning to the Senate floor for the sixth time in a little over a week to talk about the wasteful spending in these bills.

Mr. President, this is a very important measure. It provides $40 billion to fund programs for our Nation's veterans, who have served their country and need and deserve our respect and attention. It contains $25 billion for our Nation's housing needs, including low-income housing programs, housing assistance for native Americans, low-cost mortgage assistance, housing for the elderly, and much more. It provides funding for our space program, programs to protect and restore the health of the environment, disaster assistance, and the activities of many other agencies. This bill totals over $90 billion.

Yet, at the same time we are struggling to balance the budget and adequately fund necessary Federal programs, I find it somewhat disheartening that the committee spent so much time and effort to identify and protect Members' special interest items.

Mr. President, I have here a nine-page list of earmarks in this bill and the accompanying report—nine pages of set-asides for specific institutes, centers, projects, and even museums. These projects have not been considered in the normal process of prioritizing among competing requirements. They have simply been earmarked to receive funds because a Member of this body wanted to bring it home.

I ask unanimous consent that at this time this nine-page document of objectionable provisions in the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

OBJECTIONABLE PROVISIONS IN S. 1034, THE FISCAL YEAR 1998 VA–HUD APPROPRIATIONS BILL

BILL LANGUAGE

$10 million of HUD funds earmarked for housing demolition and replacement at Heritage House in Kansas City, Missouri.

Earmark of HUD funds for an economic development test program, including at least one Native American area in Alaska.

$40 million earmarked for the Economic Development Initiative within HUD, ''to finance a variety of efforts, including those identified in the Senate committee report'', namely:

$2.5 million for enlarging Scarborough Library at Shepherd College in West Virginia.

$2 million for brownfield activities in Baltimore, Maryland.

$2 million for economic redevelopment of Ogden, Utah.

$2 million to renovate Albright-Knox Art Gallery in Buffalo, New York.

$400,000 for a regional landfill in Charles Mix County, South Dakota.

$2.5 million for a construction project related to Bushnell Theater in Hartford, Connecticut.

$2.5 million for exhibit and program development at Discovery Place in Charlotte, North Carolina.

$600,000 for the West Maui Community Resource Center in Hawaii.

$1.5 million for renovation of Paramount Theater in Rutland, Vermont.

$1 million for Lake Champlain Science Center in Burlington, Vermont.

$2 million for renovation of Tapley Street Operations Center in Springfield, Massachusetts.

$2 million to develop abandoned industrial sites in Perth Amboy, New Jersey.

$2.5 million for New Mexico Hispanic Cultural Center.

$400,000 for Riverbend Research and Training Park in Post Falls, Idaho.

$2.5 million for University of Missouri for a plant genetics research unit and the Delta Research Telecommunications Resource Center.

$2 million for Cleveland Avenue YMCA in Montgomery, Alabama, to build a cultural arts center.

$1 million for Covenant House in Anchorage, Alaska.

$7.1 million of HUD funds previously earmarked for an industrial park at 18th and Indiana in Kansas City, is instead earmarked for rehabilitation and infrastructure development associated with the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum and the Jazz Museum at 18th & Vine.

$150 million of EPA funds earmarked for construction of high priority water and wastewater facilities in the area of the U.S.-Mexico Border, including $50 million for grants to Texas for improving wastewater treatment for colonias.

$15 million of EPA funds for grants to Alaska to address drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages.

$82 million of EPA funds earmarked for grants to construct wastewater and water treatment facilities and groundwater protection infrastructure as specified in the report, namely:

$7 million for Burlington, Iowa.

$7.15 million for Lake Tahoe, California.

$5 million for Richmond and Lynchburg, Virginia.

$7 million for Ashley Valley, Utah.

$1 million for Ogden, Utah.

$4 million for Jackson County, Mississippi.

$50,000 for Kinloch, Missouri.

$1.2 million for Las Cruces, New Mexico.

$5 million for Virgin Valley Water District, Nevada.

$2 million for Epping, New Hampshire.

$4.3 million for Queen Annes County, Maryland and Pocomoke River, Maryland.

$6 million for Bingham County, Rupert, and Rosell and Homedale, Idaho.

$5 million for Missoula, Montana.

$1.7 million for Essex County, Massachusetts.

$3 million for Milton, Vermont.

$5 million for Fayette and Fallowfield Township, Pennsylvania.

$6.3 million for Pulaski County and Kingdom City, Missouri.

$8 million for Abbeville, McCormick, and Edgefield Counties, South Carolina.

$3.3 million for Jackson, Washington, and Cleburen Counties, Alabama.

REPORT LANGUAGE

Veterans' Administration:

Earmarks and directive language:

$12.4 million add-on for a patient privacy/environmental renovation project in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

$900,000 add-on for the National Veterans Cemetery in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Directs the VA to proceed expeditiously with the expansion of the Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery in St. Louis, Missouri.

Directs the VA to move expeditiously to complete the third floor of the Jackson, Mississippi regional VA office. Sufficient funds are included in this appropriation for the completion of the third floor should the VA be ready to proceed in fiscal year 1998.

Directs VA to give priority consideration to construct a new dietary complex and boilerplant at Southeastern Veterans Center in Spring City, Pennsylvania.

Words of encouragement and support:

Urges or encourages the Veterans' Administration to consider establishing or expanding Community Based Outpatient Clinics in Vermont, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and southern and western Maryland.

Urges additional funding to start up and test the coal-fired incinerator at the Lebanon, Pennsylvania VAMC.

Urges VA to consider procuring a mobile clinic to be operated from the Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania VAMC.

Language supporting a joint VA–DOD effort through the Joslin Diabetes Center in Boston, Massachusetts to apply methods to improve detection capability for those prone to diabetes.

Encourages the VA to continue the VA–DOD Distance Learning Pilot Program to transition clinical nurse specialists to the role of nurse practitioners, which is established at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences at Bethesda, Maryland.

Urges the VA to continue the demonstration project involving the Clarksburg, West Virginia VAMC and the Ruby Memorial Hospital at West Virginia University, with funding up to $2 million.

Urges VA to provide adequate support for seven-site National Center for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Language expressing continuing support for the establishment of a partnership with a private, not-for-profit research and treatment center that could deliver new cancer therapy to veterans; directs the VA to expedite efforts to establish such a partnership, and mentions that Garden State Cancer Center in New Jersey is internationally recognized in this field.

Urges the VA to provide support for a cooperative program with the Diabetes Institute of Norfolk, Virginia to develop protocols for the diagnosis and treatment of diabetic neuropathy.

Language noting the need for expanding the columbarium at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Hawaii, and urges the VA to allocate necessary funds, estimated at $1.5 million for this project.

Urges favorable and expeditious review of the construction applications for State veteran homes in Cameron and Warrensburg, Missouri, which would require $13.2 million and $13.6 million in federal funds.

Requests the VA to thoroughly and expeditiously consider applications for cemetery sites for Springfield and Higginsville, Missouri, which would require almost $4 million in federal funds.

Housing and Urban Development:

Set-asides from Community Development Block Grant funds for a variety of projects and activities in various locations:

$2 million for revitalization of Los Angeles, California.

$1 million for science and mathematics programs at Morgan State University in Baltimore, Maryland.

$2 million for expansions of the Business Development Center at Hofstra University in New York.

$1 million for St. Louis University for community development program in LaClede Town, Missouri.

$1 million for University of Colorado Health Sciences Center.

Environmental Protection Agency:

Earmarks for a myriad of add-ons:

$8 million to establish up to five university-based research centers to address the most pressing unanswered questions involved in the air particulates field.

$2 million for Water Environment Research Foundation cooperative research program.

$3 million for American Water Works Association Research Foundation.

$1.75 million for National Jewish Medical and Research Center for research on the relationship between indoor and outdoor pollution.

$2 million for Lovelace Respiratory Institute to establish a National Environmental Respiratory Center coordinate research on airborne particulates.

$1 million for Center for Air Toxic Metals at Energy and Environmental Research Center.

$1 million for Texas Regional Institute for Environmental Studies.

$1 million for Institute for Environmental and Industrial Science.

$1.5 million for Johns Hopkins University School of Hygiene and Public Health to establish a National Center for Environmental Toxicology and Epidemiology to study the effect of urban toxics on human health.

$1 million to establish the Center for Estuarine and Coastal Ocean Environmental Research at the University of South Alabama.

$1.5 million for Integrated Petroleum Environmental Consortium.

$3 million to continue a demonstration project involving leaking fuel tanks in rural Alaskan villages.

$250,000 for the Nature Conservancy of Alaska for protection of the Kenai River watershed.

$3 million for the Southwest Center for Environmental Research and Policy.

$1 million for the Sacramento River Toxic Pollutant Control Program.

$500,000 for continuing of the small water system cooperative initiative at Montana State University.

$500,000 for a small public water system technology center at Western Kentucky University.

$2 million for the New York City watershed protection program.

$750,000 for the Chespeake Bay program to initiate a small watershed grants program to implement the cooperative tributary basic strategies.

$1 million to continue the sediment decontamination technology project in the New York-New Jersey harbor.

$500,000 for the Treasure Valley, Idaho, hydrologic project.

$2.5 million for King County, Washington, for a molten carbonate fuel cell demonstration project at the Renton wastewater treatment plant.

$800,000 for the National Center for Vehicle Emissions Control and Safety to establish an On-Board Diagnostic Research Center.

$500,000 to continue the Small Business Pollution Prevention Center at University of Northern Iowa.

$500,000 to continue the Compliance Assistance Center for Painting and Coating Technology.

$200,000 to complete cleanup of Five Island Lake.

$500,000 for the Ala Wai Canal watershed improvement project.

$400,000 to continue the Maui algal bloom project.

$100,000 for the Design for the Environment for Farmers Program to address the need to develop and adopt sustainable agricultural practices for the fragile tropical ecosystems of the American Pacific.

$1.5 million for the Lake Champlain management plan.

$600,000 to complete the solar aquatic wastewater treatment demonstration in Burlington, Vermont although the report language goes on to state that ''The Committee does not intend to recommend funding for additional solar aquatic wastewater treatment demonstrations in view of EPA's assessment that this technology does not appear to offer any economic advantages over conventional technologies.''

$1 million for the Alabama Department of Environmental Management to coordinate a model water/wastewater operations training program.

$150,000 to establish a regional training center at the Kentucky Onsite Wastewater Center.

$550,000 for the Idaho water initiative.

$1 million for Lake Weequahic cleanup.

$1.75 million for the Three Rivers watershed protection demonstration project in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

$1.25 million to design an innovative granular activated carbon water treatment project in Oahu.

$500,000 for a small public water system technology center at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

$2 million for a Missouri Watershed initiative at the Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute.

$500,000 for a study of dioxin levels in the Ohio River basin.

$300,000 for the California Urban Environmental Research and Education Center.

$1 million to continue a wetlands-based potable water reuse program for the city of West Palm Beach.

$700,000 for the Long Island Sound office.

$2 million for the University of Missouri Agroforestry Center to support a floodplain initiative.

$300,000 for the Northeast States for coordinated air use management.

Directive language:

Language directing EPA to consider testing ground water remediation technology developed by the International Research Center for Groundwater Research.

Language directing EPA to fund the water quality testing program along the New Jersey and New York shorelines at no less than current levels.

Language directing EPA to conduct a feasibility study for a potential pilot project to demonstrate innovative alternatives to the existing haul-water drinking water and honey bucket human waste disposal systems in the Northwest Arctic Borough.

Language directing EPA to assess whether the Edison Laboratory should be replaced and, if appropriate, to include funding in the FY 1999 budget submission.

Words of encouragement and support:

Language urging EPA to give strong consideration to funding a proposal by the Hawaii Institute of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources to further the commercialization of agriculturally based environmental remediation technologies.

Urges EPA to give priority to soil aquifer treatment research program for indirect potable reuse of highly treated domestic wastewater being conducted in California and Arizona.

Encourages EPA to undertake a demonstration project at North Dakota State University comparing satellite data to field-gathered data on farming practices in the Oakes irrigation test area in southeast North Dakota.

Urges EPA to support the Houston Air Excellence and Leadership program which seeks to identify ways in which air pollution control policy can be targeted toward the most dangerous pollutants.

Directs EPA to strongly consider funding a proposal by Fort Scott, Kansas for additional tertiary wastewater treatment via a constructed wetland which will improve the Marmaton River.

Urges EPA to give careful consideration to the establishment of a Small Public Water Systems Technology Assistance Center at West Virginia State University and the University of New Hampshire.

Urges EPA to look at the sister lake partnership between Lake Champlain Basin and Lake Orchid in the former Soviet Union as a model for its own program.

Language stating that funding within the National Estuary Program should be provided to Sarasota Bay, Buzzards Bay, and Massachusetts Bay.

Urges EPA to provide support to exploring new ways to control zebra mussels in Lake Champlain.

Urges EPA to provide assistance to the city of Gainesville, Florida, for an innovative stormwater management project to protect the Floridian aquifer from stormwater runoff.

Urges EPA to support the Sokaogon Chippewa community's efforts to assess the environmental impacts of a proposed sulfide mine project.

Language stating the Committee would entertain a future budget request by EPA to construct a solid oxide fuel cell/gas turbine power system demonstration plant at EPA's Fort Meade research facility.

Language stating that EPA should provide adequate funds to continue the Dover Township, New Jersey, cancer cluster studies.

Urges EPA to provide $3 million from the border infrastructure fund to El Paso for use in its Rio Grande environmental monitoring program and $2 million for the federal share for construction of the Jonathan Rogers plant.

Federal Emergency Management Agency:

Words of encouragement and support:

Recommends FEMA consider using the State of Maryland's western Maryland flood task force as a model for work in other states in identifying disaster mitigation opportunities, and states that FEMA should work with the State of Maryland to fund mitigation measures identified by the task force.

Urges FEMA to continue efforts, in cooperation with the National Institute of Building Sciences and the University of South Alabama, to establish a universal methodology capable of predicting damages and loss of life caused by natural hazards.

Urges FEMA to support the Pittsford, Vermont, Fire Academy effort to expand training to rail and toxic material accidents, as recommended by the Committee in prior years.

Encourages FEMA to support the Coastal Region Development Center's efforts to develop a new model plan for southeast Georgia and other coastal states for hurricane evacuation mitigation preparedness.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

Earmarks and directive language:

Earmarks an additional $10 million for Origins ATD for additional astronomy test beds that contain significant investment by U.S. institutions; directs that, in selecting the new sites, one site permit search from the southern hemisphere for candidate stars which show clear evidence of planetary systems, and a second site use a large ground-based interferometer that demonstrates new adaptive optics and nulling interferometry technologies essential for the direct detection of Earth-like planets of other stars.

Directs NASA to use $15 million to fund up to five consortia to develop specific regional applications with the use of EOS data; each consortium much include academic institutions and end users as partners and demonstrate a value-added application of EOS data to a regional problem of significant consequence.

$20 million increase earmarked for the bantam flight demonstrator.

$1.5 million earmarked for MSE-Technology Applications, Western Environmental Technology Office.

$2.5 million for a science learning center in Kenai, Alaska.

$500,000 for the Discovery Science Center, Santa Ana, California.

$2 million earmarked for continuing development of a national prototype space education curriculum by the Center for Space Education at the Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii.

$5 million for facilities enhancements at the Stennis Space Center.

Words of encouragement and support:

Commends the efforts to the Stennis Space Center in commercial remote sensing and encourages that these activities continue.

Urges NASA to use a portion of the $10 million earmarked for the next generation internet initiative to develop new internet technologies to improve interconnection to areas such as Alaska and Hawaii; also recommends Montana as an appropriate participant area in the next generation internet initiative.

National Science Foundation:

Earmarks and directive language:

$40 million to support a competitive, merit-based initiative, which may include one or more university-based research center, to enable the development of a U.S.-led public/private research initiative supporting research into plant genomes

$25 million earmarked for an incoherent scatter radar, which the Committee directs be used only to construct the radar collocated with the Department of Defense ionospheric research site (i.e., the HAARP project in Alaska)

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, what concerns me most is the growing practice of earmarking funds for a myriad of projects in the report language but then incorporating that report language by reference in the bill itself. For example, on pages 32 and 33, the bill language states:

Of the amounts made available under this heading, $40 million for the Economic Development Initiative (EDI) to finance a variety of efforts, including those identified in the Senate committee report, that promote economic revitalization that links people to jobs and supportive services.

The report identifies 17 separate projects, in specific amounts and at specific locations, totaling nearly $30 million. The effect of this bill language is to require HUD to spend three-fourths of this economic development money for these particular projects without any assessment of the relative needs of the communities which would benefit from these projects compared with many other American communities. This is a very bad practice, Mr. President. It is one of the worst that I have seen in a long time.

Another section of the bill incorporates a similar list of earmarks into the bill language. On page 62, the bill reads:

. . . $82 million for making grants for the construction of wastewater and water treatment facilities and groundwater protection infrastructure in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in the report accompanying this Act. . . .

It just so happens that the only terms and conditions contained in the report are earmarks for particular projects for the entire $82 million set aside in the bill. Again, this is backdoor earmarking and it's the worst form of pork barrel spending that I have seen in a long time.

As I have said, this bill also contains earmarks for museums, particularly, $7.1 million for the Jazz Museum and the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in Kansas City, MO.

The bill also earmarks $150 million for water and waterwaste facilities along the United States-Mexico border. While this earmark could conceivably benefit my own State of Arizona, I cannot understand why we cannot, instead, provide funding based on need and established criteria, rather than setting aside millions of dollars for certain States or areas of the country.

The report is replete with earmarks. One of the most interesting reads as follows:

$600,000 for the final year of funding for the solar aquatic wastewater treatment demonstration in Burlington, VT, to be cost-shared by the participants.

Get this, Mr. President:

The Committee does not intend to recommend funding for additional solar aquatic wastewater treatment demonstrations in view of EPA's assessment that this technology does not appear to offer any economic advantages over conventional technologies.

So we are going to spend $600,000 more on a project where, in EPA's assessment, the technology doesn't offer any economic advantages over conventional technologies. It seems a little bit ridiculous to me.

Mr. President, I won't go through the nine-page list I mentioned, but there are some fascinating earmarks in here. I will tell you, it's really interesting. Here is $1 million for renovation of the Paramount Theater in Vermont. It urges or encourages the Veterans' Administration to consider establishing or expanding community-based outpatient clinics in Vermont, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and southern and western Maryland. You are going to have to help me out here, Mr. President. Why not in Maine, California, or Texas? Instead, it is encouraging the VA to establish expanding community-based outpatient clinics in Vermont, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, southern and western Maryland. The only thing I can say is in common there is that they are low-growth States. Why would we not want to establish or expand outpatient clinics in high-growth States—Nevada, California, Texas, or Arizona? I don't know. I don't understand.

Mr. President, we don't want to do these things. I think, as I have said on many different occasions, it doesn't help us with the American people, and we waste millions of taxpayer dollars on projects that serve our own narrow interests rather than those of the Nation at large. It makes it harder for us to whittle away at the $5.3 trillion debt.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I know the order was for the Senate to adjourn at 12:30. I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business, in which Senator ASHCROFT be permitted to speak for 5 minutes.

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

The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed as in morning business until the completion of my remarks.

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

THE RIGHTS OF MAN

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, last week, my friend TIM HUTCHINSON, the Senator from Arkansas, took the floor to lend his voice to a growing chorus of disapproval over the state of United States-China relations. I commend him for his actions. While his efforts to pass a sense of the Senate resolution against most favored nation status for China were unsuccessful, his actions were the very essence of what it means to be a leader. He set out to achieve noble aspirations, and then dedicated his energies to achieve those objectives. Leadership is ascertaining noble objectives and working hard, intently and sacrificially. Such efforts push us toward our highest and best. The highest and best to which Senator HUTCHINSON called us is an end to which we must all aspire.

Teddy Roosevelt said it this way:

Far better is it to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure, than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much because they live in the gray twilight that knows neither victory nor defeat.

Twenty-two Members of the Senate had the courage to say that the tainted flow of Western currency into China must end, not because the exchange of goods between sovereign nations is injurious, but because we have in China today a ruthless regime that does not deserve unfettered access to United States markets, a regime whose brutal repression at home betrays its intentions abroad.

America is a place that has cared always for what Thomas Paine called the ''rights of man.'' The United States has always been a country that gave no quarter to tyranny or tyrants. Teddy Roosevelt put it a bit differently, cautioning that America must not become ''an assemblage of well-to-do hucksters who care nothing for what happens beyond.''

But, Mr. President, does not the vote on the Hutchinson amendment suggest that Teddy Roosevelt's worst fears are being realized? For the message being sent from China today is as unmistakable as it is disturbing. Beijing believes that life is cheap and cheaper still when that life opposes the authoritarian rule of the Communist Party.

The State Department, in its most recent human rights report, states that ''all public dissent against the party and government was effectively silenced'' in China. ''No dissidents were known to be active at year's end.'' Beijing has used imprisonment, exile, and summary execution to quiet the voices of those who cry for freedom.

China's 1982 Constitution guarantees the freedom of speech, the press, and religious belief. And yet, the hollowness of that document becomes more apparent with every passing day. Chinese authorities routinely resort to torture, the denial of due process, forced confessions, prison labor, and extrajudicial killings to crush Chinese citizens who stand up for liberty and defy Beijing.

As Nina Shea notes in ''The Lion's Den,'' China has more Christians in prison because of religious activities than any other nation. This morning's New York Times detailed a State Department report due to be issued today—and I have a copy of it here—which is sharply critical of Beijing's efforts to suppress religious worship. The

report, which is entitled, ''U.S. Policy in Support of Religious Freedom,'' says, ''The Government of China has sought to restrict all actual religious practice to government-subsidized religious organizations and registered places of worship.''

The report goes on to detail the story of four underground Roman Catholic bishops who have been imprisoned or detained. They are not alone. Many other Catholic priests, the Times notes, ''have been searched by government agents and their religious articles have been seized.''

Consider the case of Bishop Su. Hung from the ceiling by his wrists, Su was battered time and again about the head until all but unconscious. He was then placed in a cell filled with water where he was left for days unable to sit or to sleep. His high crime? His treason? A fidelity to God and a desire to exercise that devotion.

It is true that the official Catholic Church in China is registered with the Government and claims as many as 4 million members. However, the official church does not recognize the authority of the Pope, so all Vatican-affiliated Catholics are viewed by Beijing as unregistered. Moreover, as the State Department report suggests, ''Communist Party officials state that party membership and religious belief are incompatible,'' placing a serious limitation on believers.

And who, Mr. President, will denounce the mounting persecutions of Christians in China? The administration has not made a sound. Well, I would respectfully remind them that to sin by silence when one should protest makes cowards out of all men.

America must not trade civil liberty for the false idol of foreign commerce. We must be willing not just to sound historic, but we must pursue policies which are historically sound. We must be willing to condemn religious persecution both in China and around the world.

The disturbing trends revealed in the State Department report due today are not without precedent. In June 1996, the Far Eastern Economic Review reported that ''Chinese police had destroyed at least 15,000 unregistered temples, churches and tombs'' in the Zheijang province alone in just 5 months. Those church leaders who dared to resist were tortured, beaten, and killed.

Is it any wonder then that the future of Hong Kong has been the subject of great concern. At the beginning of this month, all eyes were turned toward the British colony as it reverted to Chinese control. I sincerely hope that our eyes will remain focused there, for constant vigilance is the key to exposing and resisting Chinese encroachment on freedom in the former colony.

Although China wants Hong Kong to remain a vibrant financial center and serve as an example for unification with Taiwan, Beijing has not hesitated to undermine Hong Kong's political autonomy in spite of its pledge in the 1984 joint declaration to honor one country, two systems.

China has declared the elected Hong Kong Legislature invalid and has appointed a hand-picked provisional legislative body. China's appointed chief executive of Hong Kong, Tung Cheehwa, promises that new elections will be held in 1998 but has drawn the electoral districts to limit the influence of Martin Lee's Democratic Party.

Mr. Tung has recently unveiled new measures to restrict civil liberties in Hong Kong. Public protests will have to receive prior approval and could be banned to protect so-called ''national security.'' Political organizations will be required to register with the government and prohibited from seeking or receiving funds from overseas sources. Under Tung's definition, international organizations that expose China's human rights abuses will also be banned from receiving foreign funds.

Unfortunately, the administration's Hong Kong policy has been about self-preservation rather than promoting self-government. Political activist Martin Lee got a hero's welcome on Capitol Hill, but the administration met only reluctantly with Lee. Vice President GORE conveniently forgot Hong Kong on his recent trip to China, and much to the dismay of Martin Lee and other Hong Kong Democrats, Consul General Richard Boucher attended the inaugural ceremony of China's hand-picked legislature—the legislature which replaced the freely elected body that Martin Lee had worked so hard to preserve.

Mr. President, the preservation of liberty for the 6.3 million people in Hong Kong is about more than the immediate fate of its residents. The battle for civil liberty in Hong Kong could very well be the battle for civil liberty in China. As George Will has written, China has just swallowed ''a radioactive isotope'' of Western culture in taking over Hong Kong. Hong Kong serves as a shining example of democracy and free market economics, and the effective removal of that model would set back the march of freedom in China.

In a world that is increasingly open and free, there still exist totalitarian governments which cling to political repression and deny their people the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and property. Beijing claims that the Chinese people are more concerned about social cohesion and domestic order than the growth of civil liberty—that Western democracy is a Western phenomenon and not necessarily applicable to China, that it is somehow foreign to Far Eastern culture.

But what does Beijing think about the growth of democracy in Taiwan, Japan, and South Korea? How do China's leaders explain away the deaths of perhaps thousands of students who were willing to risk everything for liberty in Tiananmen Square? How does Beijing respond to heroes like Wei Jingsheng and Harry Wu who continue to fight against oppression in spite of intimidation, imprisonment, and torture? Troublingly, Beijing cannot answer these questions. Tragically, these are questions that the West is often afraid to ask.

Mr. President, I look forward to a U.S. foreign policy that calls the community of nations to their highest and best. America for her part must be willing to stand for freedom as she has since her first days. When the Chinese people eventually rid themselves of Beijing's tyrannical leadership and embrace democracy, just as South Korea, Japan, and Taiwan have done before them, let it be said that America stood with them, stood with them and for them in their cause for freedom.

Despite the troubling revelations of the State Department report and the defeat of the Hutchinson amendment last week, I believe that we must continue to press on. Teddy Roosevelt was right; it is hard to fail but it is worse never to have tried to succeed. The right of man to strive, to seek, to find and not to yield is at the core of what individual liberty and dignity means, and it is at the core of the values we regard highly in America. It is a message of hope and calls this country to its highest and best. It is a message that America must proclaim if the coming century is to be defined by the growth of liberty and not surrendered to those who would stifle freedom.

China has been abusive to its own citizens and signals an ominous cloud over the Far East, a cloud whose poison could spread well beyond its own borders and taint the opportunity for freedom around the world. China's total disregard for religious liberty, China's contempt for the liberty of individuals in the political system, and China's willingness to require the registration of religious groups whose members would worship God freely without subservience to the government, signals to us the need for America to stand up clearly—not as an enemy to the Chinese but as a friend of those people who seek liberty from tyrants.

I believe the Chinese people seek liberty and will respond constructively to freedom just as people around the world have wherever the grace of freedom has been made available to them. The United States can no longer suggest that we might cease to be the city on a hill whose light is a beacon for freedom. We have a responsibility to maintain the commitment to freedom that those who began this Nation had, and I submit that it is time for us to signal our commitment to freedom clearly and unmistakably to those who would enter the community of nations. China seeks and wants to enter that community, and the United States must speak clearly to China about the rights of man we have always defended. I think it is time for the United States to have its voice heard and to be a contributor to the cause of liberty and freedom around the globe.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate now stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:43 p.m. recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, due to a time commitment made by one of the speakers on the military construction bill, I ask unanimous consent at this time to proceed for 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

FRICTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I watched the news last night with a great deal of distress. Our Nation is in a situation that is intolerable with our long and faithful friend to our North. I don't quite understand the crux of the situation but I will become familiar with it and the history that has brought us to this inexcusable and terrible confrontation, that now exists on the west coast of British Columbia.

I have been occupied with the death of my mother and have been somewhat out of the loop of events and the deterioration of the relationship on our west coast. I knew there were circumstances which was causing friction among the fishing fleets of both the United States and Canada. The salmon runs have been of historic proportions in our Alaskan waters but as one works to the south toward the coast of Canada and the lower west coast of the United States, the runs are not as good.

A year ago, when the American-Canadian Inner-Parliamentary Meeting was held on the Alaskan coast while traveling from Prince Rupert, British Columbia, to Skagway, Alaska, there were discussions of the situation but there was no resolution. Both the Members of the Canadian Parliament and the Members of the American Congress were reluctant to dig deeper into the situation. Now we have a full-fledged crisis on our hands and it is separated from this Nation or Canada by an ocean. It is here and it is serious.

Canadian subjects held an American flag ship by barricading it. That is a vessel that sails a regular schedule from Seattle to the coastal ports of Canada and Alaska. It was held along with all passengers, cargo, and United States mail aboard. I am outraged any action of this kind was allowed to exist in this hemisphere. If it were any other place on this planet, this Government and all Americans would have been outraged. No other place would this Nation allow this kind of action to happen.

I was outraged when I saw the American flag burned by one, I assume, barricading the vessel. I, for one in this body, demand the Government of Canada deal with this situation and with those who would have a complete disrespect for the flag of this Nation. It is the single most powerful symbol of the free world. I would hope no citizen in this country would ever do any repulsive act to the national colors of our friends in Canada. We should not nor shall not retaliate in such fashion. We should, however, focus on this situation and get it settled as honorable nations do.

I cannot believe this administration has not taken action earlier to defuse this confrontation. I live in Montana and the relationship between Alberta and Montana has been one of great respect and friendship. Yes, that relationship is strained from time to time. But, that is to be expected among neighbors. But, never has our respect for each other ever been reduced to the actions now being displayed at Port Rupert, British Columbia, as we speak.

I plead with the President to get personally involved with the leaders of Canada and work it out and not let this wound fester and become uncontrollable. Our long and deep friendship with Canada is at stake and it is serious.

I plan to appeal to the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate to look into this and would hope there is resolve within this body to deal with it and find a solution acceptable to Canada and the United States.

I appeal to both the Foreign Relations Committee and the President. Please do not stand idly by while someone burns my flag and barricades my ship. I do not plan to take this lightly and I also appeal strongly to the leaders of Canada to take actions that would defuse the confrontation and deal harshly with those who show no respect for either their own country or the United States of America.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2016) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments; as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

H.R. 2016

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, **[**$721,027,000**]** *$652,046,000,* to remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided,* That of this amount, not to exceed **[**$71,577,000**]** *$77,646,000* shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, **[**$685,306,000**]** *$605,756,000,* to remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided,* That of this amount, not to exceed **[**$46,659,000**]** *$46,489,000* shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, **[**$662,305,000**]** *$662,305,000,* to remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided,* That of this amount, not to exceed **[**$45,880,000**]** *$48,880,000* shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, **[**$613,333,000**]** *$690,889,000,* to remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided,* That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as he may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the

appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed [$34,350,000] *$52,450,000* shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, [$45,098,000] *$234,614,000*, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, [$137,275,000] *$185,115,000*, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, [$77,731,000] *$96,079,000*, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, [$40,561,000] *$21,111,000*, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, [$27,143,000] *$31,830,000*, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized in military construction authorization Acts and section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, [$166,300,000] *$152,600,000*, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, [$202,131,000] *$167,100,000*, to remain available until September 30, 2002; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, [$1,148,937,000] *$1,149,937,000*; in all [$1,351,068,000] *$1,317,037,000*.

FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, [$409,178,000] *$362,619,000*, to remain available until September 30, 2002; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, $976,504,000; in all [$1,385,682,000] *$1,339,123,000*.

FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, [$341,409,000] *$296,633,000*, to remain available until September 30, 2002; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, $830,234,000; in all [$1,171,643,000] *$1,126,867,000*.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, and for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, $4,950,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002; for Operation and Maintenance, $32,724,000; in all $37,674,000.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART II

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101–510), $116,754,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than $105,224,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART III

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101–510), $768,702,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than $398,499,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART IV

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101–510), $1,175,398,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than $353,604,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work, where cost estimates exceed $25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not apply in the case of contracts for environmental restoration at an installation that is being closed or realigned where payments are made from a Base Realignment and Closure Account.

SEC. 102. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction may be used for advances to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, for the construction of access roads as authorized by section 210 of title 23, United States Code, when projects authorized therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to begin construction of new bases inside the continental United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. No part of the funds provided in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 100 per centum of the value as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, except (1) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court, or (2) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or his designee, or (3) where the estimated value is less than $25,000, or (4) as otherwise determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the public interest.

SEC. 106. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used to (1) acquire land, (2) provide for site preparation, or (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available in annual Military Construction Appropriations Acts.

SEC. 107. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for minor construction may be used to transfer or relocate any activity from one base or installation to another, without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 108. No part of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used for the procurement of steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

SEC. 109. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

SEC. 110. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used to initiate a new installation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 111. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts

may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed $500,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan, in any NATO member country, or in countries bordering the Arabian Gulf, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

SEC. 112. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll, or in countries bordering the Arabian Gulf, may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed $1,000,000 to a foreign contractor: *Provided*, That this section shall not be applicable to contract awards for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor exceeds the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a foreign contractor by greater than 20 per centum: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to contract awards for military construction on Kwajalein Atoll for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid is submitted by a Marshallese contractor.

SEC. 113. The Secretary of Defense is to inform the appropriate Committees of Congress, including the Committees on Appropriations, of the plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel thirty days prior to its occurring, if amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed $100,000.

SEC. 114. Not more than 20 per centum of the appropriations in Military Construction Appropriations Acts which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last two months of the fiscal year.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 115. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 116. For military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were appropriated if the funds obligated for such project (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects, and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 118. During the five-year period after appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period of availability of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into the appropriation ''Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense'' to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 119. The Secretary of Defense is to provide the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives with an annual report by February 15, containing details of the specific actions proposed to be taken by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year to encourage other member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Japan, Korea, and United States allies bordering the Arabian Gulf to assume a greater share of the common defense burden of such nations and the United States.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 120. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, proceeds deposited to the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100–526) pursuant to section 207(a)(2)(C) of such Act, may be transferred to the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991, to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and the same time period as that account.

[SEC. 121. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

[SEC. 122. (a) In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

[(b) In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

[(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

[SEC. 123. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, amounts may be transferred from the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991, to the fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3374) to pay for expenses associated with the Homeowners Assistance Program. Any amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the fund to which transferred.]

SEC. 124. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, appropriations made available to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund shall be the sole source of funds available for planning, administrative, and oversight costs incurred by the Department of Defense relating to military family housing initiatives and military unaccompanied housing initiatives undertaken pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 169, title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing, military unaccompanied housing, and supporting facilities.

SEC. 125. (a) In addition to any reductions required by this Act, the following funds are hereby reduced from the following accounts in this Act in the specified amounts—

''Military Construction, Army'', $2,000,000;

''Military Construction, Navy'', $3,000,000;

''Military Construction, Air Force'', $4,000,000;

''Military Construction, Defense-wide'', $5,000,000;

''NATO Security Investment Program'', $1,000,000;

''Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part III'', $8,000,000;

''Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part IV'', $8,000,000.

(b) The reductions taken pursuant to subsection (a) shall be applied on a pro-rata basis by project and activity.

SEC. 126. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, from the funds appropriated in this Act for Military Construction, Army, the Secretary of the Army is directed to complete, using an Unspecified Minor Construction project, the Special Forces (Diver) Training Facility at Key West Naval Air Station, Florida, as authorized in the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189).

SEC. 127. (a) LEASE OF PROPERTY AUTHORIZED.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy (hereinafter referred to as the ''Secretary'') may lease, without monetary consideration, to the city and county of Honolulu (hereinafter referred to as the ''city'') a parcel of land consisting of approximately 300 acres on Waipio Peninsula, Honolulu, Hawaii (hereinafter referred to as the ''parcel'').

(b) RELATED EASEMENT.—The Secretary may also grant, without monetary consideration, an easement on, over, under and across that certain real property known as Waipio Point Access Road for access to and operation of the parcel.

(c) TERM.—The term of the lease and easement authorized under this section shall be fifty (50) years.

(d) CONDITION OF USE.—The lease and easement authorized under subsections (a) and (b) shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) The city shall use the parcel for development and operation of a public soccer park and related recreational facilities, and for other civic and public purposes as may be approved by the Secretary.

(2) Facilities developed on the parcel shall be for public use and benefit; however, usage fees may be charged to defray facility operating and maintenance costs.

(3) The city shall comply with all explosive safety criteria affecting the city's use of the lease and easement areas, as established by the Secretary in connection with the explosive safety areas supporting the ordinance handling wharves located at West Loch Branch, Naval Magazine, Lualualei, Hawaii.

(4) The city shall, at its own cost and to the satisfaction of the Secretary, make any and all improvements to Waipio Point Access Road which the city determines are necessary to provide onstreet parking along said road, and adequate access to the parcel, including, but not limited to, any necessary appurtenant utility and drainage improvements. During the term of said easement, the cost of maintenance, repair and replacement of said road and improvements shall be borne by the city.

(5) The city shall install a non-potable irrigation water delivery system to service the parcel, and in doing so, the city shall size transmission lines capable of delivering approximately 2.5 million additional gallons of irrigation water per day to agricultural lands on Waipio Peninsula under the control of the Secretary.

(e) TERMINATION.—If the Secretary determines at any time that the parcel is not being used for a purpose specified in subsection (d)(1), the lease and easement authorized under subsections (a) and (b) may be terminated, and all

right, title, and interest in and to such real property, including any improvements thereon, shall revert to the United States, and the United States shall have the right of immediate entry thereon.

(f) EFFECT OF EXPIRATION OF LEASE.—Unless otherwise specifically provided for in this section, at the end of the lease and easement term, the city shall either convey, without reimbursement, to the United States, all right, title, and interest of the city in and to the improvements subject to said lease and easement, or restore, to the extent practicable, the lease and easement areas to the satisfaction of the Secretary.

(g) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property subject to this section shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of such survey shall be borne by the city.

(h) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the lease and easement to be granted under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 128. (a) Not later than 60 days before issuing any solicitation for a contract with the private sector for military family housing or military unaccompanied housing, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall submit to the congressional defense committees the notice described in subsection (b).

(b)(1) A notice referred to in subsection (a) is a notice of any guarantee (including the making of mortgage or rental payments) proposed to be made by the Secretary to the private party under the contract involved in the event of—

(A) the closure or realignment of the installation for which housing is provided under the contract;

(B) a reduction in force of units stationed at such installation; or

(C) the extended deployment overseas of units stationed at such installation.

(2) Each notice under this subsection shall specify the nature of the guarantee involved and assess the extent and likelihood, if any, of the liability of the Federal Government with respect to the guarantee.

(c) In this section, the term ''congressional defense committees'' means the following:

(1) The Committee on Armed Services and the Defense Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on National Security and The National Security Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

This Act may be cited as the ''Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, each manager will have control of 10 minutes for debate time followed by a rollcall vote.

The Senator from Montana.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kelly Hartline, an Appropriations Committee staff member, be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of this bill.

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

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring before the Senate the military construction appropriation bill and report for fiscal year 1998. This bill reflects the bipartisan approach that the ranking member, Senator MURRAY of Washington, and I have tried to maintain regarding military construction and this subcommittee. It has been a pleasure to work with Senator MURRAY, her staff, and the members of the subcommittee throughout this process. I very much appreciate all of their support.

Mr. President, this bill was reported out of the full Appropriations Committee last Thursday by a unanimous vote of 28 to 0. The bill recommended by the full Committee on Appropriations is for $9,182,900,000. This is $799 million over the budget request and almost equal to the corresponding House bill. The bill provides $610 million less than what was appropriated last year—a reduction of 6 percent in overall spending authority for the committee from fiscal year 1997. Further, the bill reflects a reduction of 21 percent since fiscal year 1996—almost $2 billion less from just 2 years ago.

We have sought to recommend a balanced bill to the Senate, and we believe it addresses key, military construction requirements for readiness, family housing, barracks, quality of life and the Guard and Reserve components. This bill honors the commitment we have to our Armed Forces. It helps ensure that the housing and infrastructure needs of the military are given proper recognition. Also, I am pleased to report to the Senate that the bill is within the committee's 602(b) budget allocation for both budget authority and outlays.

Mr. President, this bill has some points I want to mention. We added $152 million to provide better and more modern family housing for our service personnel and their families. On another quality of life measure, we have added substantially to the budget request for medical and hospital facilities, increasing the request by almost 50 percent. We have provided $660 million for barracks construction to provide single service members a more favorable living environment. The committee also fully funds the budget request of $104 million for funding 24 class I violation environmental projects.

We also addressed the shortfalls that continue to plaque our Reserve components. The Department continues to walk away from the total force concept. Recognizing this, we have again lent support by adding $395 million to the Guard and Reserve accounts. In each case, the funds will help satisfy essential mission, quality of life or readiness requirements.

Mr. President, 22 percent of the bill, or $2.1 billion, is for downsizing defense infrastructure, or better known as the Base Realignment and Closure Program. This includes funding for the last three rounds of BRAC. Almost a quarter of all military construction dollars goes toward the base closure and realignment process.

All of the projects that we have recommended are included in either the Senate- or House-passed versions of the defense authorization bills. We will work very closely with the Armed Services Committee, as we put together a conference package for military construction.

We have tried to accommodate the sizable administration request for overseas projects in such places as Korea, Germany, and the Middle East. Mr. President, 24 percent of the administration's budget request for military construction projects is for overseas areas. This seems out of proportion when only about 16 percent of our total force is actually stationed overseas. We have funded only the essential of those projects.

We are also concerned about the recent decision made at Madrid to expand NATO and the additional costs required to implement that decision. With future defense spending constrained, this expansion has the potential to degrade the U.S. military construction and defense program seriously. I have requested a detailed report that lays out the additional funding requirements associated with the expansion, including logistical, communications, construction and other needs anticipated for the NATO infrastructure account. This will help us understand the potential costs to the U.S. taxpayer of NATO expansion.

There are many other issues that I could speak about at this time. I urge the Members of the Senate to support this bill and move it forward expeditiously.

I would say, also, we are finding in the BRAC, or base closures, that we are spending dollars that were unexpected just in environmental cleanup. The environmental cost of cleanup of these bases so they could be moved into either contract hands or private hands has been very, very high.

So I appreciate my ranking member, the work she has done, and now I yield to my ranking member, Senator MURRAY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am pleased to recommend this bill to the Senate. The recommended amount, $9.18 billion, is within the 602(b) allocation for the Military Construction Subcommittee and is frugal, some $600 million, or 6 percent below last year's appropriated level.

Nevertheless, we have added nearly $800 million to the amount requested by the administration, primarily to correct serious shortfalls in the budget request for National Guard and Reserve forces, and for quality-of-life initiatives in housing and medical care for U.S. military personnel.

In order to keep our Guard and Reserve forces healthy, we have again, as in the past, had to add substantial sums, some $392 million, to an inadequate request.

As for housing, we have added approximately $152 million for family housing, and despite this increase, we are still about $301 million below last year's level. The added funds, however, are in the new area of housing initiatives known as privatization, whereby

the money acts as seed capital which is multiplied over some three or four times with infusions of private developer funds, so the funds we have added carry an added punch.

On another quality-of-life measure, we have added substantially to the request for medical and hospital facilities, increasing the request by nearly 50 percent, for a total of $208 million.

These initiatives have been put together in a truly bipartisan fashion, in close cooperation with the distinguished chairman, Senator BURNS and his staff. It is a good product, worthy of strong Senate support. I appreciate the courtesies that have been extended to me by the chairman and his staff, and believe this close working relationship has created a product which is balanced and fair to all Senators.

We appropriated money for nearly all the projects authorized by the Senate Armed Services Committee, and have attempted to evaluate and satisfy the requests of all members fairly, and fund worthy projects, through design or minor construction if they have not been authorized. We have made every effort to include report language that members have suggested to us.

We fully funded the BRAC request, some 22 percent of the bill, fully funded environmental projects, and we have tried to accommodate the sizable construction request for overseas projects, such as barracks in Europe and Korea. Overseas construction constitutes 24 percent of the overall construction request.

The committee is concerned over the amounts that will be needed for additional costs of NATO expansion, based on the decisions at the Madrid summit, and for the funds requested for Southwest Asia propositioning of equipment in the nation of Qatar. We have asked for a report on NATO expansion costs by mid-October, hopefully in time for the Senate debate on this matter.

We have also asked the administration to execute a burdensharing agreement with the Government of Qatar, whose population of 550,000 people enjoy a $21,000 per capita income and has, in fact, offered to help defray our expenses in our prepositioning program.

This legislation is extremely important to our military personnel for many reasons. One of the most important for me is the messages we are able to send our active duty personnel serving abroad separated from family. We are providing for families—housing, day care, community support facilities—providing for families so our active duty personnel can focus on the task at hand when serving a tour on the U.S.S. *Lincoln* or patrolling near the DMZ in Korea.

I am particularly pleased the committee was able to fund several authorized projects in Washington State. At Fairchild Air Force Base, we were able to meet the base's priority need for alterations to the fire station and provide moneys for an education center and a library. The committee was able to provide moneys for barracks replacement and a medical/dental clinic at Fort Lewis, and important C–17 facilities at McChord Air Force Base. I do appreciate the committee's willingness to be responsive to the needs of Washington State.

I, again, thank the chairman for his help in making this a truly bipartisan bill, and I commend staff on both sides of the aisle for their outstanding professional work on this legislation. I join Chairman BURNS in recommending that the Senate adopt this legislation with strong bipartisan support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BURNS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 946

(Purpose: To clarify the availability of funds for activities under the lease of building No. 1, Lexington, Blue Grass Station, Lexington, KY)

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senators FORD and MCCONNELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], for Mr. FORD, for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL, proposes an amendment numbered 946.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Section 303(e) of the 1997 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery from Natural Disasters, and for Overseas Peacekeeping Efforts, Including Those in Bosnia (Public Law 105–18; 111 Stat. 168) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—The Secretary may use funds available in the Defense Working Capital Fund for the payment of the costs of utilities, maintenance and repair, and improvements entered into under the lease under this section.''.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, this amendment will clarify the availability of what specific funding sources are available for activities under the lease of facilities at Lexington, Blue Grass Station, KY. I believe this amendment has been cleared.

Mrs. MURRAY. Yes, it has.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I do not believe I have seen the amendment. I ask that action on it be suspended until such time as I, or my staff, have had a chance to examine the amendment.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ron Moranville, a fellow on my staff, be granted the privilege of the floor during the remainder of debate on H.R. 2016.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for 3 straight years now, the Clinton administration has inadequately funded the national security interests of this Nation. In response, Congress added slightly more than $20 billion to the defense budget for fiscal years 1996 to 1998, arguing that future readiness would be put at risk if we did not increase funding for military modernization.

We did add significant funds to the procurement and R&D accounts to ensure that our forces would maintain their current technological edge over potential adversaries well into the future. At the same time, however, we managed to set aside more than 10 percent of the total defense budget add-on over these 3 years, about $2.3 billion for unrequested low-priority military construction projects.

This year, we added only $2.6 billion to the defense budget, much less than in each of the previous years, but then the Appropriations Committee earmarked $800 million of that increase for military construction add-ons. Almost one-third of the total defense budget increase this year is unrequested and unnecessary.

This military construction bill before the Senate today contains funding for unrequested low-priority projects totaling more than $799 million. These projects were added because Members of this body asked for them. The services did not ask for them. The Department of Defense did not ask for them. But Members wanted funding for these projects in their States, and the Appropriations Committee gave it to them.

I note that the bill sets aside almost $400 million of the overall increase for construction projects for the National Guard and Reserves. The bill includes over $111 million for the construction of 13 readiness and Reserve centers for the Guard and Reserve, at a time when Guard and Reserve end strength is being cut by over 54,000 personnel.

I wonder what decisionmaking process was used to determine that the priorities of the Guard and Reserve for military construction so greatly outweigh the priorities of the active duty military. This bill gives the Army National Guard a 500-percent increase in project funding, or $189.5 million in unrequested projects. This decision was made by the committee despite the fact that the Army and the Army Guard agreed that the Guard's military construction requirements needed about $50 million. I wonder what criteria were used to determine that $50 million was not enough for the Guard and Reserve and how the add-on of $189.5 million was determined.

I understand that last year the Appropriations Committee directed the Army to budget $75 million from Army Guard military construction in fiscal

year 1998. I also understand that the Army failed to follow the committee's direction and request only $45 million for the Army Guard military construction budget. Does this then justify a 500-percent increase in Army Guard construction funding?

In addition to the excessive amount of add-ons in this bill, the report contains earmarks for the following projects: $1.4 million to provide refrigeration equipment and improvements at the Fort Wainwright, AK, skating facility; $300,000 for the design of a centralized vehicle wash facility at Fort Wainwright, AK; $2 million for the design of the Saddle Road improvement in Hawaii; $550,000 for a library and adult education center at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, NC; $3.1 million for planning and design of an intelligence center in Charlottesville, VA; $470,000 for design of a warfighting center at the Stennis Space Center in Mississippi.

I find it startling that Members are no longer content with earmarking actual construction projects. We now have begun the unfortunate process of earmarking portions of the planning and design money which has traditionally been provided in a lump sum to be used at the discretion and prioritization of the services.

Where will this earmarking stop? I note, without further comment, the five States receiving the largest share of these construction add-ons: Mississippi, $58.4 million; Virginia, $48.1 million; Alabama, $37 million; Kentucky, $33.1 million; and New Mexico, $32.3 million. This bill even includes an add-on for Arizona.

Finally, I point out that this bill, like many others that have come before the Senate in the past week, contains restrictive Buy America provisions which limit awards of contracts to U.S. companies only. These two sections, 111 and 112, of the bill are anticompetitive and will ensure that U.S. taxpayers do not get the best price, in many instances, because foreign firms will not be able to compete with U.S. companies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate add-ons in the military construction bill list be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE ADD-ONS TO THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998

State and installation	Project title	Budget request	In millions	
			Change	Appropriated
Alabama:				
Redstone Arsenal	Missile ENG Annex	0	$27.0	$27.0
Dannelly Field	Munitions Complex	0	4.8	4.8
Maxwell AFB	Aircfaft Maint Facility	0	5.2	5.2
Alaska:				
Elmendorf AFB	Electrical System Upgrade	0	6.1	6.1
Eielson AFB	Potable Water Storage	0	6.0	6.0
Bethel [1 2]	OPS Facility	0	4.6	4.6
Arizona: Papago Military Res [1]	Support Maint Shop	0	11.0	11.0
Arkansas: Little Rock	Control Tower	0	3.4	3.4
California: Pasadena [1]	Marine Corps Reserve Center	0	6.7	6.7
Colorado:				
Fort Carson	Mates Expansion	0	2.9	2.9
Greeley	Mobile Ground Maint Complex	0	4.7	4.7
Connecticut:				
New London	Child Development Center	0	3.7	3.7
New London	Fire Protection System	0	1.6	1.6
Delaware: New Castle Airport [1]	Squadron OPS Facility	0	7.0	7.0
Florida:				
Eglin AFB Aux Field	Assault Strip Runway	0	5.1	5.1
Ellyson Field [1]	Readines Center	0	3.8	3.8
Eglin AFB Aux Field [1]	Renovate Visiting Quarters	0	7.3	7.3
Georgia: Moody AFB	HH60 Rescue OPS Facility	0	6.8	6.8
Hawaii:				
Fort Derussey	Asian Pacific Center	0	9.5	9.5
Pearl Harbor	Seal Delivey System Facility	0	7.4	7.4
Hickman AFB [1]	Maint Complex	0	4.5	4.5
Bellows AFB [1 2]	Training Facility	0	5.2	5.2
Idaho:				
Mt Home AFB	B–1B Avionics Building	0	9.2	9.2
Mt Home AFB	F–15 Squadron OPS Facility	0	3.8	3.8
Gowen Field [1]	Aviation Readiness Center	0	3.7	3.7
Boise Airport [1]	C–130 Squadron OPS	0	8.8	8.8
Indiana:				
Hulman Reg Airport [1]	Fire Station	0	5.4	5.4
Fort Wayne IAP [1]	Medical Trng Facility	0	5.9	5.9
Kansas:				
McConnell AFB	KC–135 Squadron OPS	0	9.7	9.7
McConnell AFB	Transportation Complex	0	2.9	2.9
McConnell AFB [1]	Maint Shop	0	2.0	2.0
Kentucky:				
Fort Knox	Training Range	0	7.2	7.2
Greenville [1]	Training Range	0	9.3	9.3
Fort Campbell [2]	Equipment Shop	0	9.9	9.9
Fort Campbell	Education Center	0	6.7	6.7
Louisiana: Camp Beauregard [1]	Machine Gun Range	0	1.3	1.3
Maine: Bangor IAP [1]	Upgrade Base Facilities	0	6.5	6.5
Maryland: Annapolis [1]	Readiness Center	0	2.9	2.9
Massachusetts: Barnes ANGB [1]	Dining Hall/Fitness Center	0	3.0	3.0
Michigan:				
Augusta [1]	Readiness Center	0	6.4	6.4
Selfridge AGB [1]	Vehicle Maint/Comm Complex	0	9.0	9.0
Walker [1]	Readiness Center	0	9.4	9.4
Mississippi:				
Gulfport NCBC Base	Bachelor Enlisted Qrts	0	22.4	22.4
Miss Army Ammun Plt	OPS and Maint Facility	0	9.9	9.9
Senatobia [1]	Readiness Center	0	4.4	4.4
Key Field [1]	KC–135 SIM Training Center	0	2.0	2.0
Key Field [1]	Dining Hall	0	3.2	3.2
Nas Meridian	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	0	7.0	7.0
Gulfport-Biloxi [1]	Training Quarters	0	9.5	9.5
Missouri: Macon [1]	Armory	0	3.2	3.2
Montana:				
Malstrom AFB	Dining Facility	0	4.5	4.5
Billings [1]	Reserve Center	0	14.6	14.6
Nevada:				
Nellis AFB	Land Acquisition	0	5.9	5.9
Reno/Tahoe IAP [1]	C–130 Training Facility	0	2.9	2.9
Nebraska: Offutt AFB	Dormitories	0	6.9	6.9
New Mexico:				
Kirtland AFB	Simulation Training Facility	0	14.0	14.0
Kirtland AFB	Bridge	0	6.3	6.3
Cannon AFB	F–16 Missile Maint Shop	0	2.9	2.9
Taos [1]	Readiness Center	0	3.2	3.2
Kirtland AFB [1]	Squadron OPS Facility	0	2.8	2.8
Kirtland AFB [1]	Composite Support Facility	0	3.1	3.1

SENATE ADD-ONS TO THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998—Continued

State and installation	Project title	Budget request	In millions	
			Change	Appropriated
New York:				
Grabeski Airport [1]	Vehicle Maint Complex	0	4.3	4.3
Niagara Falls IAP [1]	Training Facility	0	2.1	2.1
North Carolina:				
Fort Bragg	Mout Training Complex	0	7.7	7.7
Fort Bragg	Medical Training Barracks	0	8.3	8.3
North Dakota: Minot AFB	Fire/Crash Rescue Station	0	5.2	5.2
Ohio:				
Wright-Patterson	Management Complex	0	22.0	22.0
Rickenbacker ANGB [1]	Fuel/Corrosion Control Facility	0	5.7	5.7
Springfield-Beckley Map [1]	Base Supply Complex	0	4.4	4.4
Oklahoma:				
Altus AFB	Land Purchase	0	11.0	11.0
Vance AFB	Base Engineering Complex	0	7.7	7.7
Will Rogers Airpot [1]	Aeromedical Training Facility	0	3.1	3.1
Fort Sill	Barracks Renewal	0	8.0	8.0
Oregon: Salem [1]	Reserve Center	0	11.8	11.8
Pennsylvania: Oakdale [1]	Reserve Center	0	24.9	24.9
South Carolina:				
Leesburg Training Site [1]	Simultation Center	0	3.8	3.8
McEntire AGS [1]	Fuel/Corrosion Control Facility	0	7.0	7.0
South Dakota:				
Ellsworth AFB	Fire/Crash Rescue Station	0	6.6	6.6
Rapid City [1]	Aviation Support Facility	0	5.2	5.2
Texas:				
Dyess AFB	B–1B Squadron OPS	0	10.0	10.0
Rapid City [1]	Aviation Support Facility	0	12.8	12.8
Utah: Fort Douglas [1]	USARC & OMS	0	12.7	12.7
Vermont: Camp Johnson [1]	Maint Shop	0	6.7	6.7
Virginia:				
Norfolk NS	Berthing Pier	0	13.5	13.5
Portsmouth Hospital	Hospital Replacement	0	34.6	34.6
Washington:				
Fairchild AFB	Fire Station	0	4.8	4.8
Fairchild AFB	Education Center	0	8.2	8.2
Fairchild AFB	Training Academy	0	3.7	3.7
Fort Lewis	Medical Clinic	0	5.0	5.0
West Virginia: Camp Dawson [1]	Readiness Center	0	6.8	6.8
Wisconsin: Mitchel ARS [1]	Aerial Training Facility	0	4.2	4.2
Wyoming: Camp Guernsey [1]	Vehicle Maint Shop	0	13.9	13.9
42 Unrequested Active Duty Milcon Add-Ons Totaling			382.9	
50 Unrequested Reserve/Guard Milcon Add-Ons Totaling			299.5	
92 Unrequested U.S. Based Milcon Add-Ons Totaling			681.7	

[1] Denotes Reserve/National Guard Construction Projects.
[2] Denotes Projects No Included on Senate or House Authorization Bills.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 FAMILY HOUSING ADD-ONS

State and installation	Project title	Budget request	Change	Authorization
Alaska.				
Fort Richardson	Neighborhood Revitalization	0	$9.6	$9.6
Fort Wainwright	Neighborhood Revitalization	0	8.3	8.3
Georgia.				
Robins AFB	Family Housing	0	5.2	5.2
Hawaii.				
Pearl Harbor	Family Housing	0	17.9	17.9
Kentucky.				
Fort Campbell	Family Housing Improvements	0	8.5	8.5
Montana.				
Malmstrom AFB	Military Housing	0	16.6	16.6
North Carolina.				
Camp Lejeune	Renovate Family Housing	0	2.9	2.9
South Carolina.				
Charleston AFB	Improve Family Housing	0	14.3	14.3
Texas:				
NAS Corpus Christi	Replace Family Housing	0	6.5	6.5
Lackland AFB	Replace Family Housing	0	7.4	7.4
Washington:				
NAS Whidbey Island	Replace Family Housing	0	32.3	32.3
Bangor	Replace Family Housing	0	15.7	15.7
Total family housing add-ons		0	145.2	145.2

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, in closing, let me say I am sure there are many good projects on this list. Many projects will serve to improve the quality of life of our military personnel and will provide facilities improvements that will enhance mission readiness, but the real reason these projects are funded in this bill is that they provide economic benefit to certain States. Even with the congressionally mandated increases in the defense budget, military training exercises continue to be cut, backlogs in aircraft and ship maintenance are growing, flying-hours shortfalls still exists, military health care is underfunded by $600 million and 11,787 service members are reportedly on food stamps and many more are eligible for food stamps, Mr. President. We simply have higher priorities for defense spending and pork-barrel construction projects.

There are many stories that are illustrative of our need for spending on priority items, and this kind of earmarking is really harming the men and women in the military. Over the weekend, there was a story in the Washington Post about enlisted sailors who are stationed in San Diego who now live in Mexico. They have to drive to Mexico because there is not affordable housing or base housing for them in San Diego, yet, we will fund these projects that are on this list. At the same time, there are 11,787 service members who are on food stamps and thousands more eligible, and we will instead fund these kinds of projects.

Mr. President, it is not an admirable practice that we are seeing continued and even increase over the years. I intend very strongly to urge the President of the United States to exercise the line-item veto on some of these projects because there is no more compelling reason for the line-item veto than some of the projects that I have talked about today. I will be engaged in urging him to do so.

I yield the floor, but before I yield the floor, I would like to take a look at the amendment and any other amendments that will be proposed at this time on the bill. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, in response to Senator MCCAIN, there are over 891,000 men and women in uniform who serve in one of the six Reserve organizations. They represent 38 percent of the total force.

For these Reserve forces, the President's budget request contained a total of $173 million—less than 2 percent of the total military construction bill allocated to the Reserve components.

More specifically, the National Guard military construction program supports over 474,673 soldiers and airmen in communities throughout the Nation. They constitute approximately 20 percent of our total Armed Forces and represent all 50 States and 4 territories.

The units and the missions of the Reserve components have changed significantly in the last 30 to 40 years. The mission and the equipment is much more complex and requires larger working bays and parking areas. The increased lethality and range of modern weapons restrict indirect firing ranges and training areas and creates new requirements necessary to ensure safety.

The Army Guard alone has more than 23,360 facilities, with a current plant replacement value of $17.3 billion. Over 50 percent of these facilities are inadequate by current Army criteria. There is a construction backlog of $2.3 billion, which as a direct impact on modernization and readiness.

The Pentagon requested only $45 million for the Army National Guard for military construction in the fiscal year 1998 budget. There are 367,000 soldiers in the Army National Guard—$45 million does not go very far in meeting their mission and quality of life requirements.

If the Congress did not act to provide additional military construction funding to the Reserve components each year, these forces would be severely handicapped as far as their ability to achieve full operational capability and their objective readiness level. Just because a project is for the Guard or Reserve does not mean it is not meritorious, it signifies that the Pentagon has decided to let the Congress foot the bill for building and maintaining the Reserve components' infrastructure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous agreement, the Senator from Arizona has 2 minutes, 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has yielded back his time.

Mr. BURNS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 946

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, the amendment that is now under consideration has been cleared on the Democratic side, and I ask that it be accepted at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 946.

The amendment (No. 946) was agreed to.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask for third reading of the bill. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been requested on final passage.

Mr. BURNS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. D'AMATO. I wonder if the Chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee, Senator BURNS, would yield for a question.

Mr. BURNS. Certainly.

Mr. D'AMATO. I appreciate all that the chairman has done to accommodate the specific needs of military installations in New York. As you know, New York has been devastated by its losses from the last two BRAC rounds. However, the one positive effect of this paring down is that the remaining bases in New York are among the most efficient and effective in the world. That is why these military construction dollars are so important to New York State.

One military base of particular concern to both Senator MOYNIHAN and myself is Fort Drum in Watertown, NY. Fort Drum is home to the 10th Mountain Division. The mission of the 10th Mountain Division is to deploy rapidly anywhere in the world and be prepared to fight and win upon arrival.

The 10th Mountain Division stands ready to depart Fort Drum and conduct operations anywhere in the world with minimal notice. The cornerstone to Fort Drum's preparedness is its high state of mission readiness. This readiness is sustained through intensive training and the most up-to-date, modern facilities.

America continually asks our soldiers around the world to respond and they are always there for us. The 10th Mountain Division is the most frequently deployed division in the Army. It is only fair that Congress appropriate the necessary dollars to ensure that our troops remain the best in the world.

Fort Drum has requested two very important projects that would greatly enhance readiness on the base and contribute to the 10th Mountain Division's extremely high response time. The first is an aerial gunnery range, funded at $17.5 million in the House. The proposed range will be an adequately sized and properly configured aerial gunnery range for Army rotary wing and Air National Guard fixed wing joint mission requirements. The facility and range area will enable the Air National Guard and Fort Drum range division to employ operations under the joint air attack team concept [JAAT] as well as consolidate existing operations to the northeast side of Fort Drum property for safe operations. Currently, rotary wing and fixed wing operations are conducted on separate sites across the Fort Drum installation.

The second project is a military training and education center, funded at $6.9 million, to replace a number of widely scattered temporary 50-year old, inefficient and marginal World War II wood facilities.

The center would make a valuable contribution to improving quality of life for soldiers, dependents and civilians at Fort Drum. Without the center, the condition of aging facilities will become less able to support the function and eventually continuing education opportunities for the population of Fort Drum will be negatively impacted. Last year, the Senate included this project in its version of the fiscal year 1997 defense authorization bill.

I would hope that the House—Senate Conference Committee would include both of these important projects in the final conference report for fiscal year 1998.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, my friend and colleague, Senator D'AMATO, has clearly set out the reasons why Fort Drum needs these two projects. They are essential to the training and readiness we and the Army have come to expect from the 10th Mountain Division. It seems whenever there has been a deployment in recent years, the 10th has been part of it. I simply add my support and my hope that the gunnery range and the training and education center will be included when the Senator from Montana and his conferees reach an agreement on military construction projects.

Mr. BURNS. I can assure both Senators from New York that both projects will be given every due consideration when the conferees meet.

PROTECTING THE FUTURE OF PICATINNY ARSENAL

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the Fiscal Year 1998 military construction appropriations bill, and would like to take this opportunity to thank Chairman BURNS and Ranking Member MURRAY for all of their leadership and hard work on this legislation. I am especially pleased by two items which were included in this bill. First, the $1.3 million which will be spent on the design of a new software engineering center at Picatinny Arsenal in my home State of New Jersey, and second, language in the bill which urges the Army to place the construction of the center on its priority list for fiscal year 1999. I am hopeful that the Army will heed the advice of the Senate, and make this project a priority for next year.

Throughout our Nation's history, Picatinny Arsenal has provided our men and women with the high-technology weapons that have helped

achieve our military victories. Most recently, during Desert Storm our forces unleashed millions of M–77 submunitions on the Iraqi Army with devastating results. This grenade-like weapon uses a precision guidance system and a mini-computer to locate its target as it descends on a parachute-like device, before it attacks and destroys it. The Iraqis were so terrified of this weapons, that they dubbed it Steel Rain. I am proud to say that this weapon was developed by some of this Nation's finest scientists and engineers at Picatinny Arsenal.

As some of my colleagues may know, Picatinny Arsenal is home to the Army Armament Research, Development and Engineering Center [ARDEC]. Virtually every piece of weaponry and ammunition in the hands of our soldiers is developed at Picatinny. In fact, Picatinny is responsible for 90 percent of the Army's lethality.

Currently, the Fire Support Armaments Center [FSAC], which conducts the research, development, and engineering for weapons systems such as artillery, mortars, and the technology behind the fire control for the entire U.S. Army, has its functions dispersed at several facilities throughout the base. While our Armed Forces in general, and the Army in particular, have been subject to drastic downsizing in the post-cold-war era, the Fire Support Armaments Center workload has increased as our modern army relies increasingly on ''smart'' weapon technology. However, while the Center is responsible for a critical area of expertise in our national security plan, its economic and productive effectiveness is severely limited because its operations are dispersed throughout the base. This, combined with the limited space available, makes work on the larger vehicles like tanks and armored personnel carriers impossible in all but the best of weather conditions and makes coordination on the many different components of any given project nearly impossible.

To remedy this, a new software engineering center has been proposed which would consolidate many of the Arsenal's operations, thus allowing work on these vehicles to proceed year round and enhancing Picatinny's capability to test and upgrade ''smart'' weapons. The proposed Software Engineering Center would also provide the Army with the ability to upgrade-technologically existing weapons systems, respond rapidly to problems encountered in the field, and save the Pentagon money. The Army estimates that this consolidation will also save $5 million a year, allowing the project to pay for itself in 3 years. I am pleased by the Senate's support of the center, and look forward to working with the subcommittee and the Army to ensure that this state-of-the-art facility becomes a reality.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the pending military construction appropriations bill provides $9.183 billion in new budget authority and $3.064 in new outlays for military construction and family housing programs for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1998.

When outlays from prior-year budget authority and other completed actions are taken into account, the outlays for the 1998 program total $9.902 billion.

This legislation provides for construction by the Department of Defense for U.S. military facilities throughout the world, and it provides for family housing for the active forces of each of the U.S. military services. Accordingly, it provides for important readiness and quality of life programs for our service men and women.

The bill falls within the revised section 602(b) allocation for the Military Construction Subcommittee. I commend the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the Senator from Montana, for bringing this bill to the floor within the subcommittee's revised allocation.

The bill provides important increases over the President's request for 1998, and I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the relationship of the conference report to the subcommittee's section 602(b) allocation be printed in the RECORD.

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

H.R. 2016, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1998

[Spending Totals—Senate-Reported Bill; fiscal year 1998, in millions of dollars]

Category	Defense	Non-defense	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:					
Budget authority	9,183	.....	.....	.....	9,183
Outlays	9,902	.....	.....	.....	9,902
Senate 602(b) allocation:					
Budget authority	9,183	.....	.....	.....	9,183
Outlays	9,920	.....	.....	.....	9,920
President's request:					
Budget authority	8,384	.....	.....	.....	8,384
Outlays	9,839	.....	.....	.....	9,839
House-passed bill:					
Budget authority	9,183	.....	.....	.....	9,183
Outlays	9,909	.....	.....	.....	9,909
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO					
Senate 602(b) allocation:					
Budget authority	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Outlays	(18)	.....	.....	.....	(18)
President's request:					
Budget authority	799	.....	.....	.....	799
Outlays	63	.....	.....	.....	63
House-passed bill:					
Budget authority	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Outlays	(7)	.....	.....	.....	(7)

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with current scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the military construction appropriation bill before us today. Senator BURNS and Senator MURRAY are to be congratulated on crafting a measure that adequately meets our military needs while at the same time addressing the pressing concerns of our soldiers.

Mr. President, at a time when our services are having difficulty meeting their recruiting goals and retention is suffering, it is more important than ever that the military address quality of life issues. Unfortunately, the administration has chosen to ignore the reality and not budget the appropriate resources for this goal.

The budget for all military construction contained in the Senate bill totals just over $9 billion, almost $800,000 above what the administration requested. As anyone who has visited some of our installations can tell you, this money is desperately needed.

I salute the work of Senators BURNS and MURRAY as well as their staffs. Their ability to prioritize within the declining budget is crucial to improving the everyday lives of our soldiers and their families. Mr. President, if we are going to continue to ask more from our military around the world, the very least we can do is to provide them with adequate housing and facilities. In addition, it should be pointed out that the committee worked with both the House and Senate authorizing committees and did not appropriate funds for any project that was not authorized.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this excellent bill.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong support for several New Jersey projects included in the Senate's version of the fiscal year 1998 military construction appropriations, as well as several New Jersey projects included in the House version of this legislation. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I hope all of these projects will be included in the final version of the bill.

I appreciate the willingness of the chairman and ranking member to include $1.3 million in design funding for a new software engineering facility at Picatinny Arsenal. This funding will allow the Picatinny to consolidate the design, development, testing, configuration control, field release and maintenance of weapon systems, simulators, and trainers. It will result in reduced cost for the Army and will improve efficiency in the software engineering process.

I also appreciate the willingness of the Senate subcommittee to provide funding for two important projects at McGuire Air Force Base. The Senate's bill includes $9.954 million for an air mobility operations group warehouse, which will increase the efficiency of the base's mobility operations. Additionally, it includes $35.217 million for an ambulatory health care center replacement. This new facility will house a full-service outpatient operation and provide adequate space for clinics, ambulatory surgery, ancillary services, storage, offices, and administration. It will improve the quality of care provided to our military personnel.

In addition, the House version of this bill provides $9.03 million for an ammunition supply point at Fort Dix, $8.8 million for a fire station at McGuire Air Force Base, $2.05 million for a fire station at Fort Monmouth, and $7.3 million to build 35 units of family housing at Picatinny Arsenal. These

are meritorious projects that deserve the support of the conferees. I hope the conferees to this bill will agree to include these projects to improve the quality of life and to support the missions at New Jersey's military installations in the final version of this legislation.

These projects are vital to New Jersey's defense infrastructure, and to those who work on these bases. I hope the chairman and ranking member will support these important New Jersey projects in the conference agreement to the fiscal year 1998 military construction bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the committee amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Washington that she has 5 minutes, 29 seconds remaining on her time. Does she wish to use it or yield it back?

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield my time back.

Mr. BURNS. I yield my time back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill, H.R. 2016, as amended, pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 192 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Abraham	Faircloth	Lott
Akaka	Feingold	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Ford	McConnell
Baucus	Frist	Mikulski
Bennett	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Gorton	Moynihan
Bingaman	Graham	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Murray
Boxer	Grams	Nickles
Breaux	Grassley	Reed
Brownback	Gregg	Reid
Bryan	Hagel	Robb
Bumpers	Harkin	Roberts
Burns	Hatch	Rockefeller
Byrd	Helms	Roth
Campbell	Hollings	Santorum
Chafee	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Cleland	Hutchison	Sessions
Coats	Inhofe	Shelby
Cochran	Inouye	Smith (NH)
Collins	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Johnson	Snowe
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Specter
Craig	Kennedy	Stevens
D'Amato	Kerrey	Thomas
Daschle	Kerry	Thompson
DeWine	Kohl	Thurmond
Dodd	Landrieu	Torricelli
Domenici	Lautenberg	Warner
Dorgan	Leahy	Wellstone
Durbin	Levin	Wyden
Enzi	Lieberman	

NAYS—2

Kyl	McCain

The bill (H.R. 2016), as amended, was passed.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to lay it on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). Under a previous order, the Senate insists on its amendments, requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints the following conferees.

The Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BURNS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. STEVENS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REID, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. BYRD, conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BURNS. I thank Senator MURRAY's staff, Dick D'Amato, Emelie East, and also on my staff Sid Ashworth, Kelly Hartline, and Jennifer Chartrand. I also thank Ben McMakin and Mazie Mattson. It was a pleasure working with these folks. They did the majority of the work.

I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, the clerk will report Senate bill 1034, the VA–HUD appropriations bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1034) making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Thank you, Mr. President.

GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, with the first phase of the hearings of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee into the abuses of the electoral process through campaign fundraising having just concluded, and the second phase about to begin, it is perhaps an appropriate time to reflect on those things that we have learned in these first few weeks and those questions that remain.

It is, I think, important to note that despite some incentive for partisanship, a tendency by the media to sometimes reach conclusions before the facts, and a persistent failure of some witnesses to cooperate, the committee has begun its work, I think, in the best traditions of the Senate. Democrats and Republicans are working together. We do have a common objective, and I think we are doing service to the institution.

These things, however, have already been learned. First, it is a result of insufficient management and poor decisionmaking and the continuing upward spiral of pressure to raise campaign funds, the Democratic National Committee made a series of bad decisions during the last election that clearly resulted in some violations of Federal law and were a disservice both to the President and the Democratic Party. Among these were the inadequacy of any process of checking the names or backgrounds of contributors or the sources of their funds. The good work of some members of the Democratic National Committee and its staff was compromised, unfortunately, by the addition of some inexperienced people who were not properly supervised or trained for their positions. John Huang was clearly among them, and it is now clear from testimony before the committee that there is a substantial chance that the result was a violation of Federal law.

Second, it is also becoming clear that the Chinese Government, the People's Republic of China, as a result or in reaction to the visit of President Li of Taiwan to the United States, planned and potentially embarked upon a plan to influence the 1996 Federal election. It is clear from the evidence provided to date that this plan targeted neither political party in particular, but probably both in general. It seems to have been primarily designed to influence the U.S. Congress. It is unclear to date the extent of those designs on the Presidential election. It is also clear that that plan involved both legal and potentially illegal means to accomplish its goal. The extent of its success, to what extent it was achieved, is not at this point known. The fact that it existed and there were any intentions implemented is disturbing enough to warrant the committee's investigation.

Third, it is established, I believe, at this point, to at least some degree of satisfaction, that the illegal activities that may have been embarked upon by John Huang or others to seek and receive foreign contributions or otherwise violate Federal Election Commission regulations and the laws of the United States with regard to fundraising were not either known or encouraged by senior personnel at the Democratic National Committee. Richard Sullivan, who was the direct superior of Mr. Huang, denied under oath that there was any plan by the Democratic National Committee to solicit Chinese or other foreign contributions. It is, however, clear Mr. Huang's activities were not sufficiently monitored or known as should have been the case in an organization of the importance of the Democratic National Committee.

Fourth, John Huang's own activities raise substantial suspicion. It is not enough for the committee to conclude that it was not properly supervised or to take any comfort in the fact that his superiors or other people in either

the White House or Democratic National Committee did not have knowledge of his efforts to raise foreign contributions. Nor is it enough to simply dismiss his activities as a poor judgment to hire him because he was inexperienced or unqualified to be vice chairman of finance of the Democratic National Committee.

His activities while at the Commerce Department in operating out of the Stevens Corp., where he both received and made telephone calls, received and sent faxes and perhaps, most suspiciously, received packages, raised continued questions. In the coming weeks, the committee will want to explore as to the nature of his activities, not simply while at the Democratic National Committee, but in the months preceding it while a Federal employee. The committee is also left with the unanswered question as to why he continued to receive briefings by the intelligence community and of what use he made of that information.

The committee is also left with questions regarding the alleged Chinese plan. While it is comforting that there is no evidence to date that policy was impacted, it is also not enough for us to rest in a comfort that it was bipartisan and not apparently solicited by either political party, based on information known to date. The question remains of whether policy was ever changed as a result of these contributions, whether the plan was actually fully implemented, and whether or not it continues. This naturally is a first priority of the committee and remains of overwhelming importance.

And questions, finally, remain with regard to John Huang. Of what use did he make of this information for corporate purposes of the Lippo Group or any other foreign interest? Were these questions both continuing before the committee and some of these preliminary issues answered?

The committee next turns its work to the National Policy Forum, its relationship with the Republican National Committee and its chairman, Haley Barbour. The committee in the coming days will receive testimony, I believe, that will indicate that Mr. Barbour, while chairman of the Republican National Committee, designed a plan, which was implemented with his participation, to solicit and eventually did receive foreign contributions in excess of $2 million, which helped, through a series of transactions, to fund the 1994 Republican campaign to take control of the U.S. Congress. Evidence will be presented that this was an active plan, fully implemented.

After a week of testimony, therefore, we will know the extent of involvement of the Democratic and Republican National Committees in these efforts to receive foreign contributions and their impact on the 1994 and 1996 elections.

With those two phases of the committee's work completed, what we will not have done is get any closer to the question of genuine and complete campaign finance reform. Several weeks have now passed since President Clinton's deadline was passed for the July 4, 1996, consideration of campaign finance reform. No campaign finance reform bill has been considered or released by any subcommittee of this Senate. No date has been set for the Senate to even begin discussion of any such genuine reform.

Indeed, there are some who would argue that the Governmental Affairs Committee deliberations are an excuse to wait until next year to even begin consideration of any campaign finance reform legislation. Using the deadline of the end of 1996 to begin consideration will assure that the 1998 Federal elections are conducted under the same campaign finance laws that bred the very problems now being discussed by the Governmental Affairs Committee. And it begs the question that, for all the important things that this Senate can learn from these hearings, all the unfortunate revelations the Senate is now experiencing, the tragic lessons the American people are now learning about this system, which Senator does not already know enough that we are raising too much money, spending too much money, and inviting both these abuses and violations of the law every day that we do not reform this system?

I know that there is a perception in our country that this failure to initiate campaign finance reform is a genuinely bipartisan problem. The American people can be forgiven for believing this because both parties have abused the system, and our hearings are resulting in learning that both the Democratic and Republican National Committees have not only violated the vested policy but clearly violated the law in this downward spiral of campaign fundraising.

It is, however, becoming less and less of a bipartisan issue when it comes to the question of reaching solutions. Last weekend, Jim Nicholson, the new chairman of the Republican National Committee, announced his opposition to banning soft money, his opposition to any limit on campaign expenditures, his opposition to controlling the costs of television. In essence, the Republican chairman of their national committee announced his opposition to any campaign finance reform.

Indeed, that mirrors our experience in the House and in the Senate. The overwhelming majority of the caucus of the Democratic Party in this Senate is prepared to vote for campaign finance reform now. It has been endorsed by our leadership. President Clinton has indicated that he would sign such legislation. Yet, only three members of the Republican caucus are prepared to even vote for campaign finance reform, and no committee chairman has been willing to bring it to consideration.

Mr. President, as our committee continues its work, we will continue to be saddened by revelations that both political parties have not challenged the best within us in raising funds for conducting these campaigns. Our only comfort is that the political leadership of this institution will at some point see the need to wait no longer and begin initiating real change. There is no room in this debate for anyone to take comfort in their actions to date.

Not only have the political committees of both parties not conducted themselves in our best traditions, not only have both possibly violated the laws, but other institutions have equal fault. While the media each day reminds us of the problems of campaign financing, the cost of television advertising continues to spiral upward. The overwhelming costs of these campaigns is a result of the rising cost of television. While every night the media rails against the system, complains against the abuses, their lobbyists roam the Halls of Congress fighting efforts to control the cost of television advertising.

So, in neither party, nor in the private institutions of the media, nor in the institutions of the political parties is there any reason for pride. Only this, that there are still people in this institution in both parties who continue the investigations, Members of the Senate who are prepared to vote to change the system, people not simply who have not succeeded in the system, but Members who have succeeded, who have raised the funds, conducted successful campaigns, but still recognize that even though individuals can succeed, it does not serve the national interests.

Mr. President, the first phase of our investigation by the Governmental Affairs Committee has now concluded. We begin two more important weeks of our work. I believe we are conducting ourselves, pursuing our objective as this Senate has commanded us to do. Much has been learned. There remains much to be done. I hope every Senator will continue to follow our work, but, mostly, join us in the commitment to change this system, find those who have abused it in the past, ensure that the law is enforced, and then give the American people a political system financed by means in which they can take real pride.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998.

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am very disappointed that we cannot stay on the bill. We have a number of Senators wishing to present amendments, so I am going to propose a unanimous-consent request. I would note that the discussions we just heard are most appropriately made in the Governmental Affairs Committee which is doing business at this time, and I am not going to answer some of what I think were partisan charges because those would best

be handled by members of the Governmental Affairs Committee. It is appropriate that we do the committee work and then move to the floor where we can have these full debates. Right now the measure before us is the VA-HUD appropriations bill, and there are serious amendments.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota be recognized to present two amendments; on the disposition of those amendments, the Senator from Colorado be recognized to offer an amendment.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Is the Senator from Colorado going to speak extensively on this amendment because the Senator from Florida had an amendment. You might recall, I say to the Senator, the Senator from Florida had spoken to us this morning.

Mr. BOND. Let me withdraw that unanimous-consent request. I ask the Senator from Colorado how long he needs on his amendment.

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding. I suspect we could move on my amendment in 10 minutes.

Mr. BOND. And the Senator from Minnesota would need?

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator from Minnesota I believe will be speaking for 45 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleague, I think I can do the first amendment in about 5 minutes and I think I can do the second in about a half an hour.

Mr. BOND. All right. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota be recognized for 35 minutes to present two amendments. Following those amendments, which at this point I do not believe will necessitate a rollcall vote, then I would ask that the Senator from Colorado be recognized for 10 minutes. I do not believe there will be a rollcall vote.

Mr. ALLARD. I am not going to ask for a rollcall.

Mr. BOND. And following that I would ask that the Senator from Florida be recognized, for what length of time?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I would only ask for 2 minutes equally divided. I have a sense of the Senate which I believe has been agreed to, and I am not going to ask for a recorded vote on that sense of the Senate.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, might I amend that unanimous-consent request to ask that, if the Senators would not mind, we do the 2 minutes equally divided for the Senator from Florida.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I would say, of course not, and moreover I would say to my colleague from Colorado, since I am going to be taking close to 40 or 35 minutes, if he would like to go second since he only has 10 minutes, I will follow my colleagues.

Ms. MIKULSKI. In other words, the Senator from Minnesota yields to the Senator from Florida and then the Senator from Colorado.

I must say we really do thank the Senator from Minnesota for his cooperation in advocating veterans and advocating us finishing the bill.

Does the Senator want to withdraw his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BOND. I will withdraw the unanimous consent.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Start over.

Mr. BOND. I ask that the Senator from Florida be recognized for——

Mr. GRAHAM. Two minutes equally divided.

Mr. BOND. Two minutes equally divided, followed by the Senator from Colorado to be recognized for 10 minutes, followed by the Senator from Minnesota for 40 minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fellow in our office, Mary O'Brien, be given floor privileges for the pendency of this sense of the Senate.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 948

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that Congress should consider legislation concerning catastrophic natural disasters)

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. President, I rise today to offer a simple, straightforward sense-of-the-Senate resolution regarding natural disasters.

The rising cost of natural disasters is a ticking time bomb that we, in Congress, are doing little to address. Since 1989 the cost to taxpayers has been nearly $40 billion.

Just this past weekend Hurricane Danny hit portions of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and my State of Florida. Although Hurricane Danny was a relatively small storm, just imagine if Hurricane Danny had been of the magnitude of a Hurricane Hugo or Andrew. The damages would be exponentially larger.

Hurricane Danny serves as a stark reminder of the ticking time bomb. We should keep in mind that we are only very early in what is expected to be an extremely active hurricane season. The time to act is sooner rather than later.

My resolution would state that it is the sense of the Senate that Congress consider legislation to deal with the rising cost of natural disaster head on—before another megadisaster occurs.

What will it take for Congress to focus on this ticking time bomb? Another Northridge earthquake that comes with a sticker price of $8.6 billion? Another Hurricane Andrew or Hugo to cost the Federal Government $6.2 and $3 billion, respectively?

Helping our Nation better prepare for natural disasters will require Federal, State, and local efforts as well as initiatives from the private sector. My resolution states that Congress should consider Federal legislation embracing the following principles:

First, people living in areas that are prone to natural disasters should assume a practical level of responsibility by acquiring private property insurance.

The problem is that in some areas, especially in my home State of Florida, it is very difficult for individuals to get adequate private property insurance. This leads us to the second principle.

Second, the insurance industry, in partnership with the Federal Government, should develop a new mechanism to spread the risk of natural disasters minimizing the cost of these disasters for the Federal Government. The goal of spreading the risk is to make private insurance available and affordable for everyone.

Third, a partnership should be forged between the private sector and governments at all levels to encourage better disaster preparedness and response.

No one is expecting to find a magic solution to natural disasters. The National Weather Service cannot play like the FBI's bomb squad and snip a few strategically placed wires to disarm future hurricanes. Nor can the National Science Foundation invent a way to stop the movement of tectonic plates and ensure that there will be no more earthquakes. But the Federal Government can at least begin discussing creative ways to assist States in preparing for and responding to natural disasters.

That is the intent of my resolution—to begin the discussion. We cannot continue to fund natural disaster after the fact.

We must take steps to make sure that every person in disaster prone areas has available, affordable property and casualty insurance.

We must work with the private sector to find creative ways of shifting the responsibility for the risk of disasters to the private sector and reduce the cost to the Federal Government.

We must encourage States to better prepare themselves for disasters and to have a clear game plan to respond when hit by a natural catastrophe.

In the next few days I will circulate a letter that I encourage all my colleagues to join me in signing. The letter will be sent to the U.S. Department of the Treasury asking for their assistance and guidance in developing such an initiative.

Mr. President, our Nation has been beset by an unusual series of natural disasters, some of which have occurred as recently as the past few days in Mississippi, Alabama, and my State of Florida and others earlier this year in the upper Midwest. This sense of the Senate asks that the Senate at an appropriate future time consider legislation that embodies the following principles: That persons who live in areas of risk of natural disaster should assume a practical level of personal responsibility for the risks through private insurance; second, that the insurance industry in partnership with the Federal Government and other private sector entities should establish new

mechanisms for spreading the risks of catastrophes that minimize the involvement and liability of the Federal Government; and third, a partnership should be formed between the private sector and Government at all levels to encourage better disaster preparation and respond quickly to the fiscal and financial impacts of catastrophic natural disasters.

Mr. President, the purpose of this sense of the Senate is to encourage those entities that have been working over the last 2 years to try to embody these principles into legislation that could be presented to the Congress, that in light of what has recently occurred they redouble their efforts to present to the Nation an appropriate partnership framework that would both mitigate and respond to natural disasters.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] proposes an amendment numbered 948.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 85, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

SEC. 423. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING CATASTROPHIC NATURAL DISASTERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) catastrophic natural disasters are occurring with great frequency, a trend that is likely to continue for several decades according to prominent scientists:

(2) estimated damage to homes, buildings, and other structures from catastrophic natural disasters has totaled well over $100,000,000,000 during the last decade, not including the indirect costs of the disasters such as lost productivity and economic decline;

(3) the lack of adequate planning for catastrophic natural disasters, coupled with inadequate private insurance, has led to increasing reliance on the Federal Government to provide disaster relief, including the appropriation of $40,000,000,000 in supplemental funding since 1989;

(4) in the foreseeable future, a strong likelihood exists that the United States will experience a megacatastrophe, the impact of which would cause widespread economic disruption for homeowners and businesses and enormous cost to the Federal Government; and

(5) the Federal Government has failed to anticipate catastrophic natural disasters and take comprehensive action to reduce their impact.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should consider legislation that embodies the following principles:

(1) Persons who live in areas at risk of natural disaster should assume a practical level of personal responsibility for the risks through private insurance.

(2) The insurance industry, in partnership with the Federal Government and other private sector entities, should establish new mechanisms for the spreading of the risk of catastrophes that minimize the involvement and liability of the Federal Government.

(3) A partnership should be formed between the private sector and government at all levels to encourage better disaster preparation and respond quickly to the physical and financial impacts of catastrophic natural disasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on amendment No. 948 offered by the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BOND. No objection.

Ms. MIKULSKI. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 948.

The amendment (No. 948) was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GRAHAM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I wish to extend my appreciation to the managers of the bill and to my colleagues for allowing expedited consideration of this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the Chair.

We do not have a pending amendment in the Chamber, do we?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, actually, I believe we do, which is the Bumpers amendment. So I ask unanimous consent that the Bumpers amendment be laid aside until the conclusion of the debate on the Wellstone amendments, and at such time as we take up the ongoing debate on the Bumpers amendment on the space station.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 947

(Purpose: To make an amendment relating to the use of public housing operating funds to provide tenant-based assistance)

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the Chair. I have an amendment at the desk numbered 947. I request that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] proposes an amendment numbered 947.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 21, line 16, insert before the period at the end the following: ": *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $290,000,000 shall be made available for tenant-based assistance in accordance with section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937".

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, today I file an amendment to provide for more public housing vouchers.

The original intent of the Federal housing assistance program was to provide temporary housing to poor individuals and families. Since its inception, the Federal housing program has grown to become a $25 billion entity.

In my view, the section 8 voucher program is the best means for low-income families to find secure, affordable rental housing. The section 8 certificate or voucher program first began in 1974 and has grown to serve over 1.5 million low-income families today. These families are empowered with the choice of where they want to live and are given the freedom to determine what surroundings they desire. Section 8 housing is the preferable means of providing affordable housing to low-income individuals. Vouchers enjoy wide support including past Republican and Democrat administrations alike. In fact, the current Secretary of HUD, Secretary Andrew Cuomo, supports an expanded voucher program.

Vouchers are very popular, which is demonstrated by the 1.5 million families who are currently using vouchers or certificates. Vouchers empower individuals and promote competition within the public housing authority and within the community, thereby lowering costs and improving conditions for the residents. Vouchers or other alternatives can be less expensive than the current public housing program. They can save the Government money and improve conditions for the tenants.

Studies have indicated that project-based housing assistance costs more on average than the voucher housing program for each family that is assisted. In fact, the findings of the June 1995 GAO report indicated that the cost of housing vouchers is 10 percent less than the cost of public housing. This study clearly demonstrated that on a national average, the section 8 tenant-based housing is cheaper than the public-unit housing program. In fact, one can say that the savings from the movement to vouchers could lead to an annual savings of $640 million per year and could be applied to over 100,000 low-income families for housing assistance.

I am a member of the Housing Subcommittee which is currently putting the final touches on authorization language for a new public housing bill. I have proposed that this approach be included in that bill. Under my proposal, 10 percent of public housing operating funds that are distributed to each public housing authority would be made available for those who want vouchers. Nothing would be required or mandated. It is simply a choice given to the resident. In fact, we make clear that any unexpended amounts set aside for vouchers would be used by the public housing authorities for normal operating funds.

Quite frankly, I really do not know how anyone could oppose this provision unless they are just opposed to giving people a choice and an opportunity. The language that I have proposed in committee also would establish a preference for crime victims. It states that a voucher would be made available to

any resident of public housing who is the victim of a crime of violence that has been reported to law enforcement. People should have the option of vouchers when their housing is unsafe.

My objective here today is to alert the appropriators to my interest in this matter and in my strong belief that we should increase the pace at which we move ahead with the conversion of housing from the old central planning and concentrated public housing model to one of choice and opportunities through vouchers.

My view is that, whenever practical, programs should be properly authorized before funds are appropriated. Therefore, I am not going to push forward here today on this issue. I will continue my work on the authorizing committee to get this choice added to the law and my efforts will be devoted to getting this done in the next several months through the public housing reform bill.

I thank you, Mr. President, and I now withdraw my amendment.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, let me express my appreciation to— I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for withdrawing the amendment. He has described some of the very difficult challenges which face both this committee and the housing subcommittee. We have a difficulty of ensuring that those people who are in public housing and do not have an option or some place to go with a section 8 certificate do not have their services cut. So we have people who are in significant numbers in public housing. We have to care for them as we look for better ways. We have worked on public housing reform and look forward to working with the Senator from Colorado on these reforms and other measures. I thank him for raising the question with us.

Mr. ALLARD. If the Senator will yield, I thank the chairman for his efforts. I know he has a tough job, and I respect his responsibilities in that regard.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Senator.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, first of all, I thank the Senator from Colorado for not pressing for a vote on this amendment, how to use the taxpayer's dollar to really create not only opportunity in public housing but also how we can end the cycle of poverty, the culture of poverty, and for public housing to be a way to a better life. I am glad the authorizers are going to consider the bill. I look forward to listening to the recommendations. I know the senior Senator from Maryland is the ranking member and we will have many spirited discussions. So how best to provide for the poor, particularly also the working poor, is, indeed, a great challenge. We do not want to repeat mistakes in the future, but we also do not want to create new mistakes in the future. So the authorizing bill is a great way to do it.

I thank the Senator from Colorado for his spirited advocacy and also for withdrawing the amendment. I yield the floor.

The amendment (No. 947) was withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 949

(Purpose: To state the sense of the Senate regarding the appropriations for discretionary activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs in fiscal years 1999 through 2002)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 949.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 85, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

SEC. 423. it is the sense of the Senate that Congress should appropriate for the Department of Veterans Affairs for discretionary activities in each of fiscal years 1999 through 2002 an amount equal to the amount required by the Department in such fiscal year for such activities.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and Senator MIKULSKI.

First of all, I rise on the floor of the Senate to commend the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on VA–HUD and Independent Agencies for restoring $273 million in cuts in veterans discretionary programs, and to include health care for fiscal year 1998.

Above and beyond this, let me also commend the committee for adding an additional $92.9 million above the President's budget request. This is a victory for veterans and their families, and it is a step in the right direction.

We have been fighting to restore these cuts for 1998. When we first found out that in the budget resolution there were proposed cuts over the next 5 years, we held a forum out in Minnesota and, really, the veterans community was unanimous in denouncing these cuts. We circulated a letter, signed by colleagues, to the appropriations subcommittee. We have some appropriators here who are clearly strong advocates for veterans, and I thank them.

We offered an amendment to the DOD authorization to transfer excess funding from the Pentagon to VA health care. We did not win on that amendment, but I thank the PVA, Paralyzed Veterans of America, the DAV, Disabled Veterans of America, and, in addition, I would also like to thank the Vietnam Veterans of America for their support.

Now, what we have in this appropriations bill is a restoration of the $273 million, and adding another $92 million. That is good news for veterans and their families. Again, I commend my colleagues, and I thank DAV and PVA and Vietnam Vets and the other organizations for helping me and helping other Senators in restoring this funding.

However, I remain deeply concerned about cuts in funding for veterans discretionary programs, health care programs, in the outyears, 1999 through 2002, which were agreed to in the bipartisan budget deal. So what this amendment essentially says to veterans is: Don't worry, because we go on record that your health care will be secure going into the next century.

This amendment is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment which says that the Senate ensures its promises for veterans. It promises veterans that over the next 4 years, 1999 to 2002, the veterans' medical system will receive the resources it requires—I put that in bold letters—to deliver quality health care to our Nation's veterans. As I think about this budget deal, if we do not at least have a sense-of-the-Senate amendment, then we are talking about, in the outyears, cuts of about $2 billion from the President's request; or, another way of looking at it, it would be close to $3 billion from 1997 funding levels.

It is wrong. We know it. This amendment I have introduced for myself and Senator MIKULSKI puts the Senate on record as saying these cuts are wrong and making it clear we go on record that we will provide the VA health care system with the resources it needs to provide as good care as possible—quality care, we hope and pray—for veterans, going into the 21st century.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment (No. 949) was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 950

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am now about to send to the desk a second amendment, which really has two provisions. The first is that within 30 days after enactment of this act, we get a CBO study that would provide to the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Senate Appropriations Committee an estimate of the cost of the provision in this amendment. The second part is that not later than 60 days after enactment of this bill, the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall hold one or more hearings to consider legislation that would add the following diseases, which would now be presumptive, from the point of view of coverage: lung cancer, bone cancer,

skin cancer, colon cancer, kidney cancer, posterior subcapsular cataracts, nonmalignant thyroid nodular disease, ovarian cancer, parathyroid adenoma, tumors of the brain and central nervous system, and rectal cancer.

I send this amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] proposes an amendment numbered 950.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

(A) Not later than 60 days after enactment of this act, the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall hold hearings to consider legislation which would add the following diseases at the end of Section 1112(c)(2) of title 38, United States Code.

Lung cancer, bone cancer, skin cancer, colon cancer, kidney cancer, posterior subcapsular cataracts, non-malignant thyroid nodular disease, ovarian cancer, parathyroid adenoma, tumors of the brain and central nervous system, and rectal cancer.

(B) No later than 30 days after enactment of this act, the Congressional Budget Office shall provide to the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Senate Appropriations Committee an estimate of the cost of the provision contained in (A).

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, today I am offering an amendment that will aid atomic veterans—veterans who were exposed to ionizing radiation while serving on active duty. Atomic veterans who may well be America's most neglected veterans. They have been seeking justice for as long as 50 years and I am determined to help them, and I think my colleagues are determined to help them.

Mr. President, I want to dedicate this amendment to the brave and patriotic Minnesotans who served in the U.S. Army's 216th Chemical Service Company, participating in Operation Tumbler Snapper—a series of eight nuclear weapons tests that took place in the Nevada desert in 1952. In particular, I want to pay tribute to two former members of the Forgotten 216th, Smoky Parrish and Gene Toronto, patriotic Americans who have been my mentors and have fought hard to fair and just treatment for all atomic veterans.

I want to say to them and their families and to other families's of atomic veterans that I will do all in my power as a U.S. Senator to ensure the Forgotten 216th and other veterans like them are never forgotten again.

Before I discuss the substance of my amendment I would like to tell my colleagues more about the Forgotten 216th because their problems typify the problems of atomic veterans nationwide. When they participated in Operation Tumbler Snapper, they believed their Government's assurances that it would protect them against any harm, but have since become convinced they were used as guinea pigs without any concern for their safety. My colleague from Maryland said to me earlier, and I hope it's OK to repeat this, in a sense it was like the Tuskegee experiment.

Immediately after a nuclear bomb blast, many were sent to measure fallout at or near ground zero, exposing them to so much radiation that their Geiger counters went off the scale while they inhaled and ingested radioactive particles. Members of the 216th were given minimal protection, sometimes even lacking film badges to measure radiation exposure and provided with no information on the perils they faced. Furthermore, they were sworn to secrecy about their participation in nuclear tests, sometimes denied access to their own service medical records, and provided no medical followup to ensure they'd suffered no ill effects as a result of their exposure to radiation. This happened in our country. Sadly, many members of the 216th have already died, often of cancer. Is it any wonder that these men now refer to themselves as the Forgotten 216th?

Mr. President, my amendment is intended to address some of the recommendations of the ''Final Report of the President's Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments'' issued in October 1995. I had an opportunity to testify before this committee about the atomic vets.

The report's recommendations mirrored the concerns atomic veterans have had for many years: the list of presumptive diseases contained in law is incomplete and inadequate; the standard of proof for those without presumptive disease is impossible to meet; and these statutes are limited and inequitable in their coverage.

The VA now maintains two lists of radiogenic diseases, a presumptive list established under Public Law 101–321 as amended by Public Law 102–578 and now consisting of 15 radiogenic diseases, and a nonpresmuptive list established under Public Law 98–542 which includes 11 diseases not on the presumptive list. My amendment would add these 11 diseases to the presumptive list, would result in the elimination of the nonpresumptive list, and the creation of a single presumptive list of radiogenic diseases. The radiogeneic diseases that would be added to the presumptive list are: lung cancer, bone cancer, skin cancer, colon cancer, kidney cancer, posterior subcapsular cataracts, non-malignant thyroid nodular disease, ovarian cancer, parathyroid adenoma, tumors of the brain and central nervous system, and rectal cancer. These veterans were exposed to this radiation. They went to ground zero. They were put in harm's way by our Government. They were never told that anything terrible would happen to them. But so many of them have had cancer, so many of their children and grandchildren have been born with a variety of different disorders and problems, the least we can do, the least we can do is make sure that they receive good care and adequate compensation.

Why the need for these changes? To begin with veterans must jump through hoops to demonstrate they are eligible for compensation for nonpresumptive diseases and, after they have done so the chances that the VA will approve their claims are minuscule.

Mr. President, to illustrate what I mean, permit me to cite some VA statistics. As of April 1, 1996, out of the hundreds of thousands of atomic veterans there have been a total of 18,515 radiation claim cases, with service-connection granted in 1,886 cases. According to VA statistics current as of December 1, 1995, only 463 involve the granting of presumptive service-connection. Thus, if we were to exclude the 463 veterans who were granted presumptive service-connection, atomic veterans had an incredibly low claims approval rate of less than 8 percent. Moreover, of this low percentage, an indeterminate percentage may have had their claims granted for diseases unrelated to radiation exposure.

Why the abysmally low percentage of claims approvals? One key reason is that VA regulations are overly stringent for service-connection for nonpresumptive radiogenic diseases. Dose requirements pose a particularly difficult, if not insuperable hurdle. While it is almost impossible to come up with accurate dose reconstructions because decades have elapsed since the nuclear detonations and adequate records don't exist, veterans are frequently denied compensation because their radiation exposure levels are allegedly too low. In this connection, let me quote from the findings of the President's Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments: ''The Government did not create or maintain adequate records regarding the exposure of all participants in [nuclear weapons tests and] the identify and test locales of all participants.'' This finding obviously calls into question the capability of the Government to come up with accurate dose reconstructions on which approval of claims for VA compensation for atomic veterans frequently depend. My amendment essentially says two things. First of all, what we are saying now is that we call on CBO to do this study and provide us with an estimate of the costs of this provision, and that is done within 30 days. And then, not later than 60 days after enactment of this act, the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs is to hold one or more hearings to consider this legislation.

Mr. President, my amendment will ensure that the VA fulfills its responsibility to give atomic veterans the benefit of the doubt in considering their claims for compensation. This is especially important because after more than 50 years there is still much about the effects of low-level radiation that is the subject of scientific controversy.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I've fought hard to enable Persian Gulf veterans to receive compensation for diseases that may be linked to their service in the Persian Gulf, at least until scientists reach a definitive conclusion about the etiology of their illnesses. I've also strongly and consistently supported former Secretary Jesse Brown's efforts to ensure that Vietnam veterans are compensated for disabilities linked to their exposure to agent orange, even though science is still unable to determine the extent of their exposure. There is no question in my mind that both Persian Gulf and Vietnam veterans deserve such compensation. At the same time, I believe that the U.S. Government must give atomic veterans the same benefit of the doubt. Unfortunately, right now, this is not the case.

Let me give one example of the discriminatory treatment of atomic veterans concerns, and that is the VA's 1993 decision to grant VA benefits based on presumptive service connection to veterans exposed to agent orange who have contracted lung cancer, a decision which I fully back, but for atomic veterans, the VA still treats lung cancer as a nonpresumptive illness.

Mr. President, I say to my colleagues, we know what happened to them. They went to ground zero. They had no protective gear. They were exposed to this radiation. Why in the world has it taken us so long—they are still waiting after 40 and 45 years —to make sure they get the care they deserve and make sure they get the compensation they deserve?

Mr. President, we just have to do better. Let me reiterate, I fully supported the decision of the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs to recommend to the President that lung cancer be treated presumptively as a service-connected condition for agent orange. I wish Secretary Jesse Brown was still with us. He probably was my best friend in the administration, in Government. He was a strong advocate for veterans. I am simply pointing out that we are not giving the atomic veterans the same treatment, and it is patently unfair.

Since January 1994, I have had a lot of meetings with members of the Forgotten 216th. I have met with their families. I met with their children. I met with their grandchildren. Let me just be very honest about this. Many of them are up there in age now. They are elderly. They may not have that many more years to live. But it is incredible to me that we have let this shameful episode in the history of our country go on by never fully acknowledging what we did to them and never providing these veterans and their families with the compassion and care that they deserve.

I don't think it is too strong for me to say that our Government lied to them. I don't think it is unfair for me to say that for 45 years, or thereabouts, we still have not given them a fair shake. Justice delayed is justice denied. The atomic veterans are not the strongest veterans organization in our country. They don't have that much clout. Many of my friends who were atomic veterans right now have cancer. Many of them are not in good health. Many of them have already died.

They are not, in short, a strong lobby. But, Mr. President, I am telling you, I had a chance to talk to some of the atomic vets before coming out on the floor of the Senate. I had a chance to talk with my colleague from Maryland, and she really helped me with this amendment. She said to me, ''Senator WELLSTONE, if you think about it in steps, it makes more sense. First, we get the CBO study, and we make it clear we want that study, we want to know what it costs, so we are not just putting veterans in parentheses, out of sight out of mind. And then have some closure and make it clear that within 60 days the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will hold hearings and consider legislation that moves this forward.''

For some colleagues, and in a way for myself because I am always so impatient, who say, ''Well, but it doesn't guarantee the result,'' that is true, but these atomic veterans have been so out of sight and so out of mind for so long that I really think this would be a really good, positive step that the U.S. Senate would be taking.

I don't know whether there will be opposition or not to the amendment. I hope there will be strong support for it. I really think this is the right thing to do. I am convinced that if every single Senator on the floor of the Senate, Republican and Democrat alike, had full knowledge of this history and full knowledge of what these veterans have gone through and full knowledge of the terrible illnesses in their families—it is really awful. This amendment doesn't even cover, I say to my colleague from Maryland, some of the pattern of disabilities and illnesses of children and grandchildren, which is frightening to me.

I just don't know, I am not prepared to say what has happened genetically within families. I don't know. I am not a doctor, and I am sure there is probably disagreement about it. But what there shouldn't be disagreement about is that these veterans deserve better. These atomic veterans are veterans. These atomic veterans deserve better from our Government, they deserve better from our country, and it is time that we take action that would be a first major step toward providing them with the compensation and care which they truly deserve.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank our distinguished colleague from Minnesota for bringing the plight of this group of veterans before us. He has made a very compelling case for the difficulties they have faced.

I believe that the approach he has worked out with the ranking member is a responsible approach. The version I have before me directs the CBO to present the study to the Committee on Veterans Affairs within 30 days and directs the Committee on Veterans Affairs to hold hearings within 60 days. I think that is an appropriate means of moving forward on this issue.

I thank him for bringing it to our attention, and we have no objection to accepting the amendment on this side.

Ms. MIKULSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, what a moving story, what a moving story to hear about the Forgotten 216th. I am sure that this has been a considerable heartbreak for every member of that unit who went to ground zero. I am sure they went with good faith in themselves and in their Government, and yet over the last 45 years, they have endured terrible blows from their Government—one, the blow of exposing them to intense radiation with no protective gear; the second, that for 45 years, the very validity of their concerns about what happened to them and their need for medical treatment were, again, rejected by their U.S. Government.

I thank the Senator for this type of amendment, because I will tell you today, I didn't want to, because of a budget situation, have to vote to reject them one more time. I think just as you have heard now from the chairman of the committee, we are going to take your amendment. We like your amendment, and I will tell you why we like your amendment. One, we are going to get to the facts about what this will cost, because too often, as the Senator from Minnesota knows, compelling human need gets all entangled over cost. This way we will know the cost. But then by asking the Veterans Affairs Committee to hold hearings within 60 days, it is a bit of a hammer, if you will, to ensure that there will be, as in our democracy, a public hearing on this.

I say to my colleague from Minnesota that it has been my observation in 20 years—10 in the House and now over 10 in the Senate—that the VA, when it came to compensation for what our veterans were exposed to, never acted on their own. They only acted because Congress pushed for the facts.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for pushing for the facts in terms of this situation, the facts on cost, the facts on what happened to them, and the facts on the consequences to these veterans and how we need to address them.

I say to my colleagues in the VA, not the committee, but in the Veterans' Administration, if you are listening to the debate, don't see this as a problem; see this as an opportunity, because here we can have one of the most unique longitudinal studies of what happened to men who were fit for duty

when they walked at ground zero, and then what were their health consequences to both themselves and to their beloved wives, as well as to their children and their grandchildren.

What a unique opportunity for both veterans, the Centers for Disease Control, and even NIH to welcome these men, to embrace these men as we try to redress the grievance that happened to them, and the lessons learned so that we then know what radiation did to people and offer insights that could help other people who have been exposed to radiation. So I thank the Senator for his amendment. I thank the Senator for his advocacy in this area. I look forward to accepting the amendment, and I look forward to hearing the CBO and the VA Committee's report.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank both my colleagues. I think 30 days CBO and in 60 days Veterans' Committee hearings in considering legislation moves us forward in a significant way. I thank both of my colleagues for their support. I thank the Senator from Maryland especially for some of her assistance in working on this amendment. I hope both my colleagues will please help us keep this in conference. I don't want this to be one of those things that it happens on the floor and then, goodbye, it is gone. I don't want to do that to these veterans. I think we will have strong support from both of our colleagues.

Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 950) was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Minnesota, who completed his amendments more quickly than we thought. We have colleagues coming to the floor who are sequenced to follow the Senator from Minnesota. Since Senator BUMPERS has not yet reached the floor, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MIKULSKI be recognized to offer an amendment on her behalf and mine and on behalf of the minority leader. I think that amendment should take less than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 951

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment on behalf of myself and Senator DASCHLE. I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], for herself, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. BOND, proposes an amendment numbered 951.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 16, line 21, strike ''$10,693,000,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$10,653,000,000.''

On page 17, line 7, strike ''$1,150,000,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$1,110,000,000.''

On page 33, after line 23, insert the following new heading:

''EMPOWERMENT ZONES AND ENTERPRISE COMMUNITIES

''For grants to Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities, to be designated by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, to continue efforts to stimulate economic opportunity in America's distressed communities, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.''

On page 53 line 22, strike ''$400,500,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$420,500,000.''

On page 55, line 14, insert after the colon the following: '': Provided further, That $20,000,000 shall be available for the America Reads Initiative.''

On page 67, line 9, strike ''$202,146,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$207,146,000.''

On page 67, line 9, insert the following before the period: '': Provided further, That for purposes of pre-disaster mitigation pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5131 (b) and (c) and 42 U.S.C. 5196 (e) and (i), $5,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be available until expended for project grants for State and local governments.''

On page 72, line 1, strike ''$2,513,200,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$2,503,200,000.''

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I wish to bring to my colleagues' attention that this amendment is Mikulski-Daschle-Bond amendment. It is being offered in concurrence with the chairman of the committee.

What this does is provide funding for empowerment zones, the ''America Reads'' initiative and FEMA disaster mitigation.

I want to note that the money that we provide is indeed a modest fund, but it, indeed, enables us to state that these are three priorities we wanted to consider in the appropriations, that we would have normally had a larger funding had the budget agreement not given us such a skimpy allocation.

What does this amendment do?

It provides $25 million to HUD for a new round of empowerment zones and enterprise communities.

It also provides $20 million for the America Reads initiative at the Corporation for National Service.

And it provides $5 million for FEMA's predisaster mitigation program.

Mr. President, while this amendment provides funding for these three separate programs, we must remember that each of these three programs have in common, namely, that they really do directly assist the residents of our Nation with their day-to-day needs.

First, Mr. President, this amendment, in providing $25 million for a second round of empowerment zones and enterprise communities, would promote job creation and economic development in economically distressed urban and rural areas.

I am sure that we would all agree this is a critical need. Unfortunately, probably every Senator here has an area in their State that is economically distressed—urban, rural, or both.

The first round of the program covered American communities of which 72 urban and 23 rural communities were either designated empowerment zones or enterprise communities.

Mr. President, what this money actually goes for, though, is job creation, economic development, job training, and empowerment of local residents. The empowerment zone is not a quick fix, but it does offer opportunity and hope.

In the area of America Reads, this amendment also provides $20 million for the America Reads initiative. This money would support 1,300 additional Corporation members who would serve as tutor coordinators. These tutor coordinators would provide direct tutoring and help mobilize and coordinate thousands of tutors to work with young children across the country.

What is the purpose of the America Reads initiative? It is to help with local school systems to make sure that every child in the United States can read by the time they are in the third grade.

It is the administration's policy, and I know supported on a bipartisan basis, that we want to see every child in the United States of America immunized by the time they are 2, screened and school-ready by the time they are 6, can read by the time they are in the third grade, and know how to use and have access to a computer by the time they are 12. That would enable our children to be ready for the 21st century.

But let us be clear. It is not the Federal Government's job to supplant local school systems. What the America Reads initiative does is mobilize volunteer efforts, provide the infrastructure to be able to greatly utilize volunteers and, in addition to local school efforts, to help our kids read. In no way will it supplant local school efforts nor local school board policies. So it will be one of the better of the Federal and local partnerships.

Mr. President, also, let us turn to Federal predisaster mitigation. I note that the Presiding Officer is from Pennsylvania. We have sure lived through a lot of floods the last 2 years. And it has been wonderful when FEMA has been able to respond ''911'' to our States. I know what Missouri endured, what our colleagues in the Dakotas and 12 other States did.

But, you know, some Federal funds used wisely could actually prevent damage to either personal property or

small business if we did some infrastructure planning. What this amendment does is provide $5 million for predisaster mitigation activities at FEMA.

Last year, we provided $2 million for a pilot program identifying communities that could benefit from the money and build on it. Mr. President, this is a modest amount of money, but I believe will help tremendously in the future.

In California, if we insist that earthquake standards are met, it then saves money when an earthquake hits.

In Dade County, the officials there have a mitigation program to protect structures against hurricane force winds.

And in my own State of Maryland, we had a unique partnership between the Governor of the State of Maryland and the Corps of Engineers to do a flood mitigation task force up in western Maryland where Pennsylvania and West Virginia coincide, and, in the area of the great floods, collided.

So, Mr. President, this modest amount of money would really go a long way in helping us assess what we need to do to protect small business and personal property. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and I believe a dollar's worth of prevention will ultimately help us save $100 in disaster relief.

Mr. President, as I stated, this amendment provides funding for three important programs:

First, the amendment provides $25 million to HUD for a new round of empowerment zones and enterprise communities.

The amendment also provides $20 million for America Reads Initiative activities at the Corporation for National Service.

And the amendment provides $5 million for FEMA's predisaster mitigation program.

Mr. President, while this amendment provides funding for three separate programs, we must remember what each of these programs have in common, namely, they all aim to directly assist residents of our great Nation.

First Mr. President, this amendment would provide $25 million for a new round of empowerment zones and enterprise communities administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The first round of empowerment zones were awarded in December 1994. The goal is to promote job creation and economic development in economically distressed urban and rural areas.

I am sure we would all agree this is a critical need. Unfortunately, probably every Senator in here has an area in their State that is an economically distressed area—urban, rural, or both.

The first round of the program covered a wide range of American communities. Seventy-two urban areas and 33 rural communities were designated empowerment zones or enterprise communities.

There are currently eight urban empowerment zones and three rural empowerment zones. There are also 4 enhanced enterprise communities and 93 enterprise communities.

Each empowerment zone received $100 million—Los Angeles received $125 million. Cleveland $90 million—each enhanced enterprise community received $25 million, and the 93 enterprise communities received $3 million.

This money can be used for job creation and economic development activities—such as building renovations and infrastructure improvements. The money can also be used to provide services such as child care, job training and transportation for residents in the zones.

In addition to the grant money, in each empowerment zone and enterprise community, employers are eligible for wage tax credits worth $3,000 for every employee hired who lives in the empowerment zone. The program is not just about moving employees from one location to another, it is also about providing employers incentives to help unemployed and underemployed zone residents.

We are talking about a hand up, not a hand out. The tax credit provision is designed to provide an opportunity structure, a chance to work hard and earn a decent living.

Empowerment zones and enterprise communities are also eligible for various other benefits including tax-exempt bond financing and tax writeoffs for depreciating personal property.

Mr. President, the empowerment zone program is not a quick fix. Many of the communities are ones that have suffered for years from high unemployment, high crime, and other problems. The program is a 10-year effort that required partnerships between community residents, local and State governments, and local businesses.

A recent GAO report noted that the zones have made some progress. The report notes that there is still work to be done, but the effort is progressing. The key is that the program is making progress and its deficiencies are ones that can be addressed.

In its own assessment of the empowerment zones and enterprise communities, HUD notified five communities that they were not making sufficient progress. These communities risk having future funding withdrawn. The point is that this is not some HUD program run wild. There are standards and expectations that are being measured.

Mr. President, the empowerment zone program is a good mix of Republican and Democratic ideas—tax incentives to leverage private dollars and community involvement in decision-making.

Mr. President, this amendment also provides $20 million for the America Reads Initiative at the Corporation for National Service. This money would support approximately 1,300 additional corporation members who would serve as tutor coordinators.

These tutor coordinators would provide direct tutoring and help to mobilize and coordinate thousands of tutors to work with young children across the country.

The America Reads initiative is an administration effort that is truly worthy of bipartisan support. The goal is simple—every child in the Nation should be able to read independently and read well by the third grade. A simple, yet key goal in the effort to ensure that every child is equipped with the basic tools needed to compete in the 21st century.

Mr. President, in 1994, 40 percent of fourth graders failed to attain the basic level of reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. This is a fact that we can't ignore and must address.

Let me be clear, the reading deficiencies of our Nation's children won't be erased with volunteer tutors. There are issues of education funding and the delivery of education that need to be addressed. I am under no illusion that the America Reads initiative is the only answer.

But Mr. President, I don't want us to make the perfect enemy of the good. The America Reads initiative is part of the answer. A Cohen, Kulik and Kulik analysis of 65 published studies showed that quality tutoring programs produced positive, though modest effects. Other studies done in Florida and England have found similar results.

Mr. President, modest is in the eye of the beholder. If I am rich and only see a modest return on my stock investment, I may be disappointed. But if I am a child who can't read like I should be able to, and someone helps me improve my reading modestly so that I can understand words on a page, I am probably very happy with my modest gains.

Mr. President, there have been many debates about the corporation for National Service. This amendment moves beyond that debate. The program will be funded and will continue to operate. This amendment seeks to provide some additional funding to support corporation activities that I am sure we all agree are worthwhile.

Finally Mr. President, this amendment also provides $5 million for predisaster mitigation activities at FEMA.

Mr. President, I don't know if there is a clearer example of ''an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.'' To put it in appropriations terms one might say that ''a dime of prevention is worth a dollar of cure.''

Currently, FEMA provides postdisaster mitigation money to communities—up to 15 percent of the amount they received for disaster recovery efforts. This money is important and necessary, but its' flaw is that it comes after a disaster has struck.

Last year, the VA–HUD bill provides FEMA $2 million to begin a pilot program identifying communities that could benefit from predisaster mitigation money. This amendment seeks to

provide money that would expand on that effort.

Unfortunately, every Senators' State has likely placed a ''911'' call to FEMA. Many times, there is nothing that we can do to escape nature's fury. However, all to often, there are things that we can do to reduce the risk to life and property. From making sure buildings meet proper standards to moving structures out of high-risk areas, there are things we can do.

Retrofitting a bridge in California to meet earthquake standards costs about $31 a square foot. Replacing a bridge that didn't meet standards would cost about $135 per square foot.

In Dade County, FL, officials have a mitigation program designed to protect structures from hurricane force winds. A cost-benefit analysis showed that for every $1 dollar in mitigation money invested to protect an emergency housing center, $5 in future damage relief costs are likely saved.

Mr. President, there are other examples I could site. The point is that the predisaster mitigation program is ultimately about saving lives, saving communities, and saving taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment. It is designed to help provide opportunity structures and economic development for our Nation's distressed urban and rural communities through the empowerment zone and enterprise communities program.

The amendment also provides support for the critical America Read initiative—designed to help ensure that all of the Nation's children can read properly by the fourth grade.

Finally, the amendment provides support to a predisaster mitigation program designed to save lives, save communities and save taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, I believe this amendment addresses concerns that transcend party lines. It is designed to support programs that directly impact the citizens of our Nation.

I want to especially thank Senator DASCHLE for his support, and Senator BOND for his willingness to work with me on this important effort. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. President, I hope that we can move expeditiously and adopt this amendment and make a great step forward in giving empowerment and help to our local communities.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am delighted to be able to rise in support of the amendment and be a cosponsor with the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from South Dakota.

As indicated, it has a modest amount of funding, $25 million, for HUD empowerment zones, $20 million for America Reads and $5 million for FEMA disaster mitigation. The funding is offset with budget authority from section 8 contract amendments, and the outlays are off set from the NASA mission support account, if anybody cares, but it is offset. And we particularly thank Senators MIKULSKI and DASCHLE for working together to make this a good bipartisan bill.

While the funding for this amendment is modest, I emphasize that it covers a number of important issues, from child literacy to disaster mitigation to the economic development of distressed communities through empowerment zones. While I have some concerns about how programs are set up and authorized, this, I think, is a very constructive way to move the bill forward.

Let me address the question of America Reads. We do not yet know the full outlines of the program the President is considering. I hope he will send forth authorizing legislation. That is the best way to do it, I think, is to get legislation establishing the parameters of the program. But let me say how important the objective is. The objective is to get people to read to small children, parents to read to their children. Officials in schools are engaged in teaching reading, but caregivers in day care centers and elsewhere must read to children.

As one who has spent a lot of time working on early childhood development—and I have to say that our national award-winning and recognized Missouri Parents as Teachers Program has demonstrated how effective this can be—I believe that reading to children from the youngest age gets their interest, their attention, and their enthusiasm in the written word, and puts them on to a lifetime of reading, which will open up opportunities, knowledge, information, and great joy for their entire lifetime.

If there is one thing that is the thread that seems to hold together all of the successful programs of getting children off to a good start, it is reading to them. It is communicating to them from the written word and attracting their attention to the written word as a means of communication.

Were we not in the middle of a very, very important process to pass this appropriations measure, I could talk a lot longer about the importance of reading to very young children. Let me just say that reading to young children—there is no finer objective. The money we have appropriated here is a symbol of the importance that we place on this activity.

The VA-HUD appropriations bill is a very tight allocation. We have had to have difficult funding choices. I hope that we made good consensus choices for what most Members consider the primary needs and concerns facing the VA-HUD are. I hope, however, that this amendment will keep the dialog moving on a path to enactment.

With that, Mr. President, I do not see any other Senators wishing to speak on this amendment, certainly not in opposition to it.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I'd like to congratulate Senator MIKULSKI on her amendment providing $20 million for America Reads under the VA–HUD Appropriations Act.

There is no more important skill we can give young people in this country than the ability to read. If a child can read quickly and accurately early in her school career, all other challenges will be much easier for them in school and in life.

I have been working for some time to bring literacy issues before the Senate, from the amendment Senator Simon and I offered to last year's welfare bill, to my work on the Appropriations Committee, to the educational briefings I host for congressional staff.

Recently, these briefings have included information from Dr. Reid Lyon from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. We now know from the research that the process of reading involves several steps. A student must acquire skills in a logical progression, and in a timely manner, in order to be able to read quickly and effectively enough to make sense of what she reads. Once this process has occurred, reading becomes a tool for learning. If this process does not occur, the prospect of helping her learn to read becomes much more difficult.

This and other evidence from research must inform what we do with regard to children's literacy. We must assure that we take advantage of the political will to improve children's literacy, by putting into place a national effort that reflects what we know. It must reflect what we know about how children learn, how important family literacy is to the literacy of the child, and what we know about how volunteer efforts work in our communities, among other things.

In order to build a successful volunteer effort, which must be part of what we do for children's literacy, we need to look at all the aspects of the effort. In what capacity will volunteers be working with students? How will the primary reading teacher be involved? What about reading specialists? How will research inform what happens in the classroom, or in afterschool or summer programs using volunteers? Where will we find volunteers in communities already taxed for help? How will they be trained in providing literacy assistance, in recruiting volunteers, or in coordinating community programs?

By simply including AmeriCorps in our efforts to improve children's literacy, we don't answer all of these questions, but we do answer some. We do call on experience already in our communities—in training, recruiting, and coordinating volunteers, in providing programs that help people learn to read, and to gain success in other areas of their lives. We do call on an incredible resource for improving people's engagement in their communities, and for improving their skills.

Literacy AmeriCorps has been very successful in my home State of Washington, in doing things like setting up talk times for people with limited English proficiency to talk with one another in English, and practice what they are learning with other people, on topics that interest them. Community support is there—and that gives us a great base to expand on as we look to improve children's literacy.

AmeriCorps has demonstrated success in many areas across the country; now it is time to enlist AmeriCorps in our efforts to help children learn to read. AmeriCorps is a much-needed ally in a complicated, difficult, and crucial endeavor.

Again, I want to congratulate Senator MIKULSKI on her amendment, and encourage all of the Members of the Senate to work with us to improve children's literacy this year.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Let us move for its adoption.

Mr. BOND. I think we are prepared to move to its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 951) was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 944

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I think the time has come for us to move on to the Bumpers amendment.

I will propose a unanimous-consent request that would set the vote for 5:30. We would ask for Senator BUMPERS to be allocated 15 minutes in support of his amendment. We would ask for 45 minutes in opposition to the amendment. The ranking member and I have had numerous requests, and we would try to parcel out that 45 minutes as best we can.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Reserving the right to object, I have just been advised that the full Committee on Appropriations is running late, and Senator BUMPERS is running a bit late. While we are checking when he thinks he will come to the floor, I ask the chairman to withdraw the UC.

I have been waiting to speak on the space station. By the time I conclude my remarks, we should know when Senator BUMPERS will be here. The delay is only because of the full committee markup.

Is that OK?

Mr. BOND. If the ranking member will yield, I was going to ask if she would speak. I was hoping that we could charge that time off of the hour. In other words, if we start now on the debate, the Senator from Maryland can speak as long as she wishes until somebody else wants to come.

Are we prepared to do a unanimous-consent?

Ms. MIKULSKI. The answer is no, not for the 5:30 vote.

Mr. BOND. Well, then, Mr. President, I will withdraw all pending unanimous-consent requests and advise my colleague that I will start my watch now, and when we get people here for a unanimous-consent, I will subtract from 1 hour the number of minutes that we have used in discussion not under the unanimous consent request.

I look forward to hearing the comments by my ranking member in support of the space station.

Ms. MIKULSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I think that is a prudent course in which to proceed. The full committee markup was delayed because the committee was late going into session because of our moving ahead on military construction.

I do want to speak about the space station and began my remarks at the conclusion of the Senator from Arkansas's proposal.

But, Mr. President, before I give my remarks, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the Bumpers amendment No. 944.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you very much, Mr. President. We laid it aside. I did not know if we had come back to it.

Mr. President, I rise again this year in support of America's space program and in opposition to the Bumpers amendment, which would strike funding for the space station.

I have said this before, and I will say it again: This amendment is a choice between the future and the past. The question is, what kind of country will the United States of America be in the 21st century? Will we be one that uses technology to help people with their day-to-day lives and keep America employed in the field of manufacturing? Then, if the answer to that is yes, we must embrace science, we must embrace technology, and we must be willing to take bold risks in scientific endeavors. That is what the space station is all about.

We need to ask ourselves, will we use American ingenuity and know-how through the unique environment of space to tackle our understanding of disease or develop new technologies that can be used here at home.

Yesterday, probably one of the most distinguished Americans and one of the most distinguished U.S. Senators, Senator JOHN GLENN of Ohio, spoke eloquently about America's space program from not only the time he rocketed around the Earth making world history but talking about the kind of scientific breakthroughs that are coming out of our space program. Right this very moment, little Sojourner is moving around Mars, gathering important information. We have done it in a way that is faster, cheaper and quicker than any other space project that we have done with such a big bang in terms of scientific information. Why are we able now to be able to move with such speed? It is because we have made such significant investments in projects like the space shuttle and the space station.

Some will argue that science carried out on the space station can really be accomplished more cost-effectively on the planet Earth. This simply is not true. The science proposed for the station cannot be accomplished on Earth at any price or at any time. Space station science requires sustained access to something called low levels of gravitational force. It is technologically impossible to create a low-gravity environment for this type of research without getting out there and being in orbit. What are these types of research? One is microgravity. The benefits of microgravity research may be numerous, including new and more pure pharmaceuticals, medical advancements, the production of new materials to use on Earth, new fire-resistant materials, new fire retardation. Just think, we might come up with a whole new concept for building supplies that can make our homes, schools, hospitals and nursing homes safe for fire.

Others will say, why not do this science on the shuttle? Why do you need to go in orbit and stay out there in orbit? I want to bring this point to their attention. The shuttle can stay up in orbit, max, about 2 weeks. We do not limit cancer researchers to 2 weeks in a lab at NIH to find a cure for a devastating disease. Why should we limit the life sciences to only 2 weeks in space? Much of the proposed research will take months, if not years, to complete.

Now, even though the astronauts might come back, the space science can continue to stay up in those racks on the space station. Remember what the space station is—it is not a station, it is a laboratory. It is not a station like a gas station, like a subway station. It is, literally, a laboratory in the sky that will have modules run by different countries. Japan, Canada, the European Space Agency, we are now in cooperation with the Russians—they will be planning part of the evacuation vehicle, and primarily the control of the station will be in the hands of an American astronaut. It is truly international and it will be truly profound.

While working on this issue, we wanted to be sure that we had adequate, maximum, robust participation from the NIH with the National Space Agency. We encouraged and then literally brought about a joint agreement between the National Institutes of Health and NASA.

Just a few years ago, Mr. Dan Goldin, the Administrator at NASA, Dr. Bernadine Healy, who was appointed by President Bush to be head of NIH at the Space Museum, signed a memorandum of understanding making sure that NIH and NASA are collaborating on life science research and also that we get maximum benefits from the space station.

One of the arguments that we hear every year is about cost. Sure, the space station does cost money. We have heard that GAO estimated that the station would cost $90 billion. That is what the Senator from Arkansas had in his info chart this morning. However, I want to say to my colleagues and to those who have been following this all day, that number is misleading. When calculating the total cost, the GAO included a large portion of the NASA human space flight budget in its analysis. The fact is that $51 billion of the $94 billion is for shuttle missions that will fly, regardless of whether we have the station or not. Those shuttles have missions to do and they are going to go anyway. So that figure is misleading. The real cost of the station, which includes final development and construction over a 10-year period is about $30 billion. No small change, but it is not $94 billion. The remaining balance of the erroneous $94 billion estimate is life science and microgravity research. This research will continue, in less effective form on the shuttle, with or without the space station.

Now, what is the cost to America if we do not do the station? We hear about the cost to maintain it, to build it. Well, the United States of America has already invested $9 billion in the redesign of the space station. What does that mean? The actual work on the space station means there are 15,000 highly skilled engineering and production contract jobs directly supporting the space station. There are 35,000 contract workers and 5,000 civil servants who work on the shuttle whose major customer for the foreseeable future is the space station. And 2,000 pounds of hardware have already been built for the U.S. portion of the station.

As mentioned earlier, long-duration microgravity research and cell and developmental biology, human physiology, biotech, fluid physics, combustion science, materials science, benchmark physics, as well as an understanding of Earth-based diseases are the core of what is the research. Biotech, combustion science, material science, and then, indeed, one of the most basic of all sciences, increased knowledge of physics. There will be practical applications of what we do. We cannot list every single one of those right this minute but we do know that we will be well on our way for materials research and life science research.

Mr. President, what else do we lose? U.S. credibility with our international partners. Russia, Japan, Europe, and Canada have already invested more than half of the $9 billion they have committed to the space station. This is a great symbol of the post-cold war era in which former arch rivals in space are now working together to build a space station for the 21st century.

U.S. competitiveness can only be maintained by continuing the long-term, cutting edge, high risk R&D that is an essential part to the space station development. The momentum gained with the June delivery of something called Node 1 to the Kennedy Space Center marking the beginning of a stream of flight elements that will continue for the next 5 years.

And finally, we lose all of the hard work that has gone into this project since the 1980's and the opportunity to see it culminate on the first launch, now less than a year away.

Mr. President, we could argue these points all night but I will not put my friends through this discussion. The bill is already taking a substantial amount of debate time. We will soon vote on the Bumpers amendment, and I am asking every Senator to think long and hard about what this amendment means. I really urge my colleagues to reject the Bumpers amendment.

At the same time, I want to acknowledge the effort made by the Senator from Arkansas. Over the last few years when he has pushed for eliminating the space station from the budget, it has forced us to do several things, including taking a good, long hard look at the cost and making sure we were getting our money's worth, to take a good long hard research look at the research to make sure we could not do it someplace else faster, quicker and cheaper. The answer, though, is no, we must do this research if we are going to do it at all in space.

I believe the Senator from Arkansas has made, indeed, a national contribution by forcing us to relook at the space station and to justify why we do need the space station. So we thank him for his national leadership on that.

Mr. President, I really do believe that to vote to remove the space station now will really be a terrible blow to America's space station. Mr. President, I am going to urge the defeat of the Bumpers amendment and to once again be able to stay the course, complete the space station and move this country and the space station into the 21st century.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, in order to sequence these amendments, we had advised the Senator from New York that we could accommodate him. I believe he needs 5 minutes and I need 1 minute, and then we would return to the Senator from Arkansas for his comments and then proceed to a vote after 15 minutes, if we would reserve 30 minutes for this side. With that understanding let me try again on a unanimous consent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Bumpers amendment be set aside, that the Senator from New York be recognized to offer an amendment for 5 minutes, that I be recognized for 1 minute; that on the disposition of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, that there be 15 minutes of debate under the control of Senator BUMPERS and 30 minutes of debate under the control of myself or Senator MIKULSKI, and that no amendments be in order to the amendment offered by Senator BUMPERS. I further ask that following the conclusion or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the Bumpers amendment.

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

The Senator from New York.

AMENDMENT NO. 952

(Purpose: To require reports by the Comptroller General on the allocation of health care resources of the Department of Veterans Affairs under the Veterans Integrated Service Network system and the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation system)

Mr. D'AMATO. I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, and Mr. TORRICELLI, proposes an amendment numbered 952.

Mr. D'AMATO. 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:

On page 16, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 108. (a) Not later than 4 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the allocation of health care resources by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under the Veterans Integrated Service Network system and the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation System. The report shall address the following:

(1) The manner in which health care resources (including personnel and funds) are allocated under the Veterans Integrated Service Network system and the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation system.

(2) Whether or not the allocation of health care resources under the systems takes into account the disproportionate number of veterans with special needs who reside in the northeastern United States.

(3) The effect of the allocation of health care resources under the systems on the quality of health care services provided by the Secretary to veterans who reside in the northeastern United States.

(4) The effect of the allocation of health care resources under the systems on the access to health care services provided by the Secretary to veterans who reside in the northeastern United States.

(b) Not later than 4 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall also submit to Congress a report on the effect of the reform of the eligibility of veterans for health care services under title I of Public Law 104–262 (110 Stat. 3178), and the amendments made by that title, on the quality of and access to health care provided by the Secretary to veterans who reside in the northeastern United States.

Mr. D'AMATO. First, I thank Chairman BOND and the ranking minority member, Senator MIKULSKI, for their tremendous leadership in developing this appropriations bill. I fully recognize the fiscal restraints under which the subcommittee must work to achieve our budgetary goals, and I commend them for effectively weighing

our national priorities with those constraints.

I file this amendment on behalf of my colleagues, Senator MOYNIHAN, Senator LAUTENBERG, and Senator TORRICELLI, because we have in the New York-New Jersey region a very difficult pressing problem.

I rise today on behalf of New York's 1.7 million veterans, in particular, to address the expected loss of $180 million in veterans' health care funding over the next 3 years. What this amendment does is seek to ensure that the funding reallocation for the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation System, known as VERA, is distributed in a fair and reasonable manner. I want to respond to specific concerns with the data used by the VA to determine the allocation of health care resources to our Nation's veterans.

This amendment would require the General Accounting Office to conduct a 4-month study, examining the factors relied upon by VERA and the Veterans Integrated Service Network to distribute health care funds.

The study will focus on the following characteristics which are significant to New York, New Jersey, and to our veterans in the Northeast: First, the high number of special needs veterans residing in the Northeast States; second, the impact of eligibility reform on veterans; and third, the quality and accessibility of health care in the northeast region.

In addition, the amendment would direct the Veterans Administration to fund all VISN's at their fiscal year 1996 level until the GAO study is received by the VA–HUD appropriations subcommittee.

Mr. President, it is absolutely crucial for our veterans in New York that the factors I have just listed be considered by the VA as the VERA system continues to be implemented.

It is imperative that the results of any GAO assessment of this VERA system being incorporated as soon as it is practicable because, without such consideration, the New York VA medical system could continue to suffer grievously. The effects of such a substantial funding cut—$180 million over 3 years—are something that we are very concerned about. For instance, a loss of VA services seems likely to have resulted in reduced levels of care. Two of New York's VA facilities, Montrose and Castlepoint, as well as others throughout the region, have suffered repeatedly. There are examples of poor care due to their ongoing merger under this system. Montrose and Castlepoint, two of the hospitals located in the Hudson Valley, have experienced skyrocketing mortality rates in both institutions. In addition, extremely poor health care and neglectful sanitary conditions have also been reported at both facilities, including: misdiagnosed infections and heart attacks; moldy suction tubes; patients lying for hours at a time in their own waste; and, in one report, a man dying for lack of a doctor as physicians conduct a meeting without their beepers.

Question: Is this as a result of a lack of proper care? We have to find out the truth and be sure that the massive restructuring and relocation of resources is done fairly but safely.

Mr. President, we are extremely concerned with concerned the effects of the VERA system on veterans health care in our Northeastern States. That is why I offer this amendment.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I join my friend and colleague from New York as a cosponsor of this amendment out of deep concern about the effects of the VERA initiative. Not only were the two biggest cuts in the Nation taken from the two VA service networks in New York, but New York was selected to go first, to be the guinea pig for the new program. The results are alarming. Since the merger of the hospitals at Castle Point and Montrose in the Hudson Valley, 200 jobs have been eliminated and the mortality rate is up 80 percent. The acting director of the hospitals said this increase is not significant, that there are always ups and downs in the mortality rate. That may be, but when there is so dramatic an increase during so dramatic a staff cut, we have to stop what is going on and take a careful look. This is not an isolated example. I have similar reports from Canandaigua and other VA facilities around the State.

One of the Veterans Health Administration's guiding principles with VERA is that ''the decrease in overall costs shall not compromise the care given to its veteran population.'' In New York we have empirical evidence that this principle has been trampled underfoot. I join my colleagues in asking that the General Accounting Office begin an investigation immediately into the quality of care being given to veterans under the constraints of the VERA formula, with particular attention being given to the two New York service networks. I hope the Senators from Missouri and Maryland will support this request.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I support this amendment and am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this effort to require the General Accounting Office [GAO] to report to Congress on the effects of the VA's veterans equitable resource allocation [VERA] system. I support the effort to fund all veterans health care networks at least at the fiscal year 1996 level until this report is complete.

As a member of the VA–HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, I voted against the implementation of VERA because I believe it would unfairly shift veterans health care resources away from New Jersey at a time when our aging veterans population has an increasing need for VA health care services. New Jersey's veterans fought hard for our country and they deserve direct access to quality medical care. I share the concern of many of my Northeastern colleagues that the VERA system may disproportionally affect our veterans access to quality health care services.

This amendment makes sense. It requires the GAO to report to Congress on the effects of VERA. It allows for a pause in the shifting of resources, which began in April, until Congress is certain that VERA will not hurt veterans in the Northeast. If the study shows that VERA will disrupt health care services to veterans in New Jersey and other Northeastern States, Congress will have the information necessary to ensure that these services are not compromised. Until Congress has this information, services should be provided at the pre-VERA levels. We should pause and assess the impact before moving forward with VERA. I hope the chairman and ranking member will include this provision, or one similar to it, in the final version of this bill.

VETERANS EQUITABLE RESOURCE ALLOCATION PROGRAM

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by Senator D'AMATO, which would protect funding levels for veterans' health care in New York and New Jersey. I understand that the amendment has been withdrawn, however, I appreciate the assurances given by Senators BOND and MIKULSKI that the subcommittee will give this request the serious consideration it deserves when this issue is raised in conference.

I, and my colleagues from New Jersey and New York, are very concerned about a Department of Veterans' Affairs [VA] initiative which would change the way the agency distributes health care funds to veterans' hospitals. During the next 3 years, the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation [VERA] Program is projected to divert as much as $148 million away from our region and send it to Sun Belt States in the South and West, whose veteran populations are increasing.

I have heard from many of the 760,000 veterans in New Jersey, all of whom have legitimate fears that this funding shift will reduce the quality and availability of veterans' services in our State. Many of these individuals, who have courageously served our Nation overseas in combat, now fear becoming victims of the VA's restructuring and broken promises.

The impact of this proposal would be devastating in countless communities across New Jersey. I believe that limiting access to the VA health care system may jeopardize the well-being and the lives of many veterans. This must not be allowed to happen.

The House of Representatives has taken a strong stand against the VERA plan by including a provision in their VA spending bill which would delay the proposed funding shift for 4 months, while the General Accounting Office [GAO] examines the impact of this action on the quality of care for veterans in the Northeast. Until the GAO study is completed, the VA would fund our

region's health services at 1996 levels, which are $12 million higher than the 1997 levels.

I strongly support this course of action, and encourage my colleagues on the subcommittee to adopt this proposal. We simply need to ensure that while the VA is providing much needed resources to certain facilities, it is not doing so at the expense of veterans in other regions. There is no harm in the GAO doing a 4 month study on whether the VA's new funding scheme is equitable. I assure New Jersey's veterans that I will continue to monitor the progress of this provision as it is debated in the conference committee, and will work to ensure that our veterans receive the health care and services that they deserve.

Again, I would like to thank Senators BOND and MIKULSKI for their consideration of this request and look forward to working with them on this and other issues of importance to the veterans' community.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, both Senators from New York have raised some important concerns regarding veterans health care in their State. Clearly, the new resource allocation system has forced some tough decisions in some networks. I believe this system is a vast improvement over previous allocation methodologies, and there are some encouraging signs that more veterans are being served in an appropriate manner. It may require some fine-tuning. That is why this committee has asked the General Accounting Office to undertake a review of the new allocation system, as I think the Senators from New York want, including what aspects of VERA may need improvement to accomplish equity and efficiency goals while maintaining quality.

The GAO report is due to be completed, I tell the Senator from New York, by September 30. As of today, they seem to be on track toward that deadline. We will work to ensure that they meet it. I think the Veterans Administration should take GAO's analysis and recommendations into consideration in making its allocations in fiscal year 1998.

In addition, a subsequent GAO report has been requested, which would look at quality of care in specific networks, including New York. Upon completion of this review, VA should incorporate any recommendations into the allocation methodology.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator BOND for his response. I thank him on behalf of the veterans of New York, New Jersey and, indeed, the whole Northeast region. I think we are appreciative of his efforts, and he recognizes the importance of these concerns.

In particular, I am appreciative of the Senator's willingness to join me in ensuring that the GAO conducts a study which will specifically focus on the impact to the Northeast region.

I understand that the Senator will join me in urging the Veterans' Administration to adopt GAO recommendations into its VERA system immediately. And because of the Senator's willingness to ensure that the New York and New Jersey VA health care needs are recognized and that the reallocation system will be fair and equitable, on behalf of myself and my colleagues, I will withdraw this amendment at this time. I thank the Senator, and I look forward to continuing to work with him on our veterans needs.

So, Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment, and I thank my colleague, Senator BOND. I look forward to working with him, and I thank him for his responsiveness to this need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 952) was withdrawn.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York. I assure him that we will work with him. We are now on the time allotted——

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, if I might ask my colleague to indulge me for one more moment.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator LAUTENBERG's name be added also as an original cosponsor of the amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 944

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, we are now on the time allotted for debate on the Bumpers amendment on the space station. We have invited those Members who wish to speak in opposition to come forward.

I see the Senator from Arkansas on the floor. I ask if he wishes to utilize some of his time.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, this morning, in my comments I quoted Prof. Elliott Levinthal, Professor Emeritus of the Stanford School of Engineering. This afternoon he faxed me some material which I would like to share with you. ''NASA's present strategic plan is based on the future human operation of Mars and its eventual colonization, with projected costs of at least many tens of billions, or perhaps more realistically, hundreds of billions.'' I want to thank Professor Levinthal for sending that to me because I could not agree with him more.

As I said this morning, Carl Sagan corrected me the year before last when I said he was opposed to the space station. I stood corrected. What he said was that the space station had some merit as a weigh station to go to Mars, but to justify the space station on the grounds of medical experimentation was shaky indeed. Now, I have the utmost respect for Carl Sagan. He was a much revered person around here. But I disagree with him about going to Mars.

It is not necessary to have a manned mission to Mars in order to explore Mars. We have already discovered that. I complimented NASA this morning on sending the Mars Pathfinder rover to Mars, which is doing a tremendous amount of research that may or may not be beneficial to us. Some of we laymen who are not astronomers have a very difficult time understanding some of this. But in any event, I don't believe we ought to spend the hundreds of billions that it will take to get to Mars with a manned exploration, and I don't think the space station ought to be launched with any—what shall I say—problematical assertions that it will cure cancer, or arthritis, or heart disease, or AIDS, or anything else. Almost every thoughtful person in this country who is in the medical or physics field thinks it is an absurdity to justify this on the basis of medical research.

Professor Levinthal goes on to say: ''Leaving aside colonization''—that is, of Mars—''do not be deluded by the thought that the space station is a useful step for the human scientific exploration of Mars. It is a poor investment. Exploration of Mars is a worthwhile and exciting goal, but it can be achieved most cost effectively with automated space craft.''

He goes on to say: ''I have been involved in consideration of the purpose of human missions since the start of the shuttle program. Committee after committee sought to find scientific, technical, military, educational, and industrial goals that could be cost-justified. None could be found . . .''

I repeat, in all of the feverish search for a justification for the space station, whether scientific, technical, military, educational, or industrial, none of them could be justified by the tremendous cost, which I said this morning will almost certainly exceed $100 billion.

Dr. Levinthal goes on to say: ''The pressures the space station are putting on Russian investment is decimating Russian support of science.''

Now, Mr. President, let me review this chart one more time about the cost of the space station. Do not be deceived. Do not be deluded by the way NASA chops its figures up. They chop it up into development costs; they chop it up into launch costs; they chop it up into operations costs. Don't worry about that. Just look at this figure right here—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

This figure counts. It is $94 billion and soaring. We have finally reached the point where the General Accounting Office, this morning, says that cost overruns have begun and show no sign of slackening.

What does it take in this body to get somebody's attention? This is not our money. I hear all these lamentations on the floor of the Senate about the poor taxpayer out there and trying to send his children to school and trying to make car payments and make his

house payment and how we are going to provide this magnificent $135 billion tax cut for the poor, suffering taxpayer, while, at the same time, adding $94 billion to his tax bill to build a space station from which we will get no benefit.

If that were just DALE BUMPERS talking, you need pay no attention. But it is every physical society of every nation who has a dime in it—the Japanese Physical Society, the Canadian Physical Society, the European Physical Society, and the American Physical Society. That is virtually 99 percent of all the physicists in the world who oppose this thing and say we ought to be spending the money on legitimate medical research. You are not going to get a cure for warts out of the space station.

Every year the National Institutes of Health send billions out in research grants.

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

Mr. BUMPERS. I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose the Bumpers amendment. As previous chairman and present member of the Subcommittee on Science, Technology and Space that provides the authorization for NASA, I would like to state my support for the space station program and the Senate appropriations bill, S. 1034. The Bumpers amendment is not new. This is an annual event here in the Senate like the first day of summer in Montana. We always know it is coming but it just never happens.

Let me start by saying that I support the missions performed by NASA. Just like the pioneers that came to Montana and settled the West, exploration in unchartered territories of space is a way to achieve our dreams of new beginnings, and visions of a better life. This is clearly illustrated by the excitement generated around the world by the Mars Pathfinder and its Sojourner rover. Every day Americans wake up to learn more information about the Mars' rocks named Scooby-Doo, Yogi, and Barnacle Bill. Record numbers of hits on the NASA website have been registered. Why? Because the Mars Pathfinder opens the door to our imagination and a new period of exploration.

This is not the only accomplishment by NASA within the past year. A rock has been found in Antarctica which excited the world with the possibility of life on the planet of Mars. The Galileo spacecraft has beamed back the intriguing photos of existence of seas on Jupiter's moon, Europa, again raising speculations of life-related chemicals. Technology is developing, like the X–33 prototype for a new generation of reusable launch vehicles, which will increase reliability and lower the costs of putting payloads in space. These endeavors inspire and expand the horizons of the pioneer spirit of all Americans and the space station is part of that endeavor.

NASA was created by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to undertake civilian research, development, and flight activities in aeronautics and space. Since its creation, NASA has undertaken a wide variety of successful programs and projects. The idea of a space station is not new. In the 1970's, Skylab provided a station to carry out experiments in astronomy, space physics, materials processing, and biomedical research.

After its success, NASA began its plans to develop a permanent orbiting laboratory for conducting life science and microgravity research and to conduct human exploration of space.

Since its original authorization in 1984, the program continues to evolve to achieve its admirable goals. Today, it is a partnership between Canada, Japan, 10 European nations, as well as Russia.

I cannot stand here before you today and say that the space station is not without problems. We are all aware of these problems and I have personally addressed them over the past several years during oversight hearings. We are aware of the risks and problems resulting from the Russian participation, the increased costs, and the technical challenges in the space station design. And we will continue to have hearings to address these issues and hold NASA accountable.

NASA is also aware of these problems and are actively seeking solutions. Mr. Goldin and NASA have been successful in streamlining and restructuring NASA's operations and facilities without compromising safety, productivity, or the goals and missions of the space program. Mr. Goldin and NASA have been successful in reducing costs, increasing efficiency, and living up to his motto of a faster, better, cheaper agency. Today, NASA is doing more for less.

So today, Mr. President, we again hear the arguments for the elimination of the space station. These are arguments to eliminate our dreams. Let's retire these arguments once and for all and begin working together to overcome these difficulties to ensure our future presence in space.

Mr. President, again, I thank my friend from Missouri. Mr. President, this is an annual thing. It kind of comes like Christmas and every other holiday that comes around. We hear from those folks who really think probably this is a great waste of money. We have all stood and marveled at the expedition to Mars. It came in under budget and was done in less time. But that is 300 million miles from where we stand today. When America does not dream, or fails to reach out, then we become a stagnant people.

Right now, as we speak, there is a reenactment of the Mormon Trail that was blazed from Omaha, NE, to the great Salt Lake Valley. Using the same mentality, we would still be driving the same vehicles now that carried those folks westbound across Nebraska and Wyoming and into Utah.

Let me start off by saying that I support the missions performed by NASA. I am from Montana, so I don't have a big stake in what NASA does, from the standpoint of my home State of Montana. But I will tell you that when we reach out and explore the unknown—where we are going now is a little more than just a wagon train from Omaha to Salt Lake City. We have seen it clearly illustrated this week and the excitement generated around the world by the Mars Pathfinder and its Sojourner recovery. Every day Americans wake up to learn more information about the Mars rocks named ''Scooby-Doo'' and ''Yogi'' and ''Barnacle Bill.''

More than anything else, when we talk about NASA, there is another little program that catches the eye and support of the American people called Mission Planet Earth. With our new technologies in sensoring, we know more about this piece of mud that we are whipping through space on called Earth. We have done it because somebody dared to dream and somebody dared to do it.

I do not think the American people, this society should back off from the challenges of exploring space. And, yes, the space station is a part of that.

Now, I chaired the authorizing committee on science, technology and space—NASA. We changed this a little bit differently. We went out to seek partnerships, and we got some commitments, but maybe it is kind of like the chicken and the egg. Maybe we are also put to the test. Can we do it? Can we captain it? I think we can. It is American know-how, it is American technology that has put us where we are. And we do not know what the benefits are. I would guess there are probably a lot of digital wristwatches around here on a lot of people's arms that were the result of the space program—new composites. We know more about Earth. We know a lot more about everything that is not written up in newspapers every day because newspapers would rather print those negative kinds of things, I guess.

We changed the way we were going to complete the challenge of a space station because we have a lot of things to learn before we go the extra step—not back to the Moon but before we go into deeper space, and so that is why we have a little rover up there on Mars telling us a lot about that planet, the red planet.

We changed our tactics because we had one primary contractor, and now we have the hardware that is ready to go to start building this so that we may take the next step into space.

So I tell my colleagues on this floor that we have changed the whole mission of NASA, and, yes, we have brought the costs down at NASA almost a third just in the time that I have been in this Senate, so we are getting there quicker, under budget and

using less money and collecting more knowledge and technology as we move along.

Dan Goldin, who is the Administrator of NASA, has done a wonderful job in repairing——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. BURNS. A bureaucracy that was almost without a mission. Now we have a mission. I strongly oppose the Bumpers amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I know we have had a somewhat confused schedule and there are a number of Senators who have sought recognition and would like to speak on this. I hope that their schedules will permit them to be here. In the meantime, I thought it would be helpful since we have heard various scientists quoted to give just an idea of a few of the benefits of space research.

First, in biotechnology, microgravity allows researchers to produce superior protein crystals for drug development and to grow three-dimensional tissues including cancer tumors for research and cartilage for possible transplant, and as a result people like Nobel laureate Herbert Hauptman addressed the biomedical research caucus of Congress on the value of orbital research for biomedicine and said, ''I strongly support space research and the development of the space station.''

Dr. T. L. Nagabhushan, Ph.D., vice president of biotechnology and development for Schering-Plough Research Institute, said

> I view the space shuttle program as a stepping stone to the ultimate program that will guarantee prolonged efforts in microgravity. Ultimately, our hope is to be able to crystallize proteins in microgravity, conduct all x ray data collection experiments in space and transmit the data to Earth for processing. This can only be done in a space station.

Dr. Jeanne L. Becker, assistant professor, department of obstetrics and gynecology at the University of South Florida, said

> The application of microgravity technology toward the development of tissue models has far-reaching potential for advancing cancer research. Like many of the new and innovative technologies, including gene therapy and immune-based treatment, space-based research must be continued and expanded in order to apply the benefits of this technology to the rapidly advancing area of health sciences.

Dr. Milburn Jessup, Deaconess Hospital, Harvard Medical School, said

> The space program offers a chance to improve our models of cancer and to develop new drugs and treatment as well as to gain knowledge about how cancer spreads. The space program has provided a breakthrough in tools for cancer research. We feel this is the tip of the iceberg of scientific discovery for us and the beginning of a new era in the care of the cancer patient.

Mr. President, I could go on and on. We have stacks and stacks of testimony from scientists, scientific organizations, physicians, medical researchers, health care researchers, people who do research in many areas of microgravity and physics and other related areas of science. We could bring all of those statements in.

I cite these just as a few specific examples of why the scientific community, and the vast majority of the scientific community, believes that the space station and space research is vitally important.

I conclude by referring to biomedical research, saying space research provides unique insights into how the heart and lungs function; the growth and maintenance of muscle and bone; perception cognition, and balance, and the regulation of the body's many systems in the field of regulatory physiology.

That is why the American Medical Association has adopted a resolution in support of the international space station.

> The AMA supports the continuation of NASA and other programs for conducting medical research and other research with potential health care benefits on manned space flights, including the continued development and subsequent operation of the international space station.

I thought I would conclude my remarks, Madam President, with a quote from Dr. Michael DeBakey, chancellor and chairman of the department of surgery, Baylor College of Medicine, who said,

> The space station is not a luxury any more than a medical research center at Baylor College of Medicine is a luxury.

He said also,

> Present technology on the shuttle allows for stays in space of only about 2 weeks. We do not limit medical researchers to only a few hours in the laboratory and expect cures for cancer. We need much longer missions in space, in months to years, to obtain research results that may lead to the development of new knowledge and breakthroughs.

Mr. President, these are just a few of the comments that the scientific community has made in support of the space station.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BUMPERS. Madam President, how much time is remaining for each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). The Senator from Arkansas has 8 minutes and the Senator from Missouri has 25 minutes.

Mr. BUMPERS. Will the Senator from Missouri entertain the idea of possibly yielding back some time and I will, too, and maybe we can expedite this? Does the Senator have any other opponents?

Mr. BOND. Madam President, we have had a number of Senators who were most anxious to speak on this. We could not get them in time. I know that Senator HUTCHISON, Senator GRAMM, Senator SESSIONS, Senator DODD, and Senator GLENN had all expressed an interest. We have tried to send out appeals to them. We hope that, if they are anxious to speak, they will be here before 5:30. But I say at 5:30 I will be prepared to yield back any time remaining on our side if the Senators have been unable to change their schedules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I wish to advise the Senator from Missouri that Senator GLENN, because of other responsibilities, will not be speaking. His statement yesterday was so eloquent he would like it to stand there as a rebuttal to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. We are checking now to see if the Senator from Connecticut wishes to speak and will so advise the chairman.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Madam President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

At this stage of the debate on these things it is always largely repetitious but some things are worth repeating. It does not change any votes sometimes, but it is therapeutic to me to say things more than once and then people who ignore it in my opinion do so at their own risk. But as I said this morning, it is a tragedy that the space station is what we call a freebie. You can go ahead and vote for this $100 billion boondoggle which will never provide any cures for any disease, will probably never even be used as a way station to Mars, that is opposed by every physicist in the world and not because it is totally worthless but because the money could be so much more effectively spent on other things.

I pointed out this morning, and it is worth pointing out again, the cost of one launch of the space shuttle could pay to allow the National Institutes of Health to approve one out of every three applications for medical research instead of one out of four, just one launch, and there are 83 such launches to support the space station program. And every one of them is calculated to occur within a 5-minute window without a hitch.

It is going to cost $94 billion in today's dollars and you assume that every one of those 83 to 90 launches is going to be split perfect. You think about it. Think about the enormity of such a promise.

Dan Goldin testified before the Subcommittee of Commerce on Science and Technology:

> It is certain that the program does not have adequate reserves built into the total development estimate to address Russian contingencies, which I will address later. There is also the issue of the impact the Russian delay has had in pushing completion of the assembly sequence beyond 2002.

You bet, October 2003 to be precise, a $2 billion cost overrun because Russia cannot come up with the money to build a service module.

And he goes on to say,

> Clearly, the drawn out timeframe for development/assembly will increase program

costs. The exact extent of this cost is being worked.

Here is how they have worked it. Here is the way NASA has worked it. Here are the promises that have been made.

Here is what NASA said on February 17, 1994:

Russian participation reduces cost by $2 billion and allows science utilization significantly earlier than with the alpha station.

Broken promise.

Another promise. NASA said the first element launch would be launched in November 1997 instead of September, 1998.

The reality. The first element launch is now scheduled for June, 1998. Broken promise No. 2.

The space station laboratory will be available in February 1998. Reality: May, 1999. Broken promise No. 3.

Promise. The space station will be completed in June, 2002. Reality: Now October, 2003. Broken promise No. 4.

Russia's participation will save the United States taxpayers $2 billion. Now we are going to have to come up with $2 billion. Broken promise No. 5.

Promise: Extravehicular activity, space walking, will be, in 1993, 350 hours they said; in 1994 it had gone up to 434 hours; in 1996 it went up to 1,104 hours; in 1997, 1,519 hours—a 500 percent increase. Broken promise No. 6.

Those are the promises we have gotten from NASA, and the cost is just now beginning to soar. They have just taken $400 million out of the science program. There won't be any money left to do a scientific experiment. They took $400 million out of science to make up some of the shortfalls.

They took $200 million out of the shuttle program and put it into the space program. The cost overruns are soaring, and GAO said this morning, in a report released this morning: No letup in sight.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 5 minutes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I thank the chairman and ranking member of this important subcommittee, because they have seen, early on, the importance and the benefits, for our present society and our future children and grandchildren, of space research continuing to move forward to find how we can live better through experimentation in space. That is going to help all of us now and in the future. They have seen this and I am so pleased that the Senate has continued to ratify its faith in space.

I cannot imagine that anyone in the past few weeks who has seen the Pathfinder exploring Mars, the pictures that are being taken by Pathfinder on Mars that show it to look about like Arizona—I cannot imagine that anyone would not be so excited about what we are going to be able to learn from this kind of continued exploration. So I think now, of all times, people who are big thinkers, who have a vision for our country, would not want to stop our efforts to explore in space.

We have talked about the importance of the health benefits that we have in the microgravity conditions in the space station before. Senator MIKULSKI and I have worked on osteoporosis and breast cancer, trying to increase the funding. You cannot, no matter what you do, no matter how much technology you have—you cannot reproduce the gravity conditions that are in space, on Earth. You cannot do it. Yet we know that those microgravity conditions will allow us to watch the development of breast cancer cells and of osteoporosis in this weightlessness and perhaps find the cure for breast cancer. We can learn how to combat osteoporosis in the older, especially women, but also men. In fact, NASA research already has led to these developments in health.

The cool suit for Apollo missions now helps improve the quality of life of patients with multiple sclerosis. NASA technology has produced a pacemaker that can be programmed from outside the body. NASA has developed instruments to measure bone loss and bone density without penetrating the skin. NASA research has led to an implant for diabetes that is only 3 inches across. It provides more precise control of blood sugar levels and frees diabetics from the burden of daily insulin injections.

I was reading about Professor James Langer's discoveries. He is from the University of California at Santa Barbara. He wrote in Physics Today that, ''Metallurgists have long sought to predict and control alloy microstructures.'' This may seem a little off the wall, but in fact it is very important when they are trying to find the very best substance with which to make products. He found that this is best done in the microgravity conditions because gravity affects the way things can solidify.

So you take all these scientific things and boil them down to: How does it make my life better? In fact, it does make our life better. It does make our health better. It does give patients who have multiple sclerosis or osteoporosis a better chance to have a good quality of life. I reject the idea that we would walk away from the possibilities for the future for better health and better quality of life, but also the products that will be formed from the scientific developments that we make with the space station. Once we have the research, then we take that technology and we make the products. And that is what has kept our economy burgeoning and growing and able to accept the new, young people who come into it after they graduate from high school and college; accept the new people who come to our country, looking for the American dream.

Part of the American dream is the commitment to research. It is the commitment to the future. An important part of that is space and the space station. That is why it is so important that we keep this commitment to space research, to NASA, to the space station. And the Senate has done that. In the 4 years that I have been in the U.S. Senate, I have been very proud of the big thinkers and their ability to see the difference between shutting off our future and our possibilities and saying we can save a small amount here, not thinking that for every $1 we invest we get a $2 return in our productivity and in our gross national product.

I respect the Senator from Arkansas. I know he believes sincerely that this is a waste of taxpayer dollars. I wish, before he leaves the Senate, that he would come around to seeing the benefits of space research so maybe in his last year here he would say: You know what? I think there is a future, it is worth keeping, that it will make life better for our children, that it will provide scientific jobs for our children, that it will keep the technology and the research and the innovations in America, along with our international partners. Because this is not just people who write in Physics Today. This is quality of life for elderly people who have osteoporosis. This is for the prevention of breast cancer. This is for the scientific base that has made America what it is today.

To walk away from that would be un-American and it would be unthinkable. So I hope our colleagues will give us the resounding vote that we have had in the past. I hope they will resolutely stand for the future, for our children and our grandchildren, and for a great America for years to come.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas. She has long been, not only an advocate, but very knowledgeable and a strong supporter of the space station. She has given us many good reasons why we should support the space station.

I am pleased, now, to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, we are all going to miss the Senator from Arkansas. He is a good friend, and I use that in the honest term, rather than the kind of puffery that often goes on around here. He takes the floor twice a year to espouse things with which I disagree. First, he wants to do things to the mining law that I don't want to do. And then he wants to kill the space station in a way that I don't want it killed. So I vote against him on both of these occasions, but I look forward to these because he keeps us honest with his concerns. He has not yet convinced me to back away from my commitment to the space station, but I pay tribute to his tenacity and to his integrity.

I have answered at some length in previous debates. I will not take the time to do that now. I simply repeat, again, my commitment to the idea of venturing into the unknown even when it seems expensive and sometimes foolish, because we are never quite sure what we are going to find. But, almost always, it comes back to benefit us.

As I stand here I am reminded of the quote, I can't give it to you exactly, of the historian who said: History is a chancy thing. America was discovered by someone who was heading for somewhere else, thought he had arrived someplace other than he had, and was named after a man who never came here.

History is like that, chancy. We are never quite sure what is going to happen to us, but great things happen to us when we explore. We are launched on this exploration now. We are far enough along that it makes sense for us to continue. Who knows what we will find? I will not pretend to know that we will find the cure for cancer or anything else when we get out there. We will surprise ourselves. It will be chancy. But that has been our history; that has been our destiny. I, for one, want to continue it in this program.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Utah. To the notes he added from history, we might add that he, Christopher Columbus, was a very modern traveler. He did it all with borrowed money. I think that is one element that should be added.

We are awaiting the arrival of Senator GRAMM of Texas, who is, I think, going to be the last speaker on this side. For the information of my colleagues, how many minutes are remaining for debate on this measure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 12 minutes and 12 seconds, and the Senator from Arkansas has 3 minutes.

Mr. BOND. I expect perhaps within 10 minutes we would be ready, or as soon as Senator GRAMM has had the opportunity to speak, we would be ready to yield back the remainder of our time.

I so inform the Senate.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, if I might before the Senator from Texas comes up, I have another historical allusion I would like to share.

Mr. BOND. I am delighted to yield 3 minutes for historical allusions from the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

It has been pointed out to me in the study of history that the nation that was the most powerful, the most progressive, that had, in modern terms, superpower status some centuries ago, was the nation of China. One of the things the Chinese did was send their explorers around the world. There were Chinese ships that were exploring as far away as the coast of Africa, I am told.

Then the Chinese Government decided that that was too expensive, that it was too chancy, that there would be no guarantee that they would learn anything or find anything or profit in any way and, as a cost-cutting measure, the Chinese cut back on their exploration and virtually left the field open to the Europeans. There was very little contact, of course, between the Europeans and the Chinese in that period, but the field was left open in a way that we can look back on in history and say: What might have happened if the Chinese had maintained their exploring activities and maintained their willingness to go into the future? What might have happened, had they not taken those cost-cutting measures? The history of the world would be very, very different.

It was the Europeans who went out on their exploration after the Chinese cut back. I don't want to see the Americans cut back on their adventure and their exploration, and then have someone else step into the breach. Because I am convinced that if we cut back on our exploration of space, someone else will step up to it. Who knows what the implications could be, hundreds of years from now?

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, I thank our distinguished chairman for yielding. I thank him for the leadership in this very difficult job. Having served on this subcommittee, I know how difficult it is, how many important issues are under his jurisdiction, and how difficult politically they are. So I want to begin by saying thank you to Senator BOND for the great job he has done.

Senator BUMPERS, every year, proposes that we kill the space station and every year we have a protracted debate on it. I think, now, Members understand the issue enough that the lines are pretty well drawn.

So, today, I am not going to go into a lengthy speech. I know Senator BUMPERS and I know the quality of his work, so I know he has made the best case he can make for his position.

I would just like to remind my colleagues that in 1965, we were investing 5.7 cents out of every dollar spent by the Federal Government in science and technology in the future. We were investing 5.7 cents out of every dollar we spent in Washington by investing in the next generation, in investing in the science and the technology to build the scientific base of the country to give us the ability to construct new tools that were more effective and sharper than tools used by people in other parts of the world. We were able to develop new technology and new products that have made us the envy of the world and have allowed us to maintain the highest living standards on Earth.

Whereas we were investing 5.7 cents out of every dollar in the Federal budget in nondefense R&D in 1965, we are now investing roughly 1.9 cents out of every dollar spent by the Federal Government in science and technology in the future. We have dramatically reduced the investment we are making in the future, and, basically, what we have done is succumbed to the siren song of investing more and more money in the next election, in programs that have a big political constituency, in programs that yield a return before the voter goes to vote in even numbered years on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, and we have systematically, since 1965, reduced the investment that we are making in the future, investment that we are making in the next generation.

This ultimately comes down to a debate between investing in the next election and investing in the next generation. While I believe we have to run the space program efficiently, we have had dramatic reductions in its growth. I think when science investment is down to 1.9 percent of the nondefense R&D Federal budget, down from 5.7 percent in 1965, that we need to be alarmed about it.

I have introduced legislation to set up a program within our existing budget to double expenditures on science and technology, to set out a 10-year goal of doubling the budget of the National Institutes of Health, doubling the budget for science and technology, because I believe that it is critical to the country's future.

Let me also say that I take a back seat to no one in controlling spending, but this is about priorities. What programs do we spend the money we spend on? I say invest it in the next generation, not in the next election, and defeat the Bumpers amendment as we have done in the past. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND. Madam President, we are about to yield back time. I turn to the distinguished sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. BUMPERS. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has 3 minutes, and the Senator from Missouri has 5 minutes.

Mr. BOND. I will be happy to accommodate the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Madam President, I will use my 3 minutes, and we will get this show on the road.

Let me just say, in the 6 years I have stood at this position saying we ought to cancel the space station, for all the reasons I enumerated all day long, one of the opponents' arguments consistently has been that we are going to cure breast cancer, prostate cancer, cervical cancer, warts, ingrown toenails, psoriasis, you name it. It reminds me of that old Huey Long story about the medicine doctor coming

through Louisiana. He was selling Low Poplarhirum and High Poplarlorum.

''What's the difference?'' someone asked him.

He said,''Well, the High Poplarlorum will cure anything from the waist up, and Low Poplarhirum will cure anything from the waist down.''

They said, ''Where do you get it?''

He said, ''We get it from the Poplar tree.''

''How do you get a medicine out of one tree that cures everything from the waist up and the waist down?''

He says, ''Well, we take sap from the bottom half of the tree, that is Low Poplarhirum, and we take sap from the top of the tree, and that is High Poplarlorum, and that's the way it works.''

Low Poplarhirum and High Poplarlorum reminds me of the debate going on about the space station today. It is going to cure everything under the shining Sun and it isn't going to cure anything. I will eat my hat—and I wish I was going to be in the Senate to do it—if it ever cures anything. That claim is not anything in the world but a hoax designed to perpetuate a $100 billion expenditure that if it were put into real research to cure breast cancer, to cure cervical cancer, to cure prostate cancer, it might get you something. It is going to get you nothing by putting $100 million into the space station.

Read the GAO report I received this morning. I am not talking about the grandiose promise Ronald Reagan made in 1984 about how we are going to do it all for $8 billion. We have already thrown $11 billion away on the first space station before we abandoned it, and now we are headed for another $80 billion, $85 billion, and we are not going to cure anything. This project has no purpose in the world but to keep people working, to keep the aerospace and defense contractors all over the country working, and to explore what?

The Russians have been up there 20 years. I, again, invite anybody in this body to tell me what the Russians have cured, what they have developed in 20 years of having space stations. They have had seven space stations; there is nothing new about that. A space station is a mechanical thing; it is not scientific. The Russians have been up there 20 years. I challenge anybody to tell me one single thing from a medical standpoint that they have gotten out of it. I can tell you the answer is nothing.

We are going to continue pouring money down this just like we did the Clinch River breeder reactor, just like we did the super collider, until we finally woke up. The GAO issued a wake-up call this morning. For God's sakes, I say to Senators, why don't you listen to it?

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

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I am sorry to hear the time has expired, because I was really getting into listening to my colleague from Arkansas. He makes me feel like I used to feel when the summer carnival came to town and I went in and I listened to people who were smooth talkers from Arkansas and elsewhere. I wound up giving them the 20, 30 cents I had saved all summer long. They are very, very compelling.

In this instance, it is not my position, it is the position of the distinguished scientists, such as the ones whose comments and quotes I have read into the RECORD that outline specifically what the benefits of the space station and space exploration have been and will be.

While we respect the very powerful arguments made by the Senator from Arkansas, I now move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 193 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Akaka	Feinstein	Mack
Allard	Ford	McCain
Bennett	Frist	McConnell
Biden	Glenn	Mikulski
Bingaman	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Graham	Murkowski
Boxer	Gramm	Murray
Breaux	Grams	Nickles
Brownback	Grassley	Reid
Burns	Gregg	Robb
Campbell	Hagel	Roberts
Cleland	Hatch	Rockefeller
Coats	Helms	Roth
Cochran	Hutchison	Santorum
Coverdell	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Craig	Inouye	Sessions
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Shelby
Daschle	Kerrey	Smith (NH)
DeWine	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Dodd	Kyl	Stevens
Domenici	Landrieu	Thompson
Enzi	Lieberman	Thurmond
Faircloth	Lott	Torricelli

NAYS—31

Abraham	Feingold	Lugar
Ashcroft	Harkin	Moynihan
Baucus	Hollings	Reed
Bryan	Hutchinson	Snowe
Bumpers	Jeffords	Specter
Byrd	Johnson	Thomas
Chafee	Kennedy	Warner
Collins	Kohl	Wellstone
Conrad	Lautenberg	Wyden
Dorgan	Leahy	
Durbin	Levin	

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 944) was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to lay it on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOND. 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. BOND. With the concurrence of the majority leader and the minority leader, I think we are prepared to have one more vote on an amendment to be offered by Senator BUMPERS. I believe other amendments pending can be resolved without a vote, so we hope to be able to have the vote on the amendment and start the vote for final passage prior to 7 o'clock.

I ask unanimous consent the debate on an amendment to be offered by the Senator from Arkansas be 20 minutes, equally divided in the usual form.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 953

(Purpose: To cap the cost of the Space Station)

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and I ask unanimous consent that no second-degree amendments be in order.

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

The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] proposes an amendment numbered 953.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new sections.

SEC. XXX. ANNUAL REPORT ON LIFE CYCLE COSTS AND SPACE LAUNCH REQUIREMENTS.

(a) For each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2013, the Administrator, along with the President's submission to the Congress of the annual budget request for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, shall submit a report that contains,

(1) a life cycle capital development and operations plan with a year-by-estimate of the United States' share of the projected expenses for development, construction, operation, enhancement, and decommissioning and disassembly of the Space Station;

(2) an updated space launch manifest for the Space Station program and the estimated marginal and average launch costs for the Space Station program for the fiscal year involved and all succeeding fiscal years.

SEC. XXX. FUNDING CAPS.

(a) The President's cumulative budget submissions for Space Station capital development and operations for the fiscal year 1994 through the fiscal year during which the Space Station achieves full operational capability may not exceed $17,400,000,000, exclusive of launch costs.

(b) After achieving full operational capability and continuing through its decommissioning, the President's annual budget submission to Congress for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall contain an amount for the operation of, and any enhancement to, the Space Station which shall in no case exceed $1,300,000,000 for that fiscal year, exclusive of launch costs.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section

(1) the capital development program of the Space Station includes, but is not limited to, the research and development activities associated with the space and ground systems and collateral equipment of the Space Station, and all direct expenses for space flight, control, data communications, assembly and operations planning, construction of facilities, training, development of science equipment and payloads, and research and program management activities associated with the construction and operations of the Space Station and its supporting elements and services until the facility is equipped and powered as planned, and declared fully operational.

(2) operation of the Space Station includes, but is not limited to, all direct research and development; space flight, control and data communications; construction of facilities; training; development of science equipment and payloads; scientific experiments; and research and program management activities associated with the operations of the Space Station; and the U.S.-Russia cooperative MIR program.

(3) enhancement of the Space Station includes all direct research and development; space flight, control and data communications; construction of facilities; and research and program management activities associated with the acquisition of additional Space Station elements and ground support facilities.

(4) direct expenses include, but are not limited to, the marginal costs of transportation and tracking and data services, launch facilities, payload processing facilities, simulator facilities, and all other enabling facilities including their collateral equipment, and all laboratory and technical services provided by NASA Centers to support space station development and scientific research.

(5) full operation capability means the facility is fully assembled on-orbit with the power, configuration and capabilities described in the system design review of March 24, 1994.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I will make this brief. I know everyone wants to get out of here, and I want to accommodate the membership.

Last week, the Armed Services Committee accepted an amendment that capped the costs on the F–22 fighter plane. They, I think, correctly decided that the costs of the F–22 could very well go way beyond anything intended by the Congress. So, Mr. President, they accepted a cap on the F–22 fighter plane.

All I am trying to do on this is do the same thing on the space station. I am using NASA's figures. These are not my figures. These are the figures that NASA says they can build the space station for and operate it. The amendment, as I say, is right where they say it is, but here is the reason I am doing this. The General Accounting Office says that since last year, the risk to the space station's costs in schedule have, in fact, increased. GAO goes on to say the station's financial reserves have also deteriorated significantly.

Now, I think the people in this body who strongly favor the space station in good conscience and as a duty to their constituents and their own conscience ought to support saying at some point there ought to be some kind of a limit on how much we are willing to spend. I am using the figures that NASA has themselves put out: $17.4 billion to build it, $1.3 billion a year to operate it. The cap does not extend to a launch cost, only to the building and deployment and to the operating of it.

That seems like a simple, straightforward amendment to me, Mr. President.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I just appreciate the effort the Senator from Arkansas is making to ensure that the spending on this widely supported and strongly endorsed program is kept under control, but the space station is already operating under administrative caps. I understand the authorizing committee is examining the potential for legislated caps. I think this is an issue appropriately to be referred to the authorizers. It deserves careful consideration, not brought forward here in the last moment on an appropriations bill debate.

I just say, Mr. President, space station is a research and development project. It has a lot of uncertainties but tremendous promise. It is rocket science. We are dealing with rocket science. We should not lock NASA in stone with caps that are pulled out of thin air here at the last minute in the appropriations process.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Bumpers amendment.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I, too, rise in opposition to the Bumpers amendment. Though well-intentioned, it is not necessary and could inadvertently, by placing a cap, lead to real concern in the area of safety.

First, we do not want to tie the hands of the NASA administrator. Second, since fiscal year 1994, the station has been subject to funding limitations, a $2.1 billion annual funding and a $17.4 billion overall funding through the completion of the assembly. Yes, these limitations are not legislatively mandated; they have been administratively carried out.

There are many references to these specific limitations to the space station budget and congressional proceedings. For example, the $17.4 billion total cap through the completion of the assembly. Recent reports indicate that NASA is expected to build the station within these limits. We should not legislate a cap. In good faith, NASA continues to meet these goals. Any additional money sought is for unforeseen problems either associated with the Russian service module or where we might now identify a certain series of safety concerns. We are learning lessons from Mir.

I don't want to tie the hands of NASA or threaten the lives of astronauts. I really encourage our colleagues to vote no on Bumpers and await the wise counsel of the authorizing committee on this issue.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BUMPERS. I hardly know what else to say about this. The figures I am using are the figures that NASA says they can build and operate it for. Now, it is obvious from the GAO report that came out this morning that these costs are beginning to get out of control. There is a shifting from one account to another. There is even shifting from nonspace station programs to space station programs.

All I am trying to do is to say, let's get it under control. There is not anything, frankly, written in stone about a cost cap amendment. Next year, if NASA comes in and says we are down $1 billion, we will certainly give it to them, if I am any judge of what is going to happen around here in the future with the space station.

But here is what the GAO report said this morning, Mr. President:

> NASA's actions to reinforce its financial reserves and keep the program within its funding limitations has in some cases involved redefining a portion of the program subject to the limitations. Such actions make the value of the current limitations as a funding control mechanism questionable. Therefore, we proposed that the NASA administrator, with the concurrence of the Office of Management and Budget, direct the space station to discontinue the use of the current funding limitations.

And they go ahead to say at the end of the review:

> Assuming that Congress decides to continue the space station program and wants to replace the current funding limitations, it should consider, after consultation with NASA, reestablishment in light of the current circumstances.

Now, the truth of the matter is, this program is heading headlong out of control. There are very few people in this body that do not know that, that do not understand that, and I am offering this amendment simply because I am saying, if you are going to build a space station, for Pete's sake let's put some kind of a limitation on it.

Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN, who chairs the Commerce Committee, tells me that he is working with NASA and he wants to work with me on putting a cap on this. One of the problems I have and worry about is, are we simply going to put some language in—and I think Senator MCCAIN shares my concern about the cost of this program. I certainly would welcome the opportunity to work with him, but I don't want a cap, and I know Senator MCCAIN doesn't want a cap that has all kinds of escape mechanisms in it so the costs can continue to skyrocket and we can continue building this big boondoggle. My whole purpose is to say to my colleagues who believe in the space station—which I do not—that I know they share my concern about these costs that GAO says are sliding out of control.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The amendment (No. 953) was withdrawn.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it is with deep gratitude that I express my appreciation to the Senator from Arkansas. I believe he has another amendment

and I now feel a wonderful sense that we will be willing to accept it if he wishes to proceed with that.

Ms. MIKULSKI. If the Senator from Arkansas would just allow a kudos comment. I thank the Senator for withdrawing his amendment, though I know that he is in no way retreating from his position. We acknowledge that position and we look forward to hearing both from him and the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee on his advice in this matter. Thanks again.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Bumper amendment to place a cap on the space station. I oppose the idea of a price cap at this time given the recent changes to the space station program surrounding the prime contractor's performance and the instability of Russian participation.

I have asked the General Accounting Office [GAO] to update their previous life-cycle cost estimate on the space station. Once this cost estimate is completed, I intend to introduce a price cap on the station. It is my hope that a price cap at that time will reflect a more accurate assessment of the space station total life-cycle costs.

I am pleased that my colleague from Arkansas has withdrawn his amendment.

I look forward to investigating these issues further after the GAO study I requested is completed and after the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee holds hearings and further consultation with interested parties including NASA.

AMENDMENT NO. 954

(Purpose: To earmark funds for a National Research Council report on the Space Station program)

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] proposes an amendment numbered 954.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. . Of the funds provided to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in this bill, the Administrator shall by November 1, 1998, make available no less than $400,000 for a study by the National Research Council, with an interim report to be completed by June 1, 1998, that evaluates, in terms of the potential impact on the Space Station's assembly schedule, budget, and capabilities, the engineering challenges posed by extravehicular activity (EVA) requirements, U.S. and non-U.S. space launch requirements, the potential need to upgrade or replace equipment and components after assembly complete, and the requirement to decommission and disassemble the facility.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, this simply requires NASA to spend up to $400,000 of its unobligated funds for the National Research Council to do a study between now and the summer of 1998 on any engineering problems that may seem insurmountable in building and deploying the space station.

I think both floor managers have looked this over and have agreed to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 954) was agreed to.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BOND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, have the floor managers had an opportunity to look over the visa waiver for Veterans' Administration doctors?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, we have had conversation with the authorizing committees and, from our standpoint, I have found no objection from the committees of jurisdiction. This one is well outside the scope of our normal activities. So I am awaiting any expression of concern. We have not had any concern from the committees who have jurisdiction over immigration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I know that the VA often has very special circumstances where doctors, perhaps from other countries, or graduates from international medical schools, are present in our VA hospitals to help with either special assignments or special chores.

From what I can understand, there was an error in last year's immigration bill that really shackled VA from the flexibility it had in this area. From what I understand, the Bumpers amendment is a benign amendment. It does not create a new classification. It does not create a new entitlement to either come to this country or stay in this country. It just reaffirms kind of what was once a usual and customary practice by the VA. So I don't anticipate an objection.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, let me just thank the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Missouri. Let me add this caveat which might help them sleep better. A veterans' hospital in Little Rock told me they have five doctors they are going to lose. I am really offering this on their behalf. This is sort of a critical situation where these doctors are going to be forced to leave and go home.

All this amendment says is that, in the future, the VA—not the doctor—could request a waiver of the visa requirement that they return home for 2 years before they can come back. That seems like a fairly laudable thing when you consider the medical shortages most VA hospitals experience. If you find when you get to the conference committee somebody objects because it may be a turf fight of some kind, I will understand that. I hope that doesn't happen. But I appreciate the accommodation you have given.

AMENDMENT NO. 955

(Purpose: To restore the authority of the Veterans' Administration to request waivers of the home residency requirement for doctors employed at VA hospitals on J–1 visas)

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] proposes an amendment numbered 955.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following new section: SEC. . Section 214(*l*)(1)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(*l*)(1)(D)) (as added by section 220 of the Immigration and Nationality Technical Corrections Act of 1994 and redesignated as subsection (*l*) by section 671(a)(3)(A) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that, in the case of a request by the Department of Veterans Affairs, the alien shall not be required to practice medicine in a geographic area designated by the Secretary.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 955) was agreed to.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BOND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 6:40 p.m. the Senate proceed to H.R. 2158, the House companion bill, all after the enacting clause be stricken, the text of S. 1034 be inserted, H.R. 2158 be read for the third time, and a vote occur on passage, all without further action or debate.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 956 THROUGH 960, EN BLOC

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I send a group of amendments to the desk, en bloc, and ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] proposes amendments numbered 956 through 960, en bloc.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 956

(Purpose: To enable the State of Florida to use prior EPA Title II funds for a grant for wastewater treatment, and for other purposes)

On page 63, lines 4 and 5, strike ''allocated to the purposes of the Safe Drinking Water Act'' and insert ''allocated for the purposes of the Safe Drinking Water Act and title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, respectively,''

On page 63, line 18, before the period, add the following proviso: ''*: Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator is authorized to make a grant of $4,326,000 under Title II of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, from funds appropriated in prior years under section 205 of the Act for the State of Florida and available due to deobligation, to the appropriate instrumentality for wastewater treatment works in Monroe County, Florida''

On page 64, line 18, before the period, add the following proviso: ''*Provided,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds other than those appropriated under this heading, shall be used for or by the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality''.

On page 65, line 13, after the semi-colon, insert ''or'', and on line 17 strike ''; or beaches''.

AMENDMENT NO. 957

(Purpose: To limit the use of locality pay differential that would provide a pay increase to an employee transferred as a result of sexual harassment)

At the appropriate place, insert:

None of the funds made available by Title 1 of this Act may be used to provide a locality payment differential which would have the effect of causing a pay increase to any employee that was removed as a Director of a VA Hospital and transferred to another hospital as a result of the Inspector General's conclusion that the employee engaged in verbal sexual harassment and abusive behavior toward female employees.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer this amendment that calls for a halt to all locality pay increases for all employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs that have been transferred due to their perpetration of sexual harassment. Let me explain why this amendment is necessary.

Over a year ago to date, the Veterans Department undertook an investigation into the allegations of sexual harassment, misconduct, and unprofessional behavior on the part of Jerome Calhoun, who was Director of the VA Medical Center in Fayetteville, NC.

In September 1996, the Office of the Inspector General of the Veterans Department issued a report confirming the allegations of sexual harassment, as well as a pattern of inappropriate and abusive behavior toward Department employees.

In most organizations today this kind of behavior would not be tolerated. Jerome Calhoun would have been fired. Unfortunately, this is not the way things work at the Veterans Department. At the Veterans Department this kind of deplorable behavior gets you a comfortable settlement.

Here are the facts: For his intolerable behavior, Mr. Calhoun was given a pay raise, bringing his already generous salary to $106,000. He was transferred to sunny Bay Pines, FL, a locale of his own choosing, and he was given the position of special assistant which is standard Government lingo for having no specific responsibilities. Quite frankly, I look at this settlement and I ask myself, where is the punishment? In the private sector this would be considered a promotion.

Mr. President, on behalf of the 200,000 employees of the Veterans Department, I ask this body to do what Department officials have neglected. Jerome Calhoun must not be allowed make such an incredible mockery of the system.

AMENDMENT NO. 958

On page 51 after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 216. INDIAN HOUSING REFORM.

Upon a finding by the Secretary that any person has substantially, significantly, or materially violated the requirements of any activity under the Native American Housing Block Grants Program under title I of the Native American Self-Determination Act of 1996 or any associated activity under the jurisdiction of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary shall bar that person from any such participation in programs under that title thereafter and shall require reimbursement for any losses or costs associated with these violations.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am offering an amendment today to correct an egregious problem at the Department of Housing and Urban Development and on tribal lands across the Nation that came to light last December. As many of my colleagues know, the Seattle Times broke an unbelievable story of greed, deception, and mismanagement in the tribal housing program shortly before the 105th Congress convened.

The Seattle Times reported that funding intended to build housing for low-income native Americans on the Tulalip Reservation in my State, went instead to construct a 5,300 square foot $400,000 home. The recipients of this taxpayer-funded home were not low-income, but instead earned a combined yearly income of $92,319 as executive director of the tribe's housing authority and contracting officer for the authority. I am confident my colleagues will agree that this abuse of HUD funding is outrageous and should be punished severely.

Unfortunately, the Tulalip house was not the only problem Seattle Times reporters found in their 6-month investigation of tribal housing programs. Instead, they turned up numerous and repeated examples of cheating, abuse, and mismanagement in native American housing programs across the United States.

In Red Rock, OK, Troy Warrior and his family of the Otoe-Missouria Indian tribe were excited at the prospect of moving into a new home. They would finally be able to afford their own home with help from HUD financing. Only a few days before the family was scheduled to move into the modest home, they were told that leaders of the tribal housing authority would get the house instead. Twenty other low-income families in the tribe faced the same dilemma. The tribal housing leaders eliminated the requirement that recipients of the homes pay for them, in effect giving themselves free houses at the expense of American taxpayers while those truly in need of the housing were left to fend for themselves.

Jimmy Viarrial, chairman of the Pojoaque Tribe housing authority in Santa Fe, NM, makes over $40,000 a year, twice the State average. But when HUD gave the housing authority $1 million for home repairs, it spent the first $45,000 on Viarrial's own five-bedroom home. Most of the rest went to remodel the homes of friends and relatives of Viarrial and the housing authority director.

Mr. President, these are just a few of the many abuses found by Seattle Times reporters last year, and I can say with confidence that there are most likely many more such abuses that have not been discovered. The American taxpayers deserve better than this. When we in the U.S. Senate tell them that their money is going to worthwhile programs to provide housing for the poorest native Americans, it is our duty to ensure that it is.

As many of you know, two officials at the Department of Housing and Urban Development were removed from their positions in the Office of Native American Programs as a result of this scandal. Furthermore, the HUD inspector general has issued a report confirming that the Seattle Times allegations are in fact true and recommending that the Native American Housing and Self-Determination Act of 1996 be amended to ensure better oversight of Indian housing authorities at HUD. These are positive developments that should be applauded. But no actions have been taken against the tribes responsible for the abuse of taxpayer money.

That is why I am offering an amendment today intended to send notice that the misuse and misallocation of taxpayer dollars will no longer be tolerated. It will be punished and punished severely. Anyone involved will be permanently barred from participating in the program, and must reimburse that program. I would have preferred to go further, but this amendment is the strongest that can be accepted and passed. It is a simple amendment that should have been law a long time ago.

I urge my colleagues to join me in my effort to inject fairness and accountability into a program rife with abuse and mismanagement. It is the least we can do for the millions of American taxpayers who expect their hard-earned money to be used wisely.

AMENDMENT NO. 959

(Purpose: To make available $1,000,000 for the Neutral Buoyancy Simulator program of NASA)

On page 70, line 18, strike out ''1999.'' and insert in lieu thereof ''1999: *Provided,* That of the amount appropriated or otherwise made

available by this heading, $1,000,000 may be available for the Neutral Buoyancy Simulator program.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 960

On page 16, line 21, strike $10,693,000,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''10,159,000''.

On page 16, line 23, strike ''$9,200,000'' and insert ''8,666,000''.

On page 23, line 6, insert ''and contract expertise'' after ''technical assistance''.

On page 23, line 24, strike ''and 1995'' and insert in lieu thereof ''1995, and 1997''.

On page 27, line 17, insert ''for'' after ''charge''.

On page 27, line 22, insert ''or moderate income family'' after ''family''.

On page 27, line 24, strike ''payment'' and insert '''prepayment''.

On page 28, line 1, insert ''of'' after the first ''the''.

On page 28, line 8, insert ''if'' after ''and''.

On page 28, line 13, insert ''from'' after ''move''.

On page 28, line 14, strike ''of'' and insert ''or''.

On page 28, line 22, strike ''223'' and insert ''220''.

On page 35, line 10, insert before the period, the following: '': *Provided further,* That any unobligated balances available or recaptures in, or which become available in the Emergency Shelter Grants Program account, Supportive Housing Program account, Supplemental Assistance for Facilities to Assist the Homeless account, Shelter Plus Care account, Innovative Homeless Initiatives Demonstration Program account and Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation (SRO) account, shall be transferred to and merged with the amounts in this account and shall be used for purposes under this account''.

On page 45, after line 18, insert the following:

''(d) Public and Assisted Housing Rents, Income Adjustments and Preferences.

''(1) Section 402(a) of The Balanced Budget Downpayment Act, I is amended by striking ''fiscal year 1997'' and insert in lieu thereof ''fiscal year 1998.

''(2) Section 402(f) of The Balanced Budget Downpayment Act, I is amended by striking ''fiscal years 1996 and 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''fiscal years 1997 and 1998''.

On page 47, beginning on line 24, strike out ''Account Transition'' and all that follows through line 7 on page 48, and redesignate the sections accordingly.

On page 51, line 11, insert before the period ''or demolition''.

''HOME PROGRAM FORMULA

''SEC. 217. The first sentence of section 217(b)(3) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act is amended by striking ''only those jurisdictions that are allocated an amount of $500,000 or greater shall receive an allocation'' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ''jurisdictions that are allocated an amount of $500,000 or more, and participating jurisdictions (other than consortia that fail to renew the membership of all of their member jurisdictions) that are allocated an amount less than $500,000, shall receive an allocation''.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I think this should take care of the amendments for tonight. In the managers' amendment, the first item is a technical correction to EPA language related to cross-collateralization of State revolving funds. The language has been requested by the Environment and Public Works Committee.

The second item, requested by Senators MACK and GRAHAM, is to enable the State of Florida to use funds obligated and available to the State of Florida under title II of the Clean Water Act to make a grant to Monroe County, FL. This is budget neutral, and similar to other amendments on VA–HUD bills.

Third, this would ensure that the Council on Environmental Quality use only those resources provided to its direct appropriations to support its activity.

The fourth item deletes the prohibition on FEMA disaster relief expenditures relative to beaches. It is expected that the authorizing committee will be addressing this shortly.

There is another amendment, a very important amendment, on page 16, which readjusts the section 8 contract renewal account from $9.2 billion to $8.666 billion, as provided by the Budget Committee, to put the bill in compliance with the budget resolution and the 602(b) allocation.

The sixth amendment limits locality pay increases for VA employees found guilty of sexual harassment.

The seventh amendment makes $1 million available in transition funds for the Neutral Buoyancy Simulator Program.

The eighth amendment authorizes HUD to bar persons violating the Indian block grant housing program from participating in the program in the future.

The other eight amendments are truly technical amendments. The HOPE Six account, the preservation account, McKinney homeless account, PHA account, account structure, demolition grants as part of HUD multifamily disposition authority, and grandfathering all existing home jurisdictions for home funding allocations.

Mr. President, I ask my ranking member if there are any further items that she has.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this side of the aisle has no additional amendments to add to the managers' amendment.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I gather we are ready to move to adoption of the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments, en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 956 through 960) were agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FEMA

Mr. GREGG. Would the Senator from Missouri yield for a question?

Mr. BOND. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. GREGG. Would the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies agree that the Federal Emergency Management Agency should act in a swift manner to settle its account with the Rockingham County jail in Brentwood, NH? As the Senator from Missouri may know, the county jail sustained flooding of more than 3 feet of water during a storm this past October. The county has been looking to FEMA for reimbursement of 75 percent of the damage it usually covers when there is a disaster.

Mr. BOND. Has FEMA settled any of this?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, the county has received roughly $150,000 from FEMA, but there is still about $178,000 outstanding. Most of the money paid to Rockingham County came only after a meeting this past March 3, which I hosted in my office with officials from FEMA and Rockingham County Commissioner Tom Battles. At that meeting, we were encouraged by FEMA that the outstanding balance would be settled within the next few months after some more flood mapping was conducted. With adequate time having passed and a new fiscal year on the way, it is only fair to Rockingham County and the State of New Hampshire that this issue be settled as budgets have to be structured.

Mr. Bond. I would say that I do agree that FEMA should work very quickly on this.

PARTICULATE MATTER RESEARCH

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998 that we are considering today allocates $35 million in the administration's budget request for research on the public health effects of airborne particulate matter. I have an amendment that simply states that these studies employ some basic sound scientific methods. This is an extremely important provision, but I would withdraw my amendment, if we could engage in a colloquy to assure that the issue will be addressed in conference.

This language will be an important part of assuring that we protect public health. Last week, the EPA finalized its rule on particulate matter. Many have questioned the science behind this rule and a great deal of uncertainty exists over the effect of particulate matter on public health. As we reach this juncture, we must remember the reason for this standard: to enhance public health. The only way we can be sure that the standard will, in fact, provide the desired benefits is through sound science. Lacking sound science, we may end up with standards that don't provide any benefit, but cost the public dearly. While we often hear about costs on industry, we must remember that those costs are passed down to individuals in the form of higher prices and higher State and local taxes. When individuals truly gain significant benefits from a standard, they are indeed better off. However, if we raise their costs for nothing or little in return, we simply make them poorer and less able to pay for basic necessities, such as health care. Last week you may recall, one District of Columbia woman died

in her apartment because of the heat and the fact that she could not afford air conditioning. Such stories remind us that poverty represents one of the greatest risk to public health. Hence, we should make sure that new regulations do not simply make people poorer. If we don't pursue sound science, we may impose regulations that actually decrease public health. By demanding that particulate matter research relies on the best available scientific methods, we can gain better knowledge over the impacts of the regulations and reform them to assure that we are actually enhancing overall public health.

Mr. BOND. I thank my colleague from Kansas for his comments. In a memorandum from the President to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency that accompanied this rule, the President committed that no new controls on businesses would be imposed until the science behind this rulemaking is reviewed 5 years from now. The results of this research will help in that decision. This is why the bill almost doubles funding for particulate matter research over last year's level.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I thank the Senator from Missouri for recognizing the importance of these studies and my recommendation. Given the significance of this research and overall limitations on funding, I think it is important that we are assured that the research will include those studies that will help us determine whether a cause-effect relationship exists between exposure to particulate matter and adverse health impacts. These include: First, controlled inhalation studies that will allow us to determine the effects of exposure to particulate matter at different concentration levels and the mechanism by which particulate matter could affect health; second, prospective epidemiology studies based on individual exposure measurements that will allow us to better examine the role of possible alternative causes of the measured increase in risk; and third, the relationship of outdoor, indoor, and personal exposures to particulate matter. Without these types of studies, we may not be any further along in resolving the scientific uncertainties associated with this rulemaking. I further believe that the results of this research should be made available for independent scientific review.

Mr. SHELBY. If my colleagues would yield for a moment, I would like to endorse the well-reasoned recommendations made by the Senator for Kansas. The recently issued particulate matter rule is troubling given the scientific uncertainties and the significant costs that will be imposed on the government, citizens, and businesses in Alabama—and in the rest of the Nation—that are already struggling to meet the air quality standards required by the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. The cost of implementing the new particulate matter standards is staggering, especially considering the questions that remain about the actual public health benefit. Further scientific examination of the matter is necessary prior to placing additional economic burdens on the American public. Premature implementation of the standards could be far more damaging to the Nation and I strongly recommend taking the time to fully review the scientific basis of the rulemaking.

Mr. BOND. My colleagues from Kansas and Alabama are correct. these studies are critical to determining whether the EPA's rulemaking is appropriate. I concur with the Senators in the importance of this research and ensuring that the particular research projects funded address the most critical questions associated with particulate matter exposure.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I also believe it is important that the research program include funding for the reanalysis of the American Cancer Society study on particulate matter that was used as the basis for EPA's risk estimate. My understanding is that the Health Effects Institute, an independent research organization that is already reviewing some of the epidemiology data, is willing to undertake this reanalysis and has received permission from the American Cancer Society, but currently lacks adequate funding to do a complete reanalysis.

Mr. BOND. I thank my colleagues for their recommendations. This will be an important issue to address when we go to conference with the House.

LYONS VA MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I would like to express my support for a provision in the House version of the fiscal year 1998 VA–HUD appropriations bill to provide $21.1 million in funding for the construction of an ambulatory care addition at the Lyons, NJ, VA Medical Center. This facility is sorely needed by the veterans in New Jersey, and I hope the Senate will recede to the House on this issue during the conference.

The Lyons VA Medical Center serves nearly 75 percent of New Jersey's veterans, and this funding will provide vital medical care for veterans who receive care on an outpatient basis. It will provide for necessary construction and renovations to enhance Lyons' clinics, diagnostic and treatment services, emergency department, and support functions. The funding will make a significant contribution to improving the access to quality medical care by New Jersey's veterans.

At a time when New Jersey's aging veteran population has an increasing need for VA health care services, we have an obligation to ensure that their health care needs are met. As a member of the VA–HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, I urge my colleagues on the committee to include this funding in the conference agreement.

Mr. BOND. As the Senator from New Jersey is aware, the outcome of the conference cannot be forecast. However, I will give strong consideration to the funding for the Lyons VA Medical Center ambulatory care addition in conference.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I, too, appreciate the Senator's support for the ambulatory care addition at the Lyons VA Medical Center, and I will join Senator BOND in doing all I can to support this funding during the conference.

PLANT GENOME INITIATIVE

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of my colleagues a provision in this measure which directs $40 million to begin the new plant genome initiative to help keep U.S. agriculture on top in the 21st century. The United States currently has a robust Federal investment in biotechnology in the human health field. While this remains a national priority, I think it is critical that we begin building on the common foundation in basic science to bring the power of biotechnology to bear in agriculture. We cannot sit idly and expect to remain the world's leader in agriculture production. U.S. agriculture currently exports a record $60 billion in agricultural products with a net trade surplus of $30 billion. This is about the long-term sustainability and competitiveness of U.S. agriculture which means that it is about meeting the world's growing nutritional needs, protecting U.S. jobs, and preserving the environment.

The future of corn and other plant species is written in the genetic code and genome mapping will give us the precise locations of genes that control important traits that can be manipulated to make corn and other vital commodities more drought tolerant; freeze tolerant; tolerant to certain chemicals, weeds, or bugs; disease resistant; less toxic and more digestible which is critical because it could lower phosphorous and nitrogen levels in animal waste.

This action incorporates the initial recommendations of the interagency working group on plant genomes [IWG] which was formed recently at my request to develop a scientific and administrative consensus on how best to accomplish this ambitious new effort to address the needs of 21st Century. The world population wants more food, less expensive food, more nutritious food, and they want it produced on less land in a more environment-friendly way. In this half century, we have seen U.S. agriculture double production by utilizing new technologies. Biotechnology will be the key in the next century to meet the needs of a world population which is expected to double in the next 30 years while protecting the world's natural resources.

According to scientists, today, biotechnology makes it possible to enter the genetic world of plants to gain a greater degree of control over the selection of genes than was possible with traditional breeding. It is now possible to locate the genes for certain traits, cut them from one organism, and paste them into another, even if the target organism is of another species. In order

to accomplish a genetic transfer between organisms using biotechnology, scientists have to be able to find the location of the genes that control a given characteristic, such as size, color, or resistance to disease. This new initiative seeks to provide a map of these locations so that scientists and producers can capitalize on this vast potential to benefit humankind and the environment.

The original idea was introduced to me by the Missouri Corngrowers Association who presented a comprehensive business plan to map the corn genome devised by the National Corngrowers Association working in conjunction with private and public scientific experts. With this additional money provided in this legislation the initiative can be expanded beyond corn to include other economically significant crops such as rice, soybeans, and wheat. After consulting with a number of scientists in Missouri and elsewhere, I have concluded that this is the kind of research that will unlock the information which holds the promise of addressing dramatically the challenges facing the world in the coming century. My hat is off to those who argued convincingly that this blockbuster initiative is vital to address the economic, nutritional, and environmental needs of the next century and worthy of blockbuster support from the Federal Government. I also applaud the administration's IWG for their strong support in beginning to formate the most scientifically and administratively feasible way to proceed so that we can maximize the return on the taxpayers' investment.

The IWG on plant genomes which was empaneled at my request to make recommendations on the plant genome initiative, consists of representatives from the Department of Agriculture, National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, Department of Energy, Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Office of Management and Budget. In its recently-released report, while funding sources were not identified, the value of this initiative was validated and recommendations were advanced to provide for international cooperation, private-public partnerships, and open public access to all the information discovered. The money awarded under this act will be done so by the National Science Foundation on a competitive basis with peer review.

Finally, I note that it is imperative that work continue to be done to integrate this initiative into the interagency effort that the IWG recommends. This means that the U.S. Department of Agriculture will have to work with us on coordinating their efforts with NSF and other agencies and they will have to provide recommendations on additional sources of funds for the effort within their budget.

PLANT GENOME RESEARCH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I commend my colleague from Missouri, the chairman of the VA/HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, for his foresight in providing funding through the National Science Foundation for plant genome research. This is a critical program for American agriculture involving a meaningful amount of money—$40 million—to advance work on plant genome projects for farm crops that contribute significantly to our economy. It has been my pleasure to work with Senator BOND for some time on the plant genome mapping effort.

Iowa is a national leader in the production of corn and soybeans. These two crops are mainstays of the Iowa economy. In order to remain competitive in the world market, we need to understand in increasing detail what the genetic mechanisms of these crops are and how they work. Researchers in many fields can use the results of the genome mapping effort to enhance these crops. The genome mapping research results will help us to understand new and better ways to increase crop yields, discover new uses and products, better the health of the plant by reducing risks to disease and pests, and to help protect the environment. This bodes well for the corn grower and soybean producer by increasing the value of the crop and, thus, increasing farm income.

I will continue to work with Senator BOND to see that this effort receives proper funding both through the NSF and the Department of Agriculture. An interagency effort, along with a strong, effective, meaningful public/private partnership is key to the ultimate success of the plant genome mapping project. We must also be aware of international genome mapping efforts. Where possible it is necessary to cooperate with those efforts.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I rise today to support the National Science Foundation plant genome initiative that is funded in the VA/HUD, Independent Agencies appropriations bill. I want to commend Senator BOND, chairman of the appropriations subcommittee, for his leadership in developing this initiative. This project will be funded with new money and will not affect current NSF programs.

The plant genome initiative, as included in the bill, is an expansion of the current, NSF Arabidopsis genome project to map and sequence the Arabidopsis genome. The plant genome initiative will advance the current Arabidopsis project and will move us beyond the current programs to more economically significant crops, such as corn, soybeans, wheat, and rice.

To compete in the global market, U.S. agriculture must continually strive to efficiently and economically improve production capabilities—such as combating serious threats from disease, pests, and climate changes—without harming the environment. The plant genome initiative will provide us the information necessary to significantly improve the environment and reduce crop and livestock production costs at the same time. It is a win-win project for producers, for consumers, and for the environment.

This project will give us the basic, fundamental knowledge necessary to ensure that our consumers continue to receive an abundant supply of high quality, wholesome food at reasonable prices. To meet the growing demand for U.S. agricultural products, we will need to increase production approximately three-fold in the next 50 years. The plant genome initiative will set us on the right path toward meeting that goal without harming the environment.

The plant genome initiative will have other far-reaching benefits, as well. It may lead to significant reductions in crop losses while also reducing our reliance on pesticides. It will allow us to improve animal nutrition to increase meat productivity. It will, also, allow us to meet consumer demands for higher quality food at reasonable prices. These are just a few of the benefits that are possible with the plant genome initiative.

I, again, want to commend Senator BOND for his foresight in providing funding for the building of a foundation that will allow us to meet the challenges of the 21st Century. Mr. President, this initiative is critically important to U.S. consumers and to U.S. agriculture. I urge my colleagues to support the NSF plant genome initiative as included in the VA/HUD appropriations bill.

MARK-TO-MARKET

Mr. MACK. I would like to commend Senator BOND for addressing the section 8 contract expiration issue by including S. 513, the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 in the VA/HUD appropriations bill. This legislation, which is cosponsored by my colleague from Missouri and Senators D'AMATO, BENNETT, DOMENICI, FAIRCLOTH, GRAMS, and CHAFEE, is a national priority for reforming the Department of Housing and Urban Development's HUD multifamily housing programs and reducing the escalating costs of project-based section 8 renewals. According to preliminary estimates by the Congressional Budget Office, this legislation will save the American taxpayer about $4.6 billion in section 8 funds over the next 10 years. This legislation not only saves scarce Federal resources, it also protects the Federal investment in affordable housing by screening out distressed properties and noncompliant owners from the Federal programs and addresses HUD's management problems with this portfolio by utilizing capable public and private third parties.

It is critical to enact this legislation into law this year. The Banking Committee unanimously approved S. 513 as part of its budget reconciliation package this June. Unfortunately, the Senate and House subconferees were unable to come to an agreement on this legislation and subsequently, it was dropped out of the reconciliation package. Accordingly, I will continue to

push this legislation and strongly support Senator BOND's effort in passing S. 513 as part of the appropriations bill.

When Secretary Cuomo testified before the Banking Committee on S. 513, he raised several concerns about the restructuring process outlined in the bill. But he also indicated his willingness to address those concerns through negotiations with the Senate. I want to point out that significant progress has been made to address the administration's concerns with the bill. Two major areas where agreement was reached relate to the use of third parties or participating administrative entities [PAE] and the use of tenant-based assistance. On the use of PAE's, HUD has agreed to maintain the Senate's priority for State and local housing finance agencies to serve as restructuring entities. However, the Senate has agreed to provide additional flexibility to the Secretary in selecting qualified PAE's while protecting the public purpose. Also, the Senate and administration have agreed to provide discretion to PAE's in determining whether tenant-based or project-based assistance will be provided for qualified properties after restructuring.

I would like to ask Senator BOND for his assurance that, as this process moves forward, he will endeavor to assure that the agreements made with the administration are incorporated into the bill.

Mr. BOND. I congratulate Senator MACK for his work in developing a workable solution to the section 8 contract renewal problem, and also Secretary Cuomo for his willingness to work with the Senate. Needless to say, it is my hope that this issue still can be resolved in budget reconciliation or through the regular authorization process. However, if it becomes necessary, we will pursue this issue through the appropriations process. I look forward to working with the Banking Committee as we move forward and I will endeavor to include any changes that are based on agreements between your committee and HUD. It is likely that those agreements would be incorporated during the conference with the House.

As a member of the Banking Committee during the last Congress and as a cosponsor of the bill, I appreciate the work that the authorizing committee has done on this legislation. Multifamily portfolio restructuring is an urgent priority. I look forward to continuing our work together in resolving the contract renewal crisis.

Mr. MACK. I thank the Senator very much for his work and dedication to this issue. I look forward to our continued cooperative effort in resolving this critical issue.

Ms. SNOW. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to address my colleagues on a matter of critical importance to veterans in the Northeast. First, I would like to express my appreciation to the Appropriations Committee and the VA–HUD Subcommittee for their hard work on this bill.

This package contains over $40 billion for the VA, including an increase in funding for VA medical care and research. The committee's recommendation for the VA represents an increase of almost $93 million above the President's budget request. The committee rejected the budget agreement recommendation to reduce VA discretionary funding by $273 million below the President's fiscal year 1998 request, arguing that such a reduction would result in fewer eligible veterans receiving comprehensive medical care, reductions to basic maintenance and repair of medical facilities, and additional delays in the processing of benefits claims. The committee stated that the outcome of such budget reductions would be completely unacceptable. I strongly agree with this sentiment, and I would like to congratulate my colleagues on their efforts.

In this spirit, I would also like to comment on changes in the VA health care system affecting a number of veterans health care facilities in the Northeast and elsewhere.

Under the new regional allocation formula being implemented by the VA, the New England network could be cut by as much as 6.36 percent from its fiscal year 1996 funding level. I realize that the New England region cut may actually be lower than the 6.36 percent over 3 years originally projected, and the numbers will be reevaluated every year. However, under the new allocation plan, many States will lose funding while others will receive considerable increases.

The VA says there will be no reduction in services to veterans in facilities experiencing cuts and that cost-savings achieved through consolidation of operations and greater efficiencies in the system will make up for the shortfalls. However, it is not clear whether this will, in fact, be the case. I appreciate the fact that the committee is waiting for the results of a General Accounting Office study, due in September, on the allocation formula. I think it is very important that we ensure that funding under this new system is fair and equitable.

Maine has a very large veterans population—152,000—dispersed throughout the State. Togus is the only veterans community hospital in my State to serve this population. Currently, Togus provides services almost exclusively to mandatory—category A—veterans. In fact, less than 1 percent of Togus' services go to nonmandatory veterans. Togus cannot be viewed as overfunded compared to other VA medical facilities. And yet, this facility, which has already made great strides in increasing efficiency and rooting out waste, may experience a reduction in funding under the new allocation formula.

I believe there is a limit to the kind of restructuring that some of these facilities can be expected to absorb without undermining the quality of care and the availability of basic services. Moreover, I am concerned that a redistribution of funds away from New England presents a potential danger that the programs under the draft strategic plan could be underfunded.

I would remind my colleagues once again that the Senate Appropriations Committee rejected the budget agreement recommendation to reduce VA discretionary funding by $273 million below the President's fiscal year 1998 request because such a reduction would result in fewer eligible veterans receiving comprehensive medical care

I strongly believe that each veteran must be treated with the dignity and respect he or she deserves by virtue of having worn our Nation's uniform, and we have a commitment to ensure that all veterans receive the benefits they deserve.

A fair allocation of VA resources must take into account the regional impact of all of the regional networks. As such, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate and in the House to ensure that the bill we send to the President provides a fair and equitable allocation of funding for VA hospitals.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH PARTNERSHIP CENTERS PROGRAM

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today in support of my friend, Senator KIT BOND and his efforts to include funding for important community development programs within the VA–HUD Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1998. In particular, I would like to highlight the provision of $12 million for the Community Outreach Partnerships Centers [COPC] program. I commend the subcommittee for its diligence in funding this program at this level.

The COPC program provides assistance to public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education for a wide range of community outreach activities. These colleges and universities may utilize COPC funds to address a variety of local needs, including housing, economic development, neighborhood revitalization, job training, and crime prevention. The program thus utilizes and leverages the enormous resources of our institutions of higher learning to establish partnerships with local neighborhoods and communities to solve their common problems.

Mr. President, I would like to applaud the outstanding community outreach efforts of Long Island University [LIU] located in my home State of New York and bring these efforts to the attention of the Subcommittee on VA–HUD Appropriations. Long Island University, founded in 1886, has a current enrollment of 24,000 students and conducts a variety of community oriented programs at each of its six New York campuses.

LIU's various community outreach programs at its Brooklyn campus are particularly successful and well suited to the COPC program. For instance, the university operates a number of educational programs for senior citizens and New York City school students, including underprivileged and

minority students. In addition, the university operates a small business development institute, a speech and pathology clinic which serves needy persons with disabilities free of charge, and a collaborative career development and cooperative education initiative.

Mr. President, Long Island University has an outstanding track record of community involvement. It has formed successful partnerships with state and local governments, including the New York City Board of Education, as well as community and business groups. It has successfully leveraged additional funding from a wide variety of sources. I believe that its activities are a successful example of positive and constructive change within the community.

I thank Senator BOND for his efforts and I commend the community outreach activities of Long Island University as a model for funding under the COPC program.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I appreciate my friend Senator D'AMATO's kind words in support of the VA–HUD appropriations bill. The subcommittee is aware of the extensive community oriented programs of Long Island university. The University is to be commended to HUD as a model for successful involvement within the surrounding community and is worthy of consideration for funding under the Community Outreach Partnerships Center Program.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I am pleased that once again the Senate has chosen to continue our Nation's commitment to the future through the exploration and study of space. Especially as we stand here today knowing that the Sojourner Rover continues its unprecedented exploration of the surface of Mars. NASA is now turning its attention to the many new missions scheduled for future, including the construction of the international space station. Mr. President, we must continue to invest in this pursuit of knowledge.

No one can predict the outcome of our investment in the space program, but one thing is certain, and that is generations to come will benefit from the knowledge and experience gained from the investment we have made, and continued exploration of space will present many more opportunities to learn.

First, the space program will provide significant contributions not only to Americans, but people all around the world. We have already seen results of space-related research in life science. Recently I learned of a NASA technology which is now being used to help diagnose vision problems in our children. This coming school year, the State of Florida will be using this technology to screen all students in kindergarten. By discovering vision problems at such an early age, we will prevent many of these children from falling behind because of undetected impairments. This type of commercial application of NASA born technology is virtually limitless.

Second, our Nation's leadership role in high technology research and development must be maintained and enhanced. The aerospace industry is a significant area of America's international competitiveness.

Third, projects such as the international space station help to continue and expand cooperation among the world's nations. Our collaborative efforts with the Europeans, Japanese, and Russians only serve to strengthen our relations in a global community. Our space program enables us to exchange exciting ideas with the world, and accelerate the pace of our own technology and space exploration.

Mr. President I believe that these are very compelling reasons for continued support of our space program. NASA deserves our support. Congress and the administration should provide the appropriate resources needed for NASA to successfully manage and enhance our space program. We must invest in our future, and invest in ourselves.

PILOT PROGRAM FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS FOR THE TERMINALLY ILL

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise to address a critical need in our society, the need for affordable health care for the terminally ill. Today, in the fiscal year 1998 Treasury and general government appropriations bill, a bill which I otherwise supported, I believe we did a disservice to those suffering from the HIV virus, cancer, and other terminal diseases. We failed to authorize a pilot program which might have severely reduced the cost of essential, and at this time very expensive, drugs which significantly prolong patients' lives and enhance their quality of life.

The Treasury and general government appropriations bill includes a repeal of section 1555 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994. This so-called cooperative purchasing provision would have allowed local governments to purchase items from the schedule of prices established by the Government Services Administration [GSA] for the Federal Government. On the face of it, this provision had some appeal, as a measure that might save money for local governments. However, many argued that section 1555 would bankrupt small businesses, increase all prices in the long term, and undermine the reliability and safety provided by a local manufacturing and distribution network. The concern about section 1555 was widespread and profound and, therefore, I supported a repeal of the provision. However, I favored one exception, which would address a critical need and give us a chance to observe the effects of section 1555. I favored the authorization of a carefully defined pilot program in cooperative purchasing of drugs for terminally ill patients.

Public hospitals in cities and counties throughout the United States are desperate to reduce the cost of health care for the terminally ill. Last year, the Nation's largest city, county, and State hospitals lost an average of $86 million per year by providing care to uninsured an underinsured patients. To avoid closure or bankruptcy, many of these institutions have to limit their more expensive services, such as the new generation of life-prolonging AIDS drugs. At the same time, many AIDS patients are deprived of adequate care because they cannot afford $15,000 per year for AIDS drug therapy. State and local programs must purchase these drugs for them.

The Department of Health and Human Services has agreed to coordinate a pilot program which would enable State and local governments to benefit from Federal Government rates when they purchase drugs for life-threatening conditions. Recent studies suggest that this could save public hospitals more than 25 percent of their current expenditures on these essential drugs. These savings would, in turn, make it possible for hospitals to help more Americans battling against terminal illness.

I think we all agree that the terminally ill and those who serve them deserve our support in making their medical care more affordable and available. At the same time, I am acutely aware of the concern of veterans' groups and others that this kind of program could eventually result in higher health care costs for all. Therefore, this pilot program would be narrowly focused and of finite length. I encourage concerned groups to contribute suggestions as we define those program constraints. Furthermore, I acknowledge that this pilot program may fail. If so, we will have learned from our error. If the program works, however, if it truly brings down the costs of life-prolonging and potentially life-saving drugs, could we live with ourselves if we refused to give it a chance?

DRUG ELIMINATION GRANT PROGRAM

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I would like to state my strong support for the VA–HUD Subcommittee's efforts to support funding in this legislation to combat the twin scourges of drugs and crime in low-income housing throughout the Nation. I am greatly encouraged by the subcommittee's action in maintaining $290 million in funding for the Drug Elimination Grant Program.

Under this important program, the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] makes funds available to local housing authorities for the purpose of combating and preventing crime, including drug-related crime. Housing authorities have great flexibility in determining how best to use these funds to address local needs. Many authorities have used drug elimination funding to create and expand community policing efforts, to make capital improvements to improve security, to fund drug awareness, prevention, and treatment programs and to organize tenant patrols and neighborhood watch programs.

I am also fully aware of the subcommittee's inclusion of $30 million for the New Approach antidrug program and I strongly support this provision. This funding will be available to help combat drugs and crime in non-federally assisted low-income housing which is too often overlooked in the traditional public housing programs.

However, I would like to state my concern with one aspect of the structure of the account which provides funding for the Drug Elimination Program. This troubling aspect is the expansion of a set-aside for the Operation Safe Home initiative, administered by the HUD Office of Inspector General, within that account. Let me be clear, I do not question the effectiveness or usefulness of the Operation Safe Home initiative. This initiative has had gratifying success in confiscating guns and drugs from public housing.

However, I am concerned with the source of funding for this initiative. By reducing the amount of funding available for drug elimination grants, we are effectively cutting into local efforts to combat crime and drugs. As chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, the committee with authorizing jurisdiction over the multitude of HUD programs, I was pleased to cosponsor S. 462, the Public Housing Reform and Responsibility Act of 1997. This legislation, which was passed out of the Banking Committee on May 8, 1997 by a unanimous 18–0 vote, contains an important provision which would allow funding for the Operation Safe Home initiative to be provided from the HUD headquarters' reserve fund. I am convinced that this is a far more appropriate funding vehicle for this initiative.

Like many other important HUD programs, such as public housing operating assistance and housing for the elderly and disabled, the administration requested a cut in the Drug Elimination Grant Program. This proposed $20 million cut would occur as a result of a set-aside within the program to fund the HUD inspector general's Operation Safe Home initiative.

Mr. President, I am grateful that the VA–HUD Subcommittee did not follow the approach adopted in the House, and instead reduced the administration's recommended cut of $20 million to a $15 million cut. However, I believe that even this reduced cut in antidrug funding is too much and the full amount should be restored to the program.

I express my wish to continue to work with the VA-HUD Subcommittee as we move toward conference with the House of Representatives on this important legislation. I am confident that attempts to increase this set-aside at conference will be unsuccessful and I am hopeful that together the Banking and Appropriations Committees can agree upon a more appropriate source of funding for the Operation Safe Home initiative.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me once again thank my good friend Senator BOND for his leadership and diligence in crafting a VA–HUD appropriations bill which makes tough choices with the limited amount of funds available. I look forward to working together as the process continues.

SELF-HELP HOUSING

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I would like to express my appreciation to Senator KIT BOND for his efforts to provide funding within the VA-HUD Appropriations bill to expand homeownership activities through the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD]. In this regard, I note with particular appreciation the provision of $30 million in funding for the Capacity Building for Community Development and Affordable Housing program.

This program was expanded and reauthorized by the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act [HOPE Act], which I was pleased to sponsor. It provides an unparalleled opportunity to support local housing and homeownership initiatives. Specifically, the HOPE Act provided for the support of housing organizations which utilize a self-help approach to homeownership opportunities.

Mr. President, I would like to commend and bring to the attention of the VA–HUD Appropriations Subcommittee the outstanding efforts of one particular self-help housing provider located in my home state of New York. The Riverhead Revitalization and Preservation Corp. [Riverhead Corp.], under the guidance and leadership of Ms. Patricia Stark, utilizes donated labor from volunteers and potential homeowners to develop and rehabilitate homes on Long Island, NY.

The Riverhead Corp. is helping to reverse the decline of neighborhoods by renovating blighted homes and providing a stake in the community for first-time homeowners. In addition, the Riverhead Corp. employs a revolving loan-fund strategy which reinvests proceeds from home sales in the further development of housing opportunities. Thus, the Riverhead Corp. helps to stimulate community revitalization, promotes job and business creation, and provides housing for deserving low- and moderate-income working families.

I commend the efforts of the Riverhead Corp. to the Subcommittee and to HUD as a model of success which would be worthy of support under the self-help homeownership auspices of the Capacity Building program funded by this legislation. Once again, I would like to thank Senator KIT BOND for his efforts to support increased homeownership throughout the Nation.

Mr. BOND. I thank Senator ALFONSE D'AMATO for his support of this VA–HUD Appropriations legislation and for our joint efforts to bring the benefits of homeownership to as many American families as possible. The subcommittee recognizes the local efforts of the Riverhead Corp. Revitalization and Preservation to increase access to homeownership on Long Island, where I know housing and development costs can often be prohibitive. I urge the Department of Housing and Urban Development to seriously consider any application for assistance on the part of the Riverhead Corp. under the Capacity Building program initiative. I too commend the Riverhead Corp. for its successful and innovative efforts to improve communities and enhance homeownership opportunities.

VETERANS PROGRAMS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, as the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, I am pleased to express my support for S. 1034, the fiscal year 1998 Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies appropriation bill, and most particularly for title I, the part of the bill dealing with VA.

I realize that this has again been a very difficult year for funding issues, with a reduced 602(b) allocation, agency spending being cut by reconciliation measures, and increased competition for what limited funding remained available. The Chair of the VA–HUD Subcommittee, Senator BOND, the ranking member, Senator MIKULSKI, and the other members of the subcommittee deserve credit for their remarkable efforts with regard to veterans' needs, as evident in this bill.

Mr. President, I remind my colleagues that the budget resolution included proposed reductions in VA spending below the current fiscal year 1997 level, and below what is generally considered the current services level. At the time that the Senate passed the balanced budget resolution, I took strong exception to the proposal funding for veterans. In my view, the budget resolution asked veterans to carry a disproportionate share of the burden to balance the Federal budget. Realizing, too, that slashing discretionary spending—especially for health care—was inappropriate, the Committee on Appropriations [Committee] saw fit to alter the spending priorities for veterans. Instead, the committee was able to increase funding for VA medical care, research, and the State Veterans Home Program. This is a tremendous achievement. While I would always want to increase support for veterans programs further, I am enormously pleased with the result of their efforts, and would like to highlight several accomplishments in particular.

For health care, the committee recommended $17.02 billion for VA medical care, an increase of $68 million over the President's request. The committee also recognized that VA is to retain, under new authorizing legislation which is part of the budget agreement, the so-called medical care cost recovery [MCCR] collections estimated to reach $604 million in fiscal year 1998. Because collections of these third-

party receipts has grown from $267 million in fiscal year 1991 to over $557 million in fiscal year 1996, I am encouraged by VA's ability to generate non-appropriated revenue. I note with caution however, that VA's outpatient billing remains problematic. Along with my colleague, Senator MIKULSKI, I intend to be attentive to VA's collection activities.

When combined, the committee's recommendation and the authorization for the retention of insurance moneys bring total discretionary resources for medical care to $17.6 billion. As we proceed with Senate approval of the VA appropriations bill, it is important to note that this amount constitutes an increase of $617 million over current spending.

I am also particular gratified by the committee's report language on the need for a community-based outpatient clinic [CBOC] in Charleston, the capital of my home State of West Virginia. Indeed, the committee noted that a Charleston CBOC would improve service to more than 27,000 veterans in Kanawha and surrounding counties, including Boone, Putnam, Lincoln, and Logan. Thousands of these veterans reside in rural areas, many miles from the nearest VA medical center. Many of them live in areas with no public transportation, where just a trip to the doctor can take several hours of driving time on winding, mountainous roads. A VA outpatient clinic in this part of West Virginia is long overdue.

Throughout my tenure on the Committee on Veteran's Affairs, I have witnessed the direct benefits of a strong research program, such as higher quality clinicians and discoveries in prosthetics, cancer, AIDS, and aging. These discoveries directly affect the everyday activities of veterans. After several years of flat funding, I believe that the time has come to increase the VA research appropriation. The Appropriations Committee agreed and included an increase in the VA medical and prosthetic research account. Although the increase—$5 million—is modest, it sends an important signal to the VA research community that we value their work and the direct impact it has on our veterans.

The increase in research funding will help support important work on the health problems of atomic veterans, Vietnam-era veterans, and gulf war veterans. Over the years, we have witnessed the emergence of special health problems associated with each war. In response, VA researchers have made important gains in the understanding of each of these populations and their clinical needs. Their challenges continue, and we must make sure that their research efforts are well supported.

I also express my strong support for the committee's action to fully fund the Court of Veterans Appeal's Pro Bono Representation Program. This program is of utmost importance to our Nation's veterans. At a time when the court is experiencing a dramatic increase in the number of appeals filed, it would be devastating to cut the funding of a program that matches up pro bono attorneys with indigent veterans. It is a small program, but it's impact is great. In fact, the Pro Bono Program will be assigning its one thousandth case to a pro bono attorney on July 24, 1997.

Mr. President, although I am pleased with the overall outcome of this bill, I have concerns about the effect of the bill's appropriation for VA's general operating expenses account. The bill provides for $786 million, which is $41 million below the current budget and $60 million below the budget request. This is a significant cut for VA to absorb, especially at a time when it is still taking VA an average of 135 days to process an original compensation claim. However, as we strive toward deficit reduction, Congress cannot continue to throw money at problems in the absence of effective leadership at agencies to bring about the change that is needed. Sadly, that absence has been profound at the Veterans Benefit Administration in recent years. It is time for VA to manage the benefits process, not just administer it. It is past time for VA to change, in major ways, beginning with the implementation of many of the recommendations contained in the recent reports of the Veterans' Claims Adjudication Commission and the National Academy of Public Administration.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that this is a very exciting time. VA has the potential for meaningful change. Whether it is in the area of a medical care or benefits administration, I believe that, on balance, the Committee on Appropriations has given VA the resources it needs to move forward with much needed reforms. I applaud the leadership of all the members of the Appropriations Committee, and especially those members on the VA–HUD Subcommittee.

Mr. President, in closing, I express my deepest gratitude to my esteemed colleague, Senator MIKULSKI, the ranking Democrat on the Senate VA–HUD Subcommittee, for her continued efforts with respect to veterans' programs. This year, as she does every year, Senator MIKULSKI has shown her unwavering support for veterans. I am pleased to call her my colleague and friend.

CSOC

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I would like to engage the Senator from Maryland in a colloquy regarding the intent of report language included on her behalf in the Senate Report accompanying S. 1034, the fiscal year 1998 VA-HUD and Independent Agencies appropriations bill concerning NASA's Consolidated Space Operations Contract.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I would be pleased to engage in a colloquy concerning CSOC.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Would the Senator agree that it is not the intent of her report language to expand the CSOC procurement to include elements of the Space Flight Operations Contract not presently envisioned to be part of the SCOC contract, as stipulated in the pending request for proposals.

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator is correct. The intent of the report language is simply to ensure that NASA include all appropriate common support functions at all NASA centers under CSOC, as defined in the request for proposals.

DON'T UNDERFUND CRITICAL TOXIC CLEANUP

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the VA-HUD and Independent Agencies appropriations bill presents an all too common dilemma—inadequate funds and very deserving programs—and the choices we must make are very difficult indeed.

I appreciate the difficult job the chairman and ranking member had in dealing with an insufficient Section 602(b) allocation.

However, as a strong advocate for our environment, and as ranking on the Budget Committee, I am very disappointed at the level of funding for the Environmental Protection Agency's operating budget. The mark for EPA's operation is $200 million below the President's request and the budget agreement.

I am specifically concerned that we are continuing to add duties to EPA without the accompanying resources. This budget does not provide the funding needed to meet Congress's demands that EPA carry out more cost-benefit analysis in its regulations, for additional outreach to small businesses, and for fuller consideration of stakeholders in the regulatory process.

Nor does it provide adequate funding to combat global warming. Indeed, at a recent Environment and Public Works Committee hearing the only issue on which all the witnesses agreed was the need for more funding for critical climate change research.

I am also disappointed that the mark does not include any funding increase for superfund. I understand the chairman believes that superfund must be reauthorized before that money is appropriated. I disagree with that assessment. However, I am working closely with Senators SMITH, BAUCUS, and CHAFEE and I expect we soon will have a bipartisan bill.

If that bill comes after this appropriations cycle, I will urge my colleagues to support a supplemental that funds hazardous waste clean up to the level in the budget agreement. The millions of people living near superfund sites deserve our efforts to fully fund this program.

I am also disappointed that the chairman's mark zeros-out Community Development Financial Institutions, or CDFI. One hundred twenty-five million dollars was included in the budget agreement. I understand the House included full funding for this important program and I look forward for a better outcome during the conference.

Mr. President, I am very pleased the Appropriations Committee, the members unanimously agreed to my amendment to transfer money for investigations of chemical accidents from EPA and OSHA to the Chemical Safety Board.

An independent Chemical Safety Board, with its expertise and objectivity, is the proper body to investigate and identify steps needed to prevent future accidents. In 1990, Congress established the independent Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board to do just that. The board was modeled on the respected and influential National Transportation Safety Board. As part of its reinventing government program, the administration cut funding for the chemical board and tried to transfer its authority to EPA and OSHA. Subsequent events, including an investigation in New Jersey, show that this reorganization was ill-advised.

By reviving the board, Congress is reasserting its authority and protecting the workers and communities around chemical industrial sites.

I want to thank those who helped revive this board. First, I want to acknowledge the help of Senator BOND and MIKULSKI. I also want to thank the public interest groups, the oil, chemical, and atomic workers, and the companies that have publicly recognized the advantage of having this board. I want to single out for acknowledgment Marathon Oil and the Rohm & Haas Corp. in that regard.

Mr. President, I ask that a letter signed by 19 public interest groups in support of the Lautenberg amendment to fund the Chemical Safety Board be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Finally, I want to thank the Chairman of the Committee for including report language assuring the citizens of Toms River, N.J. that the study of the cancer cluster will be completely carried out. The language in the report underscores the Federal commitment to pursuing the cause of the cancer cluster and making sure this research is completed.

Mr. President, as I close my statement, I want to once again acknowledge Senator BOND and MIKULSKI for the difficult job they did in face of inadequate resources.

EXHIBIT 1

July 17, 1997.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
Committee on Appropriations,
Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN STEVENS: As members of social justice, environmental, religious, and labor organizations we are writing to express our full support for a $6 million appropriation to fund the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board. We request your support and that of others on your committee in passing the Lautenberg amendment which would provide this funding.

Modelled after the respected and influential National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (CSHIB) was established by the 1990 Clean Air Act to independently investigate the root causes of chemical accidents and offer recommendations on ways to prevent accidents in the future. However, seven years after its authorization and several years after the confirmation of three of its members, the board is still without funding.

In 1994, the Administration decided that the Board was redundant in light of efforts to reinvent government. Thus, the Board's duties were subsequently passed to two regulatory agencies, EPA and OSHA. To date these two agencies have done an abominable job in investigating chemical accidents. For example, 27 months following a major accident at Napp Technologies in Lodi, N.J., which claimed the lives of five workers, an accident investigation report has yet to be released. This is not the fault of the dedicated compliance personnel in the field. OSHA and EPA are primarily concerned with determining violations of specific standards, not with the kind of comprehensive investigations needed to determine the root causes of major chemical accidents. Further, questions have been raised about the legal jurisdiction of those agencies. For example, following an accident at a Tosco oil refinery in Martinez, Calif., EPA was barred from entering the facility to investigate the accident because the agency could not provide proof of their authority to enter. Finally, jurisdictional problems have plagued the attempt to delegate authority to investigate the causes of chemical accidents within two separate agencies

The Chemical Safety Board, on the other hand, is an independent, non-regulatory body, and the Board's findings, conclusions, and recommendations cannot be admitted as evidence or used in litigation. In both this case and the case of transport accidents, Congress wisely chose to separate the regulatory agencies from those charged with investigations. Thus, the Board can investigate the root causes of industrial accidents, conduct research, oversee the performance of chemical safety standards, and recommend improvements in chemical manufacturing, processing, transport and storage free from political and industrial interference. Federal agencies, such as EPA and OSHA, are required to respond to, but are not bound to adopt, the high-profile recommendations issued by the Board. As is the case with recommendations made by the highly regarded NTSB, we would hope that those made by the Chemical Safety Board would be quickly and efficiently adhered to by industry.

Chemical accidents continue to occur on average 21 times a day in the United States, costing human lives, causing untold damage to property and the environment, and increasing health care and environmental clean-up costs. Recent chemical disasters clearly illustrate the need for this independent board and its work to refine, coordinate, direct, and improve federal chemical safety activities. Proper oversight could have prevented many of these tragedies, such as an accident last month at a fertilizer factor in Helena, Ark., which claimed the lives of several firefighters. This accident parallels a similar accident three years ago at another fertilizer factory near Sioux City, Iowa, which claimed the lives of three individuals.

We strongly support an appropriation of $6 million to fund and finally make operational the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for the health and safety of our workers, communities, and environment. Thank you for your favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

RABBI DANIEL SWARTZ,
Coalition on the Environment and Jewish Life;
PHIL CLAPP,
Environmental Information Center;
RICK HIND,
Greenpeace;
DENNY LARSON,
National Oil Refinery Action Network, Communities for a Better environment California;
RICK ENGLER,
New Jersey Work Environment Council, New Jersey Right to Know and Act Coalition;
CAROLYN RAFFENSPERGER,
Science and Environmental Health Network;
CAROLYN HARTMANN,
U.S. Public Interest Research Group;
MICHAEL J. WRIGHT,
United Steelworkers of America;
JOANNE ROSSI,
Community/Labor Refinery Tracking Committee, Philadelphia;
JOEL A. TICKNER,
Work Environment Program, University of Massachusetts Lowell, Clean Production Action;
CAROL ANDRESS,
Environmental Defense Fund;
SANFORD LEWIS,
Good Neighbor Project for Sustainable Industries;
HILLEL GRAY,
National Environmental Law Center;
DR. DAVID WALLINGA,
Natural Resources Defense Council;
RICHARD MILLER,
Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union;
DEBBIE SEASE,
Sierra Club;
DR. THOM WHITE WOLF FASSETT,
General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church;
SUSAN GOBRESKI,
Clean Water Action Pennsylvania; and
DR. NEIL CARMAN,
Sierra Club, Lone Star Chapter;

LOW-INCOME HOUSING PRESERVATION FUNDING

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I would like to commend Senator BOND and Ranking Minority Member MIKULSKI for their steadfast recognition of the need to preserve our Nation's dwindling supply of affordable rental housing units. The Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990 [LIHPRHA] is an important tool for maintaining this scarce resource. I appreciate your bill's

provision of a structure for continuing a modified capital grant-capital loan program for housing preservation activities under the existing LIHPRHA program.

As you are aware, there are almost 30,000 low-income rental units in 37 States that have been approved by HUD and are awaiting funding through this program. This represents a critical need for preservation of the existing stock, particularly in tight rental markets. In low vacancy rate areas, tenant-based rental assistance is often ineffective in meeting the housing needs of deserving low-income Americans. In New York City, for example, housing development and land acquisition costs are high and production of new affordable housing is very limited. Therefore, retaining the current housing stock is a cost-efficient and desirable means of meeting shelter needs.

Mr. BOND. Thank you for your remarks. It is my full intention to work with you to improve the LIHPRHA program. It is this subcommittee's desire to ensure that a cost-effective approach to preserving our much needed housing is adequately funded. I am especially concerned about the detrimental effects of the loss of stock on areas of the country with low vacancy rates.

Mr. D'AMATO. I thank you for your consideration and your continued commitment. I appreciate your willingness to continue this dialog and look forward to working with you throughout conference committee action to resolve this significant housing crisis in a fair and equitable manner.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to discuss several other projects that currently are funded in the House version. I am hopeful these will get full consideration by the conference committee, and be included in the final bill.

Mr. President, I believe that it is our responsibility to ensure that Federal research and its subsequent data is shared, whenever possible, with the taxpayers who fund these research programs. To this end, I would like to state my support for the $5.8 million provided in the House bill to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's [NASA] Commercial Technology Program. These funds would be used to support existing successful program goals, as well as new initiatives to link businesses from distressed communities to NASA commercial technologies.

It is critical to the competitiveness of our economy that we promote the shared use of research material between Federal agencies such as NASA and the private sector. Support for this program is an important step in that direction. The program will allow highly successful outreach efforts such as the NASA Lewis Business and Industry Summit to be carried forward and will help to ensure NASA Lewis' long-term viability as an economic force in northeastern Ohio.

Mr. President, I also believe it is our responsibility to use the success of Federal investments in technology to improve, whenever feasible, our education system. Therefore I hope the conferees will agree with the House Appropriation Committee's decision to increase NASA's Science, Engineering, Mathematics, and Aerospace Academy [SEMAA] and Mobile Aeronautics Education Laboratory [MAEL] programs $3.3 million. This increase would enable the NASA Lewis Research Center and Cuyahoga Community College to expand their already successful programs to the Cuyahoga Community College's western campus. In addition, the workstations included in the Mobile Aeronautics Education Laboratory can be replicated in Cleveland area schools.

Mr. President, as we are all too well aware, flooding disasters tragically struck the Midwest this past spring. While there is little we can do to prevent natural disasters, we must take every step possible to respond to these disasters in order to minimize potential loss of life and property. I sincerely hope the conferees will agree with the House Appropriations Committee's decision to provide $5 million to support the replacement and upgrading of outdated Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] emergency response equipment. Upgraded, functional equipment is critical to protecting our citizens from unfortunate natural disasters and I strongly believe safety issues such as the support of this equipment should be a priority in our budget discussions. I specifically believe the mobile emergency response support and mobile air transportable telecommunications deserve particular attention.

Mr. President, I note the presence on the floor of my good friend from Missouri, Senator BOND, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on VA–HUD. I would hope that he, and the Senator from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI, will give serious consideration to the programs I described.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his statement. I have listened very carefully to his remarks and I recognize his concern for the two programs he mentioned. As the Senator is aware, the VA–HUD Appropriations Subcommittee had to respond to a vast number of requests with a limited pool of resources to do it. The Senator from Ohio has raised very compelling arguments and I will carefully consider his request during the conference committee deliberations.

Mr. DEWINE. I thank my distinguished friend, and I yield the floor.

YOUTHBUILD

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I would like to commend my friend, Senator KIT BOND for his efforts as chairman of the VA-HUD Subcommittee to include $35 million in funding for the Youthbuild program. This innovative and successful program allows disadvantaged and at-risk youth to acquire educational and job skills and develop leadership abilities within their communities. In the process, the program helps to develop and rehabilitate physically distressed housing in order to provide decent, safe and affordable housing opportunities to low and moderate-income families.

I also note that the subcommittee has instructed HUD to provide a priority in funding for program applicants that demonstrate an ability to leverage private and nonprofit funding. In this era of limited Federal funding, it is essential that our program dollars are stretched to the maximum extent possible. I fully support this important provision and believe it will result in a greater benefit for each Federal dollar provided and a greater amount of local community coordination and decision-making.

I would like to bring one particular organization to the attention of the chairman and the ranking member, Senator MIKULSKI. The Bedford-Stuyvesant Restoration Corp. [Restoration] located in central Brooklyn has a 30-year legacy of economic development, job creation, and community building. Restoration currently operates an education and job training initiative, known as Career Path, which assists economically disadvantaged young adults, ages 16–24, to become productive members of the community by providing education and developing employment, citizenship, and leadership skills.

I note that the Restoration Corp. has an outstanding record of successfully leveraging local, State, and private funding through private charities, foundation support, corporate sponsorship, and a variety of private fundraising efforts. One such effort recently resulted in Restoration receiving a 5 year $1.75 million grant from Cablevision, Inc. I believe Restoration's Career Path initiative represents a successful model which leverages private funding, invests in our youth and helps to revitalize the stock of affordable housing.

By helping to fund Restoration's Career Path initiative, HUD can help to restore economic viability to the neighborhoods of central Brooklyn and assist at-risk young adults to become active and productive members of the community. Once again, I would express my appreciation and support for Senator BOND's continuing efforts to support successful housing and economic development initiatives.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my friend Senator ALFONSE D'AMATO for his support of our efforts to fund and improve the operation of existing HUD programs. The subcommittee is fully aware of the Bedford-Stuyvesant Restoration Corp. and its 30-year legacy of economic and cultural development in New York. I am confident that the Career Path initiative will receive a full and fair consideration from HUD in any future competition under the Youthbuild program.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I see my friend from Missouri, the chairman of the VA–HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, on the floor and would like

to call to his attention an important project in Ohio that I believe is deserving of funding under the Community Development Block Grant [CDBG] Program. Specifically, I am interested in the economic development initiative funding for various community development projects. A number were listed by the committee in its report on the bill. I am very interested in a community-wide effort in Lorain, OH, to convert a soon-to-be-closed hospital into a community resource center. This is an area that is economically depressed, and in addition to the economic losses associated with the closure of the hospital, the community recently discovered that the local Ford production plant will soon be closing its doors. Would the Senator from Missouri agree that an initiative which attempted to convert the hospital space into a community resource and training center be a worthy candidate for funding under the committee's EDI provision?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Ohio raising this issue. I agree with him that the project he has described in Lorain would appear to be well-suited for the EDI program.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his comments. Were it not for the fact that the hospital is scheduled to close at the end of the year, I would be content to seek funding for this project through traditional funding channels. However, the hospital is set to close in just a few months. Therefore, I have little choice but to request that the chairman of the subcommittee take a very close look at this project as he proceeds to conference with the House on the final version of this appropriations bill. Specifically, what I am seeking is consideration for support of funds to allow for renovation and conversion of this space. What I am trying to avoid is seeing this hospital close and having this wonderful facility stand empty. Should this happen, I am concerned that it stands vulnerable to deterioration, and even vandalism, to a point that the only option left for the community is to tear down the structure.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Ohio's concerns, and commend him for his efforts to seek a positive solution. As I am sure he well knows, this has been a difficult year for community development projects, such as the one he has discussed. All the same, I am impressed by the overall project, ranging from job training to child care to community service activities. I will give the Senator's request all due consideration as we go to conference on this bill. Is that satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, that is satisfactory and I thank the distinguished chairman for his willingness to work with me and the members of the Ohio congressional delegation, as well as the community of Lorain to turn the closure of the hospital into a new, positive beginning for the people of Lorain.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies has included funding for economic development initiatives in S. 1034. I am pleased that the committee report mentions a worthy project at the University of San Francisco that will provide important economic development in international business opportunities for this campus.

In the weeks ahead, I will be working with my colleagues in the Senate and House, as well as with Secretary Cuomo and his staff at HUD, to secure funds for the Center for International Business Education at the University of San Francisco, a model program for training and international commerce, environmental management and business ethics. The EDI funds would play an important role in promoting economic vitality in northern California. The center will provide jobs at home and abroad, while enhancing America's international economic competitiveness. EDI funding will assist in renovation of critical facilities and completion of a distance learning facility, while adding new programs for an important program initiative.

I thank Chairman BOND and Senator MIKULSKI for recognizing this worthy project.

AMENDMENT NO. 930

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, last Thursday Senator HATCH and myself, along with Senators LEAHY and DURBIN, offered an amendment to the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill that would delink Federal judicial pay raises from those of the Congress and senior level executive branch officials. Our amendment, which was accepted without objection, will allow judges' salaries to be adjusted automatically on an annual basis. I am pleased that it is part of the measure that will pass the Senate today.

For too many years, Congress has refused to take the political heat for accepting pay raises, and held judicial salaries hostage in the process. This congressional scheme of hiding behind judicial robes has created a tremendous financial gulf between Federal judges and the lawyers who come before them. The likelihood that this salary gap will only get worse is driving some of our best jurists from the Federal bench and making it increasingly difficult to attract top-quality replacements. Such a talent drain threatens the quality of American justice at a time when our already overburdened courts need our best and most experienced legal minds.

The numbers offer their own warning. Between 1960 and 1970, only three Federal judges resigned. But since 1980 more than 50 judges have left the bench early, many citing inadequate compensation as the reason. Indeed, a study several years ago by the American Bar Association estimated that more than one-fourth of the Nation's Federal judges may quit their jobs.

While this exodus grows, it is becoming increasingly difficult to attract the best and the brightest to Federal judicial service. Judicial candidates can clearly see the ink fading on their checkbooks. Many say they want to serve the public, but they just can't afford it.

The solution to this problem is simple, and by delinking judicial pay raises, the Senate today takes an important step toward ensuring that this situation will not be repeated. I am hopeful and optimistic that we can retain this provision when we conference the measure with the House.

Mr. President, we in Congress have taken the opportunity to show our commitment to fairness. We have recognized the mistake Congress made 20 years ago when it tied its own salary increases to those of Federal judges. This backdoor way of securing congressional pay raises hasn't worked. But by this amendment we have freed the hostages, the Nation's Federal judges, and helped to ensure the continued high quality of America's judicial system.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise today to express my concern that funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions [CDFI] Fund has not been included in the VA/HUD appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998.

The CDFI Fund is an economic development initiative that was adopted with overwhelming bipartisan support several years ago. The program is an important investment tool for economically distressed communities. Overall, Senator BOND and Senator MIKULSKI have done an excellent job of producing a bill which makes the most of the limited funding available. However, by not funding CDFI, I believe the committee has missed the opportunity to make a substantial and cost-effective investment in our distressed communities.

CDFI leverages private investment to stretch every Federal dollar. The VA/HUD appropriations bill reported by the House Appropriations Committee includes the $125 million requested by the President for this valuable program. Senator MIKULSKI has discussed her intention to revisit the issue of CDFI funding in conference. I too believe the CDFI Program deserves the opportunity to demonstrate its effectiveness in bringing economic development resources to distressed communities. I look forward to working with Senator MIKULSKI and Senator BOND during conference to restore funding for this program.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 1034, the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and independent agencies appropriations bill for 1998.

This bill provides new budget authority of $91.5 billion and new outlays of $52.6 billion to finance the programs of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, the Environmental Protection Agency, NASA, and other independent agencies.

I congratulate the chairman and ranking member for producing a bill that, with adoption of the manager's amendment, is within the subcommittee's revised 602(b) allocation. This is one of the most difficult bills to manage with its varied programs and challenging allocation, but I think the bill meets most of the demands made of it while staying under budget and is a strong candidate for enactment, so I commend my friend the chairman for his efforts and leadership.

When outlays from prior-year budget authority [BA] and other adjustments are taken into account, the bill totals $90.7 billion in BA and $99.8 billion in outlays. The total bill is at the Senate subcommittee's 602(b) nondefense allocation for budget authority and outlays. The subcommittee is also under its defense allocation by $1 million in BA.

I ask members of the Senate to refrain from offering amendments which would cause the subcommittee to exceed its budget allocation and urge the speedy adoption of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of the bill be inserted in the RECORD.

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

S. 1034, VA–HUD APPROPRIATIONS, 1998—SPENDING COMPARISONS, SENATE-REPORTED BILL [Fiscal year 1998, In millions of dollars]

	Defense	Nondefense	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:					
Budget authority	128	69,263		21,332	90,723
Outlays	128	79,561		20,061	99,750
Senate 602(b) allocation:					
Budget authority	129	60,065		21,332	81,526
Outlays	128	76,154		20,061	96,343
President's request:					
Budget authority	129	76,965		21,332	98,426
Outlays	128	80,313		20,061	100,502
House-passed bill:					
Budget authority	128	69,823		21,332	91,283
Outlays	128	80,403		20,061	100,592
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:					
Senate 602(b) allocation:					
Budget authority	(1)	9,198			9,197
Outlays		3,407			3,407
President's request:					
Budget authority	(1)	(7,702)			(7,703)
Outlays		(752)			(752)
House-passed bill:					
Budget authority		(560)			(560)
Outlays		(842)			(842)

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with current scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise to support the VA-HUD appropriations bill. Chairman BOND, a former colleague of mine on the Banking Committee, and Senator MIKULSKI, the ranking member and my good friend from Maryland, both have a deep understanding of the importance of housing programs that are so crucial to creating safe, decent, and affordable housing for the American people. I want to thank them for their hard work.

The committee did a good job of juggling many competing needs and interests that go far beyond housing programs. I want to recognize their good work in both appropriating enough funds to renew expiring section 8 contracts and in adopting the mark-to-market legislation passed as part of the reconciliation bill but unfortunately dropped in conference. This legislation, sponsored by Senators MACK, D'AMATO, BOND, and others addresses what Secretary Cuomo calls the biggest crisis facing HUD in a way that saves money and ensures the long-term preservation of the section 8 housing stock.

We have worked very hard on a bipartisan basis in a short period of time to iron out differences with HUD on the section 8 legislation. It is my hope that, as the appropriations bill moves forward, the committee will adopt the agreements we reached with HUD which will make the program easier to implement and generally more efficient. Solving this problem will rank as one of our best accomplishments for this Congress and I again want to thank the chairman and ranking member for their interest and dedication in putting the section 8 housing program on a sound financial and management footing.

Unfortunately, while these efforts on the section 8 portfolio should bear real fruit, the committee has been forced to try to squeeze too many high-priority programs into too small a box. There is simply not enough money in this bill to address the overall housing needs we face in this country.

For example, consider the public housing funding. While public housing has become a much-maligned program, this view is unwarranted. The vast majority of public housing is in good shape. Fewer than 100 of more than 3,300 public housing authorities [PHA's] are troubled. Public housing serves hundreds of thousands of elderly households and nearly 1½ million children. In many neighborhoods, public housing is indistinguishable from the privately owned housing that may be next door.

As in everything, problems do exist. There are bad housing projects and bad housing authorities. However, the Banking Committee is working on legislation that will require the Secretary to react quickly to put the bad PHA's in receivership and to demolish bad projects. We are also reforming the program to create more mixed-income communities and help make it possible for additional working families to get access to public and assisted housing. In fact, public housing represents about one-third of the housing stock affordable to minimum wage workers in ths country. It is for this reason, among others, that Secretary Cuomo called public housing a precious resource.

While these reforms will contribute greatly to the overall health of the public housing program, in order to succeed, public housing needs more funding. The bill before us provides $2.9 billion for public housing operating subsidies, the same as this year. Operating subsidies are needed to cover the shortfall between what public housing authorities can collect in rent and what it costs to run the projects. I am pleased that the committee preserved this funding at current levels.

Even with the committee's best efforts, however, the $2.9 billion covers only about 85 percent of what the PHA's need to pay for their day-to-day operations. We have put public housing authorities in a bind. They are asked to serve the poor, but not given the funding necessary to ensure that they can house the poor adequately. To close the gap, PHAs are forced to put off routine maintenance and small capital projects. In effect, the housing stock faces slow deterioration just so the housing authorities can pay the heating bill.

The capital account in this bill also stays steady at $2.5 billion. These are much-needed funds, and again, I welcome the committee's effort to protect this crucial spending. But the fact is, the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing said that PHA's need $4.5 billion per year for 10 years to take care of backlogged capital needs, in addition to keeping up with routine maintenance, which, by itself, costs $1.7 billion annually.

This combination of low operating subsidies and inadequate capital funding means that we are slowly bleeding our public housing stock to death. All the hard work and good intentions of the committee cannot make up for the fact that the chairman and ranking

member were simply not given the allocation necessary to fund these crucial housing programs at necessary levels.

Similarly, homeless funding remains level in this bill, although homelessness, despite good progress, continues to be a serious problem. While economic growth is strong, it has not reached down to the people who live on the bottom rung of society's ladder. In fact, the Conference of Mayors estimates that homelessness increased by 5 percent last year. Moreover, as we try to make public and assisted housing more available to the working poor, a worthy goal that I support, we reduce the number of assisted housing units available to the very worst off in our country. In the end, this will mean more homelessness. In my view, Congress ought to recognize that truth and expand the homeless program.

One casualty of the fiscal constraints that the committee labored within is the Low Income Housing Preservation and Homeownership Act [LIHPRH], better known as the Preservation Program. This program has preserved over 80,000 units of affordable housing permanently. Another 30,000 units await funding. I urge the committee to work in conference to find some funding for this critical program. I know of the chairman's interest in accomplishing this goal, along with appropriate reforms to the program.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for all their hard work. I support this bill and urge my colleagues to do so, as well. I will continue to work for additional funding for housing programs, and look forward to the day when we are able to adequately address the many existing demands.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to commend the managers of the Fiscal Year 1998 VA–HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriation Bill, Chairman BOND and Senator MIKULSKI, for their hard work in fashioning this measure, and for bringing it to the Floor in a timely manner. The bill appropriates $90,901,535,000 for programs in Fiscal Year 1998, is within its 602(b) allocations, and is below the amount requested by the administration by about $70,903,000.

Mr. President, I specifically commend the chairman and ranking member for taking an extremely tight 602(b) allocation and spreading it across the twenty-one agencies. There were also additional constraints posed by the budget agreement resolved to accomplish a unified Federal budget in fiscal year 2002.

This bill funds a diversity of agencies and programs. It is a challenge every year to develop a passable bill that addresses a variety of concerns from all Members of the Senate, the Federal agencies, and the American people.

Mr. President, this bill matches the President's request for Veterans Affairs, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the National Science Foundation. The managers also protected several key programs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, namely CDBG, HOME, and the McKinney Homeless programs. In addition, many cuts made in the proposed budget were restored. The highest priority was to adequately fund Veteran's medical programs, despite the proposed cut in the budget agreement. This bill matches the President's request for Veterans Medical Care, and restores the $27 million cut in Veterans Medical Research.

Mr. President, I congratulate the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee, as well as their dedicated, hardworking staff: Andy Givens and Liz Blevins for the minority and John Kamarck, Carrie Apostolou, and Lashawnda Leftwich for the majority.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, in a few minutes we will vote on the VA-HUD appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998. I want to take this opportunity to thank the chairman, Senator BOND, and his staff for working with those of us on this side of the aisle in such a collegial way. I think the fact that we were able to finish this bill tonight says a lot about the bipartisan cooperation that we have received, or has occurred between both Senator BOND, myself, and the other Members of the U.S. Senate.

Today, I note that we had robust discussions on important policy matters. But if one would note, the whole tone was one of civility, consideration, and collegiality. I am very proud of the way this bill has moved.

I am also very proud of the substance in this bill. We have met compelling human need with veterans and the poor. We have stood sentry over the important issues related to the environment, protected consumers, and ensured that Arlington Cemetery would be as fit for duty as the brave people were who lie therein. And we have, at the same time, had a very serious issue addressed in the area of science and technology funding.

So veterans' health research that will be looking at issues related to both women's health and prostate cancer, to our important space program that shows it is the best in the world, to the National Science Foundation which is looking at how we can ensure that brilliant young investigators are going to be able to have the new ideas for the 21st century that are going to lead to new products says a lot about what this bill does.

I enjoy very much serving as the ranking member and my job is made easier, more delightful, and gives me pride because of the cooperation of the majority, both its chairman and staff.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank my own staff because it takes a lot of reviewing of a lot of line items when you have seven Cabinet-level agencies and 25 other independent agencies. I would like to thank Andy Givens, my chief clerk; David Bowers for his hard work, and our excellent detailee, Stacy Closson.

So as we move on to the rollcall vote, I again look forward to working with my very able chair in the conference and bringing a great conference report back to the Senate where we can continue the pride we feel as we vote on this bill tonight.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, let me very briefly express my sincere appreciation to my ranking member for her great cooperation. The expeditious way in which this measure was handled is something that is rather unusual for the VA–HUD bill. When she indicated she thought we could wrap this up today, I said I am a skeptic; I am from Missouri; I have to be shown. And thanks to the cooperation of all Senators we have been able to do it.

I really appreciate the cooperation of Senators on both sides. Senator MIKULSKI has been very effective. I would like to add my thanks to Andy Givens, to Stacy Closson and David Bowers, and particular thanks to my staff. This is the first time that Jon Kamarck has gone through this as the chief clerk. It is quite an experience. We appreciate the work he has done. We are delighted to have the steady hand of Carrie Apostolou guiding us on EPA, veterans, FEMA matters with great skill, and Sarah Horrigan has been a great addition on the NASA and science accounts, and I very much appreciate all of that assistance.

Mr. President, since I think many Members are anxious to get started on the vote, and I do not expect anyone will be disadvantaged, I will now ask unanimous consent that we begin the vote and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the House bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows.

A bill (H.R. 2158) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all after the enacting clause is stricken, the text of S. 1034 is inserted, and the bill is deemed read a third time.

The yeas and nays are requested. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 194 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Abraham	Faircloth	Lott
Akaka	Feingold	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Ford	McCain
Baucus	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Glenn	Mikulski
Biden	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Boxer	Grams	Murray
Breaux	Grassley	Nickles
Brownback	Gregg	Reed
Bryan	Hagel	Reid
Bumpers	Harkin	Robb
Burns	Hatch	Roberts
Byrd	Helms	Rockefeller
Campbell	Hollings	Roth
Chafee	Hutchinson	Santorum
Cleland	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Inouye	Shelby
Collins	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Conrad	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Snowe
Craig	Kennedy	Specter
D'Amato	Kerrey	Stevens
Daschle	Kerry	Thomas
DeWine	Kohl	Thompson
Dodd	Landrieu	Thurmond
Domenici	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dorgan	Leahy	Warner
Durbin	Levin	Wellstone
Enzi	Lieberman	Wyden

NAYS—1

Kyl

The bill (H.R. 2158), as amended, was passed.

[The text of H.R. 2158 will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.]

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KERRY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, and S. 1034 be placed back on the calendar.

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

There being no objection, the Chair appointed Mr. BOND, Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I have already expressed appreciation to my staff, and particularly my ranking member. I want to make a special mention of my chief of staff, Julie Dammann, whose second child was due today and she stayed with us throughout the whole proceedings and wanted to see the VA-HUD bill delivered first. She has been an invaluable help in all legislative activities and helped us shepherd this through. So, a very special thank you, and best wishes to Julie, to Rolf and their other daughter, Monica. Again, I express my appreciation.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I would also echo the comments to Julie and her husband. I hope that she can go home, rest easy, put her feet up and we are looking forward to being the proud Godparents of Bond-Mikulski. Maybe we will name something after her in conference.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I don't know whether Mikulski-Dammann would be a good name for her, maybe, but it is one we can always offer, to show a little diversity.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

RETIREMENT OF MARK LACOVARA

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to recognize the work of Mr. Mark Lacovara, who has retired after more than 27 years' employment in the Senate.

Mark came to the Senate in 1969 as a reference assistant in the Senate Library and has since served in various capacities with the Official Reporters of Debates, the Sergeant at Arms, the Secretary of the Senate, and administrative services. The position from which he leaves us is that of assistant Journal clerk.

To those of us who are a part of the Senate, Mark's regard for this institution is well-known and highly valued. Such dedication is no doubt rooted in his early years. Mark grew up in the Washington, DC, area and observed his father, the late John Lacovara, in service as the Senate's Republican Deputy Sergeant at Arms. Mark began employment with the Senate as a young man of 18. As he worked, he also earned a college degree and served in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

Mark has been committed to the best interests of the Senate and to the United States throughout his career. This is evident in both the quality of his work and his enthusiasm for it.

I want to thank Mark for his outstanding service in the U.S. Senate; we will miss him. I'm certain my colleagues join me in expressing appreciation and in wishing him well.

THE RETIREMENT OF JOHN ''MARK'' LACOVARA

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, an individual with over 27 years of dedicated service to the U.S. Senate has retired. This conscientious and hard working individual is John ''Mark'' Lacovara, the assistant Journal clerk of the Senate.

Mark, a native-born Washingtonian, has served in numerous capacities in the Senate over the past 27 years. During those years of service, Mark completed his college education and earned a degree from the University of Maryland.

In March, 1969, Mark began his Senate service as a reference assistant in the Senate Library. Shortly thereafter, he moved to a doorkeeper position at the pass desk under the auspices of the Senate Sergeant at Arms. From the doorkeeper's position, Mark had the opportunity to return to work for the Secretary of the Senate as a clerk in the Senate stationery room.

In 1974, Mark was appointed clerk of enrolled bills on the legislative staff of the Secretary. In 1979, Mark was named second assistant Journal clerk, and by 1984 was working as editor of morning business for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In his capacity as morning business editor, Mark had the responsibility of producing, compiling, and formatting copy for the Morning Business section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This section includes Presidential messages, House messages, Executive communications, petitions and memorials, committee reports, the introduction of legislation, as well as additional statements. Anyone who takes a look at the RECORD will get a notion of the responsibility of the morning business editor.

As I mentioned earlier, Mark once served as second assistant Journal clerk. In 1993, Mark returned to that office in the capacity of assistant Journal clerk, where he remained until his retirement.

Often referred to as the ''bible'' of the Senate, the Journal reflects the official legal record of Senate proceedings. An individual with the responsibility of making the entries plays a critical role in the history of the Senate. Mark served in exemplary fashion as assistant Journal clerk, and took great pride in his work.

Mark loved the Senate. He served here with distinction. He believed in the Senate as a great institution and throughout his long service demonstrated his loyalty and dedication.

Mr. President, I say to Mark, thank you for your long and distinguished service. You will be missed.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, July 21, 1997, the Federal debt stood at $5,363,682,543,589.87. (Five trillion, three hundred sixty-three billion, six hundred eighty-two million, five hundred forty-three thousand, five hundred eighty-nine dollars and eighty-seven cents)

Five years ago, July 21, 1992, the Federal debt stood at $3,982,450,000,000. (Three trillion, nine hundred eighty-two billion, four hundred fifty million)

Ten years ago, July 21, 1987, the Federal debt stood at $2,314,700,000,000. (Two trillion, three hundred fourteen billion, seven hundred million)

Fifteen years ago, July 21, 1982, the Federal debt stood at $1,084,261,000,000.

(One trillion, eighty-four billion, two hundred sixty-one million)

Twenty-five years ago, July 21, 1972, the Federal debt stood at $434,462,000,000 (Four hundred thirty-four billion, four hundred sixty-two million) which reflects a debt increase of nearly $5 trillion—$4,929,220,543,589.87 (Four trillion, nine hundred twenty-nine billion, two hundred twenty million, five hundred forty-three thousand, five hundred eighty-nine dollars and eighty-seven cents) during the past 25 years.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JOANNE RAINSFORD

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, throughout the Nation, whenever a community leader passes, his or her death is noticed and mourned by many. In small towns, however, the impact of such a loss is always magnified, for in such places, the deceased is more than a well known, but distant figure, he or she is a neighbor, a member of the local church, and more often than not, a friend. Such was the case on June 29 when Edgefield, SC suffered a tremendous loss with the passing of my friend, Joanne Tisdale Rainsford.

Mrs. Rainsford first came to Edgefield to work as a teacher, and it was not long before she became a well known and liked figure around town. Her civic mindedness led her to become involved in a multitude of organizations and causes, and though not originally from Edgefield, she worked hard on behalf of her new hometown. Among other groups, the Edgefield United Way, the Olde Edgefield Trade Association, and the Edgefield Community Development Association all benefited from the efforts of this tireless, devoted, and enthusiastic woman.

One of the cornerstones of a small town is the community newspaper, and Joanne Rainsford played an important role in helping produce the local paper, the Citizen News. In the mid-1980's, she spent about a year and a half as the managing editor of that publication, and she later became the president of Edgefield County Communications, the parent company of the Citizen News.

Though Mrs. Rainsford enjoyed many pursuits, she was particularly interested in history, and she worked hard to save and showcase the unique and rich history of Edgefield County. In recognition of her service as their president, and her leadership in any number of preservation projects, the Edgefield County Historical Society just this past June voted to rename its museum the Joanne T. Rainsford Heritage Center. This was an honor of which I know she was especially proud and the action of the society is all the more meaningful as they approved this recognition shortly before Mrs. Rainsford's death.

Whether it was through her work as a teacher, in her role as a newspaper executive, or as a civic booster, Joanne Rainsford worked hard to promote Edgefield, to build the local economy, and to make her hometown an even more prosperous and desirable place to live. She was an articulate proponent of the heritage corridor, a unique project that blends history and tourism together over a 14-county region in our State stretching from the coast to the mountains. I was so impressed by her desire to bolster tourism, the No. 1 industry in the Palmetto State, that I appointed her as a delegate from South Carolina to the White House Conference on Tourism.

Mr. President, many people in Edgefield and throughout South Carolina mourned the passing of Mrs. Joanne T. Rainsford, as she was a woman who was liked and admired by all those who knew her. She was also a woman who approached life with great enthusiasm and who sought to leave her mark on the world through projects that benefited others. I can say without reservation that the work of the late Mrs. Rainsford had a positive effect on Edgefield County and that her work strengthened that community in many different ways. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of an article from the Citizen News be included in the RECORD following my remarks, it very nicely captures Mrs. Rainsford's accomplishments and her spirit. Her husband, Ben Rainsford; her stepchildren, Neely and Todd; her two sisters, Nancy and Mary; and all her friends and relatives, have my deepest condolences on this terribly sad event. We shall all miss Joanne Rainsford.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JULIA RAVENEL DOUGHERTY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am saddened to report the passing of a longtime friend, a great supporter, and one of the stalwart members of the South Carolina Republican Party, Mrs. Julia Ravenel Dougherty.

In the not so distant past, South Carolina was what was known as a one party State, where a victory in a primary election was all one needed to secure office, and where a significant segment of the population had no outlet for its views, opinions, and politics. All of that began to change in the 1960's when a cadre of forward looking politicians and interested citizens began to fight to create a true Republican Party in South Carolina.

One of the pioneers in that effort was Mrs. Dougherty, who is roundly recognized as having been a woman of great humor, strong organizational skills, and inexhaustible energy, as well as someone who was a tremendous motivator. From the Charleston County Republican Party to the gubernatorial races, and from my own Senate campaigns to the bids of GOP candidates for the White House, Julia Dougherty was always eager to roll up her sleeves and to lend her considerable talents to an election effort. Her loyalty to the party, and activism on its behalf, earned her not only the thanks and admiration of countless people, but also an appointment as a delegate to the 1964 and 1968 Republican Conventions. Her loyalty and efforts were further recognized when in 1968, she was a member of the electoral college, and cast her vote for Richard M. Nixon.

In addition to her partisan political work, Mrs. Dougherty had a strong commitment to public service, and over the years, she made many contributions to building South Carolina into an even better, safer, and more prosperous State for all its citizens. She was the first female to ever serve on the South Carolina Highway Commission, and in that role, she was a forceful advocate for the modernization of the highway patrol, as well as the increased professionalization of that force. She later served as the State chairwoman of President Carter's friendship force, and during the Reagan administration, she served on an advisory committee to the Department of Transportation. Truly an impressive record, and one of which I know Julia was justifiably proud.

Despite her great love for politics and her commitment to public service, Mrs. Dougherty never sought elected office herself. This is truly a shame for I believe she would have made even more contributions to the Palmetto State as an elected official, and she certainly would have set a high standard for ability, integrity, and dedication for others to follow.

The death of Julia Ravenel Dougherty leaves a tremendous void in South Carolina politics and life in the lowcountry. Her family, which includes her cousin and my good friend, State Senator Arthur Ravenel; husband Francis; son Park; daughters Renee and Frances; and four grandchildren, all have my deepest sympathies. Their wife, mother, grandmother, and cousin will be missed by all those who knew this most remarkable woman.

LOUISIANA SENATE ELECTION CONTEST

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, nearly 3 months ago, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration voted to begin a preliminary investigation to determine the factual basis, if any, for a contest of the 1996 Senate election in Louisiana. I want to take a few minutes today to review where the committee stands in this matter, how we got there, and why I believe it is past the time to bring an end to this investigation and to dismiss the petition of Louis ''Woody'' Jenkins contesting the November 1996 Senate election in Louisiana.

The Rules Committee is currently faced with a decision: whether or not to allow an election contest to proceed, under the Senate's authority and duty under the Constitution, without any evidence of fraud or irregularities affecting the outcome.

This is not the first such decision the committee has faced in this matter.

Senators will recall that the initial bipartisan report of the committee's outside counsel found no evidence to support the claims in the petition, and suggested only the most limited review to determine whether or not Mr. Jenkins' more sensational claims of paid multiple voting had any merit. My colleagues will also recall that the committee, on a party-line vote, rejected that recommendation and moved forward with a substantially broader investigation at dramatically increased costs. Subject to a protocol negotiated by outside counsel for the majority and the minority, committee Democrats agreed to participate in a joint investigation.

Two teams of attorneys, accompanied by active duty and retired FBI agents, were dispatched to New Orleans, while here in Washington a pair of highly skilled Government Accounting Office [GAO] detailees reviewed tens of thousands of documents subpoenaed from state and local election officials in Louisiana. In addition, Committee staff spent countless hours conferring with counsel, establishing procedures for the investigation, assisting GAO with its review, and managing the day-to-day operations in New Orleans.

In the course of the joint investigation, over 130 subpoenas were issued; key witnesses were interviewed, in some instances more than once; voters were contacted in an effort to validate their election day sign-in at the polls; numerous election officials were interviewed; and hundreds of documents were produced by both Mr. Jenkins' and Senator LANDRIEU's campaign organizations.

What has the committee learned as a result of all this effort, which has cost the taxpayers well in excess of the $250,000 originally budgeted, Mr. President?

We have learned that there is no evidence—I repeat, no evidence, Mr. President—of any fraud or irregularity on election day in Louisiana that would have affected the outcome of this election.

We have learned that key witnesses to alleged vote buying and multiple voting were paid and schooled in fabricating their stories—none of which were confirmed by other records—and may have even been threatened once they revealed the truth about the attempt to mislead this committee. Those allegations of witness tampering which occurred after the election have been referred to the proper law enforcement officials for review.

We have learned that virtually none of the thousands of so-called ''phantom votes'' identified by Mr. Jenkins exist, nor are they corroborated by the mounds of election documents subpoenaed.

We have learned that numerous other so-called irregularities in the election are not violations of the Louisiana Election Code, but are simply technical violations or are so insignificant that Louisiana State law would not recognize them as a valid basis for overturning an election.

Some have suggested that the committee suspend the investigation until such time as the law enforcement authorities conclude their separate investigations into allegations of witness tampering. I believe such sentiment—which I would like to believe is the product of caution and not partisanship—is misguided.

Investigations of criminal tampering with committee witnesses are not designed to turn up evidence that is relevant to, let alone sufficient for, a finding by the Senate that but for fraud or irregularity, the 1996 Louisiana Senate election would have been decided differently. Specifically, evidence that witnesses were paid after the election to lie about illegal activities that did not occur, did not affect the outcome of the election itself, and would not be a basis for overturning the election.

I would like to respond to the allegation, made by Mr. Jenkins, at least one of my Republican colleagues on the committee, and Mr. Jenkins' attorney that the Democrats on the committee are hostile to this investigation and have decided to kill it for partisan reasons. In response, let me remind my colleagues and everyone else present about the time line in this case:

After his defeat on November 5, 1996, Mr. Jenkins claimed that his loss was due to massive voting by dead or incompetent voters. He also alleged that certain African-American precincts in New Orleans had turned out at greater than 90 percent—in one case at more than 100 percent—and in support of Senator LANDRIEU. Both allegations proved false after petitioner sought a court order for death and incompetency records—which yielded nothing—and after an Orleans Parish official revealed that no precinct had turned out at more than 82 percent and that 8 of the top 10 precincts had been majority-white and supported Jenkins in the election.

On November 14, 1996, Jenkins then brought a State law election challenge, making no mention of dead or incompetent voters or abnormally high turnouts. Instead, he alleged that so-called precinct audits prepared by volunteers from election records—which themselves were produced under court order—yielded thousands of phantom votes and mismatched signatures on election documents, plus evidence of improper assistance by poll workers. Jenkins dismissed his own suit, citing an inability to gather sufficient evidence—despite the judge's offer to extend the statutory deadline for filing an amended complaint.

On December 5, 1996, Jenkins filed a contest petition with the Senate—which he then amended on December 17—in which he restated his allegations of phantom voting and mismatched signatures, adding a serious of sensational allegations of vote buying, multiple voting, fraudulent voter registration and other election fraud, as well as a laundry list of other complaints including vote hauling, malfunctioning voting machines, failure of poll workers to identify voters, and campaign finance violations. After Senator LANDRIEU responded on January 17, 1997, Mr. Jenkins filed a response on February 7, 1997, reiterating his earlier allegations and presenting more supporting material to the committee. Eventually, Mr. Jenkins' submissions to this committee totaled over 9,000 pages. Key portions of this material were blacked out by Jenkins to obscure the names of individuals claiming to have participated in or having witnessed fraud on election day.

In response to these extensive submissions, the Rules Committee retained two outside counsels to wade through the material and make a recommendation to the committee regarding the sufficiency of the petition. On April 8, 1997, counsel presented the committee with a report recommending dismissal of the bulk of Jenkins' allegations, with counsel to conduct a limited investigation into the most sensational allegations of vote buying, multiple voting, and fraudulent voter registration. On April 15, 1997, Mr. Jenkins testified against the bipartisan report, claiming that it would result in the committee overlooking or ignoring serious evidence of fraud and irregularity in the November 1996 election.

On April 17, the Rules Committee—on a party-line vote—rejected the counsels' report and instead initiated a wide-ranging investigation. Although the committee Democrats disagreed strenuously with the decision to open up the scope of the investigation, we agreed to continue to participate in a bipartisan investigation.

Beginning the next week, our outside counsel met with the majority's choice of outside counsel, and together they drafted a protocol not only to guide our investigation but to serve as a basis for the detail of FBI agents and GAO personnel to the committee on a nonpartisan basis. The agents were especially important, because Mr. Jenkins refused to turn over his documents to the committee or our outside counsel—including the crucial names of his fraud witnesses—until he was assured that they would be delivered to FBI agents detailed to the committee.

On May 12, the majority and minority chief counsels traveled to New Orleans to select space in the Federal building to serve as temporary committee office space. Chairman WARNER subsequently requested a 60-day lease of the space which expires on July 31.

On May 13, committee staff were joined in Louisiana by members of both the majority and minority outside counsel teams. The group conducted interviews with the Governor, the leadership of the Louisiana Legislature, the secretary of state, the commissioner of elections, and the State district attorney for East Baton Rouge. It was during these interviews that the

then-lead attorney, Richard Cullen, advised that the 45-day investigative period began that day.

During the week of May 19, with the concurrence of committee Democrats, Chairman WARNER issued over 130 subpoenas to Louisiana election officials. The vast majority of the subpoenas were answered in a timely manner.

On May 30, 1997, again with concurrence of committee Democrats, Chairman WARNER issued subpoenas to political committees affiliated with both Senator LANDRIEU and Mr. Jenkins. Senator LANDRIEU delivered her documents on June 3, the deadline for delivery in New Orleans, but Mr. Jenkins—despite having months to prepare documents in support of a case brought at his behest—sought and received an extension until Monday, June 9.

Meanwhile, GAO evaluators detailed to the committee had begun work on June 2, 1997, reviewing petitioner's allegations of the existence of more than 7,400 so-called phantom votes in the November 1996 Louisiana senate election. Included in the materials Mr. Jenkins submitted on June 9 was a substantial revision of the phantom vote totals downward to just over 5,700 votes—less than the margin of difference in the November election. Nevertheless, Mr. Jenkins continued to express the belief that upon further scrutiny, the election records would yield enough phantom votes to more than make up the difference. As has been widely reported, we now know from the GAO evaluators detailed to the committee that this is not true. In fact, GAO detailees have concluded that further investigation of the allegations they have reviewed to date would be unwarranted.

Back in New Orleans, investigators were interviewing individuals named in the unredacted materials finally provided to the committee by Mr. Jenkins on June 9. Within a week, a disturbing pattern emerged. Not only were the allegations of fraud untrue, the witnesses revealed that they had been paid by agents of the petitioner to tell their stories.

Subsequently, on June 20, committee investigators discovered that at least one of these witnesses had been threatened, by agents of Mr. Jenkins, and told to reaffirm their original stories of fraud. For his part, Mr. Jenkins denies paying any witness and claims no knowledge of any payments by his agents for testimony.

Once I learned that the only evidence of election fraud in this matter was clearly false and purchased by agents of Mr. Jenkins, I decided that I could not, in good conscience, continue Democratic participation in the joint investigation. On June 23 I advised Chairman WARNER of my concerns. On June 25, the committee Democrats announced our withdrawal from the investigation.

On that same day, June 25, I asked the U.S. Department of Justice to investigate whether the witnesses were threatened in violation of Federal law, 18 U.S.C. § 1505, which prohibits obstruction of a Senate investigation.

It is my understanding that Chairman WARNER subsequently made a similar referral to the Republican district attorney for East Baton Rouge Parish, Mr. Doug Moreau, who has scheduled interviews with both the witnesses and the agents of Mr. Jenkins who allegedly paid them to lie. According to press reports, Mr. Moreau and his staff are also currently reviewing allegations that poll workers may not have followed the Louisiana Election Code to the letter. Mr. Jenkins has said that he supports these parallel investigations, but believes that the Rules Committee should continue its probe as well.

I should add that when committee staff and the two teams of outside counsel met with Mr. Moreau on May 13, he advised them that his office had neither the resources nor the expertise to conduct a full-scale investigation of alleged election fraud that may have occurred in the 1996 Senate election fraud that may have occurred in the 1996 Senate election. Mr. Moreau was also reluctant to state unequivocally that his office, located in Baton Rouge, had jurisdiction over alleged criminal activity in New Orleans Parish. And yet, that is exactly what Chairman WARNER has requested Mr. Moreau to investigate.

Based upon the review of evidence to date, it is unfair for petitioner or anyone else to claim that Democrats want to kill this probe prematurely. This case has consumed over 7 months, hundreds of thousands of dollars—not to mention hundreds of thousands more in the parties' legal fees, a portion of which they are customarily reimbursed by the Senate—and countless hours of staff time. After all this expenditure, the investigation has produced no evidence—none at all—that would support continued investigation, let alone action by the Senate to overturn the election.

Finally, in the interest of fairness I believe we should remember our colleague Senator LANDRIEU, who has faithfully continued serving the people of Louisiana while patiently enduring countless allegations and months of uncertainty in order for the Rules Committee to pursue each and every one of Mr. Jenkins' charges—none of which have produced a shred of credible evidence.

As has been widely reported, I am currently involved in negotiations with Chairman WARNER and other members of his caucus regarding the appropriate way to close this investigation in an orderly fashion. Whatever resolution we reach on this issue should, in my opinion, first, acknowledge that the investigation to date has produced no evidence of any fraud, error, or irregularity in the 1996 Louisiana Senate election, and second, set a fixed, firm date on which the Rules Committee will meet to vote on whether to terminate the investigation and dismiss the petition of Mr. Jenkins.

I join my entire Caucus in expressing our full and complete support for our colleague, Senator MARY LANDRIEU, and call on Chairman WARNER and members of the majority to end this investigation and remove the unjustified cloud of doubt overshadowing Senator LANDRIEU and the elected officials and good people of Louisiana.

THE OMNIBUS PATENT ACT OF 1997

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am delighted that the report is finally available for S. 507, The Omnibus Patent Act of 1997. The Senate Judiciary Committee voted 17 to 1 in favor of a Hatch-Leahy substitute to this bill on May 22. I urge all Members to take the time to learn about this legislation, which is designed to assist American innovation.

The Omnibus Patent Act would reform the U.S. patent system in important ways. The bill would:

Reduce legal fees that are paid by inventors and companies;

Slash redtape in the Patent and Trademark Office;

Increase the value of patents to inventors and companies; and

Facilitate U.S. inventors and companies' research, development, and commercialization of inventions.

In Vermont, we have a wide variety of independent inventors and small companies. It is especially important to me that this bill help them as well as larger, more specialized firms. I have spoken with independent inventors and representatives of smaller companies to learn what reforms they recommended. I have tried to ensure that their recommendations were incorporated into the Hatch-Leahy substitute amendment that was reported by the Judiciary Committee.

I am especially gratified that the Hatch-Leahy substitute responds to the concerns of independent inventors and small businesses concerning the matter of 18-month publication. These concerns were articulated at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing by the president of the Vermont Inventors Association, Bill Parker. Mr. Parker suggested giving applicants who only file in the United States a choice whether or not to publish early. He also recommended that we enhance the protections granted to those who choose 18-month publication if we wish to encourage them to take that course.

The substitute does both of these things. In particular, it allows any applicant to avoid publication before the granting of the patent simply by making such a request upon filing the application and by certifying that the application has not—and will not—be published abroad. The substitute also provides for the issuance of patents on individual claims in published applications as they are approved, rather than waiting for the disposition of all claims contained in such an application, as

now occurs. This allows applicants to gain full patent protection—including reasonable royalties, damages, and attorneys fees when appropriate—for some of their component inventions earlier than they would have under the original draft of the bill.

I was also concerned that, as introduced, the bill did not adequately protect an applicant who is diligently prosecuting a patent but whose application takes more than 3 years to process. The ability to have a full 17 years of patent protection is important to small and large patent applicants alike. The Hatch-Leahy substitute makes clear than a applicant who diligently prosecutes a patent application before the PTO should receive a full 17 years of patent protection.

Another matter of special importance to me is the section I suggested be added in the Hatch-Leahy substitute to enhance access to patent information. I have long thought that electronic access should be more widespread, and I want to work with the Patent and Trademark Office to ensure the effective implementation of statewide electronic accessibility of patent information in rural Sates and eventually in all areas to make it easier for inventors to study prior art and make further advances. This should be of particular benefit to Vermont, which is only now getting a patent and trademark depository library.

Although the goal of the reexamination provisions—reducing legal bills for patent applicants—was laudable, I was concerned that the legislation protect again harassment by third parties. The Hatch-Leahy substitute enhances protection against harassment by strengthening the estoppel provisions, to prevent a party from raising an issue that was raised or could have been raised in one forum from raising it in some other forum thereafter. In this way, the reexamination provision in the Hatch-Leahy substitute will provide an alternative to the current costly and time-consuming process of Federal litigation and, at the same time, protect patent applicants against undue harassment.

I am also glad that the substitute amendment clarifies that it is not the Senate Judiciary Committee's intent to undercut the Copyright Office in any way. The Copyright Office has served this country well for over a hundred years, and it should continue in that role.

Vermont has a great tradition of ''Yankee ingenuity.'' In fact, the very first U.S. patent was granted to Samuel Hopkins, a native of Pittsford, VT, who discovered a process for making potash. Today's inventors can be much like the inventors of Thomas Jefferson's day—individuals in a shop, garage, or home lab. They can also be teams of scientists working in our largest corporations or at our colleges and universities. Our Nation's patent laws should be fair to American innovators of all kinds—independent inventors, small businesses, venture capitalists, and larger corporations. To maintain America's preeminence in the realm of technology, which dates back to the birth of this republic, we need to modernize our patent system and patent office. Our inventors know this and that is why they support this legislation.

I am delighted that our Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, has joined as a cosponsor of this important legislation. I urge the Republican leadership to proceed to Senate consideration of S. 507 without delay.

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 a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The nomination received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 748. An act to amend the prohibition of title 18, United States Code, against financial transactions with terrorists.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–2544. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a rule relative to prescribed rates for tax purposes, received on July 17, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2545. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to finances under the Treasury Forfeiture Act of 1992 for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2546. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a rule relative to extraordinary dividends (RIN1545–AU16), received on July 15, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2547. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Child Support Enforcement 20th Annual Report to Congress under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2548. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a rule relative to electronic funds transfer (RIN1545–AS79), received on July 11, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2549. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a rule relative to the electronic remittance processing system, received on July 11, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2550. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a rule relative to guidance relating to waiver of penalties, received on July 11, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2551. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a rule relative to medical devices (RIN0910–AA09), received on July 21, 1997; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC–2552. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a violation of the Anitdeficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–2553. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule relative to radiological criteria, received on July 21, 1997; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2554. A communication from the Acting Executive Director, U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a rule relative to use of electronic media by commodity pool operators, received on July 21, 1997; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2555. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, two rules including one relative to contract reform initiative (RIN1991–AB28), received on July 21, 1997; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2556. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation relative to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2557. A communication from the Secretary, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Gateway Housing Program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2558. A communication from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a rule entitled ''Procedure For Imposing Assessments on the FHLBanks'' (RIN3069–AA51), received on July 21, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2559. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of authorization of a contract for the H–60 program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2560. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, notice of retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2561. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Department of the Navy, transmitting, a notification of a study for private contractors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2562. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, a notice of retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2563. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, a notice of retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2564. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, a notice of retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2565. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to dual use technology for fiscal year 1997; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2566. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, U.S. Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certification of a license for the export of defense equipment under the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2567. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, U.S. Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certification of a Manufacturing License Agreement relative to aerial target systems under the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2568. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, U.S. Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certification of a license for export of defense services to Brazil under the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2569. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, U.S. Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certification of a license for export of defense equipment to Sweden under the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2570. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Contract with America Advancement Act of 1996; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2571. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Regulatory Flexibility Analysis; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2572. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments for FM broadcast stations; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2573. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2574. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Mangement, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments in California; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2575. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments in Idaho; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2576. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments for Weston, Idaho; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2577. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments for Mendota, California; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2578. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments for Mahnomen, Minnesota; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2579. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, purusuant to law, a report relative to allotments for Portsmouth, Ohio; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2580. A communication from the AMD-Performance and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments for Cooperstown, Pennsylvania to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2581. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communciations Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments for Superior, Montana; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2582. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments for Gillette, Wyoming; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2583. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments for Kingfisher, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2584. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments for Greenwood, Arkansas; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2585. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments for Lexington, Illinois; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2586. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments for Steamboat Springs, Colorado; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2587. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments for Randolph, Utah; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2588. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments for Huntsville, Utah; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2589. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments for Manistique, Michigan; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2590. A communication from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to allotments for Durango and Dolores, Colorado; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1048. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 105–55).

By Mr. GORTON, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 2107. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 105–56).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DASCHLE:

S. 1045. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment on the basis of genetic information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FRIST, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1046. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. MACK (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 1047. A bill to settle certain Miccosukee Indian land takings claims within the State of Florida; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S. 1048. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon:

S. 1049. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make a minor adjustment in the exterior boundary of the Hells Canyon Wilderness in the States of Oregon and Idaho to exclude an established Forest Service road inadvertently included in the wilderness; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. SNOW):

S. 1050. A bill to assist in implementing the Plan of Action adopted by the World Summit for Children; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 1051. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to enhance protections against unauthorized changes of telephone service subscribers from one telecommunications carrier to another, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1052. A bill to amend the Andean Trade Preference Act to prohibit the provision of

duty-free treatment for live plants and fresh cut flowers described in chapter 6 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BIDEN:

S. 1053. A bill to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DASCHLE:

S. 1045. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment on the basis of genetic information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE GENETIC JUSTICE ACT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the advent of testing for genes that may indicate a predisposition to disease has presented us with a new series of opportunities and challenges. While prior awareness of susceptibility to disease offers millions the chance to take preventive measures that will help them live healthier and longer lives, there also exists the possibility that genetic information will be misused. It is for that reason that I am introducing S. 1045, The Genetic Justice Act. This legislation will ensure that employees will not suffer adverse employment consequences as a result of improper use of genetic information and that employee privacy is protected.

Scientific advances now make it possible to identify genes that may indicate a predisposition to disease. For example, tests for genes associated with hereditary breast cancer will soon be commercially available. Genetic information may prove highly beneficial in areas related to prevention, treatment, diet, or lifestyle. While this is profoundly good news for patients, it also raises fears regarding how genetic information will be used in the workplace. Advances in genetic testing and screening, accelerated by the National Institutes of Health Human Genome Initiative, increase physicians' ability to detect and monitor chromosomal differences. These technologies and their resulting genomic data will enhance medical science, but may also lead to discrimination.

Regrettably, many employers may not hire individuals whom they believe will require time off or medical treatment at some point in the future due to a genetically transmitted disease. This discrimination could result despite the fact that genetic testing only indicates that an individual may be predisposed to a disease—not whether that disease will develop.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that fear of discrimination already has inhibited people who may be susceptible to disease from getting genetic testing. In some cases, this means that gene carriers will miss out on early diagnosis, treatment or even prevention. If consumers avoid taking advantage of available diagnostic tests out of fear of discrimination, they may suffer much more serious—and more expensive—health problems in the long run.

We will pay the price in more than increased health care costs if we allow genetic information to be used in a discriminatory manner. Discrimination based on genetic factors can be as unjust as that based on race, national origin, religion, sex, or disability. In each case, people are treated inequitably, not because of their inherent abilities, but solely because of irrelevant characteristics. Genetic discrimination that excludes qualified individuals from employment robs the marketplace of skills, energy, and imagination. Finally, genetic discrimination undercuts the Human Genome Initiative's fundamental purpose of promoting public health. Investing resources in the Genome Initiative is justified by the benefits of identifying, preventing, and developing effective treatments for disease. But if fear of discrimination deters people from genetic diagnosis or from confiding in physicians and genetic counselors, and makes them more concerned with job loss than with care and treatment, our understanding of the humane genome will be for naught.

Because genetic information could be used unfairly, Congress must expand the scope of employment discrimination law to include a ban on genetic discrimination. Our bill forbids employers from discriminating in hiring or in the terms and conditions of employment, and limits their ability to acquire genetic information. In order to acquire such information, an employer must show that the information is job-related and that the employee has consented to the disclosure.

Now, before the use of genetic information becomes widespread, we must make sure that dramatic scientific advances do not have negative consequences for the public. We have an historic opportunity to preempt this problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill text be printed in the RECORD and hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important legislation.

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

S. 1045

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 ''The Genetic Justice Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) EMPLOYEE; EMPLOYER; EMPLOYMENT AGENCY; LABOR ORGANIZATION; MEMBER.—The terms ''employee'', ''employer'', ''employment agency'', and ''labor organization'' have the meanings given the terms in section 701 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e). The terms ''employee'' and ''member'' include an applicant for employment and an applicant for membership in a labor organization, respectively.

(2) GENETIC INFORMATION.—The term ''genetic information'', used with respect to an individual, means information (including information regarding carrier status and information derived from a laboratory test that identifies mutations in specific genes or chromosomes, a physical medical examination, a family history, and a direct analysis of genes or chromosomes) about a gene, gene product, or inherited characteristic that derives from the individual or a family member of the individual.

(3) GENETIC SERVICES.—The term ''genetic services'' means genetic evaluation, genetic testing, genetic counseling, and related services.

SEC. 3. EMPLOYER PRACTICES.

It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

(1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to the compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment of the individual, because of genetic information with respect to the individual, including an inquiry by the individual regarding genetic services;

(2) to limit, segregate, or classify the employees of the employer in any way that would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect the status of the individual as an employee, because of genetic information with respect to the individual, including an inquiry by the individual regarding genetic services; or

(3) to request or require the collection for the employer or disclosure to the employer of genetic information with respect to an individual unless the employer shows that—

(A) the employer made the request or requirement after making an offer of employment to the individual;

(B) the information is job-related for the position in question and consistent with business necessity; and

(C) the knowing and voluntary written consent of the individual has been obtained for the request or requirement, and the collection or disclosure.

SEC. 4. EMPLOYMENT AGENCY PRACTICES.

It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employment agency to fail or refuse to refer for employment, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual because of genetic information with respect to the individual, including an inquiry by the individual regarding genetic services.

SEC. 5. LABOR ORGANIZATION PRACTICES.

It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a labor organization—

(1) to exclude or to expel from the membership of the organization, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual because of genetic information with respect to the individual, including an inquiry by the individual regarding genetic services;

(2) to limit, segregate, or classify the members of the organization, or to classify or fail or refuse to refer for employment any individual, in any way that would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities, or would limit the employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect the status of the individual as an employee, because of genetic information with respect to the individual, including an inquiry by the individual regarding genetic services; or

(3) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an individual in violation of this section.

SEC. 6. TRAINING PROGRAMS.

It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer, labor organization, or

joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining, including on-the-job training programs, to discriminate against any individual because of genetic information with respect to the individual, including an inquiry by the individual regarding genetic services, in admission to, or employment in, any program established to provide apprenticeship or other training or retraining.

SEC. 7. CONFIDENTIALITY.

If an employer, labor organization, or employment agency possesses genetic information about an employee, the employer, labor organization, or employment agency—

(1) shall maintain the information on separate forms and in separate medical files, and treat the information as a confidential medical record, except that, if the employee provides knowing and voluntary written consent—

(A) the employer may inform a supervisor or manager of the employee regarding a necessary restriction on the work or duties of, or a necessary accommodation for, the employee;

(B) the employer may inform first aid and safety personnel (when appropriate, within the meaning of section 102(d)(3)(B)(ii) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12112(d)(3)(B)(ii))); and

(C) the employer shall provide relevant information to a government official investigating compliance with this Act, on request;

(2) shall disclose the information to the employee at the request of the employee; and

(3) shall not otherwise disclose the information.

SEC. 8. CIVIL ACTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An employee or member of a labor organization may bring an action in a Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction against an employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee who violates this Act.

(b) CLASS ACTIONS.—The employee or member may bring the action for and in behalf of—

(1) the employee or member; or

(2) the employee or member, and other employees or members of the labor organization who are similarly situated.

(c) REMEDY.—The court in which the action is brought may award any appropriate legal or equitable relief.

SEC. 9. CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the rights or protections of an employee or member of a labor organization under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FRIST, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1046. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1997

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce, with my colleagues Senators KENNEDY, FRIST, and COLLINS, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1997. Our legislation authorizes the National Science Foundation [NSF] for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 and is similar to the legislation that was approved by the House of Representatives by voice vote on April 24, 1997.

The strong bipartisan support which NSF enjoys is a product of its historic contribution to American security and competitiveness. The prominent role of science in the American war effort during World War II left Americans with a new appreciation of the importance of research in establishing and preserving economic and military security. Federally funded research provided the American war effort with radar, sonar, the proximity fuse, blood plasma, sulfanilamide, penicillin, and the atomic bomb. In 1944, President Roosevelt charged Vannevar Bush, his chief science adviser, with evaluating the most effective way to harness this technological infrastructure in peacetime. The Bush report—Science—The Endless Frontier—established a strategy and rationale for Federal support of basic research. The report argued that ''a nation which depends upon others for its new basic scientific knowledge will be slow in its industrial progress and weak in its competitive position in world trade regardless of its mechanical skill.'' This report provided the blueprint for creation of the National Science Foundation.

NSF was established in 1950 to ''develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences.'' Eight years later, following the 1957 Soviet launch of the Sputnik satellite, this mission was expanded to provide greater support for science education and literacy. Over the next three decades, NSF became the primary Federal sponsor of basic scientific research in mathematics, physical sciences, computer science, engineering, and environmental science at colleges and universities. Equally important to the future of our Nation, NSF has become a primary catalyst for math and science education reform.

NSF'S ROLE IN FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The legislation which I am introducing with my colleagues authorizes $3.5 billion for the National Science Foundation in fiscal year 1998 and $3.6 billion in fiscal year 1999. Although the National Science Foundation's budget accounts for only 4 percent of Federal research and development funding, NSF provides 25 percent of Federal support to academic institutions for research. NSF's contribution is even greater in some disciplines—NSF provides nearly 50 percent of all Federal support for basic research in certain fields of science, including math, computer science, and environmental science. This funding supports approximately 19,000 research and education projects at more than 2,000 colleges, universities, primary, elementary, and secondary schools, businesses, and other research institutions. Competition for these grants is fierce. NSF funds only about one-third of the 30,000 proposals it reviews annually.

The importance of this investment cannot be exaggerated. Over the past decade, private sector investment in research and development has eclipsed Federal investment in public science. However, the Federal investment in basic science plays a preeminent role in industrial innovation in the United States. A recent review of American industrial patent applications revealed that the Government or nonprofit foundations supported 75 percent of the main papers cited as the foundation for the new industrial innovation. The remaining 25 percent were funded by industry.

NSF'S ROLE IN SCIENCE EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY LITERACY

This bill authorizes $645 million for the education and human resources directorate [EHRD] in fiscal year 1998. EHRD has primary responsibility for NSF's education and training activities. In contrast with the programs of the Department of Education, NSF science and math education programs are experiments which link learning and discovery. Proposals are selected by outside peer review panels on the basis of their potential to provide long-lasting and broad impact. NSF has made notable contributions in the areas of curriculum and instructional material development, professional development, and improved the participation in science research and science education of women, minorities, and individuals with disabilities. This legislation strengthens and enhances these efforts.

And finally, I would be remiss if I did not speak about the partnership which has been forged between the State of Vermont and the National Science Foundation. Last year, NSF grants were provided to the Barre Town Elementary School, Mountshire Museum of Science, Cabot School, Charlestown Elementary School, St. Michael's College, Johnson State College, and the University of Vermont. In 1992, the Vermont Institute for Science, Math, and Technology received a 5-year award of $7.9 million to establish a collaborative statewide education reform effort linking business, higher education, government, and community sectors.

Our bill builds upon partnerships like that forged with the State of Vermont and offers a credible bipartisan response to the research and science education challenges facing our Nation. I urge the support of all my colleagues in the Senate for this worthwhile legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join Senator JEFFORDS and Senator FRIST as a sponsor of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1997. This bipartisan legislation looks to the future by strengthening our national commitment to research and development. It also ensures the continued success of NSF's teacher training and professional development programs. In addition, it will improve science and math education from kindergarten to graduate school, and maintain America's competitive edge into the 21st century.

Few Federal agencies deliver as much bang for the buck as the National Science Foundation. The NSF funds 19,000 peer-reviewed science and education projects at more than 2,000 colleges, universities, schools, businesses, and research facilities in the United States.

NSF accounts for only 4 percent of total Federal research and development funding, yet it provides 25 percent of basic research support at academic institutions, and as much as half of all Federal funding for research in fields such as mathematics, computer science, environmental science, and the social sciences.

The NSF also plays an important role in training teachers and developing math and science curricula to prepare students for tomorrow's challenges. It has promoted innovative education programs in partnership with colleges, universities, elementary and secondary schools, science museums, and state and local governments. These programs encourage the discovery of new knowledge and its application to real-world problems.

NSF support for basic research and science education has played an important role in encouraging economic growth over the last 50 years. According to a recent study, each dollar that the Federal Government has spent on basic research has contributed 50 cents or more to the national output. These economic benefits are spread throughout the economy, enhancing the productivity of the Nation's work force and improving the quality of life of all Americans.

At the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for example, NSF funds have encouraged scientists to explore the commercial applications of their research. Technology developed at MIT had a role in the launching of 13 companies in 1995. They manufacture products ranging from computer chips to communication networks. These enterprises have bolstered the State and local economies, and provided jobs and opportunities for many citizens.

In Massachusetts, the National Science Foundation is funding a wide range of projects on the cutting edge of research. NSF grants have been instrumental in building the State's biotechnology industry, mapping the oceans at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, developing new superconductors at Harvard University's Material Research Science and Education Center, and fostering cooperative partnerships with schools, parents, businesses, and community organizations to strengthen math and science education programs.

Nationwide, NSF grants also cover a broad range of projects from health care to crime-fighting to protecting the environment. Specific grants are improving the treatment of arrythmia, facilitating the accurate identification of crime suspects, developing new biotechnology techniques to clean hazardous waste sites, and analyzing an Antarctic meteorite to determine whether or not life existed on Mars.

NSF funds benefit the humanities as well. The Next Generation Internet project will give researchers access to information from the world's libraries and museums at rates that are 100 to 1,000 times faster than today's Internet.

Recent budget projections by the American Association for the Advancement of Science paint a bleak picture for future funding of research and development. Discretionary spending, which funds all R&D programs including NSF grant support, is expected to shrink from one-sixth to one-seventh of the Federal budget by the year 2000. As a result, funds for NSF research and development will likely face reductions of 18 percent. At the same time, Germany, Japan, and France are projected to begin to overtake the United States in R&D expenditures. These developments will jeopardize America's leadership in science and technology as the 21st century approaches.

The impact of these cuts will be felt heavily in Massachusetts, which ranks third among States in NSF funding. Nearly 1,400 projects at over 140 sites in Massachusetts are funded at more than $224 million annually, and an 18-percent decrease in grant support would adversely affect students, scientists, researchers, and citizens in all 50 States.

The National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1997 that we are sponsoring will place research and development on a more secure footing over the next 2 years. It will increase NSF funding by 7.2 percent in fiscal year 1998 and 3.7 percent in fiscal year 1999. The legislation also strengthens efforts to improve science, mathematics, engineering, and technology training for teachers and students, and will enable NSF to continue to play an important role in developing a faster and more powerful Internet. In addition, it authorizes the Office of Science and Technology Policy to prepare a report analyzing indirect costs, which play a vital but poorly understood part of Federal R&D spending.

The National Science Foundation is doing an outstanding job of fulfilling their missions, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

By Mr. MACK (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 1047. A bill to settle certain Miccosukee Indian land takings claims within the State of Florida; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MICCOSUKEE SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1997

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague from Florida, Senator GRAHAM, to introduce legislation approving an agreement between the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, and the State of Florida. This agreement arose from disputes surrounding the construction of Interstate 75 through the Miccosukee Reservation in Florida.

By way of background, Mr. President, when the interstate was built from Naples across to Fort Lauderdale, the Florida Department of Transportation dredged fill dirt off the northern Miccosukee Indian Reservation and used it to construct the roadbed. The Miccosukees subsequently sued in Federal District Court on the basis of an unlawful taking of property.

The State and the Miccosukees subsequently worked out a settlement whereby Florida would keep the fill-dirt and the Indians would get several parcels of State land. One parcel is adjacent to the tribe's permit lands on Tamiami Trail and another is near the Krome Detention Center in Miami. This agreement has been signed by the Miccosukees and the Department of Interior and was endorsed unanimously by the Governor and Cabinet of Florida.

The bill we are introducing today will direct the Secretary of the Interior—as the Federal trustee of the Miccosukees—to:

First, aid and assist in the fulfillment of the settlement agreement in a reasonable manner; second, upon finding that the agreement is legally sufficient, the Secretary should sign the agreement on behalf of the United States; third, facilitate the transfer of Miccosukee land—the fill-dirt—to the Florida Department of Transportation under the terms of the agreement, and; fourth, receive in Federal trust—on behalf of the Miccosukees—the land put up by the State for the swap—adjacent to Permit Area and Krome.

Mr. President, this legislation has also been introduced by Representative DIAZ-BALART in the House of Representatives. The enactment of this legislation is very important to the Miccosukee Tribe and I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort.

Thank you, Mr. President.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon:

S. 1049. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make a minor adjustment in the exterior boundary of the Hells Canyon Wilderness in the States of Oregon and Idaho to exclude an established Forest Service road inadvertently included in the wilderness; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HELLS CANYON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA LEGISLATION

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, today I introduce a bill that corrects a Forest Service mapping error on the border of the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area [HCNRA], in northeast Oregon, that has led to the closure of an important access road. The bill will restore public access to Hells Canyon, while preserving additional wilderness acreage for the enjoyment of generations to come.

In 1975, Congress created the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area which includes the Wilderness Area and overlooks the Snake River and the Oregon-Idaho border. Along the western

rim of Hells Canyon lies Forest Service Road 3965. The 1975 act directed the development of a comprehensive management plan for the HCNRA and specifically addressed the need to analyze road access on the western rim of the canyon. The 1982 Comprehensive Management Plan, developed with extensive public participation, provided for continued motor vehicle use of Road 3965 for recreation and fire prevention purposes. The road existed prior to the HCNRA designation, but upon the discovery that the road crossed into the designated wilderness area, the road was closed.

The Forest Service inadvertently erred in its location of the wilderness boundary in question. This legislation will, therefore, adjust the wilderness boundary to bring it in line with what Congress intended when the wilderness was established. This correction will actually increase wilderness acreage.

For decades, Oregon residents have traveled this service road to experience the natural beauty of Hells Canyon. The recreation area is an important part of our heritage, and public access to it is vital. I look forward to the Forest Service managing the road with continued sensitivity to all cultural, environmental, and economic impacts.

Mr. President, 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. 1049

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

SECTION 1. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT, HELLS CANYON WILDERNESS, HELLS CANYON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall revise the map and detailed boundary description of the Hells Canyon Wilderness designated by section 2 of Public Law 94–199 (16 U.S.C. 460gg–1) to exclude Forest Service Road 3965 from the wilderness area so that the road may continue to be used by motorized vehicles to its historical terminus at Squirrel Prairie, as was the original intent of the Congress. The road shall continue to be included in the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area also established by such Act.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 1050. A bill to assist in implementing the plan of action adopted by the World Summit for Children; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE JAMES P. GRANT WORLD SUMMIT FOR CHILDREN IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today, on behalf of myself, Senator MURRAY, and Senator SNOWE, to introduce the James P. Grant World Summit for Children Implementation Act of 1997.

At the 1990 World Summit for Children, the United States and 158 other nations made a promise to the world's children. In signing the summit declaration and plan of action, they pledged, by the year 2000, to reduce child mortality rates by at least one-third, to reduce maternal deaths and child malnutrition by one-half, to provide all children access to basic education, and to provide all families access to clean water, safe sanitation and family planning information, and services. In the declaration they stated, ''We are prepared to make available the resources to meet these commitments.''

We have, in fact, made some progress over the last several years in meeting these admittedly ambitious objectives. Child mortality rates have fallen. Over 80 percent of the world's children are now immunized, saving 3 million lives annually. Nonetheless, millions of children are still dying every year for want of a vaccine costing just a few dollars or a Vitamin A capsule costing a few cents. It is estimated that 12 million children still die each year from preventable diseases and malnutrition.

The objective of the legislation Senators MURRAY and SNOWE and I are introducing today is to keep the United States focused on the commitments it made at the World Summit on Children. The bill would shift funds within the existing foreign assistance budget to meet the needs of children—without increasing overall foreign assistance. Specifically, it calls for increased allocations of funds for child survival, basic education, Vitamin A and other micronutrients, UNICEF, AIDS prevention and care, refugee assistance, family planning, and tuberculosis prevention and treatment.

This is not just a foreign assistance bill. We can and must do more in our own country to improve the health and welfare of children at risk. Therefore, this legislation also calls for increased funding of domestic programs which touch the lives of children, namely Head Start and the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children, also known as WIC. Both of these programs have proven track records of improving the lives and prospects of children from low-income families.

Mr. President, I appreciate that Congress is in the midst of serious fiscal belt tightening in order to meet our balanced budget objectives. This means that we must focus on our highest priorities. I would maintain, though, that we have no higher priority than our children and providing for their future. The programs cited in this bill, if properly funded, will improve the quality of life of children, here and abroad, and help them grow into healthy, productive adults. Moreover, it will do so without increasing our overall foreign assistance and with only a modest increase in the two domestic programs cited.

Mr. President, this bill is good for children, good for their families, and good for our future. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am delighted to once again join my colleague from Vermont, Senator JAMES JEFFORDS, in introducing the James P. Grant World Summit for Children Implementation Act. I particularly want to pay tribute to Senator JEFFORDS for his continuing leadership in the effort to aid all children.

The World Summit for Children Implementation Act is our effort to ensure that the United States implements the plan of action adopted at the 1990 United Nations World Summit for Children. Our legislation proposes a series of life-saving, cost-effective programs to protect the health and well-being of children worldwide. Importantly, while this legislation proposes several increases in individual foreign assistance programs, it does not call for an increase in overall foreign aid levels.

Specifically, the Jeffords-Murray bill increases funding allocations for child survival, basic education, vitamin A and other micronutrients, UNICEF, AIDS prevention and care, refugee assistance, and family planning. Our bill also calls for an increase in funding for two important domestic programs: WIC and Head Start.

The world's children have a right to adequate nutrition, full immunization, a decent education, and health care. The United States has traditionally led the way in promoting the well-being of children. Because the nations of the world are more interdependent than ever before, the well-being of children around the globe affects us here in the United States. Children are not just the foundation of our society and our future; they are truly the foundation of the future of the world.

According to UNICEF, more than 33,000 children die each and every day; most from easily preventable diseases. The under 5 mortality rate for children in the least developed countries is 20 times greater than that of the United States and other industrialized nations.

More than 2 million children under age 5 die each year from vaccine preventable diseases like diphtheria, measles, pertussis, polio, tuberculosis, and tetanus. Diarrhoeal diseases, often caused by a total lack of clean sanitation facilities and clean water, kill an additional 3 million children per year. And for every child that dies, several more live on with stunted growth, ill health, and diminished potential.

The world's political leadership can ill-afford to ignore these statistics. These are just the mortality statistics for young children. Equally disturbing figures are available regarding access to education, the treatment of young girls, nutrition, and child labor. Clearly, our work on behalf of children is far from completed. While we have much to celebrate, we have much more to do. And I am delighted to be joining Senator JEFFORDS to unequivocally state our belief that the United States must continue to champion the future health, education, and economic well-being of children everywhere.

Importantly, to reach children, we must reach out to the world's women including young mothers, family providers, and elders. Women are often overlooked in tradition development programs. Fortunately, the World

Summit for Children recognized to improve the lot of children, the status of women also had to improve.

For example, recognizing the important link between child survival and family planning, the World Summit for Children called for universal access to family planning education and services by the end of this decade.

Family planning saves the lives of both women and children. We know that babies born in quick succession to a mother whose body has not yet recovered from a previous birth are the least likely to survive. Increasing funds in this area has been a top priority for me in my work in the Senate, and is addressed positively in the legislation we are introducing today.

Basic education is another important component of this legislation. Of the 143 million children in the developing world not attending school, 56 percent are girls. Of the world's 900 million illiterate adults, nearly two thirds are women. World Bank studies have estimated that each additional year of education for a young girl results in a 10-percent decrease in birth rates and child death rates, and a 10 to 20 percent increase in wages earned.

Foreign aid is never a popular item. I applaud Secretary of State Madeleine Albright for her advocacy work in support of foreign aid and U.S. assistance abroad. And I am pleased that the both bodies of the Congress have voted to provide additional moneys for foreign assistance in fiscal year 1998. In my view, our foreign aid dollars are best spent when we are investing in programs that strengthen families around the globe, and give a special hand to women and children.

That is exactly what Senator JEFFORDS and I propose to do with the James P. Grant World's Summit for Children Implementation Act. I urge my colleagues to review and support this important legislation.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 1051. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to enhance protections against unauthorized changes of telephone service subscribers from one telecommunications carrier to another, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE INTERSTATE SLAMMING PREVENTION ACT OF 1997

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that will address a significant consumer issue—the unauthorized change of telecommunications subscribers from one carrier to another, otherwise known as slamming.

Consumers have the right to choose their primary long distance company and to change companies whenever they wish. Sometimes a consumer's telecommunications company is changed without the consumer's knowledge or consent, a practice known as slamming. As competition among telecommunications carriers has increased, so has the number of complaints arising from unauthorized or unknowingly authorized changes of consumers' telecommunications carriers.

To give an idea of the scope of the problem, the Federal Communications Commission [FCC] reports that it received over 1,700 complaints during fiscal year 1993. By 1995, that number had escalated to over 38,000 consumer telephone complaints and over 25,000 written complaints. In fact, the FCC says slamming complaints are their fastest growing category of consumer complaint, and my home State of Colorado ranks among the top five States in 1996 slamming complaints per million customers.

The FCC reports that a slammed consumer may lose important service features, get lower quality service, or be charged higher rates for his or her telephone calls. Slamming also distorts the telecommunications competitive market by rewarding companies that engage in deceptive and misleading marketing prices. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 includes provisions designed to reduce slamming, and it charges the FCC to adopt rules to implement these provisions.

The bill I am introducing today will give teeth to the Commission's efforts to curb slamming. I firmly believe that enforcement, streamlined processing of slamming complaints, and consumer education will help stem the tide of unauthorized carrier changes.

My bill, the Interstate Slamming Prevention Act of 1997, imposes a deadline of April 30, 1998 for the completion of the FCC's rulemaking on slamming.

Currently, the Telecommunications Act does not define a deadline for action, and one is needed to ensure that consumers are protected as soon as possible from companies that engage in deceptive marketing practices. Nine months is sufficient time for the FCC to build a full record, solicit input from all interested parties, and put forth new antislamming rules.

My legislation directs the FCC, in its rulemaking, to develop rules and regulations regarding penalties and liabilities—including substantial fines or forfeitures under section 503 of the Communications Act—for the unauthorized switching of a customer's preferred telecommunications carrier.

It also directs the FCC to consider whether telecommunications carriers should be required to set up toll-free numbers dedicated to reporting unauthorized long distance carrier switches, with the obligation for a customer service representative to answer incoming calls within 2 minutes.

I support such a toll-free number with call answering standards. Requiring consumers to pay for a call to report a slamming incident or having them endure a long wait before speaking to a customer service representative, would pose real barriers to accurate reporting.

My legislation further directs the Commission to consider a process that would secure facts and statistical data from telecommunications carriers related to the number of consumer complaints they receive regarding slamming.

By October 31, 1998, the bill directs the FCC to report to Congress the identities of those telecommunications carriers that represent the 10 top slammers for 1997—based on the ratio of annual customer complaints regarding unauthorized carrier changes to the total number of customers served by such carriers.

It is my hope that such a list will serve as an effective deterrent to companies contemplating deceptive marketing campaigns. Negative publicity could be the best defense in the fight against slamming.

This report also should identify whether telecommunications carriers have been assessed fines or forfeitures by the Commission—including the amount of the fine or forfeiture, and whether the assessment was the result of a full prosecution or pursuant to a consent decree.

After the first report in October 1998, the bill requires an annual report be submitted by the FCC to Congress each April 30.

Before Congress takes more dramatic action in this regard, my bill would look to the FCC for its recommendations on the following issues: Whether consumers should be provided a private cause of action, with minimum statutory penalties, relating to unauthorized slamming; whether the FCC's current fine and forfeiture authority is sufficient to meaningfully address and curb actions of telecommunications carriers that engage in slamming; and what penalties should be applied to telecommunications carriers which switch a customer's preferred telecommunications carrier without a customer's authorization either willfully and knowingly or by means of a forged document?

It is simply unfair for unsuspecting consumers, especially senior citizens, who in good faith select a long distance carrier only to have their long distance phone service changed without their knowledge. Slamming is unfair and against the law. My bill will help protect consumers from this unfair practice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

S. 1051

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 ''Interstate Slamming Prevention Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. ENHANCEMENT OF PROTECTIONS.

(a) LIABILITY FOR ADDITIONAL CHARGES.—Subsection (b) of section 258 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 258) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) LIABILITY FOR CHARGES.—Any telecommunications carrier'' in the first sentence and inserting the following:

''(b) LIABILITY FOR CHARGES.—

''(1) CHARGES COLLECTED AFTER VIOLATION.—Any telecommunications carrier''; and

(2) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following:

''(2) FEES FOR CHANGING BACK.—Any telecommunications carrier described in paragraph (1) shall also be liable to the carrier previously selected by the subscriber concerned for any fees associated with changing the subscriber back to the carrier previously selected, in accordance with such procedures as the Commission may prescribe.

''(3) RELATION TO OTHER AUTHORITY.—The remedies provided by this subsection are in addition to any other remedies available by law.''.

(b) ADDITIONAL PENALTIES.—Such section 258 is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) ADDITIONAL PENALTIES.—Any telecommunications carrier that violates the verification procedures described in subsection (a) shall be subject to such additional fines and penalties, including a forfeiture penalty under section 503(b)(1)(B) of this Act, as the Commission shall prescribe.''.

(c) ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS.—Such section 258 is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS.—In order to provide subscribers with additional protections against changes in providers of telephone exchange service or telephone toll service in violation of the verification procedures described in subsection (a), the Commission may prescribe the following:

''(1) A requirement that telecommunications carriers establish toll-free telephone numbers in order to permit subscribers to register complaints regarding the execution of such changes in service, including the requirement that calls to such numbers be answered in not more than two minutes.

''(2) A requirement that telecommunications carriers provide the Commission such information relating to the complaints made to such carriers regarding such changes in service as the Commission considers appropriate.''.

(d) DEADLINE FOR RULEMAKING.—The Federal Communications Commission shall prescribe the regulations required by section 258 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by this section, not later than April 30, 1998.

(e) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than October 31, 1998, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report on unauthorized changes of subscribers' selections of providers of telephone exchange service or telephone toll service. The report shall include the following:

(A) A list of the ten telecommunications carriers that, during the one-year period ending on the date of the report, were subject to the highest number of complaints of having executed unauthorized changes of subscribers from their selected providers of telephone exchange service or telephone toll service when compared with the total number of subscribers served by such carriers.

(B) The telecommunications carriers, if any, assessed fines or penalties under section 258(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by subsection (c) of this section, during that period, including the amount of each fine or penalty, and whether the fine or penalty was assessed as a result of a court judgment or an order of the Commission or was secured pursuant to a consent decree.

(C) Whether or not subscribers should be authorized to bring a private cause of action against telecommunications carriers that change subscriber selections of providers of telephone exchange service or telephone toll service in violation of the procedures prescribed under section 258(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 and, if so, the advisability of establishing minimum statutory penalties for violations addressed by such causes of action.

(D) Whether or not the fines and penalties imposed by the Commission under section 258(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as so added, are sufficient to deter telecommunications carriers from changing subscriber selections of providers of telephone exchange service or telephone toll service in violation of such procedures.

(2) UPDATE.—Not later than one year after the date on which the Commission submits the report required by paragraph (1), and each year thereafter, the Commission shall submit to Congress an update of the previous report under this subsection which sets forth the information specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of that paragraph for one-year period preceding the date of the report concerned.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1052. A bill to amend the Andean Trade Preference Act to prohibit the provision of duty-free treatment for live plants and fresh cut flowers described in chapter 6 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States; to the Committee on Finance

THE ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE ACT FLOWER EXEMPTION AMENDMENT ACT OF 1997

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, in 1991 Congress enacted the Andean Trade Preference Act which provided for duty-free treatment, or reduced duties, on many products, including fresh-cut flowers, imported from the four South American Andean countries of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru. This legislation was proposed as a means of promoting alternatives to coca cultivation and production by offering broader access to U.S. markets for legal products.

However, the impact of the ATPA on our domestic flower industry, particularly in my home State of California, has been devastating. Colombian fresh-cut flowers have been the greatest beneficiary of the ATPA. In 1992, Colombia exported $87.7 million worth of fresh cut flowers to the United States. By 1995, Colombian exports increased to over $374.4 million. This represents a 427-percent increase over that 3-year period.

Domestic growers of roses and carnations have been particularly hard-hit. In 1996, Colombia exported approximately 1.7 billion roses and carnations to the United States. Colombia now controls more than 50 percent of the United States market for roses and 80 percent of the carnation market. Overall, Colombian flowers account for about 65 percent of the United States fresh-cut flower market.

The preferential treatment accorded Colombian fresh-cut flowers under the ATPA has had a direct and dire impact on the United States flower industry—approximately 58 percent of which is located in California. This preferential treatment, however, does not appear to be serving its intended purpose.

In 1996, an International Trade Commission report found that the ''ATPA had little effect on drug crop eradication in the Andean region * * *.'' In fact, quite the opposite has happened. The number of hectares devoted to coca cultivation in Colombia increased from 37,500 in 1991 to more than 50,000 in 1995. The ITC report also found that ''[the] ATPA had a small and indirect * * * effect on crop substitution during 1995 * * *.'' Thus, the intended goal of reducing drug crop cultivation by providing market access for alternative crops has not been achieved.

Mr. President, I applaud and support the goals of the Andean Trade Preference Act. We must do all we can to encourage Colombia to seek alternatives to drug production. The impact of the ATPA on our domestic flower industry, however, has been far too great to justify the continued inclusion of fresh-cut flowers. It is imperative, therefore, that we exempt fresh-cut flowers from the ATPA.

In enacting the ATPA, Congress specifically exempted certain products, that is textiles and apparel, watches and watch parts, and petroleum products, which were considered particularly sensitive to import competition. Fresh-cut flowers should be considered a similarly sensitive domestic product, and thus also exempted from the ATPA. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1052

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

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON PROVISION OF DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR LIVE PLANTS AND FRESH CUT FLOWERS UNDER THE ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCES ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 204 of the Andean Trade Preference Act (19 U.S.C. 3203) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (7), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(9) live plants and fresh cut flowers described in chapter 6 of the HTS.''; and

(2) in subsection (e)(5)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) through (D) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that is 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. BIDEN:

S. 1053. A bill to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, since I released my first annual drug strategy in

1990, I have argued that it was imperative that we needed to act, instead of just talk, in order to confront the problem of drug abuse and drug related crime. This means focusing quickly on the risks confronting our youth, identifying practical steps our communities can take to reduce these risks, and committing ourselves to the hard work and resources needed to steer young people to productive lives instead of wasted lives.

The administration's 1998 national drug strategy provides significant steps toward these goals. Under the leadership of General McCaffrey, the administration's 1998 drug strategy calls for a 10-year antidrug plan and a 1998 budget request that includes full funding for drug control efforts that have proven to work.

The administration's budget request includes: $8.4 billion for domestic drug enforcement; $3.3 billion for drug treatment; $2.2 billion for drug education and prevention—including $680 million for Safe and Drug-Free Schools; and $2.1 billion for interdiction and international antidrug efforts—including broad, across-the-board increases for law enforcement agencies like the FBI, DEA, INS, and U.S. Attorneys.

In addition to funding these existing programs, the budget request establishes a national media campaign of prime-time antidrug television advertisements to stop kids from trying drugs in the first place—funded by $175 million from Federal Government and $175 million from private industry.

These are all positive steps which I urge my colleagues to pass into law.

What is more, these positive steps illustrate just how vital the office of the Drug Director truly is. Because, if we did not have an office—a single, responsible office charged with overseeing the Federal antidrug policy we could not even debate whether General McCaffrey's drug strategy makes sense. I believe it does. But, there may be others who do not. My key point is that without a Drug Director, we would have lost even the chance to have an informed debate over a specific proposal.

I remind my colleagues what we faced on the drug policy front when I first began calling for a drug office in 1980: it was pretty simple, there was no drug office, there were more than 50 Federal departments, agencies, and offices putting together a hodge-podge of antidrug efforts with no coherant plan.

Contrast this to what we have today, General McCaffrey has submitted a strategy and a budget—and we can now all debate what a majority of us favor and what a majority of us oppose.

This is the fundamental reason why I am today introducing legislation to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy. I know that the administration, led by General McCaffrey, has worked hard to craft this legislation, and I believe that it deserves speedy consideration—and the votes—of my colleagues.

One of the important refinements offered in this legislation is to build in some long-term planning while at the same time adding some greater accountability for the drug strategy and all its component parts.

This legislation does so by calling on the Drug Director to develop a 10-year plan, a 5-year budget coupled with a detailed annual status report assessing the progress on the strategy, as well as a detailed, program-by-program, annual budget.

In other words, this legislation would keep the Drug Director's key power to develop, define, and submit to Congress a detailed annual drug budget. A process which holds unique powers to focus congressional debate on the topic of drug policy, and which is the strongest institutional power of the Office of National Drug Control Policy within the executive branch.

In addition, this legislation will enhance a function which too often is ignored—that function: accountability. Here, the Drug Director has called for long- and short-term measureable objectives. In fact, as part of General McCaffrey's on-going efforts at the Drug Office, the General has already identified more than 54 performance targets and another nearly 80 measures of program effectiveness.

The legislation I am introducing today will help formalize this process. Let me also add, that calling on the Drug Director to provide a 10-year plan will not prevent any future administration—nor even this administration—from changing or refining that plan. It is simply to recognize that we are at a stage in our effort against drugs where we must focus on implementation and results. And, this is exactly what the legislation I offer today is all about.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation I offer today.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 89

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 89, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals and their family members on the basis of genetic information, or a request for genetic services.

S. 370

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 370, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for increased medicare reimbursement for nurse practitioners and clinical nurse specialists to increase the delivery of health services in health professional shortage areas, and for other purposes.

S. 394

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 394, a bill to partially restore compensation levels to their past equivalent in terms of real income and establish the procedure for adjusting future compensation of justices and judges of the United States.

S. 397

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 397, a bill to amend chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code, to extend the civil service retirement provisions of such chapter which are applicable to law enforcement officers, to inspectors of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, inspectors and canine enforcement officers of the United States Customs Service, and revenue officers of the Internal Revenue Service.

S. 412

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 412, a bill to provide for a national standard to prohibit the operation of motor vehicles by intoxicated individuals.

S. 537

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] was added as a cosponsor of S. 537, a bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the mammography quality standards program.

S. 599

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to protect children and other vulnerable subpopulations from exposure to certain environmental pollutants, and for other purposes.

S. 608

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 608, a bill to authorize the enforcement by State and local governments of certain Federal Communications Commission regulations regarding use of citizens band radio equipment.

S. 755

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 755, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to restore the provisions of chapter 76 of that title (relating to missing persons) as in effect before the amendments made by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 and to make other improvements to that chapter.

S. 852

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 852, a bill to establish nationally uniform requirements regarding the titling and registration of salvage, nonrepairable, and rebuilt vehicles.

S. 943

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma

[Mr. INHOFE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] were added as cosponsors of S. 943, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the application of the act popularly known as the ''Death on the High Seas Act'' to aviation accidents.

S. 969

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 969, a bill ordering the preparation of a Government report detailing injustices suffered by Italian-Americans during World War II, and a formal acknowledgement of such injustices by the President.

S. 982

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 982, a bill to provide for the protection of the flag of the United States and free speech, and for other purposes.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1002, a bill to require Federal agencies to assess the impact of policies and regulations on families, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 30, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Republic of China should be admitted to multilateral economic institutions, including the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

SENATE RESOLUTION 98

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 98, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the conditions for the United States becoming a signatory to any international agreement on greenhouse gas emissions under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

BUMPERS AMENDMENT NO. 944

Mr. BUMPERS proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1034) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 70, strike lines 17 through 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following: ''sion and administrative aircraft, $3,826,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999. *Provided*, that of the funds made available in this bill, no funds shall be expended on the space station program, except for termination costs.''

D'AMATO AMENDMENT NO. 945

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. D'AMATO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1034, supra; as follows:

On page 16, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 108. (a) Not later than 4 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the allocation of health care resources by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under the Veterans Integrated Service Network system and the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation System. The report shall address the following:

(1) The manner in which health care resources (including personnel and funds) are allocated under the Veterans Integrated Service Network system and the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation system.

(2) Whether or not the allocation of health care resources under the systems takes into account the disproportionate number of veterans with special needs who reside in the northeastern United States.

(3) The effect of the allocation of health care resources under the systems on the quality of health care services provided by the Secretary to veterans who reside in the northeastern United States.

(4) The effect of the allocation of health care resources under the systems on the access to health care services provided by the Secretary to veterans who reside in the northeastern United States.

(b) Not later than 4 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall also submit to Congress a report on the effect of the reform of the eligibility of veterans for health care services under title I of Public Law 104–262 (110 Stat. 3178), and the amendments made by that title, on the quality of and access to health care provided by the Secretary to veterans who reside in the northeastern United States.

THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION, 1998

FORD (AND MCCONNELL) AMENDMENT NO. 946

Mr. BURNS (for Mr. FORD, for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 2016) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Section 303(e) of the 1997 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery from Natural Disasters, and for Overseas Peacekeeping Efforts, Including Those in Bosnia (Public Law 105–18; 111 Stat. 168) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—The Secretary may use funds available in the Defense Working Capital Fund for the payment of the costs of utilities, maintenance and repair, and improvements entered into under the lease under this section.''.

THE DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1988

ALLARD AMENDMENT NO. 947

Mr. ALLARD proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1034, supra; as follows:

On page 21, line 16, insert before the period at the end the following: '': *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $290,000,000 shall be made available for tenant-based assistance in accordance with section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937''.

GRAHAM AMENDMENT NO. 948

Mr. GRAHAM proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1034, supra; as follows:

On page 85, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

SEC. 423. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING CATASTROPHIC NATURAL DISASTERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) catastrophic natural disasters are occurring with great frequency, a trend that is likely to continue for several decades according to prominent scientists:

(2) estimated damage to homes, buildings, and other structures from catastrophic natural disasters has totaled well over $100,000,000,000 during the last decade, not including the indirect costs of the disasters such as lost productivity and economic decline;

(3) the lack of adequate planning for catastrophic natural disasters, coupled with inadequate private insurance, has led to increasing reliance on the Federal Government to provide disaster relief, including the appropriation of $40,000,000,000 in supplemental funding since 1989;

(4) in the foreseeable future, a strong likelihood exists that the United States will experience a megacatastrophe, the impact of which would cause widespread economic disruption for homeowners and businesses and enormous cost to the Federal Government; and

(5) the Federal Government has failed to anticipate catastrophic natural disasters and take comprehensive action to reduce their impact.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should consider legislation that embodies the following principles;

(1) Persons who live in areas at risk of natural disaster should assume a practical level of personal responsibility for the risks through private insurance.

(2) The insurance industry, in partnership with the Federal Government and other private sector entities, should establish new mechanisms for the spreading of the risk of catastrophes that minimize the involvement and liability of the Federal Government.

(3) A partnership should be formed between the private sector and government at all levels to encourage better disaster preparation and respond quickly to the physical and financial impacts of catastrophic natural disasters.

WELLSTONE (AND MIKULSKI) AMENDMENT NO. 949

Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1034, supra; as follows:

On page 85, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

SEC. 423. It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should appropriate for the Department of Veterans Affairs for discretionary activities in each of fiscal years 1999 through 2002 an amount equal to the amount required by the Department in such fiscal year for such activities.

WELLSTONE AMENDMENT NO 950

Mr. WELLSTONE proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1034, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

(A) Not later than 60 days after enactment of this act, the Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs shall hold one or more hearings to consider legislation which would add the following diseases at the end of Section 1112(c)(2) of title 38, United States Code: Lung cancer, bone cancer, skin cancer, colon cancer, kidney cancer, posterior subcapsular cataracts, non-malignant thyroid nodular disease, ovarian cancer, parathyroid adenome, tumors of the brain and central nervous system, and rectal cancer.

(B) Not later than 30 days after enactment of this act, the Congressional Budget Office shall provide to the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Senate Appropriations Committee an estimate of the cost of the provision contained in (A).

MIKULSKI (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 951

Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. BOND) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1034, supra; as follows:

On page 16, line 21, strike ''$10,693,000,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$10,653,000,000.''

On page 17, line 7, strike ''$1,150,000,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$1,110,000,000''.

On page 33, after line 23, insert the following new heading:

''EMPOWERMENT ZONES AND ENTERPRISE COMMUNITIES

''For grants to Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities, to be designated by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, to continue efforts to simulate economic opportunity in America's distressed communities, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.''.

On page 53 line 22, strike ''$400,500,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$420,500,000''.

On page 55, line 14, insert after the colon the following: '':Provided further, That $20,000,000 shall be available for the America Reads Initiative''.

On page 67, line 9, strike ''$202,146,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$207,146,000''.

On page 67, line 9, insert the following before the period: '':Provided further, That for purposes of pre-disaster mitigation pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5131 (b) and (c) and 42 U.S.C. 5196 (e) and (i), $5,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be available until expended for project grants for State and local governments''.

On page 72, line 1, strike ''$2,513,200,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$2,503,200,000.''

D'AMATO (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 952

Mr. D'AMATO (for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1034, supra; as follows:

On page 16, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 108. (a) Not later than 4 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the allocation of health care resources by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under the Veterans Integrated Service Network system and the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation System. The report shall address the following:

(1) The manner in which health care resources (including personnel and funds) are allocated under the Veterans Integrated Service Network system and the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation system.

(2) Whether or not the allocation of health care resources under the systems takes into account the disproportionate number of veterans with special needs who reside in the northeastern United States.

(3) The effect of the allocation of health care resources under the systems on the quality of health care services provided by the Secretary to veterans who reside in the northeastern United States.

(4) The effect of the allocation of health care resources under the systems on the access of health care services provided by the Secretary to veterans who reside in the northeastern United States.

(b) Not later than 4 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall also submit to Congress a report on the effect of the reform of the eligibility of veterans for health care services under title I of Public Law 104–262 (110 Stat. 3178), and the amendments made by that title, on the quality of and access to health care provided by the Secretary to veterans who reside in the northeastern United States.

BUMPERS AMENDMENTS NOS. 953–955

Mr. BUMPERS proposed three amendments to the bill, S. 1034, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 953

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new sections:

SEC. . ANNUAL REPORT ON LIFE CYCLE COSTS AND SPACE LAUNCH REQUIREMENTS.

(a) For each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2013, the Administrator, along with the President's submission to the Congress of the annual budget request for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, shall submit a report that contains—

(1) a life cycle capital development and operations plan with a year-by-estimate of the United States' share of the projected expenses for development, construction, operation, enhancement, and decommissioning and disassembly of the Space Station; and

(2) an updated space launch manifest for the Space Station program and the estimated marginal and average launch costs for the Space Station program for the fiscal year involved and all succeeding fiscal years.

SEC. . FUNDING CAPS.

(a) The President's cumulative budget submissions for Space Station capitol development and operations for the fiscal year 1994 through the fiscal year during which the Space Station achieves full operational capability may not exceed $17,400,000,000, exclusive of launch costs.

(b) After achieving full operational capability and continuing through its decommissioning, the President's annual budget submission to Congress for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall contain an amount for the operation of, and any enhancement to, the Space Station which shall in no case exceed $1,300,000,000 for that fiscal year, exclusive of launch costs.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(a) the capitol development program of the Space Station includes, but is not limited to, the research and development activities associated with the space and ground systems and collateral equipment of the Space Station, and all direct expenses for space flight, control, data communications, assembly and operations planning, construction of facilities, training, development of science equipment and payloads, and research and program management activities associated with the construction and operations of the Space Station and its supporting elements and services until the facility is equipped and powered as planned, and declared fully operational;

(2) operation of the Space Station includes, but is not limited to, all direct research and development; space flight, control and data communications; construction of facilities; training; development of science equipment and payloads, scientific experiments; and research and program management activities associated with the operations of the Space Station; and the U.S.-Russia cooperative MIR program;

(3) enhancement of the Space Station includes all direct research and development; space flight, control and data communications; construction of facilities; and research and program management activities associated with the acquisition of additional Space Station elements and ground support facilities;

(4) direct expenses include, but are not limited to, the marginal costs of transportation and tracking and data services, launch facilities, payload processing facilities, simulator facilities, and all other enabling facilities including their collateral equipment, and all laboratory and technical services provided by NASA Centers to support space station development and scientific research; and

(5) full operation capability means the facility is fully assembled on-orbit with the power, configuration and capabilities described in the system design review of March 24, 1994.

AMENDMENT NO. 954

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. XXX. Of the funds provided to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in this bill, the Administrator shall by November 1, 1998, make available no less than $400,000 for a study by the National Research Council, with an interim report to be completed by June 1, 1998, that evaluates, in terms of the potential impact on the Space Station's assembly schedule, budget, and capabilities, the engineering challenges posed by extravehicular activity (EVA) requirements, U.S. and non-U.S. space launch requirements, the potential need to upgrade or replace equipment and components after assembly complete, and the requirement to decommission and disassemble the facility.

AMENDMENT NO. 955

At the appropriate place, add the following new section:

SEC. . Section 214(*l*)(1)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(*l*)(1)(D)) (as added by section 220 of the

Immigration and Nationality Technical Corrections Act of 1994 and redesignated as subsection (*l*) by section 671(a)(3)(A) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that, in the case of a request by the Department of Veterans Affairs, the alien shall not be required to practice medicine in a geographic area designated by the Secretary.''

BOND AMENDMENT NO. 956

Mr. BOND proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1034, supra; as follows:

On page 63, lines 4 and 5, strike ''allocated to the purposes of the Safe Drinking Water Act'' and insert ''allocated for the purposes of the Safe Drinking Water Act and title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, respectively,''.

On page 63, line 18, before the period, add the following proviso: '': *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator is authorized to make a grant of $4,326,000 under Title II of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, from funds appropriated in prior years under section 205 of the Act for the State of Florida and available due to deobligation, to the appropriate instrumentality for wastewater treatment works in Monroe County, Florida''.

On page 64, line 18, before the period, add the following proviso: '': *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds other than those appropriated under this heading, shall be used for or by the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality''.

On page 65, line 13, after the semicolon, insert ''or'', and on line 17, strike ''; or beaches''.

FAIRCLOTH AMENDMENT NO. 957

Mr. BOND (for Mr. FAIRCLOTH) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1034, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

None of the funds made available by Title I of this Act may be used to provide a locality payment differential which would have the effect of causing a pay increase to any employee that was removed as a Director of a VA Hospital and transferred to another hospital as a result of the Inspector General's conclusion that the employee engaged in verbal sexual harassment and abusive behavior toward female employees.

GORTON AMENDMENT NO. 958

Mr. BOND (for Mr. GORTON) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1034, supra; as follows:

On page 51 after line 11, insert the following:

SEC. 216. INDIAN HOUSING REFORM.

Upon a finding by the Secretary that any person has substantially, significantly, or materially violated the requirements of any activity under the Native American Housing Block Grants Program under title I of the Native American Self-Determination Act of 1996 or any associated activity under the jurisdiction of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary shall bar that person from any such participation in programs under that title thereafter and shall require reimbursement for any losses or costs associated with these violations.

SHELBY AMENDMENT NO. 959

Mr. BOND (for Mr. SHELBY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1034, supra; as follows:

On page 70, line 18, strike out ''1999.'' and insert in lieu thereof ''1999: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this heading, $1,000,000 may be available for the Neutral Buoyancy Simulator program.''.

BOND (AND MUKULSKI) AMENDMENT NO. 960

Mr. BOND (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1034, supra; as follows:

On page 16, line 21, strike $10,693,000,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$10,159,000''.

On page 16, line 23, strike ''$9,200,000'' and insert ''$8,666,000''.

On page 23, line 6, insert ''and contract expertise'' after ''technical assistance''.

On page 23, line 24, strike ''and 1995'' and insert in lieu thereof ''1995, and 1997''.

On page 27, line 17, insert ''for'' after ''charge''.

On page 27, line 22, insert ''or moderate income family'' after ''family''.

On page 27, line 24, strike ''payment'' and insert ''prepayment''.

On page 28, line 1, insert ''of'' after the first ''the''.

On page 28, line 8, insert ''if'' after ''and''.

On page 28, line 13, insert ''from'' after ''move''.

On page 28, line 14, strike ''of'' and insert ''or''.

On page 28, line 22, strike ''223'' and insert ''220''.

On page 35, line 10, insert before the period, the following: '': *Provided further*, That any unobligated balances available or recaptures in, or which become available in the Emergency Shelter Grants Program account, Supportive Housing Program account, Supplemental Assistance for Facilities to Assist the Homeless account, Shelter Plus Care account, Innovative Homeless Initiatives Demonstration Program account and Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation (SRO) account, shall be transferred to and merged with the amounts in this account and shall be used for purposes under this account''.

On page 45, after line 18, insert the following:

''(d) Public and Assisted Housing Rents, Income Adjustments and Preferences.

''(1) Section 402(a) of The Balanced Budget Downpayment Act, I is amended by striking ''fiscal year 1997'' and insert in lieu thereof ''fiscal year 1998''.

''(2) Section 402(f) of The Balanced Budget Downpayment Act, I is amended by striking ''fiscal years 1996 and 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''fiscal years 1997 and 1998''.

On page 47, beginning on line 24, strike out ''Account Transition'' and all that follows through line 7 on page 48, and redesignate the sections accordingly.

On page 51, line 11, insert before the period ''or demolition''.

''HOME PROGRAM FORMULA

''SEC. 217. The first sentence of section 217(b)(3) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act is amended by striking ''only those jurisdictions that are allocated an amount of $500,000 or greater shall receive an allocation'' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ''jurisdictions that are allocated an amount of $500,000 or more, and participating jurisdictions (other than consortia that fail to renew the membership of all of their member jurisdictions) that are allocated an amount less than $500,000, shall receive an allocation''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 22, 1997, at 9:30 a.m., in SR–328A to receive testimony regarding the Environmental Protection Agency's clean air regulations and agriculture.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 22, 1997, to conduct a hearing on the Federal Mass Transit Program and the reauthorization of ISTEA.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 22, for purposes of conducting a full committee hearing which is scheduled to begin at 9 a.m. The purpose of this hearing is to review the Department of Interior's handling of the Ward Valley land conveyance, the findings of a new General Accounting Office report on the issue, and to receive testimony on S. 964, The Ward Valley Land Transfer Act.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 22, 1997, at 10:45 a.m. and 2 p.m. to hold hearings.

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

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee special investigation to meet on Tuesday, July 22, at 10 a.m., for a business meeting on campaign financing issues.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 22, 1997, at 2 p.m., in room 226 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building, to hold a hearing on judicial nominations.

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor Human Resources be authorized to meet for a hearing on women's health during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 22, 1997, at 10 a.m.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

PROTECTION OF AIRBUS INDUSTRIE

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the European Community is engaged in the blatant misuse of its authority to review United States mergers shamelessly to protect Airbus Industrie. It has decided that it will use its authority to block the merger of Boeing and McDonnell Douglas. Its rationale is that the combined commercial aircraft company poses too great a risk to Airbus Industrie.

For the past 25 years, America has watched the Europeans pour billions of dollars of subsidies into Airbus Industrie to create what is now without question a highly competitive aircraft company. Airbus Industrie today boasts more than 30 percent of the global market for large jet transports. Its goal is to have 50 percent of the market and it is aggressively pursuing that goal. Many of us were shocked with French President Chirac's shameless pursuit of aircraft orders in China in exchange for the French's Government's commitment to defeat a U.N. human rights resolution.

Airbus Industrie has already destroyed the viability of the Douglas Aircraft Co. Airbus' market share has come largely at the expense of McDonnell Douglas, which last year had only 4 percent of the market. Now the Europeans, in a final blow to Douglas, want the Boeing Co. to divest itself of Douglas Aircraft Co. and put the 14,000 remaining Douglas employees out on the street.

While most Americans will find it inconceivable, the Europeans do in fact have the legal authority to block this American merger. This is true even though neither Boeing nor McDonnell Douglas have significant operations in Europe and despite the fact that our own Government has thoroughly reviewed the merger and approved it without conditions.

The Europeans have disregarded our own exhaustive review process in the United States.

The Boeing Co. has engaged in a good-faith effort to try to address the concerns raised by the European Commission about the merger—but to no avail. Nevertheless, the EC plans to block the merger. This means that Boeing aircraft may well be prevented from being sold in Europe.

From the very beginning, the European merger review proceedings have been dominated by the political considerations of the Airbus member sales. I warned the President about this in a May letter on this subject. My colleagues in the Senate supported my sense-of-the-Senate resolution on the subject last week.

The United States can no longer stand aside and allow Europe blatantly to protect Airbus at the expense of our own civil aircraft industry and our own American employees. The administration should send a clear signal that it will not allow this type of protectionism to continue and that we will retaliate decisively if the Europeans block the merger.

The European Commission's indifference to appropriate antitrust considerations and its undisguised protectionism was expressed candidly by the EC's Karl Van Miert on Tuesday, July 15 on Belgian radio: ''The EC does not want a competitive market, it wants a guaranteed market.''●

THE 25th ANNIVERSARY OF THE RESTORATION OF THE PERMANENT DIACONATE IN PATERSON

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to mark a special anniversary. This year is the 25th anniversary of the restoration of the Permanent Diaconate in the Roman Catholic Diocese of Paterson, NJ. In the Catholic faith, a deacon is a layman who willingly gives his time, talent and treasure to help not only his own church community but, through his work, the entire community. His is a life of service.

Mr. President, I deeply admire the commitment of these lay people to serve others. They bring to mind the words of the great humanitarian, Albert Schweitzer, ''The greatest gift we can give to another, is the gift of ourselves.''

The work done by the 146 deacons of Paterson's Diocese also reminds me of the long tradition of service which communities of faith have in America. Whether Christian, Jewish, Muslim, or other religion, these communities not only minister to individuals' spiritual needs, but to all of their needs. They may provide tangible support like food and shelter, or simply compassion, counseling, and concern.

Mr. President, I offer my congratulations to the Diaconate of the Diocese of Paterson, and to Msgr. Ken Lasch who, 25 years ago, laid the cornerstone upon which the Diaconate's success has been built. As a native of Paterson, I am pleased that we have these dedicated men in our midst who are serving both their church and our community.●

CELEBRATING THE HISTORY OF OUR NATION

● Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, many of us returned home to our States to celebrate the Fourth of July and the birth of this great Nation. All across this country, in both urban and rural communities, we joined as one to honor our Founding Fathers and their commitment to freedom as reflected in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Together these two documents form the foundation of our Nation.

It seems most fitting and appropriate to take a moment after we have returned from our Fourth of July activities to take note of two groups of Wyoming students that came to our Nation's Capital recently as part of programs celebrating the history of our Nation and its place in the world.

To celebrate the Constitution, and its effect on our lives as citizens, a team from Central High School in Cheyenne traveled to Washington to participate in a competition entitled ''We the People * * * The Citizen and the Constitution.'' In that event, students from across the United States competed against each other as they demonstrated their remarkable understanding of and sensitivity to the fundamental principles upon which this Nation was founded. They proved that the values that are embodied in our Nation's Constitution still resonate with meaning and importance in our lives today as they serve to fire our children's imaginations and interest in our past.

In the process of preparing for this event, those students learned a lot about the Constitution. I would imagine many of them were surprised to learn that it is truly a living document. Through the years it has been changed and amended to address the problems of a growing democracy. It has weathered every storm, including a Civil War and countless crisis faced by our Nation's leaders. Through it all, it has continued to provide the guideposts we have followed to ensure that our Nation remains strong and free.

It was very gratifying personally to see such attention focused on our Nation's Constitution. That document holds a great deal of meaning to me personally.

I have always drawn inspiration from the words our Founding Fathers used as they drafted the U.S. Constitution. In fact, when I served as the mayor of Gillette, WY, I always had a copy in my coat pocket. I gave copies to the members of the council each year on Constitution Day and every other year we read it as part of our proceedings.

Now that I have been elected to the Senate, I have to say it has new meaning for me. It refers to me. It is my job description. It is not just the basic rules for someone way off in Washington. It speaks directly to me and the purpose I serve as a Member of the Senate, a representative of the dreams, hopes, and ambitions of the people of my home State of Wyoming.

Just a few weeks ago another group came to Washington as part of a program to promote and encourage our children's interest in and enthusiasm for history. We are all familiar with the famous quote of George Santayana,

''Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.''

That is why it is so important that we continue to encourage our children to study the past and learn about the mistakes that were made, and the triumphs, too, that have made this Nation what it is today.

Looking over the list of subjects that those who participated in Wyoming History Day had worked on, I was quite impressed by the many different areas of history that had drawn their attention. I am certain they were all amazed by how much they had learned by examining the events they had chosen in detail as they prepared for the competition.

Like those young students, I also enjoyed studying our Nation's history when I was in school. I was fascinated by the stories of our past, and I took a special interest in the history of Wyoming and the days of the Old West. I read everything I could get my hands on that had to do with the early days of the West and our State's first settlers. They were brave pioneers and together they faced a great many hardships and trials as they worked to make it out West. They were remarkable people blessed with special skills and strengths. The heritage they passed down to their children is still reflected in the faces of those who have a long history with and strong ties to the land they love and rely on for their lifeblood. Our grandfathers and great grandfathers passed down their great love of independence and freedom to us, and their lifestyles helped shape our character and made Wyoming what it is today: fiercely proud, independent, and strongly self-reliant.

These programs are the kind of projects we should continue to encourage our children to pursue as a regular part of their education. By studying and reading about the history of our Nation and the world, we will not only learn how to avoid the mistakes of the past, but we will also learn how to properly plan and prepare for our future. Studying about the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence and the work our Founding Fathers put into this great Nation at its conception is a good place to begin. What better time to take up this subject than now, so close to our Fourth of July celebration. That is what Independence Day is really all about. We take great pride in our history. We celebrate the lives and work of that relatively small group of individuals, banded together by their commitment to freedom, and the dream of democracy; and who saw the reality and reassurance of a new republic. On that day in July in 1776 they began a series of events that have served to change the face of the world forever.

I am very proud of these and all our students who are studying the world's history, and our place in it. As the father of a schoolteacher, I know the commitment that is necessary to provide our children with a good education. For that process to be successful, we must all do our part—teachers, students, and parents. We should all continue to encourage our children to participate fully and actively in the programs and projects offered by their schools. The resulting challenges they will face and the rewards they will receive will have a dramatic effect on their lives. Congratulations to all those who won awards in these programs, and to those who gave their best efforts as participants. We are very proud of each one of you—and counting on you for the future.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN J. SULLIVAN

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, earlier this month, the American flag was flown proudly throughout Connecticut and across this great land, as we celebrated our Independence Day. But the previous Friday, Old Glory was flying at half-staff in the town of Fairfield, CT, as the town mourned the passing of its longest serving first selectman—John J. Sullivan.

John Sullivan came to Fairfield from Salem, MA, in the 1930's, and for more than 20 years, he was known throughout town as the owner and operator of Sullivan's Flower Shop on the Post Road. But in 1959, John Sullivan ran for public office for the first time in his life, and he was elected as the town's first selectman. His election was particularly significant, because it broke a 51-year Republican hold on Fairfield's top job. Although John Sullivan was a Democrat in a town dominated by Republicans, he was reelected 11 times, and his 24-year tenure stands as the longest in the town's history.

I think that a large reason John Sullivan was so successful in reaching across party lines to be an effective leader is because his first concern was people, not politics. When describing his management style as the head of the board of selectmen, John Sullivan said, ''I don't tell them how to vote * * * I tell them it's good for the community.''

One of the most notable battles of his political career came in 1965, when John won reelection over a popular young challenger named Stewart B. McKinney. After this defeat, Mr. McKinney went on to serve seven terms in the U.S. House of Representatives, and John Sullivan often joked that if it weren't for him, McKinney would have never been a Congressman. The two of them went on to form a close political friendship. In fact, the only building in Fairfield which bears John Sullivan's name is the Sullivan-McKinney senior housing complex.

During his tenure as first selectman, the population of Fairfield increased by 25 percent and the town's annual budget increased fourfold. But while John Sullivan oversaw the growth and development of Fairfield, the greatest sign of his legacy is the 1,200 acres of land that he had set aside as open space. Under John Sullivan's leadership, the town of Fairfield was able to secure Federal funds to purchase open space land and beach-front property. John Sullivan fought to maintain the small-town character of Fairfield, and there are now parks and woodland areas in Fairfield that serve as a peaceful refuge in this area of rapid urbanization.

John Sullivan remained active in the community long after his political career ended. He worked on behalf of many charitable organizations, in particular St. Vincent's Medical Center Foundation in Bridgeport where he served as associate executive director. A devout Roman Catholic, John was a longtime member and trustee of St. Thomas Aquinas Church. He went to Mass every day, and in 1984, John was appointed a Knight of St. Gregory by Pope John Paul II.

I think that the one quote that best illustrates what kind of person John Sullivan was came in 1983 when he retired from public office. John said, ''I am the richest man in the world. I ask for nothing. I want to give as much as I can.''

I attended John Sullivan's funeral, and having known him personally, I was not surprised to see how many people came out to pay tribute to this wonderful man. John Sullivan was a true patriot, and he will be dearly missed by all who knew him.

John was the husband of the late Mary B. Cahill Sullivan. He is survived by his brother Edwin Sullivan, his daughter Mary Donahue, and his seven grandsons, John, James, Brian, Robert, Paul, William, and Patrick. I offer my most heartfelt condolences to all of them.●

ROBERT C. WEAVER

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, Dr. Robert C. Weaver, adviser to three Presidents, director of the NAACP, and the first African-American Cabinet Secretary, passed away last week at his home in New York City. Dr. Weaver spent his entire life broadening opportunities for minorities in America. I rise today to pay tribute to this great man.

Dr. Weaver began his career in government service as part of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's ''Black Cabinet,'' an informal advisory group promoting job and educational opportunities for blacks. The Washington Post called this work his greatest legacy, the dismantling of a deeply entrenched system of racial segregation in America.

In 1960 he became the president of the NAACP, and would become a key adviser to President Kennedy on civil rights. Dr. Weaver was appointed in 1961 to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, an organization that later became the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In 1966, when President Johnson elevated the agency to Cabinet rank, Dr. Weaver was, in Johnson's phrase, ''the man for the

job.'' He thus became its first Secretary, and the first African-American to head a Cabinet agency.

Following his government service, Weaver was, among various other academic pursuits, a professor at Hunter College, a member of the School of Urban and Public Affairs at Carnegie-Mellon, and the president of Baruch College in Manhattan. Dr. Weaver earned undergraduate, master's and doctoral degrees in economics from Harvard, wrote four books on urban affairs, and was one of the original directors of the Municipal Assistance Corp. designed to rescue financially strapped New York City in the 1970's.

America, and Washington in particular, has lost one of its innovators, one of its creators and one of its true leaders—for Robert Weaver, like so few of leaders today, led not only with his words but more importantly with his deeds.

I ask that an editorial in Monday's Washington Post and an obituary from Saturday's New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 21, 1997]

ROBERT C. WEAVER

Native Washingtonian Robert C. Weaver, who died on Thursday in New York City at age 89, had a life of many firsts. Dr. Weaver served as a college president, Cabinet secretary, presidential adviser, chairman of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and as a director of the Municipal Assistance Corp., which helped save New York City from financial catastrophe. But his greatest legacy may be the work he did, largely out of public view, to dismantle a deeply entrenched system of racial segregation in America.

Before the landmark decade of civil rights advances in the 1960s, Dr. Weaver was one of a small group of African American officials in the New Deal era who, as part of the ''Black Cabinet'' pressured President Franklin D. Roosevelt to strike down racial barriers in government employment, housing and education. It was a long way to come for the Dunbar High School graduate who ran into racial discrimination in the 1920s when he tried to join a union fresh out of high school. Embittered by that experience, Bob Weaver went on to Harvard (in the footsteps of his grandfather, the first African American Harvard graduate in dentistry) to earn his bachelor's, master's and doctorate in economics. At another time in America, his university degrees might have led to another career path. For Bob Weaver in 1932, however, those credentials—and his earlier job as a college professor—made him an ''associate advisor on Negro affairs'' in the U.S. Department of the Interior.

Subsequent work as an educator, economist and national housing expert—and behind-the-scenes recruitment of scores of African Americans for public service—led to his appointment as New York State rent administrator, making him the first African American with state cabinet rank. President John F. Kennedy appointed him to the highest federal post ever occupied by an African American—the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Despite the president's support, however, the HHFA never made it to Cabinet status, because Dr. Weaver was its administrator and southern legislators rebelled at the thought of a black secretary. Years later President Lyndon Johnson pushed through the Department of Housing and Urban Development and named Robert Weaver to the presidential Cabinet.

For the nation, and Robert Weaver, the appointment was another important first. For many other African Americans who found lower barriers and increased opportunity in the last third of the 20th century, Robert Weaver's legacy is lasting.

[From the New York Times, July 19, 1997]

ROBERT C. WEAVER, 90, FIRST BLACK CABINET MEMBER, DIES

(By James Barron)

Dr. Robert C. Weaver, the first Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the first black person appointed to the Cabinet, died on Thursday at his home in Manhattan. He was 90.

Dr. Weaver was also one of the original directors of the Municipal Assistance Corporation, which was formed to rescue New York City from financial crisis in the 1970's.

''He was a catalyst with the Kennedys and then with Johnson, forging new initiatives in housing and education,'' said Walter E. Washington, the first elected Mayor of the nation's capital.

A portly, pedagogical man who wrote four books on urban affairs, Dr. Weaver had made a name for himself in the 1930's and 1940's as an expert behind-the-scenes strategist in the civil rights movement. ''Fight hard and legally,'' he said, ''and don't blow your top.''

As a part of the ''Black Cabinet'' in the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Dr. Weaver was one of a group of blacks who specialized in housing, education and employment. After being hired as race relations advisers in various Federal agencies, they pressured and persuaded the White House to provide more jobs, better educational opportunities and equal rights.

Dr. Weaver began in 1933 as an aide to Interior Secretary Harold L. Ickes. He later served as a special assistant in the housing division of the Works Progress Administration, the National Defense Advisory Commission, the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission.

A BEHIND-THE-SCENES CIVIL RIGHTS STRATEGIST DURING THE 1930'S AND 1940'S

Shortly before the 1940 election, he devised a strategy that defused anger among blacks about Stephen T. Early, President Roosevelt's press secretary. Arriving at Pennsylvania Station in New York, Early lost his temper when a line of police officers blocked his way. Early knocked one of the officers, who happened to be black, to the ground. As word of the incident spread, a White House adviser put through a telephone call to Dr. Weaver in Washington.

The aide, worried that the incident would cost Roosevelt the black vote, told Dr. Weaver to find the other black advisers and prepare a speech that would appeal to blacks for the President to deliver the following week.

Dr. Weaver said he doubted that he could find anyone in the middle of the night, even though most of the others in the ''Black Cabinet'' had been playing poker in his basement when the phone rang. ''And anyway,'' he said, ''I don't think a mere speech will do it. What we need right now is something so dramatic that it will make the Negro voters forget all about Steve Early and the Negro cop too.''

Within 48 hours, Benjamin O. Davis Sr. was the first black general in the Army; William H. Hastie was the first black civilian aide to the Secretary of War, and Campbell C. Johnson was the first high-ranking black aide to the head of the Selective Service.

Robert Clifton Weaver was born on Dec. 29, 1907, in Washington. His father was a postal worker and his mother—who he said influenced his intellectual development—was the daughter of the first black person to graduate from Harvard with a degree in dentistry. When Dr. Weaver joined the Kennedy Administration, whose Harvard connections extended to the occupant of the Oval Office, he held more Harvard degrees—three, including a doctorate in economics—than anyone else in the administration's upper ranks.

In 1960, after serving as the New York State Rent Commissioner, Dr. Weaver became the national chairman of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and President Kennedy sought Dr. Weaver's advice on civil rights. The following year, the President appointed him administrator of the House and Home Finance Agency, a loose combination of agencies that included the bureaucratic components of what would eventually become H.U.D., including the Federal Housing Administration to spur construction, the Urban Renewal Administration to oversee slum clearance and the Federal National Mortgage Association to line up money for new housing.

President Kennedy tried to have the agency raised to Cabinet rank, but Congress balked. Southerners led an attack against the appointment of a black to the Cabinet, and there were charges that Dr. Weaver was an extremist. Kennedy abandoned the idea of creating an urban affairs department. Five years later, when President Johnson revived the idea and pushed it through Congress, Senators who had voted against Dr. Weaver the first time around voted for him.

Past Federal housing programs had largely dealt with bricks-and-mortar policies. Dr. Weaver said Washington needed to take a more philosophical approach. ''Creative federalism stresses local initiative, local solutions to local problems,'' he said.

But, he added, ''where the obvious needs for action to meet an urban problem are not being fulfilled, the Federal Government has a responsibility at least to generate a thorough awareness of the problem.''

Dr. Weaver, who said that ''you cannot have physical renewal without human renewal,'' pushed for better-looking public housing by offering awards for design. He also increased the amount of money for small businesses displaced by urban renewal and revived the long-dormant idea of Federal rent subsidies for the elderly.

Later in his life, he was a professor of urban affairs at Hunter College, was a member of the Visiting Committee at the School of Urban and Public Affairs at Carnegie-Mellon University and held visiting professorships at Columbia Teachers' College and the New York University School of Education. He also served as a consultant to the Ford Foundation and was the president of Baruch College in Manhattan in 1969. His wife, Ella, died in 1991. Their son, Robert Jr., died in 1962.●

CREATING IMPROVED DELIVERY OF CHILD CARE: AFFORDABLE, RELIABLE, AND EDUCATIONAL ACT OF 1997 (CIDCARE)

● Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my strong support for S. 1037, the Creating Improved Delivery of Child Care: Affordable, Reliable, and Educational Act of 1997—better known as the CIDCARE Act. I want to commend my colleague from Vermont, Senator JEFFORDS, for his steady work on this important measure and for his commitment to enhancing the quality of child care throughout the Nation. I firmly believe that Senator JEFFORDS

has crafted a measure that would stimulate the demand for higher quality child care and I am proud to join Senator DODD as an original cosponsor of this bill.

Our society has braved a storm of changes during the last five decades. Our Nation's work environment has changed, too, with the introduction of personal computers, high-speed modems, cellular phones, pagers, and fax machines. American suburbanization has created a need for audio and video conferencing, satellite offices, and most importantly, telecommuting. In addition, there has been an influx of women into our nation's work force. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 76 percent of mothers now work. Moreover, 63 percent of two parent households now see both parents working outside of the home. While the number of working women in our country continues to rise, so has the number of children enrolled in child care. Unfortunately, the quality of this care has not risen to match the rapid increase in enrollment. That is why we must modernize the way we provide child care assistance by allocating our scarce resources more efficiently. By doing so, our children will benefit. That is clearly an investment in our Nation's future. Congress must legislate with the times to provide opportunities for our Nation's parents and child care providers to make that investment.

It is often the case with a lot of families that one parent works to pay the bills while the other one works to pay the taxes. A lot of people are working two jobs just to make ends meet, and often, both parents are working two jobs. The resulting increase in the number of employed women in the work force has dramatically expanded the number of child care providers. This expansion is truly beneficial to parents who need available child care, but the ratio of children to providers and the ensuing reduction in the quality of that care when staff and resources are stretched is still troubling. A recent nationwide study indicates that 40 percent of the child care provided to infants poses a potential risk of injury. Moreover, 15 percent of the care at center-based providers is so deficient that a child's health and safety are threatened.

In Wyoming, the quality of the care provided to our children is taken very seriously. Child care providers licensed by the State of Wyoming must have 12 credit hours in education, CPR training, meet fire marshal standards, and have a minimum amount of floor space for the children entrusted to their care. The State ensures that all licensed providers comply with these requirements and would continue to do so if this bill is passed —but they would do so much more effectively. This legislation would provide a $260 million competitive grant program to assist States in improving the quality of care we provide our children. States must use at least 30 percent of the grant funds awarded to establish a subsidy program to provide salary increases to licensed child care providers. The remainder of the grant funds awarded could be channeled toward establishing a scholarship program to help child care providers meet the costs of education and training; expanding State-based child care training and technical assistance activities; improving consumer education efforts including the expansion of resource and referral services and child care complaint systems; providing increased rates of reimbursement provided under Federal or State child care assistance for children with special-needs; or even for purchasing special supplies, equipment, or meeting other expenses necessary for the care of special needs children. Moreover, this legislation would further expand the Community Development Block Grant to States to help renovate existing child care facilities.

Equitable distribution of resources based on the percentage of income a family uses to meet child care expenses must be represented in any change to the current system. This legislation reduces, but does not eliminate, the dependent care tax credit for upper income taxpayers by changing the way the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit is administered. The income level for the receipt of the highest percentage of employment-related child care costs would be increased from $10,000 to $20,000. The percentage would be decreased at a rate of 1 percent for each additional $2,500 in adjusted gross income and a minimum percentage of 10 percent would be set for incomes of $70,000 and above. Employers would be allowed to contribute more to a dependent care assistance plan account. Moreover, families who qualify for the earned income tax credit [EITC] would receive a refund of the child care tax credit on a quarterly basis. The EITC was originally geared to assist families with dependent children—not couples without any kids at all. Clearly, changes are in order.

Small businesses are fighting an uphill battle in meeting the child care needs of their employees. Having played the small business owner role for over 25 years, I can appreciate the need for giving such employers a break. This legislation creates a tax credit for employers providing, or otherwise supporting, child care arrangements for their employees. Fifty percent of the expenses incurred by a business to meet the child care needs of employees would be credited toward the business' Federal tax liability. Included in this provision are startup costs, renovations to meet accreditation standards, professional development for child care providers, general operating expenses, and subsidized child care for lower paid employees. Small businesses need incentives in order to be more involved in meeting the child care needs of employees. After all, Congress is placing more parents into the work force following last year's welfare reform legislation. We should provide some tax incentives to employers who are providing those jobs.

This legislation would also authorize $50 million a year to establish and operate a technology-based training infrastructure to enable child care providers nationwide to receive the training, education, and support they need to improve the quality of care they provide. We must reap the benefits of the Internet to enhance the quality of child care. We spend a lot of time talking about how the Internet can be harmful to children. Here's a chance to show how it can dramatically help them. By creating a child care training and education interactive network, child care credentialing and accreditation entities for training, skills testing, and other activities needed to maintain child care credentials would be greatly enhanced. Moreover, a no-interest revolving loan fund will be established to enable child care providers to purchase computers, satellite dishes, and other equipment which would enable them to participate in the child care training provided by this technological infrastructure.

The current system for funding child care in our nation yearns for improvement. This legislation does not reinvent the wheel, it changes the tires. States must continue to receive assistance in order to achieve a higher quality of care for our children. This legislation simply provides more efficient and pragmatic methods for administering that assistance. I believe that this legislation provides the proper incentives for enhancing the quality of care we provide our children. Our society's work force is driven by changing trends. I can comfortably argue that our society is one of the most trendy in the world—a fact that has kept America on the leading edge of technological innovation. I hope that before people begin making up their minds on this bill they will take a close look at the language and what it really calls for—better care for our kids. Our Nation's work force is calling for this much-needed change. I urge my colleagues to support S. 1037, the CIDCARE bill.

MILWAUKEE VET CENTER

• Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to praise the people of the Milwaukee Vet Center. For 17 years now these Wisconsinites have counseled and assisted veterans during the difficult period of readjustment from frontline to homefront.

Fighting a war is a terrible experience, inflicting physical and psychological wounds which few veterans can fully heal on their own. The Milwaukee Vet Center has helped over 8,800 veterans of American missions in their attempts to overcome these psychological battle scars. Originally established for Vietnam veterans, its doors are now open to veterans of every major American engagement since World War II.

This center stands as a prime example of success in our Nation's social services. A division of the Department of Veterans Affairs, it provides comprehensive and personalized counseling, not only to male and female veterans but also to their spouses and children. Although the center's responsibilities include 91,513 eligible veterans in 13 eastern Wisconsin counties, its workers strive to make personal contact with as many veterans as possible. Its outreach programs engage veterans in the context of their communities, granting a fuller knowledge of where each individual stands geographically, psychologically and socially. Working with other specialized organizations, the center provides individualized services for native American and African-American veterans, among others.

Those who enter the Milwaukee Vet Center seeking help know they are dealing with some of America's most experienced social workers. Collectively, the center's employees possess decades of experience in the fields of drug and alcohol abuse, mental health problems, vocational rehabilitation, women's health treatment, and psychiatric treatment. They have worked in the public and private sectors, schools, hospitals, even disaster areas.

The Vet Center provides hands-on field experience for students in local colleges and universities such as the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, the Milwaukee Area Technical College, and the Stratton Business Institute. By sharing their wealth of experience, the Vet Center's professionals enrich these students' education and more importantly guide them on the path to a fulfilling career in public service.

I commend the heroic efforts of these public servants, and personally thank them for playing an important part in making Wisconsin great.●

MFN FOR CHINA

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr President, I rise to comment briefly on an action taken by the Senate last week. We voted on an amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, Senator HUTCHINSON, expressing the sense of the Senate that China should not receive most-favored-nation tariff treatment.

I voted against the Hutchinson amendment, but not because I necessarily support the further extension of most-favored-nation status to China. I opposed the amendment because I believe this kind of amendment should not have been offered to a must-pass appropriations bill, especially when the Senate had limited time to debate it.

At the appropriate time, we do need to have an extensive debate concerning our trade relationship with China. That debate is long overdue and greatly needed, and that debate should cover a range of issues. One of the issues that we should debate is the geometric growth in our trade deficit with China. In the past dozen years, our merchandise trade deficit with China has grown from $10 million to the staggering total of $40 billion.

Mr. President, trade is only beneficial if it is a two-way street. And right now there is no way that we can characterize our trading relationship with China in that way. We do not have reciprocal, free, and open access to China's markets.

Yes, our exports to China may have grown threefold and more since 1980, from $3.6 to $12 billion. However, Chinese exports to America during the same period grew almost fiftyfold, from $1.1 to $51.5 billion.

China is a critical part of the overall trade crisis that we face right now. We have the largest merchandise trade deficit in our history. Our second highest trade deficit is with China. China is rapidly working to build its manufacturing base and export trade. It is following in the footsteps of Japan, which has consistently been the country with which we have had our largest individual trade deficit.

We need to be concerned because trade statistics released last week indicated that for the third time in history, our monthly trade deficit with China exceeded our monthly trade deficit with Japan. That should give us cause to take a second look in considering what the future may bring in our trade relationship with China.

So I am very concerned about our trading relationship with China. But we ought to have a substantial debate on this issue. We ought not offer an MFN amendment to an unrelated appropriations bill, have a quick little debate, and then vote.

At the proper time, let us have a real debate about our trade relationship with China. Let us talk about trade deficits, market access, and reciprocity. Let us talk about selling more American wheat, oilseeds, beef, pork, and other agricultural commodities to China. Let us talk about China's tariff and nontariff trade barriers, content rules, and labor systems. Let us debate most-favored-nation status for China and the MFN law itself. And, most certainly, let us debate the issues of religious freedom and human rights in China, since these should have a bearing too on whether we grant MFN status to China.

These are important issues that deserve full and thoughtful consideration by this body and our entire Nation. I look forward to contributing to that debate, and hope that it can be done in a way that is productive and useful for the people of this country.●

MARVIN SONOSKY

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who spent his life and career working on behalf of Indian tribal governments and ensuring that the United States fulfilled its trust responsibility to Indian people, Marvin Sonosky of Alexandria, VA. On July 16, Mr. Sonosky died of heart failure. He was 66 years old. I join his many friends in mourning the loss of one of Indian country's greatest advocates. I would like to convey my sympathy to his wife, Shirley Freimuth Sonosky, and his daughters Judith Kreisberg, Joann Hirsch, and Karen Hecker and his seven grandchildren and one great grandchild.

Mr. Sonosky was born in Duluth, MN, and received his undergraduate and law degrees from the University of Minnesota. After 4 years of private practice, Mr. Sonosky came to Washington in 1937 and joined the Lands Division of the Department of Justice where he served for 17 years. As a special assistant to the Attorney General he frequently argued before the U.S. Supreme Court.

In 1951, Mr. Sonosky returned to private practice. In 1976, he formed the firm of Sonosky, Chambers & Sachse, where he practiced until his death. He remained active in the trial practice of the firm through the last week of his life.

Mr. Sonosky was a unique individual in this city in that he was one of the best advocates in his field yet he never sought the accolades or tributes that so many seek. Instead his tribute came from knowing that every day that he worked he had the potential to improve perhaps just one Indian person's life.

I would like to share with this body some of the many legislative initiatives involving Indian tribes that were the brainchild of Mr. Sonosky. These are but one measure of the impact that he had in improving the lives and opportunities of Indian tribal governments and their people and ensured that the United States stands behinds its trust obligations to them.

Following devastating losses of Indian reservation land and its resulting poverty, Mr. Sonosky worked with Congress to secure the enactment of federal statutes that returned over 1 million acres of undisposed surplus lands within those reservations to the tribes—the resources from these lands have been vital to the economies of many of these Indian communities.

Mr. Sonosky also brought to the attention of Congress the need to amend Federal law authorizing Indian tribes to recover just compensation for lands taken by the United States so that the damages awarded would not be unfairly diminished by the value of food and rations that the United States had promised in exchange for the lands it acquired. When Government officials unlawfully offset welfare claims against trust funds of individual Indians, Mr. Sonosky successfully challenged the practice in Federal court. He subsequently worked with Congress to ensure that all individual Indians who had been harmed by this practice were properly reimbursed.

While much of Mr. Sonosky's congressional efforts focused on righting past wrongs, an equal part of his work resulted in legislation that will protect Indian rights for generations to come.

Through his efforts Federal law that had previously allowed States to assume jurisdiction over certain matters on Indian reservations was amended to expressly require tribal consent prior to application of State jurisdiction. And, most significantly, when limitations contained in the statutes governing Federal court jurisdiction effectively barred Indian tribes from invoking that forum to vindicate federally protected rights, Mr. Sonosky successfully developed and advocated for a Federal law that today vests Federal courts with jurisdiction to adjudicate any claim brought by an Indian tribe.

The honor of the Nation with regard to our obligations to Indian people has indeed been well served by Mr. Sonosky. We will miss him dearly.●

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 748

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I understand that H.R. 748 has arrived from the House.

I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 748) to amend the prohibition of title 18, United States Code, against financial transactions with terrorists.

Mr. BOND. I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request on behalf of the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will remain at the desk and have its second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 1997

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I do not see any other Members seeking recognition. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9 a.m. on Wednesday, July 23. I further ask that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until the hour of 11 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes with the following exceptions: Senator DASCHLE or his designee, 60 minutes from 9 to 10 a.m., Senator COVERDELL or his designee, 30 minutes from 10 to 10:30 a.m., Senator THOMAS or Senator MACK, 30 minutes from 10:30 to 11 a.m.

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

Mr. BOND. I also ask consent that at 11 a.m. the Senate begin consideration of S. 1033, the Agriculture appropriations bill.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. BOND. For the information of all Senators, tomorrow the Senate will be in a period of morning business until the hour of 11 a.m. By consent, at 11 a.m. the Senate will begin consideration of S. 1033, the Agriculture appropriations bill. It is our hope the Senate will be able to complete action on the Agriculture appropriations bill during tomorrow's session of the Senate. Therefore, Members can anticipate rollcall votes throughout Wednesday's session of the Senate. However, no votes will occur prior to the hour of 4 p.m. Therefore, the next vote should occur after 4 p.m. on Wednesday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BOND. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:59 p.m. adjourned until Wednesday, July 23, 1997, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 22, 1997:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

PHILIP LADER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A SALUTE TO SMYRNA, GA

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, whenever I am introduced by anyone, I am most proud to be introduced as ''the Congressman from Smyrna, GA.''

I am especially proud to call Smyrna, GA my home as we celebrate the 125th anniversary of its incorporation. Pioneer settlers moved here in 1832 and Smyrna was incorporated in 1872.

The Smyrna of 1997—a thriving community approaching a population of 40,000, voted recently by Atlanta magazine as one of the best communities in the area in which to live—is far different from the small Methodist campground that existed here before the War Between the States. It is a community with a nearly perfect balance between urban amenities and small-town atmosphere. It has excellent parks, government services, small businesses, and a history in which we can all take great pride. Smyrna citizens live in a community that is widely recognized as a clean and beautiful community, and has received appropriate recognition for its work in this area.

While our small frontier village became a thriving community in the mid-1800's, it was sadly reduced to ashes during the Battle of Smyrna on July 4, 1864. Yet, true to its deeply rooted spirit of enterprise, Smyrna rebuilt itself and incorporated formally 125 years ago. The city of Smyrna—The Jonquil City—is now reaping the rewards of sound fiscal policies, enlightened city management and citizen involvement, and has developed a quality of life that is the envy of the southeastern United States.

As we celebrate Smyrna's 125th birthday, I proudly salute Mayor Max Bacon and city council members Charlene Capilouto, Ron Newcomb, Bill Scoggins, Jim Hawkins, Jack Cramer, Wade Lnenicka, and Pete Woods, for their leadership of this great city. I am also proud to honor the citizens of Smyrna, with full confidence that the Smyrna of tomorrow, as the Smyrna of yesterday and today, will continue to be a place of beauty, tranquility and prosperity; a community people flock to because it is a wonderful and beautiful place in which to raise families, conduct business, and build the American dream.

TRIBUTE TO KATHY LIM KO

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, 1997, Kathy Lim Ko was honored by Asian Health Services, Inc., Oakland, for her commitment and dedication to providing culturally competent health care to the Asian community of the East Bay.

Kathy Lim Ko was born in Cleveland, OH in 1958, the first of four children born to immigrant parents, Dr. Wen Hsiung Ko and Christina Ko. Kathy currently resides in Oakland with her husband, Maurice Lim Miller, and their two children, Alicia and Nicholas.

Kathy received her bachelor's degree at Stanford University and went on to receive a masters degree in health policy and management at Harvard University. Kathy chose to bring her extensive educational training from these prestigious universities and her knowledge and expertise in health care issues back to the community to advocate for accessible and affordable health care services for the underserved immigrant population of Alameda County.

Kathy has worked with Asian Health Services since 1984, first as the operations director, then as the program, planning and development officer, and finally as the associate director. Having served on the executive management staff for the past 13 years, Kathy has been personally involved with the growth and development of Asian Health Services from $600,000 to $6.5 million annual budget, from 6,000 to 40,000 patient visits per year, and from 30 to 120 staff members. Kathy also directed the $9 million building project, including acquisition, financing, design, construction, and the raising of $2.5 million for the capital campaign.

Through Asian Health Services, Kathy has furthered the work of community health centers nationally, specifically in providing culturally competent medical care to underserved communities. Kathy has contributed in developing the operating systems for the clinic, accessing financial markets to expand services, designing and having built the expanded facility, and developing preventive programs which lead the Nation and receive international attention. Kathy attributed the success of Asian Health Services to the strong team of dedicated, talented, and creative peers with whom she has worked.

Kathy's dedication to the community reaches beyond the boundaries of the workplace as she continually contributes her time, efforts, and insights to various community groups. Kathy has taken leadership roles within many of these organizations, serving on the board of directors of the Oakland Chinatown Chamber of Commerce, the Bay Area Asian Health Alliance, and the Asian Women's Shelter. Kathy is also a member of the Arts Magnet School Parent Teacher Association and the American Public Health Association. Most recently, Kathy has been involved with the Lao lu Mien Cultural Association, helping them to establish an organizational development plan. Kathy continues to work with this new immigrant community group to assist them in creating their own means of self sufficiency as well as retaining their cultural identity.

Kathy plans to continue her work within the community. Her professional goals include working to secure resources to further develop the community, increasing the community's understanding of its rights, creating community institutions, and strengthening the economic base from which to further develop. Kathy will continue to provide the vision and motivation which are critical to reaching her goals; to improve social conditions, empower the community, and incite social change.

TRIBUTE TO EDDIE MOSER AND KENT JAMES

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor two firefighters from the Sixth District of North Carolina, Eddie Moser and Kent James of Burlington, NC. While enjoying time off from work at a nearby lake, they rescued four people from a boat that had capsized and brought them to shore. Three survived, but unfortunately, they were unable to save the fourth victim.

Just minutes earlier, the four were getting into the boat at a pier while the two firefighters were waiting to remove their own boat and load it onto a trailer. The four motored out into the lake, when excessive weight in the forward portion of the boat caused water to seep in. Panicking, the four boaters started screaming as the boat began to sink. Moser and James heard the cries for help and jumped into their own boat and quickly motored out. By the time the firefighters got to them, the boat was overturned and only one of the passengers was swimming. Moser and James put two of the struggling passengers safely into a third boat operated by a passerby and swam the remaining passengers to shore. The firefighters gave CPR to one of them, a 44-year-old Gibsonville man who had been caught under the boat and could not swim. Unfortunately, the efforts were too late and Earl M. Smith, Jr., passed away.

During the first 10 to 12 minutes of the rescue, the firefighters had no lifesaving equipment other than their own manpower. It was in those minutes that their water safety and lifesaving skills as firefighters saved the lives of Melvin Murray, Nellie Murray, and Jill Marley. Jill Marley, the only passenger who could swim, says that Moser and James not only saved her life, but the lives of her boyfriend and her boyfriend's mother. The firefighters utilized their training in CPR, EMT, and water rescue to make this heroic rescue.

Burlington Fire Chief Frank Andrews has honored both men with a distinguished Life Saver Award. He said he would ask the Burlington City Council to give the two an accommodation honoring their actions. However, the two firefighters said they are humbled by all the attention. They felt they were just trying to help those in need and were not seeking any recognition. They said they did what any other trained person would have done. Burlington Fire Operation Chief Tommy Belton feels that

they did something out of the ordinary and he is very proud of them.

Moser has been with the Burlington Fire Department for 9 years and James has been with the department for 6 years. These brave men should be recognized and commended for their outstanding act of public service. On behalf of the citizens of the Sixth District of North Carolina, it is my honor to recognize those who risked their own lives to save others. We are all grateful for their selfless act.

CELEBRATION OF McCOMB SESQUICENTENNIAL

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to highlight an especially important milestone for the State of Ohio. From August 15 to the 17, the village of McComb will be celebrating its sesquicentennial birthday. Festivities include opening ceremonies, village tours, and a parade. I would like to recognize this profound civic event. As the Member of Congress, beholden to the constituents of McComb, I appreciate all their hard work which continues to make McComb a vibrant community. Their spirit of family and responsibility serves as a model for other towns to follow. I commend all the villagers of McComb as they celebrate their birthday, and I look forward to many more to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF KRISTEN DiLORENZO—NEW YORK'S 19TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE 1997 GIRLS NATION

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to commend this year's participants to Girls Nation, an annual program which brings high school girls from across the country to our Nation's capitol. I am especially pleased to recognize a talented young constituent, Ms. Kristen DiLorenzo of Newburgh, NY, who was chosen to represent our great State.

Girls State is the first step before going on to Girls Nation, where leaders from across the State gather to learn about city, county and State level government. It was at this summit that Kristen was elected by her peers. With this honor, she became one of only 96 high school girls, representing 48 States, chosen to come to Washington, DC, to get a hands-on lesson in civics and politics. These young women were selected because of their extraordinary display of leadership qualities.

Sponsored by the American Legion, Girls Nation has been bringing future leaders to Washington, DC, since 1947. The aim of this nonpartisan program is threefold: To teach the workings of the Federal Government; to further cultivate an interest in the civil and political realm; and to inculcate a value of good citizenship in these young women who have already shown an aptitude in civics.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to recognize this outstanding program, and I am proud to have such an extraordinary young woman like Kristen in my district, representing the great Empire State.

CIDCARE ACT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing CIDCARE, in an effort to effectively stimulate the demand for higher quality care for our Nation's children while simultaneously removing barriers and providing resources to improve the quality of child care in the United States.

Child care continues to be a worry for most families as stories continue to surface about the lack of quality child care. Moreover, research has clearly demonstrated that a high-quality child care program is one that makes the healthy development and education of children its first objective and strives to stimulate the learning process of all children through developmentally appropriate activities that foster social, emotional, and intellectual growth. In addition, families in today's society are increasingly required to have both parents enter the work force. Accordingly, the demand for quality child care is increasing as is the need for credentialed and accredited child care providers.

Accordingly, CIDCARE will stimulate the demand for higher quality child care for our Nation's children while simultaneously removing barriers and providing resources to improve the quality of child care in the United States.

Many of my colleagues may have read about the tragic circumstances surrounding the Fiedelhotz family in Florida. The Fiedelhotz' son Jeremy died after only 2 hours at a day care facility. Though this tragedy should have never happened, it is an unfortunate example of what can and may continue to happen unless we encourage and inform all parents about the need for accredited and credentialed child care providers and facilities.

CIDCARE through the Tax Code will encourage the demand for accredited or credentialed child care. This will be accomplished in the following manner: First, by increasing the amount which an employee can contribute to a dependent care assistance plan if a child is in accredited or credentialed child care; second, changing the dependent care tax credit to allow parents to receive a higher and more equitable dependent day care credit; third, providing tax benefits for employers which provide quality child care; fourth, extending eligibility for businesses to take a qualified charitable deduction for the donation of educational equipment and materials to public schools, accredited or credentialed nonprofit child care providers; fifth, establishing a $260 million competitive grant program to assist States in improving the quality of child care; sixth, expanding public information and technical assistance services to identify and disseminate to the public what is important for child development in child care; seventh, providing $50 million to create and operate a technology-based training infrastructure to enable child care providers nationwide to receive the training, education, and support they need to improve the quality of child care; eighth, creating a child care training revolving fund to enable child care providers and child care support entities to purchase computers, satellite dishes, and other technological equipment which enable them to participate in the child care training provided on the national infrastructure; ninth, requiring that all Federal child care centers will have to meet all State and local licensing and other regulatory requirements related to the provision of child care, within 6 months of the passage of this legislation; and tenth, extending the Perkins and Stafford Loan Forgiveness Program to include child care workers who are employed full time providing child care services and have a degree in early childhood education or development or receive professional child care credentials.

I want to urge all of my colleagues to review this bill and to cosponsor this important bill. Our children are our future and we must insist that they receive the best care possible, especially during their early development years.

I urge your support

WHO'S MANAGING THE MONEY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the Summer 1997 edition of the Cleveland Branch NAACP Update contained an interesting article about the role of African-Americans in the money management industry. In the article, entitled, ''Who's Managing The Money,'' Kevin A. Carter and Tony Chapelle take a closer look at the number of minorities in investment guidance positions.

Carter and Chapelle's article provides data concerning an apparent lack of African-American money managers, as well as figures showing that the bulk of African-American dollars are spent outside of the black community. Because of these realities, Carter and Chapelle stress the importance of African-Americans being employed ''in money jobs'' and knowing how to ''leverage their purchasing power.''

Mr. Speaker, I found this article to be very informative. ''Who's Managing The Money'' reminds us of the hurdles still standing in the way of African-Americans achieving economic freedom and financial independence. I commend Mr. Carter and Mr. Chapelle for writing such an excellent article, and I wish to share it with my colleagues and the Nation.

WHO'S MANAGING THE MONEY

(By Kevin A. Carter and Tony Chapelle)

After viewing the movie Jerry McGuire, and the Academy Awards Ceremony, most African Americans are familiar with the Cuba Gooding, Jr. quote ''show me the money.'' As an African American athlete, Gooding's character (Rod Tidwell) has remained as Tom Cruise's (Jerry McGuire) only client after Jerry is fired from Sports Management Incorporated. Rod wants Jerry to ''show him the money,'' or negotiate a long-term contract with the Arizona Cardinals. While the movie illustrates several valuable lessons about life, it also highlights one disturbing reality of African American existence—African Americans do not ''manage the money''—even when they are the principal product or service.

In the movie, Jerry is a white American, and no African American sports agent is identified at any segment in the movie. This inequity is reflected in real life. While African American athletes amass billions in wealth, less than 10% have African American agents. This inequity is also reflected in your daily life! By the year 2000, African Americans will earn $500 billion a year in income. Unfortunately, Black consumers typically spend 93% of their money with non-Black companies. Our current $400 billion dollars in purchasing power is only being channeled into approximately $30 billion in revenues for Black owned businesses!

This inequity of ''who's managing the money'' is reflected throughout the financial markets.

African Americans represent less than 2% of all the investment consultants in the country. Importance: Where will you obtain your investment guidance?

There are only 37 Black investment managers with discretion over portfolios at majority-owned institutions (either asset management firms, or major pension funds). Importance: Blacks at white firms usually have access to more resources—more frequent and larger trading commissions for minority brokers, bigger donations for community organizations and more chances to bring in Black interns.

In 1996 only 5% of the money management firms hired by institutional money managers were minorities. Of that amount, African American money managers only managed $1.045 billion, or one-and-a-quarter percent (0.025%) of the money invested by these institutional money managers. Importance: Growth in investment accounts is not paralleled by a growth in business for African American securities companies.

Of the over 7,000 mutual funds, seven African American-owned companies now offer a total of twelve mutual funds to consumers. Six of the twelve funds were started within the last 12 months. Importance: As stockholders, pension fund managers have an important voice in the hiring, purchasing and operations of American corporations. A voice that could be used to better conditions for African American, and other minority, workers.

According to the most recent statistics available from the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, African Americans comprise only 8.8% of the securities and commodities brokerages and exchanges and 11.7% of the insurance agency and brokerage industry. Importance: Growth in the financial services industry is not reflected in growing employment opportunities for African Americans.

Why should African Americans focus on who's managing money? Because savings and the accumulation of wealth are the engines which drive industrial production and economic growth in this country. In America, savings are redirected into business equity and debt that creates new plants, products and jobs. The economic strength of a community (and a country) is determined by what it produces in goods and services, not by what it consumes! If African Americans are not employed in the ''money'' jobs, or leverage their purchasing power, the capital markets will not be used to address African American concerns and issues.

So don't always assert ''show me the money,'' ask ''who's managing the money!''

TRIBUTE TO THE LAKE COUNTY FOP

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to congratulate the Fraternal Order of Police [FOP], Lake County Anton Lodge No. 125. Yesterday, the Lake County FOP began hosting the annual Indiana State Fraternal Order of Police Golf Tournament at Broadmoor Country Club in Merrillville, IN and Summertree Golf Club in Crown Point, IN. Specifically, I would like to congratulate Lake County FOP chairman, Patrick Tracy, and co-chairmen, Robert Porras and Tony Ramirez, on the leadership they have displayed in organizing this event. The Lake County Anton Lodge is expecting the 2-day event to attract over 400 golfers throughout the State of Indiana. Several executive officers of the Indiana Fraternal Order of Police will be in attendance at this tournament, including State president, Mike Cook, State vice-president and Anton Lodge No. 125 president, Tim Downs, national trustee, Robert Imborek, and former national president of the Fraternal Order of Police, R. Pat Stark.

The largest and most commanding voice on behalf of our Nation's law enforcement officers, the FOP was founded in 1915 in Pittsburgh, PA, with the intent of improving the working conditions of police who were assigned long and tedious shifts 365 days of the year. Since 1915, the organization's membership has grown to nearly 2,000 local lodges, with almost 270,000 members nationwide. The FOP has, over the years, successfully served as a unifying voice for the men and women protecting our communities by providing its members with the latest developments in labor and employee relations through both an aggressive schedule of seminars and several prominent publications. Due to the dissemination of information pertaining to bargaining, employee relations, and representation, more labor contracts are negotiated by FOP lodges than by any other professional police association. The FOP proudly attributes its success to the foundation of its organization, which is best described in the phrase ''Police Representing Police.''

The Fraternal Order of Police has also effectively represented the interests of its members through the pursuit of an aggressive national legislative agenda, advancing issues important to rank-and-file law enforcement officers. The National Legislative Program of the FOP, the most active and comprehensive of any law enforcement organization in Washington, is committed to legislation which will support better living and working conditions for law enforcement officers, improve safety for officers on the job, and continue to increase the level of efficiency and professionalism of law enforcement.

Through its local lodges, the Fraternal Order of Police plays a crucial role in bettering the relationship between law enforcement and local communities. Local FOP lodges have been active in such programs as youth sports, drug and crime awareness programs, and other community activities which have served to integrate the efforts of police forces and individual citizens in combating crime. It is through the support of events, like the annual golf tournament, that the FOP can continue its fine work in strengthening our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending the Fraternal Order of Police, Anton Lodge No. 125, as it hosts the Annual Indiana State Golf Tournament. The work the Lake County Fraternal Order of Police has done for our communities has undoubtedly improved the quality of life in Indiana's First Congressional District.

DENIAL OF PAY ADJUSTMENT FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

HON. MAX SANDLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that exempts Members of Congress from receiving the cost of living pay increase for fiscal year 1998. It is irresponsible for us to increase our own pay at a time when we have not met our obligation to the American people to balance the Federal budget. We are at a critical point in our Federal spending priorities. We are making decisions to cut spending that will impact all Americans.

At a time when some in Government are seriously considering cutting Medicare benefits to our seniors in order to balance the budget, how can we justify giving ourselves a pay raise? Our parents worked a lifetime for those benefits. We cannot in good conscience increase our pay while breaking our commitment to them. These are some of the most vulnerable in our society and their health care needs must come first.

At a time when unfairly cutting veterans' benefits is under consideration, how can we justify giving ourselves a pay raise? Our veterans laid down their lives for our country. Our world dominance today is due in large part to the men and women who have served our country in harm's way throughout history. We have an obligation to them not to turn our backs on their health care needs.

At a time when we are struggling to give every student an opportunity for a college education, how can we justify giving ourselves a pay raise? Our students represent the future of our country. By providing them the opportunity to further their education, we advance the American ideals of social progress and equality. We must do everything within our power to make post secondary education more affordable for everyone who wants to attend.

At a time when we cannot adequately fund transportation and infrastructure repairs and improvements, how can we justify giving ourselves a pay raise? The strength of America's economy was built on the foundation of a world class infrastructure. We cannot continue to increase our productivity and expand our economy without improvements to our infrastructure.

We have just begun to work toward easing the tax burden on the American people. How can we justify giving ourselves a pay raise before that task is complete? The Taxpayer Relief Act that recently passed the House raised the estate tax exemption from $600,000 to $1,000,000 by the year 2007. Many families in

my district in east Texas who own farms or small businesses could lose significant portions of their family property waiting for this provision to be implemented. The exemption should be $1 million now, not 10 years from now.

As one of my constituent's wrote, Congress is here to take care of people. Congress must get to work on the people's business. I hope my fellow Members will join me in opposing a congressional pay raise until we have taken care of the people.

''END THE DEATH TAX NOW!''

HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Small business Subcommittee on Taxes, Business Opportunities and Exports, and as a private individual, there is nothing more inconsistent and unfair than estate taxes, better known as death taxes. This is the last opportunity the Government has to say thanks for a job well done. What you have accumulated at death is after a lifetime of paying electricity, sewer, water, gasoline, sales, real estate, mortgage, and deed filing, capital gains, excise, State and Federal income, and in some cases, death taxes when one or both of your parents die.

ARE WE THERE YET?

My kids made up a game to play when we drive back and forth to Washington. It's called, Name That Tax. Have you ever tried to entertain three little kids in a mini van? It beats, Are we there yet? What happens when you get married, you get—that's right—a marriage tax. This is not the cost of the wedding, which is not about a ticket tax? Got that. What about a toll tax? Yes, we have that also. What about gas tax? Yes, President Clinton raised that by 4.3 cents to pay for more welfare spending—he calls it deficit reduction—the Government gets fatter while you get slimmer. And what happens when you make a phone call? Yes, the long-distance tax, the short-distance tax. If you put a string between two tin cans for primitive communications, you have to pay tax on string. If you stop at a grocery and make sandwiches, most States have a lower sales tax on grocery items, but if you are in a hurry you pay a travelers's tax at the local McDonalds. But you dare not phone ahead to another cell area, because you'll get hit with a roving tax.

The death tax is the Federal Government's last chance at leveling your income and spreading the wealth—socialism. As an attorney, before I was elected, I had to tell a farm family that half their land had to be sold to pay for death taxes: that's a tough sell when it takes $1 million worth of assets to make $30,000 a year. And it had to be paid within 9 months.

SOME RELIEF COMING

Each year I have been a Member of Congress I have cosponsored legislation to outlaw this tax. Now, under Republican leadership in this tax by nearly doubling the exemption to $1.2 million, even more for farms and small businesses. If we had a Republican President, perhaps the entire estate tax could be eliminated.

Writing in the June 30, 1997, edition of ''FarmWeek,'' Ross Korves, an economist for the American Farm Bureau Federation, cites some very interesting facts. In spite of the annual $17 billion in death tax revenues, this drive to collect 1 percent of the annual taxes paid to the Federal Government comes from a general dislike for people who have wealth. And, he states, ''a tax on savings and investing will quite logically result in less saving and investing. Less saving and investing leads to a slower growing economy, fewer increases in productivity, and a slower rise in the growth of the standard of living.'' A Tax Foundation report compared the disincentive effects of the estate tax and of the income tax. The foundation calculated how high the top income tax rate would have to be to have the same disincentive effect as the current estate tax system. Get this: the study showed the estate tax has roughly the same effect on entrepreneurial incentives as a doubling of the income tax.

And in 1993, Fiscal Associates, Inc., estimated that if the estate tax had ended in 1993, by the year 2000 the effects of ending the estate tax would be reflected in economic output with an economy about $79 billion larger, an increase of 228,000 jobs, and a total capital in the economy of about $640 billion larger. Korves quotes B. Douglas Bernheim of Stanford University, who wrote 10 years ago in a publication called, ''Does the Estate Tax Raise Revenue?'' Bernheim says no. Korves agrees:

> Stronger economic growth would help offset the loss of direct revenue resulting from repealing the estate tax. The increased revenue from economic growth and the revenue losses from estate tax avoidance outlined by Bernheim are definitely larger than the current direct revenue from the estate tax. Eliminating the estate tax is likely to result in more revenue to the federal government than the current tax system.

Hey, what about fairness? I visited a farm family a few weeks ago. The wife had inherited the farm from her parents. When her dad died 20 years ago, the family had to pay death taxes. The mother died a few months ago, and death taxes again have to be paid. The goal is to pass the farm on to the three children, each of whom works full time on the farm and has a full time job in the city.

I read an article by a university professor on why she thought death taxes were appropriate. After her various spread the wealth and social responsibility arguments, I concluded that we should impose death taxes only on those people who think death taxes are appropriate. What's more annoying is we pay taxes for higher education and use our precious after-tax dollars to send our kids to college so they can hear this professor. Then they become Congressmen who believe taking everybody's money is real justice, and that is the reason the death tax is not repealed.

IN LOVING MEMORY OF JAMES ARTHUR HUGHES

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

HON. CHAKA FATTAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague Mr. FATTAH, and I would like to call to your attention James Arthur Hughes of Philadelphia, PA, who recently passed away.

James, known to those affectionately as ''Jim,'' was born on October 21, 1925, in Whitetown, NC, to Willie Arthur and Carrie Alice Coles Hughes. A man of deep and quiet faith, Jim spent his early years in the fellowship of Smith Chapel Baptist Church.

After serving his country in the service of the U.S. Navy during World War II, Jim worked and resided in Harrisburg, PA, where he directed a vocational school for tailors and seamstresses. After moving to Philadelphia, Jim became a lifelong member of Calvary Episcopal Church where he was confirmed in the faith in 1955.

Jim believed that education was the key to the future and to success. He continued his post-high-school education at Pioneer Business School and Temple University where he specialized in finance and mortgage lending. His talents for banking and finance were put to good use as Jim became vice president of the Carver Loan and Investment Co. He subsequently joined Berean Federal Saving Bank, the oldest African-American owned savings and loan institution in the country, where he became vice president and managing officer.

Although he officially retired in 1992, Jim continued to work with Berean as a consultant. Further, Jim also served as the president and CEO of the Eden Cemetery and was special assistant to the controller of the city of Philadelphia.

Jim was a man of extraordinary vision and energy. He was a founding member and first African-American to serve on the board of governors of the State System of Higher Education in Pennsylvania, serving for more than 13 years. His love for education was further evidenced in his work as a member of the council of trustees for Cheyney University for the last 14 years. Jim was also a member of the Penndelphia Scholarship Foundation, a college scholarship fund for the disadvantaged.

Jim's service and love for his community was also evident through his work as a member of the NAACP, the West Indian Benevolent Association, and the Philadelphia Urban League. He also served as president of the South Saint Bernard Street Improvement Association.

Jim was known and highly respected for his financial acumen, but his true passion was golf. He was an initial investor and fervently served as a board member and past president of the Greater Philadelphia Golf and Country Club, the first African-American owned 18 hole championship golf course in the country. Jim was past president and club champion of the Del-Vay Golf Club, an officer with the Freeway Golf Club, member of the Just Golfer Golf Club, and a former member of the Philadelphia Chapter of the National Negro Golf Association. Jim also co-founded and was vice president of the Hughes, Jones, Oglesby Golf Foundation, which was founded to instill the love of golf in other young African-Americans.

Jim was the loving husband of Ann E. Adams Hughes, the proud father of the Honorable Vincent Hughes, State Senator of Pennsylvania and his stepdaughter Veda Diallo, the proud father-in-law of the Honorable Renee Cardwell-Hughes, as well as the proud grandfather of Ariell and Alek Hughes.

Mr. Speaker, we ask that you join us, our colleagues, Jim's family and friends, and the

State of Pennsylvania in remembering James Arthur Hughes' outstanding and invaluable contributions to the community.

TIME TO CHANGE A STATIC CUBA POLICY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues' attention an editorial that appeared earlier this month in the Miami Herald. The editorial concludes, based on a recent poll by Florida International University's Institute of Public Opinion Research, that among the Cuban American community in Dade County, there is a wide and healthy plurality of views on a number of issues, including current United States policy toward Cuba.

Such a diversity of opinions and an active debate on Cuba policy are in the national interest, and I look forward to renewing that debate in this body. It is time to explore this diversity of opinion and reexamine the static assumptions underlying our 39-year-old policy toward Cuba.

The editorial follows:

[From the Miami Herald, July 1, 1997]

YEAR 39 AND COUNTING

Frustration is a powerful, if maddening, force. And it runs through the results of the most recent poll of Dade County residents of Cuban heritage. Such, and other, deeper emotions may well explain some of the survey's findings, as well as some of its apparent contradictions.

Since 1959 Cubans have migrated to Greater Miami seeking haven from Fidel Castro's revolution. After 38 years, many still anxiously await Castro's demise, await the end of his totalitarian regime, await a free Cuba. People inevitably tire of waiting.

The poll by Florida International University's Institute of Public Opinion Research, funded by The Herald, suggests a growing pessimism, unlike in the heady days after the Iron Curtain came crashing down. Then, Christmas toasts in Miami were made to the next *Nochebuena* in Havana. FIU's similar poll in 1991 found that 77 percent of those questioned expected major political change in Cuba within five years.

This latest poll, though, shows that only 36 percent believe that such change is likely, with another 38 percent responding that change likely never will come or that they don't know when it may. Perhaps this is to be expected now, 16 months after Castro's MiGs shot down two unarmed Brothers to the Rescue planes, killing four civilians. That barbarous act froze the possibility of rapprochement with the United States that had existed for a time then.

Today Castro remains, if not the world's wiliest dictator, certainly the longest-lasting. He has consistently manipulated to his own favor events that could potentially damage his power; witness the 1980 Mariel boatlift and the 1984 exodus of rafters. His cunning leaves not only Washington but Cuban exiles at a loss for strategy. Perhaps that's why 73 percent of those polled said that the U.S. embargo has not worked well. And yet, absent anything better, 72 percent favored continuing it.

Moreover, the survey reflected something that few outside of South Florida often recognize: Not all Cubans here think the same. In fact, the poll reflects a wide and healthy plurality of views on a number of issues. Consider the 48 percent for and 45 percent against establishing a national dialogue with Cuba; the 60 percent for and 38 percent against U.S. companies doing business with Cuba; the 43 percent in agreement and 49 in disagreement with a Miami radio station that stopped broadcasting Cuban music by artists living on the island.

The influence of young Cuban Americans and of the more-recent arrivals from Cuba also made its mark, diversifying and moderating views. Yet on the question of whether exiles might return to Cuba, painful nostalgia clearly mixes with pragmatism. Poll respondents who arrived after 1990 appeared most willing to entertain thoughts of returning, perhaps because of their closer island ties.

Yet more important is to note the few, some 20 to 30 percent overall, who might return under questionable economic or political circumstances. While nearing four decades of diaspora, Cubans here, citizens and noncitizens alike, know not when those circumstances may change. But this poll shows anew that the diversity of Cubans' views in South Florida is anything but static, and stereotypes are inaccurate.

SHARPSBURG'S FALLEN HERO

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a fallen hero in Sharpsburg, NC, in my congressional district. Wayne Hathaway, Sharpsburg's chief of police, was brutally slain in the line of duty last Thursday.

Chief Hathaway served 25 years, more than half his entire life, enforcing the law and keeping the peace in Sharpsburg. Last week, the chief made the ultimate sacrifice while responding to a call about a domestic dispute. The accused killer did not end his crime with the chief but turned his gun on his own wife and tragically took her life as well.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, I joined 1,200 mourners in Sharpsburg to pay tribute to Chief Hathaway's quarter century of service, leadership, and friendship. Law enforcement officers serve each and every day across this country in the battle against the criminal element to keep our streets and communities safe. We in Congress must give our police the support they need so that the service and sacrifice of Wayne Hathaway and all the dedicated officers like him are not made in vain.

Nothing is more important to our people than safe streets and communities in which they can life, work, and raise a family. Wayne Hathaway provided that public safety to Sharpsburg for 25 years, and we are in his debt.

Jesus teaches us ''Greater love has no one than this, that he lay down his life for his friends.'' (John 15:13).

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday Sharpsburg buried a fallen hero who laid down his life for his friends and neighbors. Our thoughts and prayers are with the family and friends of Wayne Hathaway.

TRIBUTE TO MARVIN J. SONOSKY

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who spent his life and career working on behalf of Indian tribes and people to ensure that the United States lived up to its trust responsibility to them, Marvin Sonosky, of Alexandria, VA. On July 16, Mr. Sonosky died of heart failure. He was 88 years old. I join the many friends of Mr. Sonosky in mourning the loss of one of Indian country's greatest advocates. I would like to convey my personal sympathies to his wife, Shirley Freimuth Sonosky, his three daughters, Judith Kreisberg, Joann Hirsch, and Karen Hecker, and to his seven grandchildren and to his one great grandchild.

Mr. Sonosky was born in Duluth, MN. He graduated from college and law school at the University of Minnesota. After four years of private practice in Duluth, Mr. Sonosky came to Washington in 1937 and joined the Lands Division of the Department of Justice, where he served for 17 years. He was named a special assistant to the Attorney General and frequently argued before the U.S. Supreme Court. In 1951, Mr. Sonosky returned to private practice, first in association with two Washington law firms and later as a sole practitioner. In 1976, he founded the law firm of Sonosky, Chambers & Sachse, where he practiced until his death. Through the last week of his life, he remained active in the trial practice of the firm.

Mr. Sonosky was a unique individual in this city, in that he was one of the best advocates in his field, yet he never sought the accolades or tributes that so many seek to obtain. Instead, his tribute came from knowing that every day that he worked he had the potential of improving perhaps just one Indian person's life. I would like to share with my colleagues some of the many legislative initiatives involving Indian tribes that were the brainchild of Mr. Sonosky. These are but one measure of the impact that Mr. Sonosky had in improving the lives and opportunities of Indian tribal governments and their people, and which has done much to ensure that the United States stands behind its trust obligation to them.

Following devastating losses of Indian reservation land, and its resulting poverty, Mr. Sonosky worked with Congress to secure the enactment of Federal statutes that returned over 1 million acres of undisposed of surplus lands within those reservations to the tribes—the resources from which have been vital to the economies of many Indian communities. Mr. Sonosky also brought to the attention of Congress the need for legislation authorizing Indian tribes to recover just compensation for lands taken by the United States, so that the damages awarded would not be unfairly diminished by the value of food and rations that the United States had otherwise promised in exchange for the lands acquired. And when government officials unlawfully offset welfare claims against trust funds of individual Indians, Mr. Sonosky successfully challenged that practice in Federal court, after which he worked with Congress to ensure that all individual Indians who had been harmed by the practice were properly reimbursed.

While much of Mr. Sonosky's work with Congress focused on righting past wrongs, an equal part of his work has resulted in legislation that will protect Indian rights for generations to come. Through his efforts, Federal law that had previously allowed States to assume jurisdiction over certain matters on Indian reservations were amended to expressly require tribal consent prior to application of State jurisdiction. And most significantly, when limitations contained in the statutes governing Federal court jurisdiction effectively barred Indian tribes from invoking that forum to vindicate federally protected rights, Mr. Sonosky successfully pushed for legislation that today vests the Federal courts with jurisdiction to adjudicate any claim brought by an Indian tribe.

The honor of the Nation with regard to our obligations to Indian people has been well served by Mr. Sonosky. We will miss him dearly.

THE CONNECTING LINE

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, those who think the investigation into the scandals surrounding the Clinton White House are sadly mistaken if they dismiss it as a merely partisan attack.

The New York Times has never been known as a mouthpiece for the Republican Party, and could not be accused of aiding or abetting such partisanship. All the more significant, then, is the Tuesday column by A.M. Rosenthal, entitled ''The Connecting Line.''

The ''connecting'' is done to the bewildering and seemingly unconnected scandals, and establishes a common theme.

That common theme, Mr. Speaker, is the manipulation of the United States by the People's Republic of China, and the extent to which the actions of the Clinton administration made that manipulation possible. The column is a must-read for anyone who still thinks, and dares to claim, that this scandal is only about campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why preparation should not be made for the consideration of impeachment of the President, a suggestion I do not make lightly.

I place the Rosenthal column in today's RECORD.

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1997]

THE CONNECTING LINE

(By A.M. Rosenthal)

In just one day last week three stories were reported that told of the stunning successes the Chinese Politburo has achieved in manipulating America and diminishing it as a credible political player in the Far East.

Americans can find similar stories almost every day in their press. But American journalism, like American diplomacy and politics, has failed to show the clear line that connects the stories. And historically—meaning from tomorrow deep into the next century—that failure can be the Politburo's biggest triumph of all.

One story dealt with China's plan to influence the American Presidential race and how President Clinton insisted that the agent of Beijing's chief overseas economic commercial partner be given a role in the campaign.

This agent, John Huang, received regular C.I.A. briefings. If the White House does not understand that anything interesting the C.I.A. told him found its way through his Indonesian masters to their Beijing partners, it would be obscene self-delusion amounting to dereliction of duty.

Another story was about the growing worry in Congress that U.S. intelligence has not kept track of how China's increasing military and political power affect America. The house has called for a report within a year. It appropriated $5 million to hire academics to help our multi-billion-dollar intelligence machinery.

The third story told of how the dissident movement has been crushed in China. The Communists got a free hand when the Clinton Administration dropped human rights as a goal of its foreign policy. The Communist then had no worry about economic penalty for the torture and murder of Chinese guilt of trying to express themselves. So they set to work.

Just another human rights story. But the connecting line among all the successes of China is human rights. The line begins with President Clinton's decision in 1994 to renege on promises he had made to use economic pressure to help imprisoned Chinese and Tibetan dissidents.

Human rights for Chinese—the right to speak, write and worship as they choose—should be important in themselves to Americans. They should make us cherish and protect our own, inspire us to give a hand to those who have none.

The apologists for China sneer at all that. What are we, missionaries? They say Americans supporting human rights thirst for enemies after the Soviet breakup and select China for the role.

This is a knowing falsehood. The opposite is true. Like other police-state rulers, Chinese Communists live in fear of their people's desire for liberties. They see American democracy as the danger to the Communist Party, the inevitable enemy. They search out other dictatorships for help in damaging America.

That is why China sells nuclear technology to the likes of Iran. To weaken America—that is the connecting line in Politburo policy.

For Mr. Clinton, the decision to betray Chinese human rights was the beginning of the line to the other accommodations and appeasements that flowed from it. Could he have brought into his campaign a man useful only because of his links with China, direct or indirect, if he were still standing up to what the Communists were doing to dissidents?

The President's men, and women, walk the line with him. For career reasons, they pretended to believe his cynical fantasy that deserting human rights would somehow make the Communists improve human rights. They said straight-faced that it would also persuade the Politburo to safeguard America's security interests—no more sales of cruise missiles and nuclear technology to the Irans of the world.

So when American intelligence did report those sales, the Administration whined a bit but accepted Beijing's insulting answer that it knew nothing about the sales. They expected Americans to believe even pistols could be exported from China without Beijing's approval.

Only one thing prevents Beijing from fully relishing its double victory over Chinese human rights and American's claims to international moral leadership.

Beijing has not yet stamped out one human rights struggle—the passion for freedom of worship. Yesterday the U.S. again acknowledged the persecution of Christians in China. America's Government will try to remain detached. Amerca's people may not.

HONORING COL. ROBERT J. COUGHLIN'S RETIREMENT FROM THE U.S. ARMY

HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor Col. Robert J. Coughlin, who is retiring in November from the U.S. Army, after may years of devoted service. Col. Robert J. Coughlin will officially retire on November 1, 1997, after 28 years of active service to the U.S. Army. He began his Army career shortly after graduating from Northeastern University, with a B.S. degree in chemical engineering, and marrying Kathy, his wife of over 28 years. In 1969, he was promoted to 1st Lt. and served as a chemical engineer and company commander at Pine Bluff Arsenal in Arkansas. In 1971, he was assigned to Fort Carson, CO, and was promoted to the rank of captain. In January 1973, the Coughlins moved to New Orleans where Captain Coughlin graduated from Tulane University with a masters degree in chemical engineering. After serving a tour in Germany, Major Coughlin attended the Naval Command and Staff College in Newport, RI, and went on to serve as a chemistry instructor at the U.S. Naval Academy. After serving as one of the best chemistry instructors in the armed services, Major Coughlin was sent to Fort McClellan, and promoted to the rank of Lt. Col. After his tour at McClellan, he and his family again moved to Germany, this time to the 1st Armored Division Headquarters located in Ansbach. During his second tour in Germany, he was selected to serve as the battalion commander at Fort McClellan in 1990. While serving at Fort McClellan, he was promoted to the rank of colonel, and selected to attend the Air War College in Montgomery, AL. He then served as the director of training at Fort McClellan before assuming his current command at the Deseret Chemical Depot, in Tooele, UT.

Colonel Coughlin commanded the Deseret Chemical Depot through a very difficult period and was personally responsible for its successful standup as a separate Army installation with an annual operating budget of over $25 million. Through his hard work and dedication he earned an unprecedented high level of trust from local citizens, as well as State and local officials, overcoming great opposition to the start up of the first full-scale chemical demilitarization facility within CONUS. Under Colonel Coughlin's command the Tooele Chemical Demilitarization Facility has safely destroyed thousands of obsolete chemical weapons and over 1,000,000 pounds of chemical agent. His leadership was critical to ensuring high levels of emergency preparedness and the maximum safety of depot workers and the public from the risks associated with the chemical stockpile stored at the Deseret Chemical Depot.

Throughout his Army career, Colonel Coughlin has displayed unique abilities to manage and lead. Colonel Coughlin's leadership consistently earns the untiring trust of the

work force under his command, and helps them to produce at levels far above of expectations. He has always gained the respect, loyalty, and dedicated service of the managers and employees that have had the good fortune to work with or for him. When he retires on November 1, 1997, the Army will lose the service of a good man and a dedicated public servant. His contributions have been many, and the positive effect he has had throughout his career on those that he has worked with will long be appreciated. Colonel Coughlin has been an invaluable asset to the U.S. Army and the United States of America. I personally wish to take this time to thank Colonel Coughlin, his wife Kathy, and their two daughters, Karyn and Kelli, for the many sacrifices they have undoubtedly made in the service of our Nation. I wish them all the best of luck in the future.

CARL MAXEY: A CHAMPION OF JUSTICE

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. McDERMOTT Mr. Speaker, our country has lost a true champion of justice. Carl Maxey, of Spokane, WA, died last week, on Thursday, July 16, 1997. An accomplished attorney, Mr. Maxey was a widely known, and deeply respected, civil rights advocate whose activism spanned his lifetime. Despite a difficult childhood that included placement in an orphanage and early years on an Idaho Indian reservation, Carl Maxey rose to prominence through his hard work and unwavering commitment to justice and fair treatment for all. Mr. Maxey was a longtime resident of Spokane, where he graduated from the School of Law at Gonzaga University. He then became the first African-American from eastern Washington to pass the Washington State Bar examination, and began a successful law practice that included defense representation in a number of well-known Washington State criminal cases.

A blossoming legal career did not deter Carl Maxey from lifelong civil rights activism. As the civil rights movement emerged in the South, he dedicated himself to its goals, working zealously for more than 40 years to realize them. His efforts included legal services to rights workers, political organizing and candidacy, and pro bono representation of poor, and often minority, clients.

A mentor and inspiration to many African-Americans, Carl Maxey long will remain a model for all Americans. His leadership sprang from a rare combination of undeniable personal magnetism, unswerving conviction, and unyielding determination. His loss is deeply felt because Carl Maxey enriched all whom his good work touched. We are profoundly saddened by his death, and extend our deepest sympathies to his family.

TRIBUTE TO LT. COL. BILL SIMMONS

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lt. Col. Bill Simmons for his extraordinary dedication to the defense of our Nation and our community.

Bill has moved throughout the ranks of the Marine Corps in a short period of time. In 1976 he was commissioned as a second lieutenant following graduation from the Naval ROTC Program at Iowa State University. Because of his distinguished and exceptional service he was soon promoted to company commander.

The words ''promoted because of exceptional service'' have followed Bill throughout his career. Therefore, today I call upon my distinguished colleagues to join me in honoring Bill for his exceptional service and congratulate him on his promotion to the Marine Corps Office of Legislative Affairs.

Bill is not honored here today solely for his service to the Marine Corps. He is also a distinguished community servant and a loving family man. Bill had developed, organized and implemented a drug intervention program in our community schools. This program sponsors dialogue between both students and their mentors truly convincing these students not to use drugs. Bill has also organized more than 200 Color Guards, the 1996 Taste of Encino Race and sponsored the Toys for Tots Program. All the while, Bill was tending to his duties as a battalion officer, father, and husband.

If I had to choose one phrase to describe Bill I would say he ''can do''. He has served to maintain relations between the people of our community and has served organizations such as the Encino Chamber of Commerce and the Van Nuys Police Department. His ability to ensure that everyone's interests and ideas are properly represented has enabled him to move throughout the ranks of the military and serve those in our community.

I join the family and friends of Lt. Col. Bill Simmons and citizens of Encino in honoring Bill today for his distinguished service to our community.

RECOGNIZING INDIA'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding United States foreign involvement with India. Last December I visited India and spoke with some of the country's business leaders, and I discovered that businesses in India are entrepreneurial, active, and growing. Due to India's undying spirit to be a participant in the world's economy, Indo-United States relations and bilateral trade have grown during the past year. The United States is now India's largest trading partner and foremost foreign investor. Many U.S. companies are looking for opportunities for further expansion. Both the Indian market and government are working to secure a place for United States business in India. The economy, markets, and infrastructure are being reformed and liberalized. India needs foreign investment and technological development. Foreign aid from the United States is instrumental in implementing programs that help solve problems in the areas of health, family welfare, and education.

In light of India's current reforms, its strong democracy, and its devotion to the welfare of its people, it is clear that India has and will continue to put United States aid to good use. On August 15, India will be celebrating its 50th anniversary of independence and democracy. It is imperative that the United States recognize India's achievement at this time and renew its commitment to the country. I recently received a letter from the Ambassador from India, Naresh Chandra, who explained in detail India's past achievements and current goals. I have included the Ambassador's letter with my statement, and I encourage my colleagues to read it.

India is growing and expanding, and now it is time for the United States to participate in that expansion.

AMBASSADOR OF INDIA,
Washington, DC, July 11, 1997.

Hon. ALCEE HASTINGS,
U.S. House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HASTINGS, Almost a year ago when I had just about started my assignment as Ambassador to this great country, I had occasion to write to you on an amendment moved by Congressman Dan Burton on the Foreign Operations Bill. This amendment was not approved by a vote of 296 to 127. It now appears that the House would be moved to consider a similar amendment to the Foreign Operations Bill for FY 1998.

First, I would like to say that my year in Washington has been a most interesting and rewarding experience, the highlight of which has been the encouragement and support that I have received from Members of Congress, like yourself. We have witnessed during this period a further upswing in Indo-US relations and in the growth of bilateral trade making US our largest trading partner as well as the foremost foreign investor in India.

US trade with India which was a mere $500 million in 1991 is now around $9.5 billion. Many US companies are considering further expansion of their operations in India. Enron which had to cross many hurdles to commence the $1.2 billion Dabhol power project is so interested in the opportunities emerging in the Indian market that it has plans to invest an additional $10 billion over the next decade. Many processed foods with American brand names have become very popular in the Indian market. Automobiles of US design are increasing their presence on Indian roads. Banks and financial institutions too are taking advantage of recently created business opportunities. In the insurance sector also, the door has been opened for starting joint ventures in the field of health insurance.

The coalition of parties ruling at the Centre have not only continued with economic reforms but expanded it into many more areas. Custom duties and other taxes have been further liberalized to encourage foreign investment in infrastructure and other areas of the economy. The US Administration has included India among the 10 most important emerging markets and this is borne out by the number of major US companies operating in India. A list of these companies is enclosed.

There is now in India much greater understanding and acceptance of the need for foreign investment and technology collaboration for meeting the vast needs of India's developing economy. All sections are agreed that this is necessary to maintain and increase the growth rate of around 7 per cent that we have been achieving in recent years.

While US aid funds are relatively much smaller than the inflow of capital into business and industry, they do serve the purpose of enabling very important programmes to be implemented in backward areas for the benefit of the disadvantaged in the field of health, family welfare and education. These programmes involving interacting of American experts and officials with NGOs and Indian volunteers is of great help in enhancing people to people understanding between the two countries.

In a month from now we would be celebrating the 50th anniversary of India's independence and democracy. While we have achieved much during this period by way of consolidation of the nation state, providing adequate food security for the people, and setting the base for economic development, there are still many challenges that we have to face and overcome for providing the desirable level of living to large sections of our people. At this time of review and introspection, we are conscious of the benefits that we have derived by way of bilateral cooperation with the US in the important areas of agriculture, education, science and technology. At this time when we are looking for much greater cooperation in these areas, it is unfortunate that we might have to tackle something of a negative nature in the House.

It was gratifying to see in the debate on the House floor that took place in June last year on a similar amendment, that several Congressmen very ably put forth the following points:

(i) India has made a success of its democracy and established powerful institutions like an independent judiciary, a free press and vigorous political parties providing for consultation and participation in Government in accordance with the rule of law.

(ii) India, which like the US has a multi-religious and multi-ethnic society, has resolved conflict situations in a lawful, democratic manner and taken concrete steps to further improve the human rights situation, including the setting up of an effective National Human Rights Commission.

(iii) Indo-US business and trade relations have improved considerably with the US companies taking good advantage of the opportunities emerging in the Indian market, as borne out by the large number of US companies operating successfully in India.

(iv) The situation in Punjab had been resolved and the situation in Jammu & Kashmir has improved.

All the above points continue to be not only valid, but have acquired even greater force. Investment approvals pertaining to US companies are now for the order of $8.5 billion. The opportunities existing for US companies in infrastructure sectors like telecom, roads, ports and power have a potential for fruitful investment of over $20 billion per year.

The US Administration has acknowledged the improved situation with regard to human rights and also cited the problems created by the trans-border support for terrorist activities in India; the most recent example of which was the explosion caused in a train in Punjab which killed thirty-four civilian passengers on July 8th with serious injuries to many more. This highlights the need for not doing anything to encourage front organizations created for the sold purpose of mobilizing support and funds for essentially terrorist outfits.

Since last year there have been general elections to the State Assemblies in Punjab with a voter turn-out of over 69% and which brought the Sikh-dominated party, the Akali Dal to power in association with another party, namely, the Bhartiya Janata Party. There could not have been a clearer rejection of the separatist movement in the State of Punjab.

In Jammu & Kashmir too, general elections recorded a good voter turn-out of around 55% and resulted in Dr. Farooq Abdullah gaining majority not only in the Kashmir valley, but also in the regions of Jammu and Ladakh. This democratically-elected State Government has revitalized the Government machinery despite the strains created by terrorist gangs on the law and order machinery with the help of agencies across the border.

Initiatives taken by Prime Minister I K Gujral from the time he was the Minister for External Affairs have greatly helped in improving bilateral relations between India and its neighbors. As part of this policy, special steps have been taken to initiate discussions with Pakistan to tackle all outstanding issues. Agreement has been reached in the talks held so far to set up Working Groups for seeking solution to specific problems including the State of Jammu & Kashmir and terrorism. The House was good enough to applaud these efforts. It is our hope that progress at these talks would help create a better climate for tackling terrorist activity.

This letter has become much longer than I intended, but the subject being very important and your consideration and support of great value to us, I had to put the relevant facts before you. I am confident that with your goodwill and encouragement we shall build upon the strong foundation that has been laid in recent years in our bilateral relations. As always, I and my staff at the Embassy are available to assist you in any way possible. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely,

NARESH CHANDRA.

IN TRIBUTE TO REAR ADM. ROBERT ELLIS FRICK

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special tribute to Rear Adm. Robert Ellis Frick, the U.S. Navy's Program Executive Officer for Submarines. I ask that you and the other Members of this distinguished body join me in acknowledging his extraordinary service to our Nation.

Bob Frick leads some of our Nation's most important and complex weapons acquisition programs—design and construction of Seawolf submarines, design of the new attack submarine, and design and development of all submarine combat systems. His contributions to the Navy have spanned an active duty career of almost 36 years.

Mr. Speaker, Bob Frick epitomizes the best in a modern naval officer. The high regard in which he is held marks Bob as one of our most effective and respected Navy leaders. Known for his technical expertise and insightful leadership, Bob has inspired and mentored many naval officers and civilian leaders. Decorated with numerous awards, Bob has been honored with the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, and the Meritorious Service Medal (with 4 Gold Stars), and the Navy Commendation Medal (with 2 Gold Stars).

A native of Erie, PA, Bob Frick enlisted as a seaman in the U.S. Navy in 1961. After completing basic training, he was assigned to U.S.S. *Sabalo* (SS 302) in Pearl Harbor, HI, where he earned his silver dolphins for completing his initial qualification in submarines. Bob was then selected for and completed enlisted nuclear propulsion training in 1964. His performance resulted in his selection to attend Purdue University under the Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program. Bob graduated from Purdue University in 1969 with both bachelor and master of science degrees in mechanical engineering.

Commissioned as an ensign in June 1969, Bob completed Nuclear Propulsion Officer Training and reported as a division officer aboard U.S.S. *Will Rogers* (SSBN 659), earning his gold dolphins in December 1971. His assignment included non-nuclear systems coordinator during an 18-month conversion and refueling overhaul at Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. Bob next served as engineer officer on U.S.S. *Haddock* (SSN 621) through a 15-month refueling and combat systems conversion overhaul at Mare Island Naval Shipyard. He then served as executive officer first on U.S.S. *Drum* (SSN 677) and then on U.S.S. *Kamehameha* (SSBN 642) during a strategic weapons conversion overhaul at Portsmouth Naval Shipyard.

From April 1984 until October 1987, Bob served as commanding officer, U.S.S. *Birmingham* (SSN 695), an assignment which included the ship's first major overhaul at Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard. Following command, he served as the deputy commander for Submarine Squadron One in Pearl Harbor and as senior member of the CINCPACFLT Nuclear Propulsion Examining Board. In 1990 Bob elected transition to the Material Professional Program with assignment as the assistant program manager for attack submarines responsible for all SSN 688 class submarine new construction efforts. In July 1992, he was assigned as the Senior Military Assistant to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology. In August 1993 Bob reported to Naval Sea Systems Command and assumed the duties as the deputy commander for submarines.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of his career, Bob Frick has faced tremendous challenges. His leadership and personal fortitude have been central to the operational effectiveness and reliability of submarines, and to our national security strategy which they enable and support. The successful completion and commissioning of U.S.S. *Seawolf*, the most advanced submarine in the world and the first new class of attack submarines to enter the fleet in over 21 years, is but the latest example of Bob Frick's tremendous leadership. Although he will be sorely missed in the Navy, Bob's vision, leadership, and personal style will continue to have a great impact on our Navy and our Nation for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues and the citizens of this great country, I am proud to have the opportunity to honor Rear Adm. Robert Ellis Frick with ''Bravo Zulu'' for a job well done. I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me to wish Bob and

his wife Susan, and children Jennifer, Sarah, and Kevin, ''Fair Winds and Following Seas'' as they begin their next voyage.

NEW ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROVISIONS IN THE UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO POLITICAL STATUS ACT

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I am an original cosponsor of United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act, chairman of the subcommittee which had original jurisdiction over this legislation, and an advocate of English as the official language of the United States. In this capacity I want to clarify statements which are being circulated outside of and within Congress based on incorrect and outdated information that contradicts the English language provisions of the legislation as recently amended.

This remarkable bill sponsored by Resources Committee Chairman BILL YOUNG, Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH, Resident Commissioner CARLOS ROMERO-BARCELÓ of Puerto Rico, and some 90 others, provides a three-stage self-determination process to resolve the United States century-old political status problem with Puerto Rico by the year 2010. The United States citizens of Puerto Rico and all U.S. taxpayers deserve no less.

Since the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act was first introduced in the 104th Congress, extensive English language provisions and requirements have been added to build upon the 100-year tradition of English as an official language of Puerto Rico. The new and amended English language provisions are directed at the existing status of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico as a territory under United States sovereignty, and alternatively, the transition of Puerto Rico to a State, depending on the outcome of the legislation's congressionally authorized referenda.

Thus, the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act, H.R. 856, provides an informed self-determination process for the United States citizens of Puerto Rico and clearly addresses the language issue from several vantage points, without violating constitutional limits affecting the people and State government. The language provisions of the bill as amended and approved with virtual unanimity by the Committee on Resources on May 21, 1997, follows:

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROVISIONS IN H.R. 856, THE UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO POLITICAL STATUS ACT

Language Policy [Section 3(b)]—

''English shall be the common language of mutual understanding in the United States, and shall apply in all of the States duly and freely admitted to the Union.''

''The Congress recognizes that at the present time, Spanish and English are the joint official languages of Puerto Rico, and have been for nearly 100 years.''

''English is the official language of Federal courts in Puerto Rico.''

''The ability to speak English is a requirement for Federal jury service.''

''Congress has the authority to expand existing English language requirements in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.''

''In the event that the referenda held under this Act result in approval of sovereignty leading to Statehood, English language requirements of the Federal Government shall apply in Puerto Rico to the same extent as Federal law requires throughout the United States.''

Statehood Ballot Definition [Section 4(a)(C)(7)]—

''English is the official language of business and communication in Federal courts and Federal agencies as made applicable by Federal law to every other State, and

''Puerto Rico is enabled to expand and build upon existing law establishing English as an official language of the State government, courts, and agencies.''

Transition Plan [Section 4(b)(C)(i)]—

''In the event of a vote in favor of Statehood, the president shall include in the transition plan proposals and incentives to:

''Increase the opportunities of the people of Puerto Rico to learn to speak, read, write, and understand English fully, including but not limited to, the teaching of English in public schools, fellowships, and scholarships.''

''The transition plan should promote the usage of English by the United States citizens of Puerto Rico, in order to best allow for—

''The enhancement of the century old practice of English as an official language of Puerto Rico,

''The use of language skills necessary to contribute most effectively to the Nation in all aspects, including but not limited to Hemispheric trade,

''The promotion of efficiency and fairness to all people in the conduct of the Federal and State government's official business; and

''The ability of all citizens to take full advantage of the economical, educational, and occupational opportunities through full integration with the United States.''

MAKING AIRLINE TAXES PALATABLE

HON. STEVE C. LaTOURETTE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I call to my colleagues' attention the attached editorial that appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on Thursday, July 17, 1997. As the editorial accurately states, under H.R. 2014, ''fees for using the tax-supported airways would be more evenly distributed among the airlines, whatever their size. And the airline's (Continental) numbers support this contention.''

Than you, Mr. Speaker for allowing me this opportunity to raise this important issue which will significantly impact consumers and our Nation's airline industry.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 17, 1997]

MAKING AIRLINE TAXES PALATABLE

U.S. airline passengers can expect to be squeezed to help pay for a range of congressional tax cuts.

New taxes on air travel are inevitable, whether a Senate or House version of a revenue-raising measure is adopted. But the latter offers fliers a better and fairer deal.

The country's major airlines say they are not opposed to such taxes in principle. After all, they should be intended primarily to guarantee a reliable funding source for the Federal Aviation Administration, which operates the national air traffic control system and other support services.

But the big carriers have lobbied vigorously against the Senate's proposal to retain the existing 10 percent excise tax on most domestic tickets—reduced to 7.5 percent on some rural segments—and place a similar charge on the domestic portion of an international flight.

Instead, they have embraced a plan by House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Bill Archer for a 7.5 percent domestic tax with an additional $2 charge for each segment of a flight.

Both bills call for increased taxes on international travel. The House version is steeper, but is expected to be modified in conference.

Texas Republican Archer's bill is favored by Continental Airlines, the largest operator at Cleveland Hopkins International Airport, among comparable carriers that charge a variety of fares on most of their routes. But Southwest Airlines and other discount carriers prefer the Senate plan.

Continental rightly argues that under the Archer plan, fees for using the tax-supported airways would be more evenly distributed among the airlines, whatever their size. And the airline's numbers support this contention.

Continental also complains that imposing a tax on the domestic portion of a one-stop international flight, as in the Senate version, would put U.S. flag carriers at a disadvantage against foreign airlines that operate nonstop from U.S. gateway cities. Cleveland's case for adding a London flight could be damaged if such a tax is introduced, Continental says.

Airline excise taxes have been around since 1941, when a 5 percent levy was imposed on most means of travel. Before 1978, the government set ticket prices. But with deregulation's variations in ticket prices, different passengers on the same flight can pay different amounts in taxes for the same use of the air traffic control system.

Continental and the other major airlines argue that the Archer plan beings the tax system closer in concept to a user fee, which they believe the public would support. But its bigger appeal, for now, is that it would not make such a dent in the pocketbook.

CONSUMERS' NUTRITION AND HEALTH INFORMATION ACT

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. 2208—the Consumers' Nutrition and Health Information Act. I am pleased that my colleagues Representatives ED TOWNS, MARTIN FROST, and BOBBY RUSH are joining me in supporting this legislation as original cosponsors.

The Consumers Nutrition and Health Information Act is designed to increase consumers' access to timely, accurate information about the health benefits of foods and nutrients. It is very similar to the language on health claims contained in the Food and Drug Administration [FDA] reform bill reported with bipartisan support by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee last month.

The bill would permit manufacturers to make health claims on food labels without having to go through the long, complex FDA preapproval process when claims were based on authoritative statements published by the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for

Disease Control and Prevention, and other Federal scientific organizations with official responsibility for public health protection or research relating directly to human nutrition. The manufacturer would be required to notify the FDA of the proposed claim 120 days before its introduction to the market and would have to provide the FDA with an explanation of the basis for the claim.

The need for this legislation is perhaps best demonstrated by history of the health claim for the nutrient folic acid. In 1992, the Public Health Service reported that about half the 2,500 neural tube birth defects such as those that result in spina bifida that occur in the United States each year are preventable with sufficient folic acid consumption among women of childbearing age. One of the most effective means of getting this information out to women would have been on food labels. But the FDA did not approve this claim for food labels until 1996, a 4-year lag.

By giving a presumption of approvability to health claims for foods based on official, authoritative statements by Federal agencies such as the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, this legislation will better ensure the public's timely access to this important information. And by retaining the FDA's right to review such claims for 120 days before they are made, the legislation protects against false or misleading claims going to market.

I encourage my colleagues to join Representatives TOWNS, FROST, RUSH and me in cosponsoring this bill. Your support will highlight the importance of this reform and ensure that it is a key element of any broader FDA reform effort that may be undertaken in this Congress.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF TEXAS SENATOR FRANK MADLA

HON. CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, in my hometown of San Antonio, TX, tomorrow, a close friend and colleague in the Texas Legislature will be honored for 25 years of extraordinary public service to our community and State. Texas State Senator Frank Madla started life on a family ranch in the small town of Helotes, TX. His career stands as a testament to his values: helping others, dedication to family, and hard work. I am proud to know him, his wife, Helen Cruz Madla, and his children Frank III and Marci Morgan.

First elected to the Texas House of Representatives in 1972, Frank Madla has distinguished himself as an advocate for improving our education system, protecting the public health, preserving our environmental resources, helping others with the ravages of alcoholism and drug abuse, and relieving the challenges of mental retardation. After 20 years of service in the Texas House, he moved to the Texas Senate in 1993. His accomplishments include authoring legislation to increase health care access in rural areas and for indigent women and children, facilitate the delivery of services to persons with disabilities, create a gifted and talented program for Texas schools, find solutions to avert a water crisis in central Texas, and strengthen the child abuse reporting system. These are but examples of his many endeavors to increase public safety, streamline the delivery of essential services, and bring health care to those without it.

Unlike the Federal legislature, service in the Texas Legislature requires outside employment. Senator Madla prepared himself well by securing a strong education. He graduated from my alma mater of St. Mary's University in San Antonio with a bachelor and masters of arts degrees in government. From Our Lady of the Lake University, another of my alma mater's, he received certification in public school administration. Senator Madla is a teacher. His first job out of college was teaching history and civics at Escobar Junior High School. Senator Madla, since the beginning of his legislative career, has shared his academic and practical knowledge as an instructor in government and political science at Incarnate Word College and St. Mary's University. Beyond the classroom, he has been a teacher to his friends and colleagues, instructing us in the positive values he embodies.

I am not the only one who thinks highly of Senators Madla. His list of honors is too long for me to recount here. But the variety of groups that has recognized his accomplishments speaks volumes. Organizations representing education, the medical community, law enforcement, and public employees have honored Senator Madla with Legislator of the Year and other outstanding accolades. As someone who served with him, I can state with confidence that these awards are well deserved and hard earned. Senator Madla has dedicated his life to public service, to helping those who cannot always help themselves, to create opportunities for diverse communities. A quarter century of service is in itself a worthy accomplishment, but when done with such dedication and commitment, it is an outstanding achievement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT A. WEYGAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, 1997, I was unavoidably detained and was not, therefore, able to vote on rollcall votes 279 and 280. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted ''yea'' on both votes.

During that time, I was hosting an interactive cable TV show with Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Donna Shalala, and the vice president for government relations for the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, Max Richtman. Secretary Shalala and Mr. Richtman joined me to discuss and take phone calls from my constituents on the current congressional and Presidential proposals aimed at repairing the ailing Medicare System.

Many of the programs contained in H.R. 2158, the Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill are of great interest to me. A great amount of the HUD housing in my district is section 202 and section 811 housing for elderly and the disabled. I am pleased therefore, that the bill passed by the House provides $839 million for these programs.

I am also pleased that the legislation included $30 million for the YouthBuild program. YouthBuild is a HUD-funded program that provides academic and skills training to at-risk young men and women. Several weeks ago, I visited the YouthBuild program in Providence, RI. On that visit, I met 18 of the 20 YouthBuild trainees on their first day in the program. I was pleased to learn yesterday that only one of the students I met with has since left the program. The rest are now spending half their time in the classroom, many preparing for their GED's, and the rest of their time learning important job skills as they rehabilitate a previously abandoned three-story home. At the end of their work, the students will have learned valuable skills and provided housing for a worthy family.

The legislation also provides $7.23 billion for the Environmental Protection Agency and its important programs such as the Brownfields Program are also of great concern to my district.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill provides money for a wide range of programs that support science and space exploration. The National Science Foundation, which funds a wide variety of research projects at Rhode Island's universities, received more money than last fiscal year and more than requested in the President's budget. In addition, several NASA programs survived budget cutting. We have been reminded over the last few weeks of just how valuable NASA's work is to our Nation and the world. The drama associated with the difficult conditions faced by two Russians and an American on Mir has attracted worldwide concern. Farther away, the triumphs of a balloon-encased spacecraft and its breadbox-sized companion on the surface of Mars has piqued the interest of people worldwide about huge Martian floods and the prospect that our world may not be as unique as we once thought. Remarkably, at the same time, the space shuttle lifted off from Kennedy Flight Center, conducted important yet risky experiments and returned to Earth with hardly a notice.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. MAX SANDLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 1997

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 2107, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes:

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank Representative SIDNEY YATES and Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER for their efforts to save the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA] and the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH], and for raising the awareness of the importance of both agencies to education.

The cost to fund both the NEA and the NEH is less than $1 per taxpayer per year, and the return from both agencies is immeasurable. Small grants of a few thousand dollars

matched with private donations go a long way toward promoting arts education in school districts, and preserving our Nation's heritage in local communities. Through partnerships with State and local organizations, the NEA is able to integrate art into multiple educational and after school programs throughout the State of Texas. This means we are implementing new and innovative methods to help students develop problem solving and reasoning skills, hone communication ability, expand creativity, and instill self-esteem and discipline. All of these tools are important if we want our children to be successful in the 21st century.

For the past 4 years, the Dallas-based Partnership for the Arts, Culture, and Education, Inc., [PACE] conducted a study to determine the impact that arts education has on students' overall academic performance. Throughout the study they found teachers who used innovative ways to stimulate the minds of their students. One class learned the principles of physics during a trip to the symphony hall, while another class learned about the relationship of muscles to the skeleton from studying dance. The PACE study also found that the greater the exposure to the arts, the greater the student performance on standardized test scores.

In my district, the Texas Council of Humanities [TCH] in partnership with the NEH has taken an active role in advancement of humanities education through history, literature, religion, languages, and other fields related to culture and society in elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education. One grant recipient of TCH is Wiley College and Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, who received a $2,000 award for a symposium examining the roles of black women. In addition, TCH awarded a grant to Paris Junior College for the collection of data and a lecture series on the history and culture of the surrounding African-American community. Without the NEH, there would be no TCH or study of the history of an African-American community in a town called Paris, TX.

The NEA has continuously supported State and local organizations that bring arts to rural America. In my district, the NEA has given much needed support to organizations like the Texarkana Regional Arts and Humanities Council and the Marshall Regional Arts Council. These councils have funded various arts in education programs and touring companies throughout my district. The Texarkana Regional Arts and Humanities Council has presented talented groups, like the Amabile Piano Quartet and the Deeply Rooted Chicago Dance Theatre. In addition, the NEA has supported the Northeast Texas Communities in Schools, an organization that helps bring major performances to local schools.

The NEA also supports the Believe in Me after-school program in Austin, TX. This program uses dance to give youth, many of whom are involved in drug and gang activity, the tools they need to be successful in the community.

I cannot say that every child will turn out to be the next Einstein or Michelangelo or Maya Angelou, but we can give these children a solid foundation on which they can build their dreams. As the artistic director for the 52d Street project stated, ''There is no way to fast forward and know how the kids will look back on this, but I have seen joy in their eyes and have heard it in their voices and I have watched them take a bow and come up taller.''

I believe we must recognize the impact that the NEA and the NEH have on our heritage, culture, and economy, and the benefits to education. As a father of four children, I believe we have a responsibility to give our children every opportunity possible for success. And if the care and education and development of our children is not a priority role of Government, then what is?

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF LANDSAT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to say a few words to commemorate a significant milestone in our Nation's civil space program. July 23 marks the 25th anniversary of the launch of the first of the Landsat Earth observation satellites—satellites that have vastly increased our understanding of our home planet and provided innumerable practical benefits to our citizens.

I agree with the words of the then-Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Dr. James Fletcher, who stated in 1976 that if he had ''one space age development to save the world, it would be Landsat and its successor satellites.'' With a 25-year continuous record of unique and scientifically important accomplishments, Landsat has indeed saved the world—capturing in images an invaluable photographic record of the changes that have occurred on our planet.

It would be difficult to overstate the importance of what has been achieved with the Landsat program. The data from the Landsat spacecraft constitute the longest record of the Earth's landmass as seen from space. It is a record unmatched in detail, coverage, and quality. That data record has proven invaluable to the hundreds of users who observe and study the Earth, who manage and utilize its natural resources, and who monitor the changes brought on by natural processes and human activities. It has become an integral part of the U.S. Global Change Research Program and NASA's Mission to Planet Earth—critical initiatives that promise to deliver even more dramatic increases in our knowledge of the Earth in the coming decades.

The uses to which Landsat data have been put are myriad. For example, the data have been used to monitor timber losses in the Pacific Northwest, estimate soil moisture and snow cover, and forest growth. Landsat has been used to monitor strip mine reclamation, land use in urban areas, and water quality in the Nation's lakes. It has been reported that Landsat images have even been used by law firms gathering legal evidence and by fast food restaurants seeking to estimate whether population growth has been great enough in a geographical area to warrant awarding a new franchise.

Landsat was originally developed and launched by NASA in 1972 as an Earth Resources Technology Satellite [ERTS]. Landsat–1 was followed by a series of more advanced and capable spacecraft—a series that will continue with the scheduled launch of Landsat–7 in 1998. Landsat–7 will gather remotely sensed images of the Earth's land surface and its coastal regions for global change research, regional environmental change studies, national security uses, and many other civil and commercial applications.

In addition, NASA is preparing to launch a next-generation counterpart to Landsat: the Earth Orbiter–1 [EO–1]. The EO–1 mission will demonstrate advanced new detector technology that could dramatically lower the cost of acquiring Landsat-type data in the future.

What has the Landsat program achieved since that first launch 25 years ago? It has established the United States as the world leader in land remote sensing. It has contributed significantly to our understanding of the Earth. It has helped create an entire value-added industry based on the creative uses of Landsat data. It has delivered on the promise of using space technology to meet societal needs. In short, it has made our world a better place.

CONGRATULATIONS TO BROOME, NY

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the virtues that make America the greatest and freest nation this planet has ever seen can be found in their truest forms not in the giant megacities on either coast but in the small towns and villages in between. I'd like to mention one of them today, a very special one, in fact.

This year the town of Broome in Schoharie County in upstate New York is celebrating its 200th anniversary, making it nearly as old as our Nation itself.

The town of Broome was first known as Bristol when it was formed in 1797, but was changed to Broome in 1808 in honor of then Lt. Gov. John Broome.

The original town was much larger, with parts of the original town broken off to form or combine with the towns of Conesville, Gilboa, or Middleburgh. In fact, the first town meeting in 1836 was held in the house of Peter Richtmyer in the present day town of Conesville.

By 1860, Broome was a thriving community of hillside farms, businesses, and 2,182 people. Among the businesses was a quarry which supplied stones for the capital building in Albany. The changing economy and demographics of the 20th century reduced the population to 761, according to the 1980 census. But the 1990 census showed that the decline in population had been reversed, and the population increased to 926. Today, there are only seven working dairy farms left, and many of the town's 29,000 acres are occupied by summer homes and hunting camps.

What makes the town of Broome attractive for such purposes is what makes small town life so pleasant and popular in today's America.

Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased when that part of Schoharie County containing the town of Broome was added to our district in 1992. The same small-town virtues I mentioned, the pride, patriotism, and spirit of voluntarism, are found here in abundance.

A ceremony marking the town of Broome's 200 years of existence will be held at Firemen's Hall in the hamlet of Livingstonville on

Sunday, August 10. Mr. Speaker, I ask you and all members to join me in wishing this charming community of wonderful people a happy 200th birthday, with many best wishes as it approaches its third century.

SOUTHCOAST RADIO COMES TO WASHINGTON

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to declare how proud I am to have taken part today in a truly unique radio experience. Southeastern New England residents got a step closer to their Nation's Capital today thanks to a very special radio broadcast, live from my Washington office. WSAR-SouthCoast (1480 AM) brought a beehive of politics to the ears of a great many of my constituents back home, and I want to sincerely thank the station for demonstrating their commitment to keeping our community informed about important issues before our national legislature.

Modern technology and a couple of very resourceful radio personalities linked SouthCoast Radio to a long list of special guests. I want to thank Rick Edwards and Richard Trieff for making today an interesting and captivating experience for thousands of SouthCoast residents with their probing interviews of national journalists, Federal lawmakers, and administration officials.

I also want to thank all those who stopped by 512 Cannon this afternoon to share their views and to take callers' questions and comments. Rick and Richard tapped into the insider perspectives of top-notch political journalists like Chris Black of the Boston Globe, Jonathan Salant of the Associated Press, and Ellen Ratner of Talk Radio News Service. The radio team peppered with questions national legislators such as Representative BOB RILEY of Alabama, Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island, Representative JOHN TIERNEY, and Senator JOHN KERRY of Massachusetts, and SouthCoast Representatives BARNEY FRANK and myself.

Rick and Richard got a Clinton administration perspective on local Massachusetts issues by chatting with Maria Echaveste, Assistant to the President and Director of the Office of Public Liaison. And the talk radio duo got Fall River Mayor Ed Lambert and National Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids President Bob Novelli to discuss the remarkable efforts of the Greater Fall River Fresh Air Kids. It was certainly a lively day of political discussions for SouthCoast residents.

I commend Rick Edwards and Richard Trieff, and the entire crew at WSAR, for a day well spent on Capitol Hill. I want to thank Rick and Richard for making the trip down to our Nation's Capital, for putting together a first-rate docket of radio personalities, and for making it possible for SouthCoast residents to talk one-on-one with a number of Washington's movers and shakers. Phone lines were kept open throughout the 6-hour show, and a good number of southeastern Massachusetts and eastern Rhode Island listeners got to grill the men and women who write their laws, administer their programs, and produce their news.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation needs more civic journalism. WSAR's program today clearly illustrates how electronic journalism can grant special access to ordinary citizens, and how talk radio can connect people who are hundreds of miles apart. A functioning democracy depends upon the people's ability to express their ideas, questions, and concerns to those who represent them. Thanks to modern technology—and because of the efforts of committed civic journalists like Rick Edwards and Richard Trieff—we can continue to strengthen our democracy while keeping our local community informed.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1997

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill, H.R. 2160:

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Messrs. SCHUMER and MILLER.

Mr. Chairman, while I understand and appreciate the proponent's interests in pursuing this amendment, I believe their concerns are misplaced and their proposed remedy misguided. I have worked closely with my friend and colleague from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, on a number of important issues over the years, and I do not question his motives; however, I regret that we are once again at odds over this emotional agricultural matter.

Mr. Chairman, only last year, the Congress enacted major, far-reaching agricultural reform legislation. In that measure, we dramatically changed our Nation's long-standing policies affecting farming and agricultural markets, including sugar production—which, I believe, is the only program crop to lose the Government guarantee of a minimum price. I supported these efforts to reform and modernize the sugar price support program and believe these changes have benefitted all segments of the industry. These reforms represented an important first step.

However, we simply have not allowed enough time to pass to ensure we achieved our goals in revising the sugar program and determine whether these changes were sufficient. I would also remind my colleagues that this House defeated a similar amendment during the farm bill debate.

Mr. Chairman, for this reason alone, I believe it is unfair and unwise to make such a drastic change in the U.S. sugar program as proposed in the amendment at this time.

We will hear today that this is an issue of fairness and the free-market system; consumers will be pitted against farmers, producers against refiners and manufacturers. I believe these arguments are overly simplistic, picking and choosing statistics which best represent the proponents' arguments, and the distinctions they promote do an injustice to the sugar producers of our great Nation, be they farmers of sugarcane, sugarbeet, or corn.

Mr. Chairman, I do not deny that there are some very real differences between the proponents and opponents on the issue before us, and I doubt any amount of debate is likely to change the position of the amendment's authors. However, I have learned over my years in Congress, and as a New York City councilman, that no issue is one-sided, nor is there often only one all-inclusive right answer to a problem. Reasonable people can, and often do, disagree.

I believe the issue before us here today falls into that category. We differ on what the impacts of a particular program may or may not be, and how best to address these issues. But, I do not believe either side has a claim to the so-called high ground.

And, with all due respect to the amendment's proponents, I do not take a back seat to their concern for the American consumer. I represent a congressional district, a part of New York City, where the 1990 median family income was only around $30,000 a year. In the areas of Queens and the Bronx which I have the pleasure to represent, the cost of living is a very real issue with everyday impacts on the hard-working families of the 9th Congressional District of New York.

The proponents argue that their's is the only way to protect the consumer, to potentially lower the cost of sugar and products containing agricultural sweeteners by a few cents or, more likely, fractions of a cent. This is all well and good, if they can ensure the savings they propose will indeed be passed along to the American consumer. A prospect which they can not guarantee.

But, cost aside, the proponents can also not be sure their amendment, if approved, would not seriously disrupt the supply and availability of sugar throughout our country.

Mr. Chairman, my constituents do not benefit if they have the potential of saving a penny or two on a product but can no longer obtain that commodity or the product is no longer available in a sufficient and steady supply to meet their needs.

I have often commented in meetings I have had over the years that I am unaware of any farms in my urban district, except for one lone victory garden started during World War II. But, I am sure of one thing, and that is that each and every one of my constituents eats and needs a secure, steady supply of produce and food products at a reasonable price. As such, I will continue to support those programs which I believe ensure just that, and oppose those measures which I believe will not.

I will note here, also, that New York State does play a role in domestic sugar production, with numerous farms that grow corn which is utilized in sweetener production.

Mr. Chairman, my strong, historic support of agriculture programs, including sugar, and the associated refining and processing infrastructure, is based upon this—perhaps simplistic—premise: That the United States must continue to ensure all its people are provided the best, most secure, and stable source of food products possible. And, I believe this goal is best accomplished by reducing our dependence on foreign sources of agriculture products through the encouragement and promotion of a strong domestic agriculture system, and challenging unfair, anti-competitive foreign sources of food.

While we are usually on the same side of most food related issues, from time to time, I part paths with this Nation's food processors. As is the case here, I side with the producers

and not the refiners and processors. I do not fault them for their support of this amendment and the desired changes they seek in the sugar program, and I know we will work together on future issues of mutual concern.

I believe the virtual elimination of this program as now proposed would place the U.S. sugar industry as a whole, and the American consumer in particular, at the mercy of the inconsistent and heavily subsidized world sugar market.

Unlike my colleagues who support the amendment, I simply do not believe the American consumer is likely to realize a significant, if any, benefit should the amendment prevail. But, I am concerned that the domestic producers of sugar could suffer from reduced prices and would be made particularly vulnerable to foreign sources of sugar.

While refiners may pass along their savings, I seriously doubt many processors are likely to reciprocate. While the cumulative amounts being bandied about today are significant, and represent real money regardless of one's social standing, the bottom-line is that we are talking about pennies or fractions of pennies on a commodity basis.

Quite frankly, I do not even know how one would calculate the savings that say a manufacturer should pass along for their finished product that now may cost them a fraction of a cent less to produce. Are we likely to see cans of soda from a machine selling for 59 cents instead of 60 cents?

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to some very basic statistics which I believe make clear the short-sightedness of the amendment.

The current sugar program operates at no cost to the Federal Government, and a special marketing tax on sugar farmers is earmarked for deficit reduction;

U.S. consumers pay an average of 25–28 cents less for sugar than do shoppers in other developed countries;

From 1990 to 1995, the retail price of sugar actually decreased approximately 7 percent;

U.S. retail sugar prices are approximately 32 percent below the average of other developed countries and the third lowest in the developed world;

New York consumers pay 5 percent less for sugar than the average consumer worldwide;

Close to a billion dollars are generated each year by the U.S. sugar industry in the State of New York alone; and, finally,

More than 5,690 jobs in New York State rely on the sugar industry.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and cast a vote in favor of a strong, fair and balanced domestic sugar program and product to the American farmer.

A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

HON. CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELÓ

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, today, as the sole representative of the 3.8 million disenfranchised U.S. citizens living in Puerto Rico, I am introducing a bill to amend section 301(h) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act that would allow the Puerto Rico Aqueduct and Sewer Authority [PRASA] to apply for a waiver from certain wastewater treatment requirements affecting its Mayaguez facility.

Under existing law the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] is not allowed to accept new applications for waivers from secondary treatment requirements. The proposal does not alter the rigorous criteria for issuing a waiver nor does it override the judgment of EPA. Our proposal reflects the goal of both Congress and the administration to find innovative, alternative and less-costly ways to apply existing statutes without compromising the environmental objectives underlying existing law.

Many scientists and experts agree that plans to construct deep ocean outfalls at locations can provide the best environmental and economic alternative for wastewater treatment. The plans would not only preserve but would even improve the coastal environments where these discharges occur.

PRASA proposes the construction of a deep ocean outfall that would release primary treated wastewater miles from shore at a depth and location that will have no adverse impact on human and marine life.

This alternative would improve the coral environment where the current outfall discharges and would also save the Government of Puerto Rico about $65 million over 20 years that can be spent to address other water supply and infrastructure problems affecting the island.

EPA and the Department of Justice have agreed to enter into a consent order with PRASA that provides for deep water ocean outfall alternative to a secondary treatment plant. However, this alternative cannot even be considered without this legislation; and under the terms of the consent order, this alternative can only be considered if this legislation is enacted by August 1, 1998.

PRASA is currently conducting an Environmental Impact Statement review to assess relative benefits of the two treatment alternatives. This EIS will be completed before August 1, 1998 and will help EPA determine which alternative is preferable. If this legislation is enacted, EPA will have this choice; if it is not enacted, there will be no choice, regardless of the environmental or economic consequences. This is what this proposal will accomplish. It is a sound approach to environmental regulations.

It is imperative to stress the fact that this is only a limited and technical amendment that allows PRASA to refile under section 301(h). PRASA would be required by EPA to meet the same stringent legal and scientific tests, conduct the same environmental studies and implement the same monitoring program applicable to existing recipients of section 301(h) waivers. This amendment would not assure that a waiver would be granted; that decision would remain entirely within EPA's discretion.

EPA will be the ultimate decisionmaker, and will determine if PRASA's proposed alternative is feasible and environmentally beneficial. If after the review, that alternative is acceptable, then PRASA will immediately begin construction on the facility, with discharge location approved by the EPA. If EPA finds the alternative unacceptable, then PRASA will proceed with construction of the secondary treatment plant.

Puerto Rico is not asking for preferential treatment. Rather, we are only requesting that EPA balance the cost of constructing a secondary treatment facility against the environmental, economic, and social benefits of constructing an outfall at a deep water location.

There are precedents for such limited amendment to section 301(h), recently for San Diego during the 105th Congress. In the instance of San Diego, legislation was enacted to permit EPA to consider a section 301(h) waiver application proposing a similar alternative to secondary treatment. I believe we deserve the same opportunity to implement alternatives and seek a section 301(h) waiver.

My environmental record speaks for itself. I would not support any measure that I believe compromises our resources or the environment of the island. I urge my colleagues to consider this proposal and its commonsense approach. The proposal is limited and targeted, provides for an efficient process, does not modify existing standards and would be implemented by EPA only if environmental and economic objectives are accomplished. I am hopeful that it will receive favorable congressional action at an early date.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, last week I missed a series of postponed votes because my pager did not function. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on Rollcall No. 270, ''no'' on Rollcall No. 271, ''no'' on Rollcall No. 272, and ''no'' on Rollcall No. 273.

A TRIBUTE TO LEWIS H. VAN DUSEN, JR.

HON. JON D. FOX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to tell you that Lewis Harlow Van Dusen, Jr., of Pennsylvania is this year's winner of the American Bar Association's Michael Franck Professional Responsibility Award. This important award is given annually by the American Bar Association to a lawyer for outstanding contribution to the field of professional responsibility. The award is to be formally presented to Mr. Van Dusen by N. Lee Cooper, the president of the ABA, on Friday, August 1 in San Francisco, CA, in connection with the American Bar Association's annual meeting.

Mr. Van Dusen received his undergraduate degree from Princeton University and his bachelor of civil law from Oxford University in England. He served with distinction on the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility longer than any lawyer in the history of the ABA except his own partner, Henry S. Drinker—from 1953 to 1956 and then again from 1962 to 1974, chairing the committee for the last 3 years. During his tenure the ABA adopted the model code of professional responsibility which is still the current ethics code in a dozen jurisdictions. The committee, under Van

Dusen's leadership, tackled some of the most difficult ethics issues confronting the modern bar and his entire career has been dedicated to maintaining and improving the ethics of his chosen profession.

Mr. Van Dusen led the esteemed firm of Drinker Biddle & Reath for 35 years, beginning his law career at Drinker in 1935. He is currently counsel to the firm. His areas of concentration have included litigation, labor, transportation, estate planning, environmental and international law.

Mr. Van Dusen was chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association in 1968 and president of the Pennsylvania Bar Association in 1974 and 1975. In addition, Mr. Van Dusen is also a member of the International Bar Association.

Mr. Van Dusen served with distinction in the U.S. Army from 1942 to 1945 ultimately as lieutenant colonel. Mr. Van Dusen was honored for his service when awarded the Bronze Star Medal, Decorated Purple Heart, Legion of Merit of the United States, and Legion of Honor, Croix de Guerre of France.

Mr. Van Dusen was one of the founders of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO]. In addition, he has been active in the American Philosophical Society, the American Judicature Society, the American Law Institute, the American Bar Foundation and the American College of Trial Lawyers. He also serves as a permanent member of the Judicial Conference for the Third Circuit and from 1980 to 1982, he served on the Committee to Study Pennsylvania's Unified Judicial System.

Mr. Van Dusen is the consummate Philadelphia lawyer. I am proud to bring this well deserved honor to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO THE FIRST ARMENIAN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF FRESNO

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the First Armenian Presbyterian Church of Fresno, CA, which is celebrating its 100th anniversary this year. The Armenian commitment to religion is symbolized by the birth and expansion of this church.

The First Armenian Presbyterian Church of Fresno was the first Armenian church organized in the State of California. It began on July 25, 1897 when 40 men and women met in a hall in Fresno. The church was duly received and enrolled in the fellowship of Presbyterian churches by the Presbytery of Stockton at a meeting in Oakland, CA, on October 20, 1897. The first session was formed and the Reverend Avedis Vartanian, Khachig Michaelian, and Hagop Azhderian were elected as the first ruling elders.

The church had its origins in the Armenian Ladies' Patriotic Society established in Fresno on May 1, 1892. The declared purpose of the society was to support orphans, ministers, and evangelists in Armenia. In 1913, the society changed its name to the Women's Benevolent Society of the First Armenian Presbyterian Church and is now commonly known as the Ladies' Aid Society.

The Reverend L.T. Burbank preached the first sermon of the church in the Armenian language and was invited and unanimously elected as the first pastor of the church. Following the ministry of Rev. Burbank came the construction of a church building at the corner of Santa Clara and Fulton Streets. This steepled, octagon sanctuary was recognized most notably through the writings of the late William Soroyan, who—as a boy—attended the church and wrote about his experiences.

The communicant membership of the church has grown from 40 charter members to 450. The Sunday school and four Bible study groups are providing Christian education to believers of every age. Fellowship groups minister to the needs of the young, the old, the married, the single, and the Armenian-speaking. Additionally, a building committee has completed the construction of a social hall, the final phase of a 25-year expansion program.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I honor the First Amenian Presbyterian Church of Fresno, CA. The focus and religious excellence of the church serves as a model for religious establishments all over the world. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing the First Armenian Presbyterian Church continued success and inspirational religious teachings.

DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION RESTORATION ACT OF 1997

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation that will begin to address an inherent unfairness under present law that affects the surviving widows of our Nation's veterans. As you know, many of these veterans gave their lives for our country, yet their surviving spouses are now being denied benefits that were promised to them.

In 1970, Congress enacted legislation that guaranteed widows of military veterans who died from service-connected disability that their dependency and indemnity compensation [DIC] benefits would be reinstated upon the termination of the widow's subsequent marriage(s) by death or divorce.

The apparent rationale behind this reinstatement policy was twofold: first, to encourage DIC widows to remarry, thereby removing them from the DIC rolls and saving the Federal Government money; and second, bring veterans' benefits statutes in line with other Federal survivor programs, e.g. Federal Civil Service employees, Social Security annuitants, which granted reinstatement rights in this instance.

However, in 1990, Congress passed the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 which abruptly terminated DIC reinstatement rights for widows who lost these benefits upon remarriage. To make matters worse, the Department of Veterans Affairs never formally notified DIC widows of their loss of reinstatement rights, thereby relegating notice to be disseminated by word-of-mouth or by notices in publications of military and retiree organizations.

As you would suspect, many widows continued to apply to the VA for reinstatement of their benefits, only to learn for the first time that their benefits were being denied. Imagine the shock and surprise of these widows who were never notified of the change in the law, many making financial planning decisions under the mistaken assumption that they would be eligible for reinstatement if their subsequent marriage ended by death or divorce.

Mr. Speaker, my bill will reinstate DIC eligibility for widows who were remarried before November 1, 1990 and whose second or subsequent marriage is terminated by death or divorce. Recognizing the budget restraints under which Congress must operate, I initially have set the compensation rate at 50 percent of the current DIC rate. The bill would also require the Department of Veterans Affairs to notify all current and previously eligible DIC widows of the change.

I urge all of my colleagues to please consider supporting this bill.

TRIBUTE TO CHESTERFIELD SMITH

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, this weekend is the 80th birthday of a U.S. institution, Chesterfield Smith. A celebration to take place in Tampa, FL will no doubt include most of the luminaries of the bar over the past half century. Most luminous among them will be the birthday boy.

Chesterfield Smith is truly America's lawyer. Few can imagine—let alone accomplish—many of the things he has. He was one of the first to conceptualize the national law firm. He built one, Holland and Knight, which is a Florida-based powerhouse.

He was also the first to conceptualize an activist agenda for the American Bar Association which he served as president in 1973, and for many years before and since. Then he accomplished it, and that institution was forever changed.

His challenge to his, and my, profession has been to provide quality, affordable legal services for all persons in need. He has fought for funding for the Legal Services Corporation, but also for personal responsibility by individuals and law firms to fill in where Government funding has been lacking. He has always been a role model.

Mr. Speaker, Chesterfield will tell you in his best Southern twang that he's ''just a country lawyer.'' He certainly is. And he's a lot of other things. Probably more than anyone else, Chesterfield Smith has changed the way law is practiced and the way the world's largest law advocacy organization operates. Not bad.

And, Mr. Speaker, let's not speak in the past tense. As one who has collaborated with Chesterfield for more than a quarter century, I know how much he still can do. The next generation of lawyers needs him to conceptualize ever new forms of practice and advocacy.

As one of Chesterfield's many, many fortunate friends and self-appointed leader of his congressional fan club, I send warmest wishes to him, Jacqueline and his partners and colleagues on this very special milestone.

TOWARD A FREE AND PEACEFUL CYPRUS

HON. ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reflect on Cyprus' troubled history. For years, the people of Cyprus have suffered under the yoke of Turkish aggression. But I also rise to look with hope toward the future. For recent events have left the people of Cyprus with the best hopes for peace they have had in decades.

Cyprus is a unique nation, one which has always served as a bridge between the cultures of East and West. The mix of cultures of the Cypriot people was for generations a blessing rather than a curse. Almost four decades ago, when Cyprus was granted independence from Britain, it appeared that for the first time in centuries the Cypriot people would be able to determine their destiny. But that opportunity was torn from their grasp by the threat of outside aggression. In 1974, that threat was realized when the Turkish military invaded Cyprus, dividing the island and causing immeasurable pain and suffering. While the idea of ethnic cleansing was not invented on Cyprus, it was carried out with brutal efficiency. Thousands were forced out of their homes, never to return. Families were torn apart, separated only by an artificial line drawn by aggression. Cyrpus' natural beauty was forever scarred by outside invaders.

As Americans, it is vital that we support the peace process in Cyprus while the opportunity remains. The United States is uniquely situated to play an important and constructive role in the effort to build peace in Cyprus. The President's recent appointment of Richard Holbrooke as his special representative to Cyprus is especially welcome. Ambassador Holbrooke has ably demonstrated his skill as a peacemaker and a diplomat. His role in the process only serves to reassure optimists that the opportunity for peace is real, and that the United States is deeply committed to the effort for peace in Cyprus. We cannot let this opportunity slip out of our grasp. We must stand with the people of Cyprus as they work to throw off the yoke of Turkish oppression.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE HAND OVER OF HONG KONG ON TAIWAN

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, on June 30th of this year, British rule over Hong Kong ended and the former British colony was returned to China. I was honored to be a member of the congressional delegation to observe the reversion of Hong Kong to PRC control. On that same day, as the celebration was taking place in Hong Kong, Taiwan's President Lee Teng-hui, authored an article which was published in USA Today discussing the implications of the hand over of Hong Kong for the future relations between the 21 million people living in a democratic society in Taiwan and the more than one billion people who have yet to experience freedom and democracy on the Chinese mainland. As President Lee correctly notes in his article, The Republic of China has undergone a dramatic transformation from a country operating under martial law to a full fledged democracy with a vibrant market economy.

President Lee is justifiably proud of the achievements his country has made in the past decade, much of which has taken place while President Lee has been Taiwan's leader. President Lee states in this article that he hopes the government on the Chinese mainland will undergo a similar democratic transformation in the next decade but properly notes that, to date, there has been little progress on the mainland toward achieving the twin goals of freedom and justice. President Lee believes when this transformation occurs on the mainland, reunification across the Straits of Taiwan will become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, having seen Taiwan make the dramatic change to market-oriented democracy, President Lee believes Hong Kong should be able to maintain its democratic status and the Chinese mainland ought to embrace democracy in the first decade of the 21st century. This is a lofty goal, but one that I know all of my colleagues hope will occur. In the meantime, we must look toward the island of Taiwan as a beacon of democracy in a very complex and rapidly changing area of Southeast Asia. In the light of the recent events in Hong Kong, I urge my colleagues to read the article I included with my statement.

TAIWAN YIELDS MODEL FOR A FREE HONG KONG

(By Lee Teng-hui)

Today, the era of colonial rule will come to an end in Hong Kong. This is a proud event for all Chinese wherever they are, and offers a new opportunity for creating a democratic Chinese nation. We earnestly hope that the Beijing authorities will be able to maintain the prosperity and stability of Hong Kong, and will ensure that the people of Hong Kong continue to enjoy freedom, democracy and basic human rights. This is the only way to act in accord with the joint values and trends of mankind today, regional peace and development, and the common dignity and interests of all Chinese people.

Taiwan's experience offers reason for optimism.

A little more than one year ago, the Republic of China successfully held a direct presidential election on Taiwan, completing a crucial objective of our political reform. At the time, the concept of constitutional government stressed by Americans over two-hundred years ago kept coming to my mind: ''. . . all Men are created equal, . . . they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, . . . among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness . . . to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Government.''

Indeed, with the joint effort of the entire populace and their government, the Republic of China has upheld the principle of popular sovereignty on Taiwan, and has succeeded in lifting martial law, liberalizing the formation of political parties, realizing the practice of free speech, re-electing all national parliamentarians who had been in office for a long time, and carrying out a direct presidential election. Through these endeavors, the Republic of China has undergone profound change, and has become a full-fledged democracy.

However, we cannot overlook the fact that still over 20 percent of the world's population, most of whom live on the Chinese mainland, have no way to enjoy these rights. The Chinese on both sides of the Taiwan Strait share the same cultural and racial heritage. Thus, there is no reason why we cannot jointly build a system of democracy and freedom, and fully exercise our God-given rights.

In 1979, before martial law was lifted in Taiwan, a number of protesters demonstrating against government censorship of their magazine were arrested and jailed in what became known as the Kaohsiung Incident. At the same time, the Chinese communists authorities arrested the human rights activist Wei Jingsheng. Today, many of those involved in the Kaohsiung Incident have redeemed themselves through the ballot box and have become important elected political leaders on Taiwan. However, Mr. Wei remains in jail. The marked differences in systems and values between the two sides are the fundamental reason why each of the two parts of the China we all want to see reunified one day still remain separate political entities.

Democracy has become a world trend, and is without doubt the greatest achievement of mankind this century. One reason civilization continues to progress is that we have the courage to realize our dreams, and we have the heart to care about each other and provide mutual support. We must continue to uphold this spirit and sentiment, so that democracy ultimately becomes the common way of life of all humanity. May people living in every corner of the global village enjoy democracy!

Thus, we cherish the young buds of democracy on the Chinese mainland. Certain forms of election in rural townships and villages have spread on the mainland in recent years. We are happy to see it succeed and call on the Chinese mainland authorities to show the courage and determination to boldly take the grand route to democracy. Join with us and bring democracy to all of Chinese society, seeking everlasting well-being and peace for the Chinese people!

Unquestionably, if Taiwan can achieve democracy, then Hong Kong should be able to maintain democracy, and there is no reason why the Chinese mainland can not do everything possible to head in that direction. This is the true way to solve the China problem.

In the 21st century, Mankind will certainly prove that ''All roads lead to Democracy!''

SANCTIONS ON RUSSIAN ENTITIES

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing bipartisan legislation to express congressional sentiment that the proliferation of missile technology to Iran from any source in Russia be stopped.

There is substantial evidence in support of allegations that Russian entities have provided assistance to Iran's missile program. According to February 1997 reports by the Los Angeles Times and the Washington Times, Russia has transferred SS–4 guidance components to Iran. In May, the Washington Times further reported that two Russian companies, the Central Aerohydrodynamic Institute and Inor, had contracted with Iran to supply missile parts and technology, including a wind tunnel

for missile design, missile design software, and laser equipment. In a recent unclassified report, the CIA said that Russia has been a primary source of missile-related goods to Iran.

The transfer of this technology is serious. Missiles modeled on the Russian SS–4 would have a reach of 2000 km—enough to threaten United States installations in the Middle East and Persian Gulf, Israel, and our NATO ally Turkey. Ironically such capabilities also threaten the territory of Russia itself.

Let's not forget the lessons of the Persian Gulf war, when Iran targeted Israel with SCUD missiles: rogue countries that have these capabilities will not be deterred. Next time they may choose to add chemical or biological warheads.

I have expressed these concerns regarding Russian assistance to Iran to Vice President Gore, National Security Advisor Sandy Berger, and the Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. They assured me that the Administration would address this issue and subsequently, it did raise it with the highest levels of the Russian Government.

In several meetings, I have also expressed my strong concern to Russian Ambassador Yuliy Vorontsov. The Ambassador told me that the Russian Government shares our concern about the threat of proliferation. He said it is investigating seriously these allegations to determine responsibility. Yet, we have not seen any tangible efforts so far that Russia has tried to punish those entities responsible for exporting missile technology to Iran.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the Russian Government take all appropriate steps to cease the cooperation between Russian entities and Iran. The Russian Government has the legislative and regulatory tools at its disposal to stop unauthorized transactions of missile technology. We are asking that they use them.

If we do not see clear evidence that Russia has taken practical steps to stop missile assistance to Iran, the resolution calls on the United States to enact the sanctions provided for in Presidential Executive Order 12938 on the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction. This means freezing the assets and seizing the property of those entities responsible for proliferation.

The resolution also calls for tougher standards for providing United States aid to Russia.

Lastly, the resolution urges our European allies to join us in taking action against those Russian organizations and individuals responsible for exports that violate international agreements.

Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the special constraints on the Russian Federation as it seeks to improve its export control system—not the least of which are the economic conditions of that country. But stopping missile technology proliferation to Iran is in everyone's interest. It is time for Russia to act.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan concurring resolution

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed Treasury/Postal Service Appropriations, Military Construction Appropriations, and VA/HUD Appropriations.

The House passed H.R. 1853, Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act.

House Committee ordered reported the following appropriations for fiscal year 1998: Defense; Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education; and Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7785–S7878

Measures Introduced: Nine bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1045–1053. **Pages S7862–63**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1048, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998. (S. Rept. No. 105–55)

H.R. 2107, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 105–56) **Page S7862**

Measures Passed:

Treasury/Postal Service Appropriations, 1998: By a unanimous vote of 99 yeas (Vote No. 191), Senate passed S. 1023, making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, after taking action on further amendments proposed thereto, as follows:

Pages S7785–S7803

Adopted:

By 54 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 190), Campbell (for DeWine) Amendment No. 936, to prohibit the use of funds to pay for an abortion or pay for the administrative expenses in connection with certain health plans that provide coverage for abortions.

Pages S7787–90

Kohl (for Bingaman) Amendment No. 937, to strike provisions prohibiting the use of appropriated funds for the sole source procurement of energy conservation measures. (By 35 yeas to 64 nays (Vote No. 189), Senate earlier failed to table the amendment.) **Pages S7786–87**

Military Construction Appropriations, 1998: By 98 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 192), Senate passed H.R. 2016, making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, after agreeing to committee amendments, and the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S7814–23**

Burns (for Ford/McConnell) Amendment No. 946, to clarify the availability of funds for activities under the lease of Building No. 1, Lexington, Blue Grass Station, Lexington, Kentucky. **Pages S7818, S7821**

Senate insisted on its amendments, requested a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair appointed the following conferees: Senators Burns, Hutchison, Faircloth, Craig, Stevens, Murray, Reid, Inouye, and Byrd. **Page S7823**

VA/HUD Appropriations, 1998: By 99 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. 194), Senate passed H.R. 2158, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, after striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of S. 1034, Senate companion measure, and after taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows:

Pages S7803–12, S7823–57

Adopted:

Graham Amendment No. 948, to express the sense of the Senate that Congress should consider legislation concerning catastrophic natural disasters. **Pages S7825–26**

Wellstone/Mikulski Amendment No. 949, to state the sense of the Senate regarding appropriations for discretionary activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs in fiscal years 1999 through 2002. **Page S7827**

Wellstone Amendment No. 950, to provide for the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs to hold hearings to consider certain disease related legislation. **Pages S7827–30**

Mikulski Amendment No. 951, to provide for increased funding for empowerment zones and enterprise communities. **Pages S7830–33**

Bumpers Amendment No. 954, to earmark funds for a National Research Council report on the Space Station program. **Page S7843**

Bumpers Amendment No. 955, regarding J–1 visas for doctors at Veterans Administration hospitals. **Page S7843**

Bond Amendment No. 956, to enable the State of Florida to use prior EPA Title II funds for a grant for wastewater treatment. **Pages S7843–45**

Bond (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 957, to limit the use of locality pay differential that would provide a pay increase to an employee transferred as a result of sexual harassment. **Pages S7843–45**

Bond (for Gorton) Amendment No. 958, to limit participation in the Native American Housing Block Grants Program under certain conditions. **Pages S7843–45**

Bond (for Shelby) Amendment No. 959, to make funds available for the Neutral Buoyancy Simulator program of NASA. **Pages S7843–45**

Bond/Mikulski Amendment No. 960, to make certain technical and clerical corrections. **Pages S7843, S7845**

Rejected:

Bumpers Amendment No. 944, to reduce the appropriation for the implementation of the space station program for the purpose of terminating the program. (By 69 yeas to 31 nays (Vote No. 193), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S7804–09, S7833–34, S7836–41**

Withdrawn:

Allard Amendment No. 947, to make an amendment relating to the use of public housing operating funds to provide tenant-based assistance. **Pages S7826–27**

D'Amato Amendment No. 952, to require reports by the Comptroller General on the allocation of health care resources of the Department of Veterans Affairs under the Veterans Integrated Service Network system and the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation system. **Pages S7834–36**

Bumpers Amendment No. 953, to cap the cost of the Space Station. **Pages S7841–42**

Senate insisted on its amendment, requested a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair appointed the following conferees: Senators Bond, Burns, Stevens, Shelby, Campbell, Craig, Cochran, Mikulski, Leahy, Lautenberg, Harkin, Boxer, and Byrd. **Page S7857**

Subsequently, S. 1034 was returned to the Senate calendar. **Page S7857**

Agriculture Appropriations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for the consideration of S. 1033, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, on Wednesday, July 23, 1998. **Page S7878**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Philip Lader, of South Carolina, to be Ambassador to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. **Page S7878**

Communications: **Pages S7861–62**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S7863–69**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S7869–70**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S7870–72**

Authority for Committees: **Pages S7872–73**

Additional Statements: **Pages S7873–78**

Record Votes: Six record votes were taken today. (Total—194) **Pages S7787, S7790–91, S7823, S7841, S7857**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:45 a.m., and adjourned at 6:59 p.m., until 9 a.m., on Wednesday, July 23, 1997. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7878.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

CLEAN AIR REGULATIONS AND AGRICULTURE

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry: Committee concluded hearings to examine the impact of Environmental Protection Agency revisions to the national ambient air quality standards for ground-level ozone and particulate matter on the agriculture industry, after receiving testimony from Carol M. Browner, Administrator, Environmental Protection

Agency; Phillip J. Wakelyn, National Cotton Council of America, on behalf of the Department of Agriculture Agricultural Air Quality Task Force, and Adam J. Sharp, American Farm Bureau Federation, both of Washington, D.C.; and Robert C. Junk, Jr., Pennsylvania Farmers Union, Harrisburg, on behalf of the National Farmers Union.

APPROPRIATIONS—TRANSPORTATION/INTERIOR

Committee on Appropriations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following bills:

An original bill (S. 1048) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998; and

H.R. 2107, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, with amendments.

APPROPRIATIONS—LABOR/HHS/EDUCATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies approved for full committee consideration an original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998.

FEDERAL MASS TRANSIT PROGRAM

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded hearings to examine the importance of the Federal mass transit program and proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, after receiving testimony from Gordon J. Linton, Administrator, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation; Derick Berlage, Montgomery County, Maryland, on behalf of the National Association of Counties; John P. Poorman, Capital District Transportation Committee/Metropolitan Planning Organization, Albany, New York, on behalf of the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations; Edward Wytkind, Transportation Trades Department/AFL–CIO, William Millar, American Public Transit Association, Barbara Singleton, Community Transportation Association of America, Hank Dittmar, Surface Transportation Policy Project, Bernice Shepard, American Association of Retired Persons, and Nancy J. Smith, Project ACTION/National Easter Seals Society, all of Washington, D.C.; and Eugene J. Berardi, Jr., Adirondack Trailways, Kingston, New York, on behalf of the American Bus Association.

WARD VALLEY LAND TRANSFER

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee held hearings to examine the Department of the Interior's review of the proposed transfer of federal land in Ward Valley to the State of California for use as a site for the disposal of commercially generated low-level radioactive waste, and S. 964, proposed Ward Valley Land Transfer Act, receiving testimony from Senator Boxer; Representatives Bilbray and George Miller; Gary Jones, Acting Associate Director, Energy, Resources, and Science Issues, Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division, General Accounting Office; John Garamendi, Deputy Secretary of the Interior; and California Deputy Cabinet Secretary Michael A. Kahoe, Sacramento, on behalf of California Governor's Office and California Department of Health Services.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded hearings on the nomination of Stanley O. Roth, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Robb, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

CENTRAL ASIA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded hearings to examine United States foreign policy in the independent states of the Caucasus and Central Asia, after receiving testimony from Stuart E. Eizenstat, Under Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs; Caspar Weinberger, Forbes, Inc., Lt. Gen. William E. Odom, USA (Ret.), Hudson Institute, and Paul A. Goble, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, all of Washington, D.C.; and Martha Brill Olcott, Colgate University, Hamilton, New York, on behalf of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

CAMPAIGN FINANCING INVESTIGATION

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Committee met in open and closed session to discuss certain immunity issues with regard to the special investigation on campaign financing, but made no announcements, and recessed subject to call.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded hearings on the nominations of Frank M. Hull, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, Joseph F. Bataillon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska,

Robert Charles Chambers, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of West Virginia, Janet C. Hall, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, and Christina A. Snyder, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf. Mr. Hull was introduced by Senators Coverdell and Cleland; Mr. Bataillon was introduced by Senators Hagel and Kerrey, Mr. Chambers was introduced by Senators Byrd and Rockefeller, Ms. Hall was introduced by Senators Dodd and Lieberman, and Ms. Snyder was introduced by Senator Feinstein.

WOMEN'S HEALTH

Committee on Labor and Human Resources: Committee concluded hearings to examine how information relating to women's health care is communicated to women and their providers, and on proposed legislation to provide comprehensive patient protections through improved access to quality health plans and continued research in women's health issues, after receiving testimony from Vermont State Senator Barbara W. Snelling, Shelburne; Phyllis Greenberger, Society for the Advancement of Women's Health Research, and Judith L. Lichtman, Women's Legal Defense Fund, both of Washington, D.C.; Judith H. LaRosa, Tulane University School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, New Orleans, Louisiana, on behalf of the American Heart Association; Bradley A. Arrick, Dartmouth Medical School, Hanover, New Hampshire; Gloria Feldt, Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Phoenix, Arizona; and Mary J. O'Sullivan, University of Miami, Miami, Florida.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 17 public bills, H.R. 2205–2221; and 1 resolution, H. Con. Res. 118, were introduced. **Page H5569**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 192, providing for consideration of H.R. 2003, to reform the budget process and enforce the bipartisan balanced budget agreement of 1997 (H. Rept. 105–195); and

H.R. 2209, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998 (H. Rept. 105–196); and

H. Res. 193, providing for consideration of H.R. 2160, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998 (H.Rept. 105–197).

Pages H5568–69

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Emerson to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H5493

Recess: The House recessed at 1:17 p.m. and reconvened at 2:00 p.m. **Page H5499**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Shackleford Banks, North Carolina Wild Horses Protection Act: H.R. 765, to ensure maintenance of a herd of wild horses in Cape Lookout National Seashore (passed by a recorded vote of 416 ayes to 6 noes, Roll No. 290); **Pages H5501–03, H5544–45**

Warner Canyon, Oregon Ski Hill Land Exchange Act of 1997: H.R. 1944, to provide for a land exchange involving the Warner Canyon Ski Area and other land in the State of Oregon (passed by a recorded vote of 423 ayes with none voting "no", Roll No. 291); **Pages H5503–04, H5545**

Maintenance of Dams and Weirs in the Emigrant Wilderness: H.R. 1663, amended, to clarify the intent of the Congress in Public Law 93–632 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to provide for the maintenance of 18 concrete dams and weirs that were located in the Emigrant Wilderness at the time the wilderness area was designated as wilderness in that Public Law (passed by a recorded vote of 424 ayes to 2 noes, Roll No. 292);

Pages H5504–05, H5545–46

Trademark Law Treaty Implementation Act: H.R. 1661, amended, to implement the provisions of the Trademark Law Treaty (passed by a recorded vote of 425 ayes with none voting "no", Roll No. 293); **Pages H5505–07, H5546–47**

Lasting Peace and Stability on Cyprus: H. Con. Res. 81, amended, calling for a United States initiative seeking a just and peaceful resolution of the situation on Cyprus (agreed to by a recorded vote of 417 ayes to 4 noes, Roll No. 294);

Pages H5507–11, H5547

Democratic Elections In El Salvador: H. Con. Res. 88, congratulating the Government and the

people of the Republic of El Salvador on successfully completing free and democratic elections on March 16, 1997 (agreed to by a recorded vote of 419 ayes to 3 noes, Roll No. 295); **Pages H5511–13, H5547–48**

Coup d'Etat In Sierra Leone: H. Con. Res. 99, expressing concern over recent events in the Republic of Sierra Leone in the wake of the recent military coup d'etat of that country's first democratically elected president (agreed to by a recorded vote of 418 ayes to 1 no, with 1 voting ''present'', Roll No. 297); **Pages H5513–15, H5549–50**

European Commission Re Merger of Boeing and McDonnell Douglas: H. Res. 191, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the interference of the European Commission in the merger of the Boeing Company and McDonnell Douglas (agreed to by a yea and nay vote of 416 yeas to 3 nays, Roll No. 298); and **Pages H5517–21, H5550**

Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act: H.R. 1585, amended, to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps (passed by a recorded vote of 422 ayes to 3 noes, Roll No. 299. Agreed to amend the title). **Pages H5521–26, H5550–51**

Suspension Failed—Republic of Congo: H. Res. 175, amended, expressing concern over the outbreak of violence in the Republic of Congo and the resulting threat to scheduled elections and constitutional government in that country (with two-thirds required for passage, failed to agree by a recorded vote of 279 ayes to 147 noes, Roll No. 296). **Pages H5515–17, H5548–49**

Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act: By a yea and nay vote of 414 yeas to 12 nays, Roll No. 289, the House passed H.R. 1853, to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act. The House completed debate and began considering amendments on July 17. **Pages H5526–44**

By a recorded vote of 207 ayes to 220 noes, Roll No. 289, rejected the Mink of Hawaii motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report it back forthwith with amendments that require states that fund programs for homemakers, single parents, and pregnant women and programs that promote gender equity to be funded at the same level as in fiscal year 1997. **Pages H5541–43**

Agreed to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as amended. **Page H5541**

Agreed To:

The Klink amendment that requires States to make available to the general public its report submitted to the Secretary of Education concerning its performance on vocational-technical education benchmarks. **Pages H5533–34**

Rejected:

The Mink amendment that sought to require states that fund programs for homemakers, single parents, and pregnant women and programs that promote gender equity to be funded at the same level as in fiscal year 1997 (rejected by a recorded vote of 207 ayes to 214 noes, Roll No. 286); and **Pages H5526–33, H5538–39**

The Kennedy of Massachusetts amendment that sought to establish an on-site workforce development coordinator (rejected by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 287). **Pages H5534–37, H5539–40**

The Clerk was authorized in the engrossment of the bill to make technical and conforming changes to reflect the actions of the House. **Page H5544**

H. Res. 187, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill was agreed to on July 17. **Pages H5413–14**

Agriculture Appropriations: The House continued consideration of H.R. 2160, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998. The House completed debate and considered amendments on July 16 and July 17. **Pages H5551–62**

Amendment Pending:

The Obey amendment was offered that seeks to reduce crop insurance program funding by $36 million and increase Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) funding by $23.7 million. **Pages H5553–62**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:01 a.m. on Wednesday, July 23 and reconvened at 12:21 a.m. **Page H5566**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appear on pages H5493.

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H5570–78.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and twelve recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H5539, H5539–40, H5542–43, H5543–44, H5544–45, H5545, H5546, H5546–47, H5547, H5548, H5548–49, H5549–50, H5550, and H5550–51. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: Met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 12:22 a.m. on Wednesday, July 23.

Committee Meetings

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH—REAUTHORIZATION PROPOSALS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Forestry, Resource Conservation, and Research held a hearing on reauthorization proposals in agricultural research. Testimony was heard from Bob Robinson, Administrator, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, USDA; and public witnesses.

DEFENSE; LABOR, HHS, AND EDUCATION; AND COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Ordered reported the following appropriations for fiscal year 1998: Defense; Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education; and Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary.

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government began markup of the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government appropriations for fiscal year 1998.

CONDUCT OF MONETARY POLICY

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy held a hearing on the Conduct of Monetary Policy. Testimony was heard from Alan Greenspan, Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.

HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Training and Life-Long Learning continued hearings on H.R. 6, Higher Education Amendments of 1998. Testimony was heard from David Longanecker, Assistant Secretary, Department of Education; and public witnesses.

SECURITY AND FREEDOM THROUGH ENCRYPTION (SAFE) ACT

Committee on International Relations: Ordered reported amended H.R. 695, Security and Freedom Through Encryption (SAFE) Act.

The Committee also approved a motion to authorize the Chairman to make motions on the House Floor under Rule XX, relative to H.R. 1757, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years l998 and 1999, and European Security Act of 1997.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT—RESTORING RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution held a hearing on H.J. Res. 78, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States restoring religious freedom. Testimony was heard from Representatives Istook, Edwards, Campbell, Capps and Bishop; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime held a hearing on the following: H.R. 218, Community Protection Act of 1997; H.R. 339, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry certain concealed firearms in the State, and to exempt qualified current and former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed handguns; and the Law Enforcement and Community Protection Act of 1997. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Committee on National Security: Subcommittee on Military Readiness held a hearing on the operation and maintenance financial management. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the GAO: Jack L. Brock, Director, Defense Information and Financial Management Systems; and Sharon Cekala, Associate Director, Military Operations and Capabilities; and the following officials of the Department of Defense: Alice C. Maroni, Principal Deputy Under Secretary (Comptroller); Helen T. McCoy, Assistant Secretary, Army (Financial Management and Comptroller); D. P. Christie, Assistant Secretary, Navy (Financial Management and Comptroller); and Robert F. Hale, Assistant Secretary, Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller).

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 1309, to provide for an exchange of lands with the city of Greeley, CO, and the Water Supply and Storage Co. to eliminate private inholdings in wilderness areas; and H.R. 1843, Local Free Access Act. Testimony was heard from Senator Allard; Robert C. Joslin, Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Forest Service, USDA; Douglass P. Teschner, member, House of Representatives, State of New Hampshire; LaVere Nelson, Mayor, Greeley, Colorado; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 1635, to establish within the United States National Park Service the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom Program; H.R. 755, to amend the Internal Revenue

Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate any portion of their income tax overpayments, and to make other contributions for the benefit of units of the National Park System; H.R. 1718, to provide for the conveyance of certain lands in Wyoming to the County of Park, WY; and H.R. 708, to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study concerning grazing use of certain land within and adjacent to Grand Teton National Park, Wyoming and to extend temporarily certain grazing privileges. Testimony was heard from Representatives Stokes, Portman, Duncan and Cubin; the following officials of the Department of the Interior: Denis P. Galvin, Acting Deputy Director, National Park Service; and Eluid L. Martinez, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation; and public witnesses.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF FY 1997

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a modified closed rule on H.R. 2160, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998. The rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI (prohibiting unauthorized and legislative provisions in an appropriations bill) and clause 6 of rule XXI (prohibiting reappropriations in an appropriations bill) against provisions in the bill except as otherwise specified in the rule. The rule provides that no further amendments shall be in order except: those amendments printed before July 22, 1997 in the Congressional Record; the amendments printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 21, 22, and 23; and the amendment by Representative Obey pending when the Committee of the Whole rose on July 22, 1997. The rule provides that each amendment made in order shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 10 minutes (except as otherwise specified in section 2 of the rule) equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce to five minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a fifteen minute vote. The rule also provides that after a motion that the Committee rise has been rejected on a day, another such motion on that day may be entertained only if offered by the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or the Majority Leader or their designee. The rule provides that after a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill has been rejected, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may not entertain another such motion during further consideration of the bill. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1997

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a closed rule on H.R. 2003, to reform the budget process and enforce the bipartisan balanced budget agreement of 1997, providing one hour of debate in the House equally divided between Representative Barton of Texas and an opponent. The rule also provides one motion to recommit. Testimony was heard from Representatives Nussle, Neumann, Bunning, Barton of Texas, Castle, Wamp, Minge, Tanner, Stenholm, Evans, Boyd, and Tauscher.

HUMAN CLONING RESEARCH—FEDERAL FUNDING PROHIBITION

Committee on Science: Subcommittee on Technology held a hearing on the Prohibition of Federal Funding for Human Cloning Research. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES; PROSPECTUSES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Public Grounds and Economic Development approved for full Committee action the following: H.R. 29, to designate the Federal building located at 290 Broadway in New York, NY, as the ''Ronald H. Brown Federal Building''; H.R. 81, to designate the U.S. courthouse located at 401 South Michigan Street in South Bend, IN, as the ''Robert K. Rodibaugh United States Bankruptcy Courthouse''; H.R. 548, to designate the U.S. courthouse located at 500 Pearl Street in New York City, NY, as the ''Ted Weiss United States Courthouse''; H.R. 595, to designate the Federal building and U.S. courthouse located at 475 Mulberry Street in Macon, GA, as the ''William Augustus Bootle Federal Building and United States Courthouse''; H.R. 613, amended, to designate the Federal building located at 100 Alabama Street NW, in Atlanta, GA, as the ''Sam Nunn Federal Center''; H.R. 643, to designate the U.S. courthouse to be constructed at the corner of Superior and Huron Roads, in Cleveland, OH, as the ''Carl B. Stokes United States Courthouse''; H.R. 824, to redesignate the Federal building located at 717 Madison Place, NW., in the District of Columbia, as the ''Howard T. Markey National Courts Building''; H.R. 892, amended, to redesignate the Federal building located at 223 Sharkey Street in Clarksdale, MS, as the ''Aaron Henry United States Post Office''; H.R. 962, to redesignate a Federal building in Suitland, MD, as the ''W. Edwards Deming Federal Building''; H.R. 994, to designate the U.S. border station located in Pharr, TX, as the ''Kika de la Garza United States Border Station''; H.R. 1479, amended, to designate the Federal building and U.S. courthouse located at 300 Northeast

First Avenue in Miami, FL, as the ''David W. Dyer Federal Courthouse''; H.R. 1484, amended, to redesignate the Dublin Federal courthouse building located in Dublin, GA, as the ''J. Roy Rowland Federal Courthouse''; H.R. 1502, to designate the U.S. courthouse located at 301 West Main Street in Benton, IL, as the ''James L. Foreman United States Courthouse''; H.R. 1851, to designate the U.S. courthouse located at 200 South Washington Street in Alexandria, VA, as the ''Martin V.B. Bostetter, Jr., U.S. Courthouse''; H. Con. Res. 98, authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Safe Kids Buckle Up Car Seat Safety Check; 5 Courthouse Design prospectuses; 2 amending Committee Resolutions, 3 Miscellaneous Construction Prospectuses and 2 11(b) Resolutions.

FREE TRADE AREA OF THE AMERICAS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Trade held a hearing on Free Trade Area of the Americas. Testimony was heard from Representatives Kolbe, Campbell and Farr; Jeffrey Davidow, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Department of State; Jeffrey M. Lang, Deputy U.S. Trade Representative; JayEtta Z. Hecker, Associate Director, International Relations and Trade Issues, National Security and International Affairs Division, GAO; and public witnesses.

INFORMATION OPERATIONS BRIEFING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to receive a briefing on information operations. The Committee was briefed by departmental witnesses.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 1997

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, to hold hearings on the nominations of Catherine E. Woteki, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Food Safety, and Shirley Robinson Watkins, of Arkansas, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, 9 a.m., SR–332.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on District of Columbia, to resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the government of the District of Columbia, focusing on the Departments of Health, Human Services, and Public Works, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, to hold oversight hearings on the Federal Reserve's monetary policy report to Congress pursuant to the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, business meeting, to consider the nomination of Jane Garvey, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, business meeting, to consider pending calendar business; to be followed by hearings to examine natural gas issues, focusing on the world energy supply and demand to the year 2015, the role of government in large scale gas projects in foreign countries, and emerging technologies in gas field development that are making natural gas more economical to market, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Governmental Affairs, to resume hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on the Judiciary, to hold hearings on proposed legislation to authorize funds for the Office of National Drug Control Policy, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Full Committee, business meeting, to resume markup of S. 10, to reduce violent juvenile crime, promote accountability by juvenile criminals, and punish and deter violent gang crime, and to mark up S. 53, to require the general application of the antitrust laws to major league baseball, 2 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Labor and Human Resources, business meeting, to mark up S. 1020, proposed Arts and Humanities Amendments of 1997, S. 1046, proposed National Science Foundation Authorization of 1997, proposed Workforce Improvement Partnership Act, and to consider pending nominations, 9:30 a.m., SD–430.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Risk Management and Specialty Crops, hearing on the Commodity Futures Trading Commission's proposal to lift the prohibition on agricultural trade options, 1:30 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, hearing on the Conduct of Monetary Policy, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1262, Securities and Exchange Commission Authorization Act of 1997; H.R. 1839, National Salvage Motor Vehicle Consumer Protection Act of 1997; and H.R. 2032, to make correct certain provisions of the Safe Drinking Water Act, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing to examine the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's reinvention project, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, hearing on Iran Libya Sanctions Act—One Year Later, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, hearing on Microcredit and Microenterprise: The Road to Self-Reliance, 2 p.m. 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, to mark up the following; H.R. 1109, to amend the Immigration and Nationality

Technical Corrections Act of 1994 to eliminate the special transition rule for issuance of a certificate of citizenship for certain children born outside the United States; H.R. 1348, Expanded War Crimes Act of 1997; H.R. 2027, to provide for the revision of the requirements for a Canadian border boat landing permit pursuant to section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and to require the Attorney General to report to the Congress on the impact of such revision; H.R. 2181, Witness Protection and Interstate Relocation Act of 1997; and private measures, 10:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, to consider H.R. 2203, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, 4 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, hearing on Science, Math Engineering and Technology Education, 1 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to mark up the following: H.R. 2036, Aviation Insurance Reauthorization Act of 1997; H.R. 2005, to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the application of the Act popularly known as the ''Death on the High Seas Act'' to aviation incidents; H.R. 2204, Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1997; Water Resources Survey Resolutions; Ocean Pollution Reduction Act of 1997; H.R. 29, to designate the Federal building located at 290 Broadway in New York, NY, as the ''Ronald H. Brown Federal Building''; H.R. 81, to designate the U.S. courthouse located at 401 South Michigan Street in South Bend, IN, as the ''Robert K. Rodibaugh United States Bankruptcy Courthouse''; H.R. 548, to designate the U.S. courthouse located at 500 Pearl Street in New York City, NY, as the ''Ted Weiss United States Courthouse''; H.R. 595, to designate the Federal building and U.S. courthouse located at 475 Mulberry Street in Macon, GA, as the ''William Augustus Bootle Federal Building and United States Courthouse''; H.R. 613, to designate the Federal building located at 100 Alabama Street NW, in Atlanta, GA, as the ''Sam Nunn Federal Center''; H.R. 643, to designate the U.S. courthouse to be constructed at the corner of Superior and Huron Roads, in Cleveland, OH, as the ''Carl B. Stokes United States Courthouse''; H.R. 824, to redesignate the Federal building located at 717 Madison Place, NW., in the District of Columbia, as the ''Howard T. Markey National Courts Building''; H.R. 892, to redesignate the Federal building located at 223 Sharkey Street in Clarksdale, MS, as the ''Aaron Henry United States Post Office''; H.R. 962, to redesignate a Federal building in Suitland, MD, as the ''W. Edwards Deming Federal Building''; H.R. 994, to designate the U.S. border station located in Pharr, TX, as the ''Kika de la Garza United States Border Station''; H.R. 1479, to designate the Federal building and U.S. courthouse located at 300 Northeast First Avenue in Miami, FL, as the ''David W. Dyer Federal Courthouse''; H.R. 1484, to redesignate the Dublin Federal courthouse building located in Dublin, GA, as the ''J. Roy Rowland Federal Courthouse''; H.R. 1502, to designate the U.S. courthouse located at 301 West Main Street in Benton, IL, as the ''James L. Foreman United States Courthouse''; H.R. 1851, to designate the U.S. courthouse located at 200 South Washington Street in Alexandria, VA, as the ''Martin V.B. Bostetter, Jr., U.S. Courthouse''; H. Con. Res. 98, authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Safe Kids Buckle Up Car Seat Safety Check; Courthouse Design Prospectuses from fiscal year 1997; Amendments to two prior Committee resolutions; Construction Prospectuses; and two 11(b) Resolutions, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing on Barriers Preventing Social Security Disability Recipients from Returning to Work, 10:00 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Trade, hearing on the New Transatlantic Agenda, 2:00 p.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis, and Counterintelligence, executive, briefing on Foreign Counterintelligence Threat Against Congress, 4:30 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

JOINT MEETINGS

Conferees, on H.R. 1757, to consolidate international affairs agencies and to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for the fiscal years 1998 and 1999, 4 p.m., H–140, Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9 a.m. Wednesday, July 23

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: After the recognition of certain Senators for speeches and the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 11 a.m.), Senate will begin consideration of S. 1033, Agriculture Appropriations, 1998.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 23

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 2003, Budget Enforcement Act of 1997 (closed rule, 1 hour of debate);

Complete consideration of H.R. 2160, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (modified closed rule); and

Consideration of H.R. 2169, Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (open rule, 1 hour of debate).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barr, Bob, Ga., E1463
Blagojevich, Rod R., Ill., E1477
Brown, George E., Jr., Calif., E1473
Coble, Howard, N.C., E1463
Dellums, Ronald V., Calif., E1463
Etheridge, Bob, N.C., E1467
Fattah, Chaka, Pa., E1466
Fox, Jon D., Pa., E1475
Gallegly, Elton, Calif., E1471
Gejdenson, Sam, Conn., E1470
Gilman, Benjamin A., N.Y., E1464
Hamilton, Lee H., Ind., E1467
Hansen, James V., Utah, E1468
Harman, Jane, Calif., E1476, E1477
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1469
Kelly, Sue W., N.Y., E1464
LaFalce, John J., N.Y., E1475
LaTourette, Steve C., Ohio, E1471
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E1469
McGovern, James P., Mass., E1474
Manton, Thomas J., N.Y., E1474, E1477
Manzullo, Donald A., Ill., E1466
Miller, George, Calif., E1467
Oxley, Michael G., Ohio, E1464
Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E1466
Radanovich, George P., Calif., E1476
Rodriguez, Ciro D., Tex., E1472
Romero-Barceló, Carlos A., Puerto Rico, E1475
Sandlin, Max, Tex., E1465, E1472
Sherman, Brad, Calif., E1469
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E1476
Solomon, Gerald B.H., N.Y., E1468, E1473
Stokes, Louis, Ohio, E1464
Upton, Fred, Mich., E1471
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E1465
Weygand, Robert A., R.I., E1472

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 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, $150.00 for six months, $295.00 per year, or purchased for $2.50 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. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶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.