United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1998 No. 14

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 24, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable BILL BARRETT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 927) ''An Act to reauthorize the Sea Grant Program.''

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 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) for 5 minutes.

WHETHER CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF FORCE IN THE PERSIAN GULF IN 1991 CONTINUES TO AUTHORIZE FORCE IN 1998

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I think we were all heartened by the developments over the weekend when the Secretary General of the United Nations was able to put together an agreement with Iraq concerning the current crisis there. It is certainly a promising development, and we all hope and pray that it will be the solution to the crisis.

But given Saddam Hussein's history of broken promises, we all will remain skeptical and will wait to be shown that this time it is for real. It is understandable, therefore, that the President has stated that the United States forces currently deployed in the region will stay there for the foreseeable future, and again, given the history of broken promises, it is entirely possible that we may face again soon the question of the use of military force against Iraq.

So, it is important, even though we have this moment to catch our breath, to remind ourselves of Congress' responsibility in this matter. In my opinion, and I think an opinion widely shared, the initiation of military action that is contemplated in Iraq clearly implicates Congress' responsibilities under the war-making clause of section 8, article 1, of the Constitution.

The President's position, as I understand it, has been that he already has sufficient authority in this matter derived, in a way, from the Persian Gulf War resolution that this Congress passed back in 1991. The administration claims that it is appropriate to see that Persian Gulf War resolution as looking forward to the authorization of force not only to implement then existing Security Council resolutions, which at the time of course dealt with getting Iraq out of Kuwait, but also to contemplate future Security Council resolutions, including the one that after the war set up the United Nations commission and the inspection regime that is now at issue in going after Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

That Security Council resolution, number 687, of course was adopted after the Persian Gulf War, and unlike the ones that preceded the war, did not expressly contemplate or state that member states of the U.N. could use force, or ''all necessary means,'' to use the proper phraseology, to carry out its purposes.

I do not believe those of us who were here in 1991 for the debate before the Persian Gulf War would say that the text of the resolution passed before the Persian Gulf War, and certainly not the debate that preceded passage of the resolution, support the idea that we were then granting authority for some future military action to force compliance with a weapons of mass destruction inspection regime that did not then exist.

Over the weekend we have heard former Secretary of State Baker remind us all that the issue at the time that we went to war in 1991, the mandate at that time, was to get Iraq out of Kuwait.

I have today released a report, a memorandum, done at my request by the Congressional Research Service on this issue. A copy has been sent to all Members' offices. I believe the analysis of these legal, but very important, considerations done by CRS reinforces the argument that this 105th Congress cannot rely on what the 102nd Congress did, and that we need to face up to our current constitutional responsibilities.

The Constitution requires authority from Congress before this country initiates a major military attack for good reasons, both as a check against any precipitous action by a President, but also to be sure that the American people, acting through their representatives in Congress, have been consulted and do consent.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

Should we face another major military confrontation with Iraq in the coming weeks or months, Congress must fulfill that responsibility and conduct the kind of debate, the thorough debate we did in 1991. I think we all remember that debate as one of Congress' finest moments, in which we were soberly engaged in a meaningful discussion of a critical issue. It helped to unify the country.

We should welcome a debate and a vote again, as the President should. He needs to know that the country is behind him.

It is troubling to look ahead to circumstances that might arise very quickly in the next weeks or months that might not enable us to have the kind of debate and vote that we should. Therefore, I hope my colleagues will unite in requesting that the leadership proceed while we enjoy this reprieve to have the kind of discussion that is warranted under the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the memorandum from the Congressional Research Service.

The memorandum is as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, February 23, 1998.

To: Honorable David Skaggs.

From: American Law Division.

Subject: Whether 1991 Congressional Authorization of Force in the Persian Gulf Continues to Authorize Force in 1998.

This memorandum is in response to your request that we briefly evaluate an argument that has been presented in the present debate over use of United States military forces in and over Iraq, namely whether Congress can be said to have authorized in its 1991 enactment the use of U.S. military forces to carry out resolutions of the Security Council of the United Nations adopted subsequent to the conflict in 1991 in the Persian Gulf.

We here deal with a specific and limited, though important, question. We do not consider what the Constitution, in its authorization to Congress to declare war, requires of Congress and the Executive Branch in the initiation and carrying out of combat with Iraq. We do not consider what restraints the War Powers Resolution imposes on the President's use of force in and over Iraq in the absence of some affirmative pre-action approval by Congress. We do not consider what effect upon the ability of the United States to act, within its constitutional structure, may be derived from United Nations authorization(s). To be sure, these issues are implicated in the response to the question with which we do treat, but it is possible to assess a resolution of this single question without also attempting to venture answers to the other questions.

Following the invasion of Kuwait and its occupation by Iraq, the Security Council adopted Resolution 660, demanding that Iraq withdraw from Kuwait. After adoption of a series of other Resolutions, the Security Council in 1990 adopted Resolution 678, which is considered the United Nation's authorization for the carrying out of the military actions that took place, by which member states were authorized to use ''all necessary means to uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peach and security in the area.''

Although President Bush and his Administration took the public position that no authorization by Congress was necessary, at the last moment the President did seek congressional approval, which was forthcoming by close votes in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. P.L. 102–1, 105 Stat. 3, 50 U.S.C. §1541 note. The Joint Resolution became law January 14, 1991. The pertinent part of the Joint Resolution provided: The President is authorized, subject to subsection (b), to use United States Armed Forces pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 (1990) in order to achieve implementation of Security Council Resolutions 660, 661, 662, 664, 665, 666, 667, 679, 670, 674, and 677. §2(a).

After Iraq's military defeat, the Security Council on April 3, 1991, adopted Resolution 687, setting out conditions to which Iraq had to agree in order for a cease fire to come into effect. Among the obligations, Iraq had to accept the neutralization under international supervision of its chemical, biological, and medium- or long-range missile capabilities. Furthermore, the Resolution stated, the matter was to remain before the Council, which would ''take such further steps as may be required for the implementation of the present resolution and to secure peace and security in the area.''

On November 12, 1997, in response to various moves by the Government of Iraq to disavow and to hinder the inspections to which Iraq had agreed as a result of Resolution 687, the Security Council adopted Resolution 1137, condemning Iraq for its actions, demanding adherence to its agreement, and specifically referencing Resolution 687. Resolution 1137 further stated ''the firm intention to take further measures as may be required for the implementation of this resolution.''

One reading of the series of United Nations resolutions from 660 (1990) through 678 (1990) and on to 687 (1990) and 1137 (1997) is that the Security Council has authorized its member states to take enforcement action under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter against Iraq not only to force Iraq from Kuwait, which has, of course, been achieved, but additionally to require Iraq to comply fully with its obligations to rid itself of its prescribed weapons and to continue to accept UN inspections to assure its compliance with the obligation to destroy the weapons. That is not the only reading, other members of the Security Council being in disagreement with the United States and the United Kingdom on the proper interpretation. Indeed, while Resolution 678 did specifically authorize member states to use ''all necessary means,'' both Resolution 687 and Resolution 1137 appear only to pledge that the Security Council will ''take such further steps'' and ''to take further measures'' without in either Resolution authorizing member states to act.

In any event, the issue is not the correct interpretation of the series of United Nations resolutions; rather, it is what Congress may be understood to have authorized in P.L. 102–1. That is, did Congress authorize only the use of United States military force to drive Iraq from Kuwait? Or, more broadly, did Congress authorize open-endedly the use of United States military forces to achieve whatever goals subsequently adopted Security Council Resolutions may have set out?

Facially, P.L. 102–1 bears little indicia of the broader reading. Its pertinent authorization paragraph, set out above, references the use of force ''pursuant'' to Resolution 678 and the implementation of Resolutions 660–677, which have to do with the unconditional withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait. As we have noted above, Resolution 678 authorized member states to use ''all necessary means to uphold and implement Resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area.'' The phrase ''all subsequent relevant resolutions'' doubtlessly refers to all the Resolutions following 660 and leading up to Resolution 678. While it might be read to include Resolutions adopted subsequently to 678, and the Security Council might interpret it that way as well as its member states, the pertinent point here is what the congressional enactment comprehends.

First, the authorization paragraph specifically references Resolution 678 and expressly states that action pursuant to that Resolution is ''in order to achieve implementation of'' the specifically identified Resolutions from 660 to 677. The express wording of this paragraph appears to target exactly the United Nations goal of ending the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait.

Reference to the purpose clauses, the preamble, of P.L. 102–1, which has no legal force but does declare congressional intention and is relevant to understanding the meaning of the law that Congress has enacted, confirms this reading of the authorization. That is, while the third ''whereas'' clause states the danger to world peace of the existence of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, the other clauses all relate to the termination of the occupation of Kuwait. It is true that the same ambiguity noted above with respect to the language of Resolution 678 may be discerned in the sixth ''whereas'' clause, because of its referencing of Resolution 678.

Whereas, in the absence of full compliance by Iraq with its resolutions, the United Nations Security Council in Resolution 678 has authorized member states of the United Nations to use all necessary means, after January 15, 1991, to uphold and implement all relevant Security Council resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area[.]

Thus, the more likely reading of the authorization section of P.L. 102–1 is that Congress specifically authorized the use of United States military forces to drive Iraqi forces from Kuwait. Congress would have taken the reference in Resolution 678 to ''all subsequent relevant resolutions'' to mean those Resolutions that preceded 677, those, that is, referenced by number in 678. Congress further would have understood the reference in Resolution 678 to the use of force ''to restore international peace and security in the Area'' to encompass the restoration of the *status quo ante*, the withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait. Certainly, there is nothing in the authorization section of P.L. 102–1 that requires or compels a reading that would be in effect an open-ended authorization of the use of United States military forces to achieve any subsequently adopted goals of the United Nations.

Nonetheless, sufficient ambiguity does exist to permit the possible construction of the language of P.L. 102–1 as authorizing United States military force to carry out subsequently-adopted Resolutions setting forth an intention to force Iraq, under threat of military force, to rid itself of prescribed weapons and to permit United Nations inspections to assure that the result has been achieved. It is not clear, as noted above, that the Security Council has adopted any authorization for its member states to use military force to achieve these results, but we pass that question by.

The pertinent question is, given two possible interpretations of congressional meaning, how do we resolve the matter?

Second, one must look at the textual object. Although two meanings are possible, one is more likely to represent the meaning to be ascribed to it by Congress. If, however, after confronting the actual language to be interpreted and finding a likely but not compelled interpretation, how do we then infer or deduce meaning from context and surroundings? One such method, favored by the

courts, including the United States Supreme Court, is under some circumstances to adopt a default means of interpretation. When, for example, the issue arises in the context of a critical or critically important question of constitutional meaning, courts impose a ''clear-statement'' rule under which Congress, or some other entity, will not be understood to have meant to say something having great bearing on its powers or on the Constitution without saying it clearly, perhaps expressly. For example, when the issue is whether by the terms of a statute Congress has waived the sovereign immunity of the United States, the Court will not apply ordinary rules of statutory construction but will require the clearest possible expression of congressional intent; any waiver must be unequivocal. E.g., United States Dept. of Energy v. Ohio, 503 U.S. 607 (1992); Library of Congress v. Shaw, 461 U.S. 273 (1983). Of course, the particular issue with which we deal is highly unlikely to present itself as suitable for judicial resolution, but subsequent Congresses and private parties may resort to such rules of construal.

Congress has been highly protective of its powers in this area, especially of the use of United States military forces abroad, since the great debate in this country with respect to the undeclared war in Indochina, which eventuated in the adoption, over a presidential veto, of the War Powers Resolution. P. L. 93–148, 87 Stat. 555, 50 U.S.C. §§1541–1548. In view of the hesitancy of Congress to act in respect of the Gulf War and of the close votes in both Houses, how likely is it that Congress would have authorized the President to use United States military forces to effectuate a United Nations Resolution or a series of Resolutions that were to be adopted sometime in the future? It is, of course, possible for Congress to authorize something on the basis of an occurrence not yet having resulted. But with respect to the commitment of United States forces abroad? Again, Congress might do so, but ought we to conclude that it did so in 1991 on the basis of contestable language susceptible to more than one interpretation? Might a clear statement of Congress' intent to do so be required before such a construction is adopted?

In short, to conclude that P. L. 102–1 contains authorization for the President to act militarily in 1998 requires the construction of an interpretational edifice buttressed by several assumptions. We must conclude that Congress in 1991 intended to base its authorization of United States military action upon the future promulgation of United Nations policy developed in the context of circumstances unknown or at most highly speculative in 1991. We must conclude that Resolution 687 did authorize member states to act to implement its goals and not merely reserved to the Security Council a future determination of what it might authorize. We must conclude that Resolution 1137 did authorize member states to act to end Iraqi recalcitrance and not merely expressed the aspiration of the Security Council to do something in the future. And we must conclude that Congress in 1991 was so confident of United Nations policy in the future that it would have authorized the future committal of United States military forces to achieve what the Security Council wished to achieve.

We have examined legislation enacted later by Congress in the same year that bears on Operation Desert Storm, in particular P. L. 102–190, 105 Stat. 1290, and P. L. 102–25, 105 Stat. 75, and find nothing bearing on what Congress might have thought it was doing in P. L. 102–1. Certainly, there is nothing in those Acts to be construed as additional authorizations.

In the end, it is for the Congress to determine what the 102d Congress meant in adopting the joint resolution that became P. L. 102–1. How, if Congress' interpretation is different from that of the President, Congress is to give effect to its determination presents another question altogether.

JOHNNY H. KILLIAN,
Senior Specialist, American Constitutional Law.

TRIBUTE TO GOLD MEDAL WINNING U.S. WOMEN'S OLYMPIC HOCKEY TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, America's two newest sports heroes are the pride of every American. I rise today to pay tribute to a group of talented, hard-working women who have written a new chapter in America's glorious Olympic history, the U.S. women's Olympic hockey team.

Minnesota is the birthplace of hockey in America, Mr. Speaker, and the first ever gold medal in women's Olympic hockey was won by a spirited, never-give-up American team that included two Minnesotans. Jenny Schmidgall of Edina, Minnesota, and Alana Blahoski of St. Paul, Minnesota, along with 21 other members of the U.S. women's team, brought home the gold from the 18th Olympic winter games in Nagano, Japan. The American women's team won all six of its games.

Mr. Speaker, what a marvelous Olympic tournament it was, and what a remarkable team won the gold medal. As a proud Minnesotan and a patriotic American, my heart burst when Jenny Schmidgall was awarded her gold medal and spontaneously blurted out our national anthem. Our hearts as Americans burst in pride when our women's hockey team, every single member, raised their hands to the sky in saying our national anthem with all the strength left in their souls.

Mr. Speaker, after losing to Canada four times in the world championship since 1990, the U.S. women's Olympic hockey team defeated Canada 3 to 1 last week to claim the gold medal. It was the second time the Americans had defeated their fiercest rival in four days. It was also the first U.S. hockey gold medal since the 1980 miracle on ice at Lake Placid.

Mr. Speaker, great joy swept over Minnesota as the U.S. women held hands, waved American flags, and accepted their well-earned gold medals. As her parents, Dwayne and Terri Schmidgall of Edina, would be quick to tell you, Jenny Schmidgall had prepared long and hard for her moment in the land of the rising sun. Jenny graduated from Edina High School, in the heart of our Third Congressional District, this past spring, and will be skating for the University of Minnesota next year.

In fact, that is the reason Jenny's picture did not make the Wheaties box, because she is still an amateur, and NCAA rules are about as arcane as some of the rules around here, and she was not allowed to be pictured.

But anyway, when Jenny skated at Edina's Lewis Park, she was known as little Gretzky. She grew up learning the game at Lewis Park at Edina while following her hockey playing dad onto the ice.

There was magic in the air at the Big Hat arena in Nagano the day of the gold medal game. Jenny's parents got to the game and learned that their seats were not with the rest of the parents down below in the lower bowl but, rather, in the upper deck away from the rest of the parents of the women's team.

But all that changes when Wayne Gretzky, the great one himself, tapped Dwayne Schmidgall on the shoulder, and seeing Schmidgall's Team U.S.A. jackets and asked if she had somebody playing in the game. Gretzky told them, by the way, he hoped their team would win and left when the score was one to nothing in favor of the Americans.

In this first Olympic women's tournament, Jenny Schmidgall scored two goals and had three assists. She also helped set up the first U.S. goal in the gold medal game. As her mother Terri said, holding back tears, and I am quoting now, ''When you know all the hard work that went into this and see them this way, it's really something.''

Mr. Speaker, it is really something. All the women on Team U.S.A. have stories to tell, stories like Jenny Schmidgall's. They all followed others onto the ice at an early age and often met with resistance when they tried to join in the boys' games. But showing great American ethic that makes our nation shine, these women would not take no for an answer. They practiced. They persevered. Last week, they realized their dream. They brought home the gold.

Mr. Speaker, one sign held up above the U.S. team's bench in Nagano said it all: ''U.S. Women, the Real Dream Team.'' Now the women of the 1998 U.S. Olympic ice hockey team are stirring new dreams in the hearts and minds of girls throughout America. They stirred our passion over the past fortnight halfway around the world, and they will live in our hearts forever.

Congratulations to Jenny, to Alana, and to the other 21 members of the U.S. women's ice hockey team as well as your wonderful coaches, managers, trainers, and other officials. You have made America proud.

PUERTO RICO'S CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, 1998 is a centennial year. We think

of centennial years as occasions to celebrate. In 1976, for example, the country joyfully celebrated the bicentennial anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. On this centennial, we recall that 100 years ago, the United States defeated Spain in the Spanish-American War and, as a result, acquired Puerto Rico as a possession.

It is a bittersweet anniversary for many of the 3.8 million U.S. citizens living in Puerto Rico. Make no mistake. The people of Puerto Rico are proud to be citizens of the United States, and they have affirmed, repeatedly, their desire to be an integral part of this great Nation.

In the poll booth, 95 percent of them have voted continuously for strengthening their rights of U.S. citizenship. And on the battlefield, in every war the country has engaged in during this century, Puerto Ricans have pledged their commitment to the Nation and its democratic ideals with their lives.

There is one regret. Despite a progression from military rule to a federally appointed civil government in 1900, the granting of U.S. citizenship by statute in 1917 and the adoption of a constitution for local self-government in 1952, Puerto Rico continues to be an unincorporated territory of the United States, or as it is called in international forums, a colony.

The residents of Puerto Rico are subject to the authority and plenary powers of Congress under the territory clause of the U.S. Constitution. We may not vote in presidential elections, and we have no voting representation in Congress.

The economic, social, and political affairs of the people of Puerto Rico, in great measure, are controlled and influenced by government which is in no way accountable to them. In 1898, Puerto Rico became a colony of the United States; a century later, it remains a U.S. colony. Puerto Rico has a dubious distinction of being the longest standing colony of over 1 million inhabitants in the whole world.

Only the Congress has the power to end this chapter of colonialism. Only Congress has the authority to create the opportunity for the full exercise of self-determination by the people of Puerto Rico.

□ 1245

And Congress alone bears the political responsibility and the moral imperative to act.

H.R. 856, the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act is status neutral. It does not promote, endorse or advocate one political choice over another. Instead, it seeks to create Constitutionally-sound and Congressionally approved definitions of political status options for the residents of Puerto Rico; it proposes a timetable for referendums on status and it makes provisions, should they prove necessary, for a smooth transition to and the implementation of a new political status.

For nearly five decades, the Commonwealth status has been misrepresented to the voters of Puerto Rico. In 1950, when the Congress passed the Puerto Rico Federal Relations Act, which authorized the people of Puerto Rico to draw up a constitution and reorganize a local self-government, the intent was to establish a provisional government until the issue of status was resolved. But when Commonwealth was ''sold'' to our people, it was billed as a bilateral pact that could only be altered by mutual consent, implying that the new status conferred political and economic autonomy and sovereignty to the island.

The United States Government became a party to this misrepresentation in 1953 when it notified the United Nations that it would no longer submit reports regarding the status of Puerto Rico because the island had achieved a ''full measure'' of self-government under the new ''constitutional arrangement.''

Unfortunately, the misinformation campaign continues unabated. Since the creation of the so-called Commonwealth, Puerto Ricans have voted in two referendums on status. But in the most recent of these, the 1993 plebiscite, the definition of Commonwealth on the ballot ''contained proposals to profoundly change, rather than continue the current Commonwealth of Puerto Rico government structure,'' observed the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and several other colleagues in a 1996 letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

What is more, as our colleagues explained, ''Certain elements of the Commonwealth option, including permanent union with the United States and guaranteed U.S. citizenship, can only be achieved by full integration into the U.S. leading to statehood. Other elements of the Commonwealth option on the ballot, including a government-to-government bilateral pact, which cannot be altered, either are not possible or could only be partially accomplished through treaty arrangements based on separate sovereignty.''

To perpetuate this farce, this rhetorical slight of hand that disguises Puerto Rico's true status as a colony, defrauds the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico of their right to self-determination. It leaves them disenfranchised, in a state of political limbo.

Mr. Speaker, we are 8 years into the decade that the United Nations General Assembly has dedicated to the eradication of colonialism, and we act as if we were frozen in time. Does this country and does this Congress really want to celebrate 100 years of colonialism? This centennial gives us no joy. In order for all to celebrate, Congress must act. It is time to pass H.R. 856.

THE YEAR 2000 CENSUS

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to continue the conversation I began a few weeks ago about the 2000 Census. As I have said, I believe we need to work together to ensure that we have the best, most honest Census possible. But I believe we are a long way from realizing that type of Census.

As everyone involved in the decennial Census knows by now, I have concerns that we are headed for a failed Census. Today, I want to discuss what I believe are the serious mistakes the Clinton Administration has made to date, and what I believe they need to do to start correcting them in time to save the 2000 Census.

The biggest mistake, indeed a colossal mistake, was made right from the start. They decided to ignore Congress. They thought they could just go ahead and design any methodology they wanted and just say to Congress: This is what we are going to do, and you just pay for it. That is not how our system works on any issue.

Mr. Speaker, we expect the Decennial Census to cost almost $4 billion. In other words, we spend real money on the Census. As a general rule, Congress does not give the executive branch $4 billion and say, hey, do whatever you want with it, you know best.

Under our system, Congress controls the purse strings. So when the administration wants to spend tax dollars, they come to Congress and justify what they want to do. This gives Congress the ability to shape how the money is spent.

Congress plays an even larger role in the conduct of the Census. We do this for one basic reason: the Constitution mandates that it is the Congress' responsibility to direct the manner in which the Census is taken. Let me quote from the Constitution itself: Quote: ''The actual enumeration shall be made within every subsequent term of 10 years, in such a manner as they, meaning the Congress, shall direct by law.'' End quote. In other words, the Constitution places the responsibility for the Census on the Congress, not the executive branch.

For reasons I do not fully yet understand, the Clinton Administration used the ''Hillary Health Care Model'' for designing the 2000 Census. They decided to design a complicated, untested Census plan that was created by ''experts.'' And since the idea was sanctioned by well-meaning experts, they just figured there was no reason to explain it or to sell it to average Americans and certainly no reason to work with the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, remember the secret health care task force that designed the original Health Security Act? They were all well-meaning, hard-working individuals with great educations and they designed the ultimate graduate school seminar project. The plan was over 1,000 pages long. They had thought

of every possible problem. And when the American people raised concerns, they just said do not worry, we know best. When Congress asked questions, the President threatened vetoes. Well, the Clinton health care plan collapsed.

Unfortunately, they are headed down the same path on the Census. They used some legitimate problems in the 1990 Census as an excuse to totally redesign a 200-year method for taking the Census. But because they used experts, in this case statisticians, to design this unprecedented method, they decided they did not need approval from Congress. How could Congress have any legitimate concerns after all, because the Census Bureau used ''expert panels'' to create this new concept?

Well, ''expert panels'' weren't elected by the people. Professional statisticians are not constitutionally responsible for directing the Census. Academics do not have the responsibility for deciding how taxpayers' dollars are spent. That is Congress' job.

By the way, I have a Ph.D. in marketing and statistics, so I understand the theory behind what they are trying to pull off. I believe, however, that the Clinton Administration dropped the ball in informing the Congress, working with the Congress, and seeking approval from Congress.

This serious miscalculation has placed the 2000 Census in danger and the institution of the Federal Government most impacted by a failed Census is the United States House of Representatives. Every State legislature, every city council, every school board needs a successful Census to legitimately represent the people. Let me repeat that. Every State legislature, every city council, every school board needs a successful Census to legitimately represent the people.

If the administration fails in the implementation of their academic theory, all representative bodies in this country will be thrown in turmoil and uncertainty.

The majority in Congress have made it very clear that we do not approve of the administration's current plan. What we want, or more precisely what we intend to pay for, is a traditional Census that is transparent and fair. We understand the problems of the 1990 Census and we want them fixed. We do not believe, however, that we need to throw out the baby with the bath water.

To date, I am not satisfied they have gotten the message downtown. In November, Congress passed and the President signed legislation to continue on an actual enumeration. They have not gotten the message.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote from the legislation—''that funds appropriated under this act . . . shall be used by the Bureau of the Census to plan, test and become prepared to implement the 2000 decennial census, without using statistical methods. . . .''

It seems pretty clear that the law requires them to prepare for a traditional Census. I don't believe that's what they are doing. They're budget submission hides behind legalisms and technicalities and says, ''The Administration has not included additional funding for nonsampling census activities because that funding is not required by the agreement.''

To me, that is yet another slap in the face to the Congress. They seem to have this attitude that Congress' opinion doesn't matter.

The 2000 Census is in deep trouble at this moment. The Commerce Department's own Inspector General has said that. I stand ready to work with the Administration. We want and we need a successful Census in 2000. But the attitude downtown needs to turnaround. They need to understand that we have a role to play—a very major role to play—in the planning, preparation and implementation of the 2000 Census.

POST OFFICE COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997 the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes, the Federal Government is called to spend billions of dollars to try and repair communities after they fall apart. It is far better for the Federal Government and its agencies to lead by example, and one of the ways that we can lead by example is best illustrated by the impact that the United States Postal Service has on our communities.

Post Offices are the heart and soul of America's small towns, drawing people to main streets and preserving the core of these communities. Despite this vital role, the Postal Service continues to move post offices to the outskirts of town, leaving devastated communities in their wake.

This is happening across the country, not just in my community in Oregon. I have heard similar stories from Washington, Montana, Colorado, Ohio, Louisiana, New York, and everywhere in between. Small downtowns across the country are being stranded despite the protest of town residents.

Mr. Speaker, it is absurd that the Postal Service gives its customers more say in which Elvis stamp to issue than where the post offices are located. Residents of Christianburg, Virginia, know this story all too well. They used to gather at a post office in the center of town to collect their mail and talk about the events of the day. Today, their main post office has moved 3 miles from downtown leaving only a small contact station in its wake. The gathering place for the community has become this window in a grocery store next to the motor oil and the fuel filters.

Fortunately, Christianburg residents refused to take this affront as the final word. Residents of the town, supported by the city council and their Chamber of Commerce, fought back and finally after a 2-year battle, it appears as though the Postal Service has conceded that a ''communications breakdown'' occurred and they are apparently ready to reverse this decision.

Our Nation's governors know that these post office relocations are directly contributing to the decline of their towns and reducing the access of the elderly and disabled to post office services. The governors have now asked for our help. They have asked Congress to eliminate the loophole that is keeping citizens from having a voice in these post office relocation decisions.

They have also asked that we require the Postal Service to comply with the same local zoning and building codes that apply to State and local governments. Governors made this request because they know firsthand the problems caused when the Postal Service claims immunity from the same laws that private citizens, businesses and local governments abide by.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the governors and have introduced H.R. 1231, which would meet their goals. The Post Office Communities Partnership Act strengthens the voice of local citizens in decisions to relocate or rebuild postal facilities. It would give at least 60 days notice before renovating or relocating. It would require the Postal Service to consider a number of additional factors, including the community sentiment, the extent to which the post office is a part of a core downtown, and the effect a new facility may have on a community. And it must comply with all local zoning, planning and land use regulations.

The bill is fair. It does not place unnecessary burdens on the Postal Service. For the first time they would be treated as a responsible member of the community and not above local laws.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to join with my distinguished colleagues to speak about H.R. 1231, the Post Office Relocation Act. In particular, I want to express my appreciation to Representative BLUMENAUER for organizing this forum and to recognize his efforts in fashioning thoughtful legislation that directly responds to the postal needs and concerns of constituents in every community in our country.

Regardless of where one may reside, the services that the U.S. Post Office provides are deeply rooted in the essence of community and by extension connote a sense of identity. Thus, rural and urban residents understandably react unfavorably when their mail delivery or local post office is altered in some way. A community's reaction is unduly compounded when they have a sense that their concerns and needs were not considered as part of the decision-making process.

In just the last year, I have been approached by several communities in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania that are faced with some type of difficulty regarding postal services. While the circumstances of these cases are quite different, the level of frustration they have experienced with respect to their ability to interject individual thoughts and opinions has been the same.

The residents of Whitaker, Pennsylvania—in my district—have had to deal with having the

operating hours of their local post office reduced to 10AM to 2PM. I don't care where you live, four hours of service is utterly inadequate. In a community nearby to Whitaker, the small, close-knit community of Jefferson Boro is currently being served by four different post offices. Can you imagine four different post offices delivering mail to one community of just over 3,000 households? In yet another part of my district, Rural Ridge has been trying to reach consensus with the U.S. Postal Service on what type of delivery best meets the needs of their community.

While the particulars of these cases are disparate, they all point to the need for greater participation on the part of affected individuals and communities in the decisions arrived at by the U.S. Postal Service. The Post Office Relocation Act is responsive to this need and lays out a reasonable structure through which substantive discourse will occur and collaborative decisions will be reached.

At the risk of being repetitive, I will not outline every provision of the bill. I do however, want to briefly highlight some parts that I think embody the common sense approach taken by Representative BLUMENAUER's legislation. As a starting point, H.R. 1231 would require the U.S. Postal Service to give residents a 60 day notice before the renovation, relocation, closing, or consolidation of their post office. This notice can either be hand delivered or delivered by mail. In addition, a notice of such action must be published in one or more newspapers of general circulation within the zip codes served.

The Post Office Relocation Act does not stop with this good beginning, but also incorporates an allowance for any person affected to offer an alternative proposal and the requirement for hearings to be conducted. Finally, this bill revises the factors that are considered to include the sentiment of the community, whether postal officials negotiated with persons served, and the adequacy of the existing post office.

The Post Office Relocation Act will most assuredly add to the great amount of respect that we all hold for the U.S. Postal Service. I am hopeful that this discussion will lead to more members adding their support to this bill which currently has 49 cosponsors. I also want to offer my strongest encouragement to the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Service to examine this most necessary bill as soon as possible.

Again, I want to recognize Representative BLUMENAUER for introducing H.R. 1231, the Post Office Relocation Act. I appreciate having this chance to express my support for the bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand in support of H.R. 1231, the Post Office Relocation Act. I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation and urge its passage.

Rural areas like my district especially feel the pinch when the post office announces the move of a local office. Post offices in such rural areas are the social and information centers in the town, and are usually located in the heart of the business district. Downtown areas in rural America are often fragile and many local businesses depend on the foot and car traffic which post offices attract.

One town in particular, Castine, is a small coastal town that is the home of the Maine Maritime Academy, faced a similar dilemma. Castine's post office, one of the oldest continually operating post offices in the country, was built in 1814 and has changed very little over time. Probably to the Postal Service it looks like a dilapidated, inefficient place to conduct business. But to the citizens of Castine, it was a treasured facility, an historic sight, and the heart and soul of the community.

It was Castine's bicentennial year and the townspeople were faced with losing a part of what makes their community so unique.

The Postal Service decided that Castine's office should be relocated out of the heart of downtown Castine, but the citizens had other ideas and many of them thought they could create the space needed to ensure quality mail service and they should not be shy about sharing them with the post office. And as a result of this outcry from the public and attention from national news organizations, the Postal Service reconsidered their proposal.

Mr. Speaker, this is good legislation. I appreciate being able to support the legislation.

UNFAIRNESS IN TAX CODE: MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997 the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be here before the House to discuss an issue that is so important to the people of the district that I represent. I have the privilege of representing one of America's most diverse districts, representing the south side of Chicago, the south suburbs in Cook and Will counties, bedroom communities like Morris, or the small town I live in, as well as a lot of cornfields and farm towns. Whether I am at the union hall, or the local VFW or the business and professional women's club or the local grain elevator, there is a common series of questions that my constituents ask time and time again:

Do Americans feel that it is fair that our tax code imposes a higher tax penalty on marriage? Do Americans feel that it is fair that 21 million married working couples with two incomes pay on average $1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married than an identical couple with two incomes that lives together outside of marriage?

□ 1300

Do Americans feel that it is right, that it is fair, that our Tax Code actually punishes marriage and provides an incentive for divorce? In fact, really, for many married couples, the only way they can avoid paying the marriage tax penalty is to file the paperwork for divorce.

My colleagues, the marriage tax penalty not only is unfair; it is wrong that our Tax Code punishes society's most basic institution: the institution of marriage. It punishes 21 million married working couples, on average, of $1,400.

Let me give Members an example of a south suburban couple, a couple I have the privilege of representing in the south suburbs of Chicago. This particular couple, we have a machinist. He works at the local Caterpillar manufacturing plant where they make heavy equipment like bulldozers and cranes and earth movers. This particular machinist makes $30,500 a year.

Now if he is single, after the standard deduction and personal exemptions, this particular machinist is in the 15 percent tax bracket. Now say he and his girlfriend decide to get married, and his girlfriend is a tenured schoolteacher in the Joliet public schools. Say she is making an identical income of $30,500. Now, if she stays single, she would also be in the 15 percent tax bracket.

But because this machinist at the local Joliet Caterpillar plant and this tenured schoolteacher at the local Joliet public schools decide to get married, just because they get married, they, of course, file jointly on their income taxes; and in that case, with this couple, this machinist from Joliet and the schoolteacher from Joliet, since they are married and file jointly, their combined income of $61,000 produces the average marriage tax penalty of almost $1,400.

Is that right that this south suburb couple, this working couple with two incomes, should pay higher taxes just because they are married?

When we think about it, $1,400 may be a drop in the bucket here in Washington, D.C. We do have a 1.7 trillion dollar budget. But for this working couple in Joliet, $1,400 is one year's tuition at Joliet Junior College, it is 3 months' worth of day care at a local child care center and several months' worth of car payments, and it is also a significant portion of a downpayment on a home.

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

Mr. WELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for bringing to the attention of the Members this very vital issue.

At home, I have been saying that the surplus that we seem to be generating, part of that in tax cuts should go to alleviate this problem. So it fits well with the need to bring about some tax justice.

I thank the gentleman very much for bringing it to the attention of the House.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who I believe is a cosponsor of our legislation.

It is so important we look for ways to allow middle-class working families to keep more of what they earn. As we

look at the Tax Code we want to make the Tax Code fairer; and, clearly, eliminating the marriage tax penalty should be a number-one, must-do priority.

I am proud that 235 Members of this House are cosponsoring the Marriage Tax Elimination Act, which many have also said should be called the Working Women's Tax Relief Act, because in so many cases it is the woman's income which is taxed away with the marriage tax penalty.

The Marriage Tax Elimination Act is fairly simple legislation. It allows a married working couple with two incomes to have the choice, the power of choice to choose whether to file as two singles or to file jointly, as many married couples do today; and, of course, we give them that choice. The benefit of having that choice is not only as a married couple they get the benefit from the lower rates but, in this case, this machinist from Joliet and this tenured schoolteacher from Joliet would have the opportunity to avoid the marriage tax penalty.

My colleagues, this should be a bipartisan priority. Let us all work together.

HOUSE MUST VOTE ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM DESPITE SENATE ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). 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. Mr. Speaker, if all things go according to plan, in several hours the Republican leadership in the United States Senate will succeed in killing campaign finance reform in that body. This will be a tragedy of enormous proportions.

Regardless of what action the Senate takes, however, the House must be allowed to vote on campaign finance reform this spring. This Speaker has pledged that we will. Currently, it is still on the schedule.

I hope that defeat in the Senate will not mean that that will lessen the appetite for our leadership to bring this to the floor. The House should be allowed to debate, to offer amendments and to have a free and open discussion of how we reform the system that finances our elections.

Campaign finance reform is crucial not only to the democratic process in this House but it is crucial to all Americans. Because it is the lack of campaign finance reform that continues to allow vast amounts of money from industries to come into the Congress, to distort the outcomes of the democratic process and America's consumers to pay at the marketplace. They pay in higher pharmaceutical prices and drug prices because of campaign contributions in the extensions of patents. They pay higher cable rates because of campaign contributions. They see that the effort to reform HMOs, managed care practices in this country that the public finds unacceptable, are now being thwarted by a concerted campaign effort by the National Association of Manufacturers.

Time and again we see that public resources are sold cheaply because of campaign contributions by the affected industry, by the oil and gas industry, by the mineral industry, by the grazing industry, by the broadcast industry. Time and again Americans find that their tax rates are increased. They find that the costs they pay in the marketplace are increased because of the influence of these large, large contributions to the politicians in the United States Congress.

The time has come to have an open debate and to pass campaign finance reform. If we do not, we will find that the consumers of this country, the taxpayers of this country, will continue to be the losers in this system. But, also important, we will continue to see the erosions and the underpinnings of our very democratic principles and our democratic institutions as the vast waves of soft money overwhelm what the decisions of local voters are in districts, the vast waves of soft money that very often are anonymous and that dictate the outcome of and influence the outcome of these elections.

The time has come for the Congress to be square with the American people. Not rig the outcome, as is being done in the Senate, but to have a debate where competing plans can be offered to the House.

Two weeks ago, 100 Democrats wrote Speaker GINGRICH to demand he honor the pledge to hold a bipartisan vote this spring. Earlier, 30 Republicans wrote to the Speaker calling for him to schedule a vote; 187 Democrats have signed a discharge petition calling for a fair and open vote on competing proposals on the House floor.

This should not be a structured debate so we only get one alternative. There are many good ideas on both sides of the aisle, and we ought to spend time. It is not as though this Congress is working hard. The French have been debating whether they should vote and work on a 35-hour workweek. This Congress has been working on a 35-hour month. So there is plenty of time to have this debate, to have it open, to let people participate and let them vote on these competing efforts to bring about campaign finance reform.

If we do not, we will go into another election where, at the end of that cycle, we will see a recurrence of the campaign scandals by both parties, by individual campaigns and by organizing committees. The American public deserves better than that. The time has come now to start to set out the parameters of that debate, and I look forward to statements by the Speaker and the majority leader as to how the debate will be handled in the coming months.

BANKRUPTCY REFORM

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, very shortly now we will be engaged in one of the most serious debates of the forthcoming remainder of the session, and that is on bankruptcy reform.

I see that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) is in the well here with me. He is one of the cosponsors, along with several others, of a bona fide bankruptcy reform measure that in this coming month of March will see four to five hearings, gaining testimony from every sector of our society, on the needs of the public and of the financial community, of the credit establishments and of the people who need a fresh start and really can use the bankruptcy laws to their advantage. And the best portions of all of those will be part of the hearings that we plan to hold.

How has this come about? The last time that the Congress acted on an overwhelming set of proposals for bankruptcy was 1978. Since that time, we have had ups and downs in the financial health of our society, but in the last year, even with an economy that seems to be ever moving upward, we had 1,300,000 bankruptcy filings. That is an outrageous number and one that has worried financial houses and institutions, lending institutions, and people from every walk of life for a variety of reasons.

How can it be that, with the economy continuing to draw strength, at the same time the curve of the economy goes up so does the curve of bankruptcy? There is something terribly wrong.

We have endeavored to put together a bill that would in some way try to restore the way Americans do business, a sense of accountability and personal responsibility in how they deal with their finances.

It appears that because of the statutes of 1978 it becomes a matter of financial planning many times for people to go bankrupt, a matter of convenience, a matter of how they can get out of a situation and keep all the materials, materials they have garnered over the years and still go bankrupt. So we have to fine tune it to bring this accountability.

What we do generally in this bill that we are proposing is to say that when a person really needs a fresh start and we acknowledge that that is the fact, that some people become so overwhelmed by debt, so incapable of meeting the emergency strains on their pocketbook and other factors, that they have no recourse but to go bankrupt. And we acknowledge that, and we conform to that, and we make it easy for people to do that. But we also then take the extra step to say that when an individual is or an entity is contemplating

bankruptcy and there is a demonstrable ability to repay some of the debt, even if not all of it, even if only a small proportion of it, that that moral obligation is in the forefront, they should be given the opportunity and, yea, they should be mandated to repay some of that debt.

So we have a formula that would go into place; and when we determine that after all the bills are lined up and a person's ability to pay is gauged, if we determine that, indeed, some, maybe 20 percent, of the total outstanding bills could be paid in 5 years, over a period of 5 years, then that individual should go into what we call Chapter 13 in order to enter into a plan whereby they can begin to repay some of the debt that they have built up over the years.

Now, many will blame the rash of credit cards that seem to be floating around and that, therefore, we ought to have credit companies withhold those credit cards so that the people will not be overcharging and overdebting themselves. But we do not know if that is the answer or not. We will be looking into that. Is there a predator creditor in the picture? If so, we have to make sure that that does not happen.

But, by and large, it is still a question of personal responsibility. If I am given five or six credit cards, does that mean I have to use all of them, exhaust the limitations of all of them and knowingly put myself into debt? And, if I do, should I then be excused from paying the debt because of the temptation of having four or five plastics in front of me?

These are the questions that we have to pose and we have to answer as judiciously as possible in the forthcoming weeks. The way we have planned this is to end this debate.

ELDER ABUSE IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks there have been several news reports about one of the most rapidly growing crimes in our communities. In fact, the Los Angeles Times and the Orange County Register have both reported a rise in physical and financial abuse against senior citizens.

As our population continues to grow older, we must be prepared to face the reality of these horrible crimes. As leaders in our communities, we must be prepared to deal with this growing problem of elder abuse.

□ 1315

All too often seniors are taken advantage of in their own homes. Many perpetrators see senior citizens as easy targets who are both vulnerable and oftentimes unable to defend themselves. It is our responsibility to help protect our elders from these criminals and to ensure that they feel safe within their own homes. I have been working closely with the local agencies, law enforcement agencies and the FBI to develop legislation that will effectively protect senior citizens from abuse.

H.R. 3181 does this. H.R. 3181, the Older and Disabled Americans Criminal Protection Act, authorizes shared housing agencies to run background checks on potential caretakers. Shared housing agencies give seniors the opportunity to remain within their own homes by matching them with a caretaker who cares for them in lieu of rent. Unfortunately, shared housing agencies do not have the proper tools to help ensure the safety of these senior citizens. H.R. 3181 gives shared housing agencies the proper mechanism to run State and FBI background checks on potential caretakers before placing them in the home of a senior citizen. The local police departments in my district along with the FBI have commended H.R. 3181 as a proactive effort to prevent crime. They recognize the growing problem of elder abuse and realize that my bill attacks these crimes by lessening the chance that they will ever occur. As people grow older, remaining in their homes should increase their level of comfort and security, not threaten it. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in this effort to protect our loved ones and to battle the growing problem of elder abuse. It is our responsibility to give our communities the proper tools to battle crime. Cosponsor H.R. 3181 and protect our senior citizens.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk for a few minutes about putting Social Security first. The challenge is, what the President can do and what Congress might do to give a higher priority for saving Social Security.

For review, this is a pie chart of Federal Government spending for this year. As we see, one of the largest pieces of the pie is Social Security that takes 22 percent of the total Federal budget. Social Security right now, sends out $660,000 a minute in Social Security benefit payments. But by 2030, we are going to be spending almost $6 million a minute for Social Security benefit payments. An 866% increase.

That represents part of the problem. The fact that there are relatively fewer workers paying their Social Security taxes to finance these increasing benefits represents the other part of the problem. It is probably one of the most challenging problems facing Congress and the White House. Yet politicians in Washington have avoided dealing with this very important issue because of the potential political demagoguery. We have to deal with the hard facts of how we are going to make Social Security continue for those that are now retired, for those that are going to retire in the near future, as well as our kids and our grandkids.

Let me just give my colleagues a quick review. In 1935, the Social Security system was devised and passed into law. It has always been a pay-as-you-go program. In other words, existing workers pay in their taxes and those taxes are immediately sent out in benefit payments to existing retirees. So it is sort of a Ponzi game, sort of like a chain letter. Early retirees made out very well. Taxes started out as 1.5 percent of the first $3500 of payroll. Now it is 12.4 percent for the employee and the employer's share for the first $65,000. Over the year we have continued to increase taxes on workers. In fact these taxes have been increased 36 times since 1971.

This next chart shows the dilemma for Social Security. The red part represents how much in debt Social Security is going to be in the future. If nothing is done, eventually Congress must provide an additional $400 billion a year to cover promised benefit payments. This little blue blob on the top left is the short-term surplus that is in the Social Security trust fund. Congress supposedly fixed Social Security in 1983. What they did is substantially increase taxes on workers. But this fix was short-lived. By 2011 there will again be a cash shortage. Dorcas Hardy, a former Social Security Administrator, is estimating that we are going to run short of money as early as 2005. But even in the scenario of 2011, what does Congress do to come up with the money to meet their obligations of paying back the $600 billion borrowed from the trust fund. Well, Congress can cut spending someplace else, they can increase taxes like they have been doing for the last 40 years every time Social Security was a little shy. They can borrow more money from the public and disrupt some of the downward pressures on interest rates that we have achieved so far.

I think it is important, and just for a minute, allow me to say that we do not have a balanced budget. We are not going to have a balanced budget this year, next year, any year for the next 5 years of the President's budget, because every year all the surplus coming into the Social Security trust fund is used to balance the budget. So every year, the national debt increases between $120 billion and $170 billion. Every year. That is how much more the national debt is going to increase. I think it is interesting to note that one of the dilemmas of this Congress is the fact that now 15 percent of the budget is required to pay interest on the debt. So if we can pay some of that debt back and start paying down that debt, we reduce interest cost. Let me just briefly run through these charts.

Because we have increased taxes so often on workers, this chart shows how many years you are going to have to live after you retire in order to get the money back you and your employer put in. If you retire after the year 2006, you have to live 26 years after you retire just to break even. It is a serious problem. We need to deal with it.

ON THE INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ALLEVIATE THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY WORKER SHORTAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will introduce a package of 5 bills to help our economy address the critical shortage in information technology workers. We are fortunate to live and work in a time of economic growth and expansion. Unemployment is low and production is up. But we cannot take these good times for granted. We have to continue to take those measures necessary to sustain our thriving economy.

One of the hazards that could derail our economic engine is a growing shortage of skilled workers. Too many firms across the country are facing serious difficulties in hiring workers with needed skills. This shortage, which has been estimated to be as high as 190,000 employees nationwide, is especially restricting the growth and development of our Nation's information technology industry, which is the vanguard of our national economic boom. This shortage of skilled workers is costing our economy over $10 billion a year in lost revenue.

But high tech firms are not the only ones suffering from this workforce shortage. When asked about the main barriers to expansion and competitiveness, companies across the country in many different industries point to the difficulty of getting skilled workers.

While the current low unemployment rate contributes to this problem, its roots are more fundamental. In the new economy, skill requirements are going up in many industries, even so-called low-tech industries. More than half of the new jobs created require some education beyond high school. The percentage of workers who use computers at work has risen from 25 percent to 46 percent, nearly half, in the last 10 years. States such as Colorado, Maryland, Rhode Island, Washington have all recently released reports highlighting the pressing need of employers for skilled workers.

Standard supply and demand economics will not address this shortfall. Most firms, but particularly small and medium-sized enterprises, have limited capacity to engage in significant and sustained workforce development efforts. Managers and owners of most firms are simply too busy running their business to develop training systems. Firms lack information on the type of training they need and where to get it. And, unless their competitors are willing to invest in training as well, such an investment will increase the relative cost of their products above that of their competitors.

So there is a natural inclination not to be the first ones to invest in training. And so when confronted with a shortage of skilled workers, most firms try to hire workers from other companies. Competition for skilled employees is so high that companies are offering irresistible packages, including signing bonuses, long-term bonuses, finder's fees, to lure trained employees away from firms who have invested the time and money to train them. Just across the Potomac River, SRA Technologies, a fine firm, a technology firm in my district, offers a $10,000 bounty to employees for every trained worker who signs on as a result of their recommendation. But we are not increasing the supply sufficiently, which is the real long-term solution to this problem.

As the United States enters its unprecedented seventh year of growth, attributed in part to the dynamic expansion of the technology industry, Congress must move to remove barriers to technology industry expansion. My legislation addresses the worker shortage and the need to provide additional training through a number of approaches.

The first bill creates Regional Skills Alliances. Modeled after the successful Manufacturing Extension Program, this bill would provide Federal support to encourage companies to participate in consortia which would address their industry's specific skill needs. The Federal involvement in this program amounts to one-third of the cost. Every dollar in Federal support will be matched by a dollar in State and local government support and a dollar in direct industry support, so that the competitive pressure not to be the one to take the initiative on training is relieved.

The second provision allows the Secretary of Labor to establish Regional Private Industry Councils. PICs play a constructive role in addressing the workforce needs within a State. But these organizations are State organizations and not formed to address problems that may cross State lines. To remedy that situation, my legislation would allow the Secretary of Labor to certify and fund regional PICs that address regional problems. They would be funded directly by the Secretary of Labor to ensure that they do not detract from existing State programs.

The third bill would offer employers who train employees for information technology jobs a tax credit for 50 percent of the training costs up to $2,500 per year per employee.

The fourth bill would ensure that the Federal Government's investment in training is well spent by allowing these Private Industry Councils to reward bonuses to training providers with a high percentage of placement. This will help establish a more outcome-based system to ensure that training providers emphasize placing their students in jobs. My bill would amend JTPA to allow funds to be used for bonuses for the most successful training providers.

It would also allow high technology professionals to more easily immigrate to the United States so that we are not exporting jobs abroad but are paying American workers at home. It is a good and necessary package of legislation. I urge my colleagues' support for it.

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to suggest that we can increase take-home pay and improve retirement security in America by leading our country to a new level of freedom and opportunity for every American worker and taxpayer. I am not talking about raising the minimum wage. I am talking about reducing taxes further, especially on working-class Americans, those who are on modest incomes, those who have fixed incomes because they are wage earners and salaried workers. The first step in reducing taxes, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), who preceded me here in the well, suggested, is to eliminate the marriage penalty in the Tax Code. Then we should go on to pass the Middle Class Tax Relief Act and the Taxpayer Choice Act, both introduced by the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), which would have the effect of raising the income levels for the 28 percent tax bracket. That would put more working Americans in the lowest tax bracket, the 15 percent tax bracket, and for those who are already in the 15 percent tax bracket, we would increase the personal exemption. The effect again, more take-home pay for working-class Americans.

Let me be clear about one thing. I think I speak for almost all House Republicans when I say this. If the President has money for more social spending, then we have money for tax cuts. But also let me be clear about one other thing. That is we cannot have, we should not have, tax relief without real tax reform. We have to stop the IRS collection abuses. The best way to do that is to end the IRS as we know it. That is why I and many House Republicans have signed a pledge, a written pledge, and we have cosponsored legislation to sunset the Tax Code by the year 2001. This is a death sentence for the Tax Code and we hope would move the country in the direction of a fairer, a flatter, a simpler Tax Code and a tax system, one that is hopefully based on a single rate of taxation. But we do not have to wait until the year 2001. What

we could do right now is let taxpayers choose between paying a flat tax and the current system. You heard me right; they could simply, come tax day, choose whether to report their income and pay a flat tax on that income or to stay in the present system. We do not have to wait to 2001. That is the Washington way of studying things to death; it is called paralysis by analysis back here in Washington.

We could also and should also let taxpayers have the choice of investing a portion of their payroll taxes, their FICA contributions, into a directed IRA, an individual retirement account, so that they can earn a better return on their money than Social Security. To do that though we have to, as Mr. SMITH just has suggested here, we have to take the Social Security Trust Fund off budget once and for all. We have to let the trust fund stay in, the surplus rather, stay in the Social Security, let the surplus stay in the Social Security Trust Fund so that it will continue to accrue and compound interest.

We can do this. We can give workers a choice now again between a flat tax and the current system, between being able and having to put all their payroll taxes in Social Security or at least being able to put a portion in a directed IRA so that they can earn a better return than Social Security. The net effect is higher take-home pay, better retirement security and more freedom and opportunity for every American.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent the citizens of central Florida's 7th Congressional District. Our area and other central Florida communities were in the path of devastating tornadoes yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, while our residences, our businesses and our communities can and will be replaced, the lives of an unprecedented number of wonderful human beings has been lost forever. I would like to extend my heartfelt sympathy to the families and friends who have lost loved ones in this terrible natural disaster.

The people of my district are strong, determined, faith and family-oriented. They will rebuild, they will heal their wounds, but they will never forget that night or those lost.

Yesterday, I had the opportunity to again see the wonderful people of my district in central Florida come together. I saw volunteers, law enforcement, emergency management personnel, utility workers, Red Cross representatives, private contractors, State and local and Federal officials and employees working together.

Mr. Speaker, I salute and pay tribute to the fine citizens of my State and district, and I want to take this opportunity to say thank you to my colleagues and others who have made expressions of concern and support during this difficult time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 34 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 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 in our lives and in our world we experience the contrasts of life. There are threats of war and promises of peace. There are moments of laughter and times of tears. There are seasons of love and occasions of disdain. There are instances of trust and others of suspicion. And yet, with all these feelings and attitudes, we have Your abiding word and Your reconciling peace.

As we walk through the uneven paths of our existence, may we rejoice and be glad that underneath are Your everlasting arms supporting us and making us whole. For these and all Your blessings, O God, we offer this prayer of thanksgiving. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT 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.

SALUTING ILLINOIS BROADCASTERS AND BROADCASTERS ACROSS THE NATION

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, broadcasters across this Nation have a single mandate from the Federal Government, to serve the public interest in the communities where they operate. I am pleased that the Illinois broadcasters in my State do such an excellent job both on and off the air.

A recent survey conducted by the Illinois Broadcasters Association indicates that the average TV station in my State contributes over half a million dollars annually in air time for public service announcements and over 80,000 per radio station.

These stations are an integral part of small town USA and even create a sense of community in large cities. Local stations provide the news we depend on, the weather warnings we count on, and the public affairs programs which give viewers and listeners the opportunity to hear from their elected officials.

I salute the Illinois broadcasters in my district and the broadcasters across the Nation that do such a fine job day in and day out. America's system of free, over-the-air broadcasting has been on the job since the 1920s and still serves us well almost 80 years later. It is one thing we can all count on in the next millennium.

WE NEED ALLIED SUPPORT IN IRAQ

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the American people are saying if military action is needed in Iraq, America should not do it alone, and the American people are right. The days of sending American soldiers overseas with a rifle on their shoulder and a credit card in their pocket just does not cut it anymore, Mr. Speaker, especially when many of our so-called allies sit on the sidelines and shout Yankee go home to boot.

Kofi Annan is to be commended for his efforts. It sounds good. But in any event, I think the wise words of Ronald Reagan apply here: Trust but verify; trust but verify.

But I will not, Mr. Speaker, support military action unless our allies are on the battlefield with us. We represent Uncle Sam; we do not represent Uncle Sucker.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY

(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, I was among hundreds of Republicans last month who stood and applauded President Clinton when he spoke in this Chamber I applauded because I thought he said that we should use any budget surplus to save ''Social Security first.'' That is why so many of us vigorously applauded a position we thought he was taking. However, I have gone back and looked at his speech. What he actually said was we should ''reserve'' every penny of the surplus until we ''save'' Social Security.

What does that mean? We find out from the President's budget recently

submitted that it does not mean reserving the surplus for Social Security Trust Fund, because in the budget he presented, there is $100 billion in new taxes, $100 billion in new spending, but nothing about putting the surplus into Social Security. In fact, his senior economic advisers later have said they don't know what ''reserving'' it means.

Mr. Speaker, Mark Twain said everybody talks about the weather, but nobody does anything about it. This administration talks a good game about Social Security, but he hasn't done anything about it in his budget proposal. It would be nice if the President treated Social Security better than Mark Twain treated the weather.

IRS REFORM IS LONG OVERDUE

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, Rush Limbaugh, in an interview with the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) asked why would Bill Clinton defend the IRS?

Let us think about that. Why would Bill Clinton defend the IRS? If my colleagues recall when the President was confronted with hearings this past month which exposed the incredible abuse of power that seems to be a way of doing business over at the IRS, his first reaction almost instinctively was to defend the IRS.

His first reaction was to say that things are really not that bad, and he criticized the Republican reform plan. Of course, that was until he saw the polls that the American people were having none of it, that they have known for years that the IRS suffers from heavy-handed tactics, sloppiness and lack of accountability.

This last point is the key point. Any agency or bureaucrat that lacks accountability will, over time, abuse its power. The Republican IRS reform proposal would inject real accountability into the IRS, and make the audit process accountable to an outside review body for the first time ever. It is long overdue.

SULLIVAN AWARD TO PEYTON MANNING, QUARTERBACK AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in the last 4 years, Peyton Manning, quarterback for the University of Tennessee, has earned a reputation not only as one of the finest college athletes in the country, but also as an individual of exceptional integrity and character.

Tomorrow, the Amateur Athletic Union will present the Sullivan Award to Peyton Manning, recognizing him as the most outstanding amateur athlete in the country. This prestigious award recognizes not only athletic ability, but also exceptional leadership, moral character and sportsmanship.

In his time as starting quarterback at University of Tennessee, Peyton Manning has become the SEC's all time leading passer and has broken a total of 42 NCAA SEC and Tennessee records.

However, Peyton Manning's accomplishments go far beyond the football field. He graduated near the top of his class in only 3 years, and he is well known for his leadership and service to his school and the community.

Last spring, Peyton Manning passed up the opportunity to make millions of dollars by turning pro, instead choosing to stay at the University of Tennessee to continue his education and finish his fourth year of college eligibility. Peyton Manning certainly deserves the Sullivan Award, and I commend the Amateur Athletic Union on their selection of Peyton Manning as their athlete of the year. No one is more deserving of this award.

PRIORITIZING SPENDING AND FOCUSING ON DEFENDING OUR BORDERS

(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, it is often said that those who do not learn from the past are doomed to repeat it. Today, this Nation stands on the edge and the threshold of runaway drug use and rising violence against all Americans. So how do our liberal colleagues plan to counter this most dangerous trend? Well, my colleagues can guess it, $120 billion in new taxes and more Washington-knows-best, unworkable big government programs. They are proposing that we make the Federal social bureaucracies larger and more invasive into the lives of American people.

To them I say, enough is enough. What does it say about our government when the IRS employs five times as many as the FBI and 14 times as many people as the DEA? When did policing the American taxpayer become more important than policing America's drug dealers and criminal thugs?

Now more than ever we must practice fiscal discipline and common sense by reprioritizing spending and focusing our government on defending the borders of this Nation and the safety of the American citizens.

OPPOSING THE USDA'S ORGANIC LABEL STANDARD

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago it became apparent that producers of organic foods were having a marketing problem. The public was confused about what organic meant. The label ''organic food'' was being cheapened by the public confusion.

So, in 1990 the Congress passed a law to correct this problem, organic Foods Production Act, a single set of criteria by which food products could be labeled as organic. However, what the USDA is proposing is both overreaching and inadequate.

For example, the USDA proposal would allow irradiated foods. Further, the proposal would permit genetically engineered ingredients. It would permit vegetable ingredients where the plants had been fertilized with municipal wastes.

I think we need to send this agency, our U.S. Department of Agriculture, out to talk with consumers. They need to find out what organic means to the consumer now, and it does not mean radiated, engineered or sludge-fertilized food.

□ 1415

I am emphatically opposed to these proposed standards.

CUBAN DISREGARD FOR INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today, February 24, marks the anniversary of a tragic case of the Cuban regime's blatant disregard for international legal and moral standards.

Two years ago today, three U.S. citizens and a U.S. resident exiled in the United States died at the hands of the Cuban Air Force. The Cuban regime did not care that these were civilian planes. The regime in Cuba did not care that they were flying over international waters. The illegal Cuban government did not care that these four men were keeping a vigilance in search of Cubans risking their lives in these treacherous waters. The corrupt dictator, Fidel Castro, did not care then, nor does he care now.

What many are not aware of is that the violations in this case did not end with the shootdown of these four brave men. The grandniece of one of the victims was still in Cuba. This 11-year-old girl was suffering from Reye's syndrome. Her ailments were affecting her sight, and the pain to her fragile body was intolerable. But as the niece and the granddaughter of individuals who had fled Castro's claws, she was denied basic medical attention.

When a visiting doctor began tending to her suffering, the Cuban regime detained him and threatened his family. Castro did not care about the pain of the defenseless child, and the regime did not care, nor does it care now, about basic human rights.

ORDERING SELECTED RESERVE OF ARMED FORCES TO ACTIVE DUTY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105–217)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message

from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on National Security and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 12304, I have authorized the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard, when it is not operating as a Service within the Department of the Navy, to order to active duty Selected Reserve units and individuals not assigned to units to augment the Active components in support of operations in and around Southwest Asia.

A copy of the Executive order implementing this action is attached.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 24, 1998.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, February 23, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 202(b)(3), Public Law 103–227, I hereby appoint the following Member to the National Education Goals Panel:

Mr. Martinez, CA.

Yours very truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, February 12, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 203(b)(1) of Public Law 105–134, I hereby appoint the following individual to the Amtrak Reform Council:

Mr. S. Lee Kling, Villa Ridge, MO.

Yours very truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS AT CEREMONIES IN OBSERVANCE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House on Thursday, February 12, 1998, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to represent the House of Representatives at wreath-laying ceremonies at the Washington Monument for the observance of George Washington's birthday held on Monday, February 23, 1998:

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.

Mr. HOYER of Maryland.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE KENNY HULSHOF, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Scott Callicott, Office Director of the Hon. KENNY HULSHOF, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, February 12, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena (for testimony) issued by the Circuit Court for Marion County, Missouri in the case of *State* v. *Kolb.*

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

SCOTT CALLICOTT,
Office Director.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, 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.

NATO SPECIAL IMMIGRANT AMENDMENTS OF 1998

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 429) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for special immigrant status for NATO civilian employees in the same manner as for employees of international organizations, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 429

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 ''NATO Special Immigrant Amendments of 1998''.

SEC. 2. SPECIAL IMMIGRANT STATUS FOR CERTAIN NATO CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(a)(27) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (J),

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (K) and inserting ''; or'', and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(L) an immigrant who would be described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of subparagraph (I) if any reference in such a clause—

''(i) to an international organization described in paragraph (15)(G)(i) were treated as a reference to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO);

''(ii) to a nonimmigrant under paragraph (15)(G)(iv) were treated as a reference to a nonimmigrant classifiable under NATO–6 (as a member of a civilian component accompanying a force entering in accordance with the provisions of the NATO Status-of-Forces Agreement, a member of a civilian component attached to or employed by an Allied Headquarters under the 'Protocol on the Status of International Military Headquarters' set up pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty, or as a dependent); and

''(iii) to the Immigration Technical Corrections Act of 1988 or to the Immigration and Nationality Technical Corrections Act of 1994 were a reference to the NATO Special Immigrant Amendments of 1997.''.

(b) CONFORMING NONIMMIGRANT STATUS FOR CERTAIN PARENTS OF SPECIAL IMMIGRANT CHILDREN.—Section 101(a)(15)(N) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(N)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(or under analogous authority under paragraph (27)(L))'' after ''(27)(I)(i)'', and

(2) by inserting ''(or under analogous authority under paragraph (27)(L))'' after ''(27)(I)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 429, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2429, the NATO Special Immigrant Amendments of 1998, was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PICKETT). The bill would allow aliens who are civilian employees of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and have worked for many years in the United States to retire here with their families as special immigrants. The number of special immigrant visas available each year, currently about 10,000, would not be increased.

Currently aliens who have been longtime employees in the United States of numerous international organizations are eligible to retire here as special immigrants. NATO employees are also deserving, and should be granted this same privilege.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization kept the peace in Europe for four decades, saving untold American lives. We should now bestow this small honor on its employees as well.

According to testimony received at the hearing of the Subcommittee on Immigration Claims held on H.R. 429, the total number of people who would benefit from this bill is about 130.

Also at the hearing, Paul Virtue of the Immigration and Naturalization Service stated, ''We do not oppose this proposal and do not foresee any budgetary or resource impact on the Service if this bill should be enacted.''

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 429.

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. It is not a controversial bill. H.R. 429 would grant special immigrant status to retired civilian NATO employees who served in the headquarters of the Protocol on the Status of International Military in Norfolk, Virginia. Special immigrants and their families are entitled to permanent resident status in the United States now. H.R. 429 would immediately impact 60 families and only approximately 132 individuals.

We certainly have no quarrel with NATO civilian employees who have lived in the United States for extended periods of time exercising this privilege, or extending this right to them or this privilege to them. However, we do believe there should be some degree of reciprocity for Americans who are working for NATO abroad who would like to retire with their families in Belgium or Germany, for example, if they should elect to do that, and that has not been addressed in any way.

That is not a knock against the bill; the bill is fine. It would have been nice if we could have put something in there or if the other countries could address that issue to demonstrate some degree of reciprocity.

The final point I would like to make though is that while we believe that the NATO personnel and their families who remain in the United States after retirement certainly should be extended this prerogative, many of the requirements are equally applicable to some other circumstances, and I would like to spend a minute or two just laying those out for my colleagues, because we need to address some of these issues and make sure that our immigration policy continues to be consistent and the rationale for our immigration policy continues to be consistent.

Supporters of H.R. 429 have asserted that NATO personnel should be allowed to remain permanently in the United States for four reasons.

Number one, they say their children came to the United States at elementary school age and have never experienced a lifestyle in their country of origin. That is correct.

Number two, they say their children possess educational qualifications and experiences that are unique to the United States and that are unlikely to be fully recognized if they return to their native countries. That is also correct.

Number three, they say that current law requires children of NATO employees to return to their native country upon graduating from high school or college, thereby breaking up families. That, too, is correct, and a good argument in support of this bill.

Finally, they say that NATO employees should be able to retire into the communities that have become their home after years of service to NATO in the United States. That, too, is correct.

All four of those arguments are good arguments in support of this bill. But they are also good arguments for addressing the issues that relate to Haitians who have been in this country under the same or similar circumstances and to which the same arguments would be equally applicable.

So I hope as we pass this piece of legislation, we take time to understand the rationale for passing this legislation, and apply that same rationale to other people for whom these four arguments would be applicable, such as the Haitians, the Hmongs, and some other folks who have come to this country at our invitation and with our blessing and have exactly the same arguments in favor of extending citizenship to them on a permanent basis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PICKETT), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and thank the committee for their dispatch of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to say that the Supreme Allied Command Atlantic is in my Congressional District, and H.R. 429 was introduced so that non-U.S. NATO civilian employees would be treated the same as civilian employees of all other international organizations located in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there are only approximately 60 non-U.S. employees employed by NATO in southeastern Virginia, and these civilians are divided between the Allied Command Atlantic Communications Logistic Depot, ACLANT, in Yorktown, and the headquarters of the Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic, SACLANT, in Norfolk.

The civilians and their dependents, a total of about 132 people, are from eight NATO nations: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. They are issued a NATO–6 visa, and most are employed on contracts of indefinite duration.

Under the terms of their visa, they are considered nonresident aliens and can only remain in the United States as long as they continue to be employed at ACLANT or SACLANT. The dependent children of these civilians are not allowed to retain the NATO–6 visa after attaining the age of 21. However, those children who are full-time students may retain their visa until age 23.

The dilemma facing a number of these families is that their children come to the United States at elementary school age and never experience the lifestyle of their country of origin. They acquire educational qualifications and experiences that are unique to the United States.

□ 1430

Under present legislation, when these children graduate from high school or college, the family is forced to break apart because the children, having attained the age of 21, must leave the United States. A similar situation faces a NATO employee upon retirement. The civilian and his or her spouse are unable to retire into a community that has become their home after their years of service to NATO in the United States. I would add here that these people do reside in the community in my district, and make very, very fine community citizens.

Until 1990, the problem confronted employees of all international organizations located in the United States. Amendments to the U.S. Immigration and Nationality Act passed in 1990 and 1997 resolved this situation to a large degree for G–4 visa employees of international organizations and their dependents. These amendments provide G–4 visa holders with the opportunity to obtain special immigrant status for adults if they have lived in the United States for 15 years, and for children if they have lived in this country for 7 years, based upon certain other conditions.

The provisions of these amendments apply to non-U.S. civilians employed by all international organizations located in the United States except for NATO. Presently there is no executive order that defines NATO as an international organization in the United States, and due to their NATO status, additional legislation is required to enable 1992 civilians to benefit from the privilege accorded to G–4 visa holders. These are employees such as those of the United Nations.

The SACLANT administration has consulted the Secretary of Defense, Foreign Military Rights Affairs, the State Department, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. It has been concluded by them that this issue can best be resolved by legislation to further amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for special immigrant status for NATO employee civilians in the same manner as for employees of international organizations. H.R. 429 has been introduced for this purpose.

This initiative is fully endorsed by NATO headquarters and is urgently needed to redress what is regarded as a very unfair situation for employees working for the collective security of all NATO nations. I request that you give favorable consideration to the privilege of special immigrant status which is enjoyed by those employed by all other international organizations in the United States.

I might add, again, that this is a very small group of people we are speaking

of. All of them are highly educated and highly trained. They work in very sensitive positions for NATO and their present status is, I believe, an oversight that should be corrected.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just reiterate to my colleagues that this is not a controversial bill. It serves a very worthy purpose, and the fact that I have talked about some things that the bill could cover and should cover should not overshadow the good aspects of the bill. I hope that the House will have the courage to address some of those issues, but that is not a negative about this bill. This bill should be supported.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, that I appreciate his effort to expand the four criteria that he listed to include other groups like the Haitians and the Hmongs that he mentioned. But unfortunately, that is not a valid application of those criteria.

I say this because there are at least two major distinctions. One is in the case of the NATO employees, who were specifically admitted to work for NATO and indirectly for the United States, and that is not the case with these other groups that were mentioned.

Secondly, the NATO employees have to have been in the United States for an aggregate of 15 years. Again, that would distinguish the NATO employees from members of the other groups that were mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 429, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXAMINATION PARITY AND YEAR 2000 READINESS FOR FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS ACT

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3116) to address the year 2000 computer problems with regard to financial institutions, to extend examination parity to the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision and the National Credit Union Administration, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3116

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 ''Examination Parity and Year 2000 Readiness for Financial Institutions Act''.

SEC. 2. YEAR 2000 READINESS FOR FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the Year 2000 computer problem poses a serious challenge to the American economy, including the Nation's banking and financial services industries;

(2) thousands of banks, savings associations, and credit unions rely heavily on internal information technology and computer systems, as well as outside service providers, for mission-critical functions, such as check clearing, direct deposit, accounting, automated teller machine networks, credit card processing, and data exchanges with domestic and international borrowers, customers, and other financial institutions; and

(3) Federal financial regulatory agencies must have sufficient examination authority to ensure that the safety and soundness of the Nation's financial institutions will not be at risk.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms ''depository institution'' and ''Federal banking agency'' have the same meanings as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act;

(2) the term ''Federal home loan bank'' has the same meaning as in section 2 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act;

(3) the term ''Federal reserve bank'' means a reserve bank established under the Federal Reserve Act;

(4) the term ''insured credit union'' has the same meaning as in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act; and

(5) the term ''Year 2000 computer problem'' means, with respect to information technology, any problem which prevents such technology from accurately processing, calculating, comparing, or sequencing date or time data—

(A) from, into, or between—

(i) the 20th and 21st centuries; or

(ii) the years 1999 and 2000; or

(B) with regard to leap year calculations.

(c) SEMINARS AND MODEL APPROACHES TO YEAR 2000 COMPUTER PROBLEM.—

(1) SEMINARS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal banking agency and the National Credit Union Administration Board shall offer seminars to all depository institutions and insured credit unions under the jurisdiction of such agency on the implication of the Year 2000 computer problem for—

(i) the safe and sound operations of such depository institutions and credit unions; and

(ii) transactions with other financial institutions, including Federal reserve banks and Federal home loan banks.

(B) CONTENT AND SCHEDULE.—The content and schedule of seminars offered pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be determined by each Federal banking agency and the National Credit Union Administration Board taking into account the resources and examination priorities of such agency.

(2) MODEL APPROACHES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal banking agency and the National Credit Union Administration Board shall make available to each depository institution and insured credit union under the jurisdiction of such agency model approaches to common Year 2000 computer problems, such as model approaches with regard to project management, vendor contracts, testing regimes, and business continuity planning.

(B) VARIETY OF APPROACHES.—In developing model approaches to the Year 2000 computer problem pursuant to subparagraph (A), each Federal banking agency and the National Credit Union Administration Board shall take into account the need to develop a variety of approaches to correspond to the variety of depository institutions or credit unions within the jurisdiction of the agency.

(3) COOPERATION.—In carrying out this section, the Federal banking agencies and the National Credit Union Administration Board may cooperate and coordinate their activities with each other, the Financial Institutions Examination Council, and appropriate organizations representing depository institutions and credit unions.

SEC. 3. REGULATION AND EXAMINATION OF SERVICE PROVIDERS.

(a) REGULATION AND EXAMINATION OF SAVINGS ASSOCIATION SERVICE COMPANIES.—

(1) AMENDMENT TO HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT.—Section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1464(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) REGULATION AND EXAMINATION OF SAVINGS ASSOCIATION SERVICE COMPANIES, SUBSIDIARIES, AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—

''(A) GENERAL EXAMINATION AND REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—A service company or subsidiary that is owned in whole or in part by a savings association shall be subject to examination and regulation by the Director to the same extent as that savings association.

''(B) EXAMINATION BY OTHER BANKING AGENCIES.—The Director may authorize any other Federal banking agency that supervises any other owner of part of the service company or subsidiary to perform an examination described in subparagraph (A).

''(C) APPLICABILITY OF SECTION 8 OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT.—A service company or subsidiary that is owned in whole or in part by a saving association shall be subject to the provisions of section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act as if the service company or subsidiary were an insured depository institution. In any such case, the Director shall be deemed to be the appropriate Federal banking agency, pursuant to section 3(q) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

''(D) SERVICE PERFORMED BY CONTRACT OR OTHERWISE.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), if a savings association, a subsidiary thereof, or any savings and loan affiliate or entity, as identified by section 8(b)(9) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, that is regularly examined or subject to examination by the Director, causes to be performed for itself, by contract or otherwise, any service authorized under this Act or, in the case of a State savings association, any applicable State law, whether on or off its premises—

''(i) such performance shall be subject to regulation and examination by the Director to the same extent as if such services were being performed by the savings association on its own premises; and

''(ii) the savings association shall notify the Director of the existence of the service relationship not later than 30 days after the earlier of—

''(I) the date on which the contract is entered into; or

''(II) the date on which the performance of the service is initiated.

''(E) ADMINISTRATION BY THE DIRECTOR.—The Director may issue such regulations and orders, including those issued pursuant to section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, as may be necessary to enable the Director to administer and carry out this paragraph and to prevent evasion of this paragraph.

''(8) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(A) the term 'service company' means—

''(i) any corporation—

''(I) that is organized to perform services authorized by this Act or, in the case of a corporation owned in part by a State savings association, authorized by applicable State law; and

''(II) all of the capital stock of which is owned by 1 or more insured savings associations; and

''(ii) any limited liability company—

''(I) that is organized to perform services authorized by this Act or, in the case of a company, 1 of the members of which is a State savings association, authorized by applicable State law; and

''(II) all of the members of which are 1 or more insured savings associations;

''(B) the term 'limited liability company' means any company, partnership, trust, or similar business entity organized under the law of a State (as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act) that provides that a member or manager of such company is not personally liable for a debt, obligation, or liability of the company solely by reason of being, or acting as, a member or manager of such company; and

''(C) the terms 'State savings association' and 'subsidiary' have the same meanings as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 8 OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT.—Section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(9), by striking ''to any service corporation of a savings association and to any subsidiary of such service corporation'';

(B) in subsection (e)(7)(A)(ii), by striking ''(b)(8)'' and inserting ''(b)(9)''; and

(C) in subsection (j)(2), by striking ''(b)(8)'' and inserting ''(b)(9)''.

(b) REGULATION AND EXAMINATION OF SERVICE PROVIDERS FOR CREDIT UNIONS.—Title II of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1781 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 206 the following new section:

''SEC. 206A. REGULATION AND EXAMINATION OF CREDIT UNION ORGANIZATIONS AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.

''(a) REGULATION AND EXAMINATION OF CREDIT UNION ORGANIZATIONS.—

''(1) GENERAL EXAMINATION AND REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—A credit union organization shall be subject to examination and regulation by the Board to the same extent as that insured credit union.

''(2) EXAMINATION BY OTHER BANKING AGENCIES.—The Board may authorize to make an examination of a credit union organization in accordance with paragraph (1)—

''(A) any Federal regulator agency that supervises any activity of a credit union organization; or

''(B) any Federal banking agency that supervises any other person who maintains an ownership interest in a credit union organization.

''(b) APPLICABILITY OF SECTION 206.—A credit union organization shall be subject to the provisions of section 206 as if the credit union organization were an insured credit union.

''(c) SERVICE PERFORMED BY CONTRACT OR OTHERWISE.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), if an insured credit union or a credit union organization that is regularly examined or subject to examination by the Board, causes to be performed for itself, by contract or otherwise, any service authorized under this Act, or in the case of a State credit union, any applicable State law, whether on or off its premises—

''(1) such performance shall be subject to regulation and examination by the Board to the same extent as if such services were being performed by the insured credit union or credit union organization itself on its own premises; and

''(2) the insured credit union or credit union organization shall notify the Board of the existence of the service relationship not later than 30 days after the earlier of—

''(A) the date on which the contract is entered into; or

''(B) the date on which the performance of the service is initiated.

''(d) ADMINISTRATION BY THE BOARD.—The Board may issue such regulations and orders as may be necessary to enable the Board to administer and carry out this section and to prevent evasion of this section.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'credit union organization' means any entity that—

''(A) is not a credit union;

''(B) is an entity in which an insured credit union may lawfully hold an ownership interest or investment; and

''(C) is owned in whole or in part by an insured credit union; and

''(2) the term 'Federal banking agency' has the same meaning as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

''(f) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—This section and all powers and authority of the Board under this section shall cease to be effective as of December 31, 2001.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH).

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

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

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3116, the Examination Parity and Year 2000 Readiness for Financial Institutions Act. This bill is a product of hearings which the Committee on Banking and Financial Services held in November and February to examine the potential impact of the year 2000 computer problem on the Nation's financial institutions. It was reported from committee on February 5 on a voice vote with broad bipartisan support, and I want to express my appreciation to the minority for their cooperation, particularly the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), and assistance in facilitating timely action on this bill.

For those of our colleagues who may not yet be aware of this issue, the year 2000 problem, or Y2K problem, as it is sometimes called, arises from the fact that most computers represent the year with only two digits. Hence, 1998 is simply recorded as ''98.'' Unfortunately, that means when the clock rolls over to January 1, 2000, many computers may incorrectly assume that 00 means 1900 rather than 2000. As a result, computers may reject data entries, calculate erroneous results, or simply shut down.

As inconsequential as this issue may appear, it is clear from testimony presented at the committee's hearing that the year 2000 problem poses a serious challenge to the banking sector and to the economy as a whole. Thousands of financial institutions in the United States rely on computers for such functions as check clearing, direct deposit, accounting, automated teller machines, ATM networks, credit card processing, and electronic data exchanges with external parties.

Even passenger security systems, vaults, phone systems, elevators, and other building systems could malfunction if embedded data-sensitive microchips failed to process the year 2000 date change.

Most of the effort to address the year 2000 problem does not require new legislation. The bill before us today is designed to deal with a couple of discrete aspects of the problem as it relates to financial institutions.

First, H.R. 3116 requires Federal financial regulatory agencies to hold seminars for financial institutions on the implications of the problem for safe and sound operations, and to provide model approaches for solving common problems. The bill gives the agency broad latitude to work together and with outside industry organizations to accomplish these objectives.

Second, H.R. 3116 extends to the Office of Thrift Supervision and the National Credit Union Administration the authority to examine the operations of service corporations or other entities that perform services under contracts for thrifts and credit unions, thereby giving these two financial regulatory agencies statute parity with the other three, the Fed, the OCC, and the FDIC, which already have such authority.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote aye on this important measure, and I would like to thank in particular the staff for all of their work for what appears to be a very esoteric but surprisingly sophisticated issue.

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

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

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

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I join with my friend and colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, in urging the House to suspend the rules and approve H.R. 3116, the Examination Parity and Year 2000 Readiness for Financial Institutions Act.

It is imperative that Congress give greater focus to the potential ramifications of what is being called the year 2000 or Y2K problem. We have a series of date-related programming problems that can adversely affect computer operations, beginning, really, as early as January of 1999. If not corrected, these problems could create serious disruptions throughout our economy.

Credit cards could read as expired, insurance policies could get lost, checks could bounce, phone lines could crash, and entire computer systems could fail under the weight of nonsensical dates.

The potential implications for the United States and, indeed, the global economy are virtually mind-boggling.

But even if these problems can be averted, the economic costs of resolving the problems will still be enormous.

The cover story in this week's Business Week estimates that correcting year 2000 problems could cost the economy roughly $119 billion in lost economic output, simply between now and the year 2001. This would cut roughly half a percentage point off economic growth in 2000 and early 2001, roughly equal to the estimated economic damage anticipated from the financial crisis in Asia.

The year 2000 problem is particularly serious for financial institutions and their regulations. The failure of computers to distinguish between the year 2000 and the year 1900 or the risk they will misread dates as commonly used symbols for ''die dates'' in financial accounting could result in loan schedules being miscalculated, debts being cancelled, payments and bank statements being delayed, electronic funds transfers being lost, 100-year interest charges and late payment fees being imposed on consumers, and a virtually limitless variety of other problems.

Some analysts warn and believe that the entire financial system could shut down New Year's Day 2000. Fortunately, the Federal Reserve Board, other bank regulators, and the Nation's larger banks have taken the year 2000 problem quite seriously for several years and have spent considerable sums to develop and test potential solutions.

But the same has not always been true of smaller banks, thrift institutions, and credit unions. These institutions sometimes lag behind in year 2000 compliance, in part because they do not fully comprehend the potential disruptions that would occur and also, to a certain extent, because they lack the resources to commit to developing solutions.

Smaller institutions are further hampered by the fact that they typically outsource most data processing, check clearance, credit card, and other computer dependent operations, to outside service providers and assume that these companies will handle the year 2000 problems.

Unfortunately, these companies often face problems of their own in resolving year 2000 problems. Any failures to make appropriate adjustments in these computer networks will easily be compounded throughout the entire financial system.

As of now, the Comptroller of the Currency, and only the Comptroller, has the authority to examine the operations of affiliated service corporations and outside vendors that perform services for banks to monitor compliance in resolving year 2000 problems.

Clearly, this authority must be expanded on a uniform basis to permit comparable examination of year 2000 compliance by service providers to thrift institutions and credit unions.

H.R. 3116 addresses these problems in several ways. First, it directs the Federal bank, thrift, and credit union regulatory agencies to offer seminars to financial institutions on the implications of the year 2000 computer problem on safe and sound operations.

Second, it requires each agency to make available to financial institutions model approaches for addressing year 2000 computer and data processing problems.

And, third, the bill provides the necessary authority to the Office of Thrift Supervision and the National Credit Union Administration to examine the operations of affiliated service corporations and outside vendors that provide services under contract to thrifts and credit unions.

□ 1445

This will provide both agencies with comparable authority to the bank regulatory agencies for monitoring the Year 2000 compliance.

Mr. Speaker, I again applaud the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) chairman of the committee, and the staff, both the majority and the minority, for working on this bill. It is extremely timely and important legislation. It is necessary to assure the safety and soundness of our financial system. I strongly urge its adoption.

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

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

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

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I will take the whole 5 minutes, but I do want to rise in strong support of H.R. 3116. I am an original cosponsor and believe this is a very far-reaching bill and we are giving adequate time to address the problem of Y2K, as it has come to be none, and we need this advance planning time.

Certainly, we will be addressing the readiness question in this legislation, as well as providing parity and examination authority among the Federal banking agencies and the National Credit Union Administration.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) has very well, along with the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) our ranking member, explained the Y2K problem. And in a nutshell I would simply say that it is the ability of a financial institution's computers to recognize data in their own computer base as well as databases from other systems. And I will not go into the full and complete explanation that Chairman LEACH has made, except that I would also say, however, that as has been noted that financial institutions are spending millions of dollars and man-hours trying to fix their systems presently, and what we are doing here today, both for the Y2K problem, as well as the parity question for examination authority, is hopefully negating those problems and we will be saving both the industry and the consumers untold billions of dollars both in unnecessary disruptions and inconveniences and a lot of legal questions that could arise.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do rise in complete support of this bill. I think we should note that particularly that in dealing with the parity authority for the Federal regulators, as well as the NCUA and the OTC, that what we are doing here is providing services to savings associations and credit unions to help them fulfill their part of the safety and soundness mandate of the banking institutions.

Again, I urge full support of the legislation and I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his leadership.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me, and I rise to commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) the ranking member, and the sponsors of this legislation on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services on their effort to ensure that our Nation's financial institutions are adequately addressing the Year 2000 computer problem.

It has been said that almost 70 percent of all the network computers around the world are connected to banking and financial institutions. If that is so, then the Year 2000 computer problem, left unattended, could not only detrimentally affect every depositor and creditor in that computer-dependent industry, but also could potentially cripple international commerce. It is clear that our Nation's financial institutions must move expeditiously to ensure that they will not be at risk at the beginning of the new millennium.

H.R. 3116, the Examination Parity and Year 2000 Readiness for Financial Institutions Act, will help them achieve that goal. By requiring the industry to provide seminars for financial institutions on the implications of the Year 2000 problem for safe and sound operations, as well as developing model approaches for solving common year 2000 problems in such areas as vendor contracts, the bill takes an important first step to better assure American customers and depositors that their local banks and credit unions will be safe and open for business when the Year 2000 rolls around.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, we in Congress have been working diligently over the past 2 years to raise the Nation's awareness and to push our Federal Government, as well as State and local governments, and private industry, for immediate corrective action. We have done this through legislation and an ongoing series of current congressional hearings and attentive oversight, even with the national Republican radio address.

As chair of the House Committee on Science's Subcommittee on Technology, we have held six hearings on the Year 2000 problem, many in conjunction with the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight's Subcommittee on Operations, chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

In legislation, we required the creation of a national Federal strategy on the Year 2000 problem. Federal quarterly reporting requirements and a statutory prohibition on the Federal purchase of any information technology which is not Year 2000 compliant.

I am also very pleased that the President has finally joined with Congress to help ensure that our Nation will address the Year 2000 problem in a timely and effective manner. The President's recent Executive order establishing a Year 2000 Conversion Council, chaired by John Koskinen, to make correcting the problem the highest priority attention for both the public and private sector, is vital to our Nation's ability to correct the problem by the unrelenting deadline. This is an important step if we are to avert catastrophic failure of government and industry computer systems. We have been calling for leadership from our Nation's chief executive for over a year. The President is at last giving this issue the attention it deserves.

And while I am anxious to work with Mr. Koskinen and the national Year 2000 Council on future efforts, today I intend to support this necessary measure to ensure the American people that not only is their money safe, but they will have reasonable timely access to it in the Year 2000 and beyond.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 3116. I also want to again congratulate Chairman LEACH and Ranking Member LAFALCE for their leadership, and I look forward to working with them as Congress moves to enact other Year 2000 solutions.

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

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to conclude by saying this issue is extraordinarily important for consumers. It is important for America's competitive position abroad. To become Year 2000 compliant will involve a multi-billion dollar cost to the economy and success or failure will affect the competitive position of many types of private sector organizations at home and abroad.

I am particularly concerned at home with the competitive position of various vendors to financial institutions, some of which are on top of the problem, some of which are less so. Abroad, we could literally see a run to American financial institutions who are on top of the problem, in contrast with foreign competitors. Europe is intertwined with a series of problems related to European Community. In Asia there is a series of very different kinds of problems. Neither in the world is putting as much attention as the United States is. So as there are challenges, there are also potential opportunities for those institutions who are on top of this particular subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by saying that also from a job sense, we are going to see perhaps the greatest shortage of software engineers and technicians in the history of the country in almost any industry. And it is important for individuals not only in the financial services sector, but in other types of critical industries, to be very sensitive to these issues. Obviously, relating to airlines which is one most in the public mind, but there are many others as well.

In any regard, this is a very, very modest bill that the Congress is putting forth. Behind the bill is also the sense that involved is an education process of which the Congress is a part. And while this bill will not be an answer to anything, it is intended to precipitate serious attention to the issue.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I have no further requests for time. I would like to thank particularly the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), as well as the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for her thoughtful attention.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, this Legislation, H.R. 3116, will not solve the Year 2000 problem. Giving some financial regulators "statutory parity" with other regulators will not solve the problem. Everyone will have to take responsibility to secure that their own systems will be Year 2000-compliant. We must hope that the government will be as diligent in its compliance with the so-called Millennium Bug problem as it want the private sector to be.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) has reported unfavorably on the FDIC's readiness. Before the Subcommittee on Financial Services and Technology, Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, US Senate, Jack L. Brock, Jr., Director, Governmentwide and Defense Information Systems, testified on February 10, 1998 (Year 2000 Computing Crisis: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's Efforts to Ensure Bank's Systems Are Year 2000 Compliant) that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) has not met its own "y2k-compliant" standards. According to GAO, the FDIC has not yet completed the assessment phase of the remediation process, despite its own standard that banks under the agency's supervision should have completed this phase by the end of the third quarter of 1997.

The bill requires the regulators to provide information (seminars, etc.), make available to financial institutions model approaches to address the Year 2000 problem, and to give the regulators examination authority to examine third party service provides under contract to federally-insured institutions.

James Mills, of NAFCU, testified before the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services, "Historically, the role of providing education and training is one best performed by the private sector, namely trade associations and industry-related organizations . . . Rather than require federal agencies to offer seminars, perhaps any legislative efforts should require federal agencies to participate in such programs or make it advisable and permissible to participate." NAFCU believes that the focus of H.R. 3116 should be strictly limited to ensuring compliance. In its present form, H.R. 3116 contains a broad and permanent expansion of NCUA's examination and regulatory authority . . . Legitimate questions may be raised as to whether, absent the year 2000 issue, NCUA, as a federal financial regulatory agency, should have the authority not just to examine but to actually regulate private business enterprises incorporated under the laws of various states. The authority given to NCUA in H.R. 3116, is not limited to the examination and regulation of credit unions, but would allow NCUA to examine and regulate third-party businesses, vendors and outside providers. Do the members of the Committee intend to give NCUA authority to regulate private entities?"

Ellen Seidman, Director OTS, added, "Clearly, the primary responsibility and liability for Year 2000 compliance rests with the regulated institutions themselves, including those that rely on service providers . . . Some service providers, however, have been resistant to these contractual provisions and, as a result, thrifts have been hindered in their ability to contract for services."

This bill raises legal liability questions that may actually thwart a financial institution's ability to address the y2k problem more effectively. Introducing legislation on the y2k issue would only give more people more incentive to sue companies which are not compliant. How does the bill define "year 2000 compliance"? It isn't clear. Such ambiguity only causes further problems. The real problem with y2k isn't the computers, its the people. More legislation will only compound the problem.

Year 2000 issues with computers cause numerous headaches but by no means unsolvable problems. Solutions exist, and since we do exist in a relatively free market, we should allow it to work.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3116, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to include in the RECORD additional statements and to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3116, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1998

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 365) regarding the bill S. 1150, the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reauthorization Act of 1998.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 365

Resolved, That, upon the adoption of this resolution, the House shall be considered to have—

(1) taken from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1150, to ensure that federally funded agricultural research, extension, and education address high-priority concerns with national or multistate significance, to reform, extend, and eliminate certain agricultural research programs, and for other purposes;

(2) struck out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 1150 and inserted in lieu thereof an amendment consisting of the text of the bill H.R. 2534, to reform, extend, and repeal certain agricultural research, extension, and education programs, and for other purposes, as passed by the House;

(3) passed the bill S. 1150 as amended; and

(4) insisted on the House amendment and requested a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 365. This resolution, upon adoption, will delete all of the Senate language within S. 1150, including that which has been the cause of concern of many Members, and insert in its place the language of H.R. 2534, which was passed by the House last November.

Passage of the resolution is merely a necessary procedural step which allows the House to declare itself in disagreement with the Senate and to request a conference on the House-passed language.

Mr. Speaker, so there is no confusion, I know my colleagues had concern with the Senate language. The objective here in H.R. 365 is simply to reauthorize the Foreign Agricultural Research Extension and Education Programs within the Department of Agriculture. The funding provisions which came under scrutiny in the Senate version are not, I repeat, are not in this bill or the language in this resolution.

The language identical to 365 passed the Committee on Agriculture by a unanimous vote on Wednesday, October 29, and the full House on November 8 by a vote of 291 to 125. It is the first comprehensive overhaul of agricultural research programs since 1977. It encompasses over $14 billion in 5 years.

The last two decades have brought sweeping changes to agricultural trade, production, and the government's approach to agriculture culminating in the reforms accomplished in the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, commonly referred to as the Freedom to Farm Bill.

In the Committee on Agriculture, we have adapted to these changes by focusing on American agriculture's competitiveness around the globe, working to eliminate barriers to American farm products and to open international markets.

Mr. Speaker, every farmer I know would prefer a market to a subsidy, and it is on that principle and in that knowledge that Congress, 2 years ago, began getting government out of the farmers' business. But that is not to say that government does not still have a role. It clearly does, and agricultural research is an enormous part of it.

Today, agricultural research is more important than ever in transitioning to a market economy and securing new markets for American farm products overseas and ensuring that we continue to produce the world's highest quality food and fiber at competitive prices. The core bill, H.R. 365 lives up to this challenge in addition to reauthorizing numerous agricultural research programs through the year 2002.

□ 1500

The bill includes reform provisions to ensure peer and merit review of all USDA research programs, greater accountability in the development of Federal research priorities, and greater dependence on cost sharing through requirements for matching funds. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution so that we may move forward with this issue.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 365, a resolution which contains four provisions that upon their adoption will provide the following:

One, it will take Senate bill 1150 from the Speaker's table; two, it will strike all after the enacting clause and insert the text of H.R. 2534 as passed by the House and ably described by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH); three, it will pass Senate bill 1150 as amended by H.R. 2534 and insist on the House amendment and request a conference with the Senate.

I would like to make it perfectly clear that this resolution merely allows us to go to conference with the Senate. That is all.

H.R. 2534 passed the House on November the 8th, 1997, by a vote of 291 to 125 and is the result of a bipartisan effort. H.R. 2534 provides for a straightforward reauthorization and reform of current USDA agricultural research programs. H.R. 2534 does not contain any of the savings and reallocation measures associated with Senate bill 1150.

Confusion and concern over this issue prevented our going to conference on this bill at the end of the first session, the 105th Congress. I recognize that there are concerns about provisions in the Senate bill. For this reason I urge Members to permit us to go to conference so we can begin to work through these differences. The sooner we begin working on a suitable conference report, the more time we will have to carefully consider these concerns while ensuring that support for vital agricultural research programs is not unnecessarily delayed.

Again, I strongly urge passage of this resolution.

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

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON).

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and I rise in support of the resolution.

I would like to take the opportunity to congratulate the Committee on Agriculture on this bill. Agricultural research is the heart of a system of agriculture which allows less than 2 million American farmers and ranchers to feed 260 million Americans and hundreds of millions of more people overseas.

This bill reflects great credit on the distinguished chairman of the committee, my good friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), and all of his colleagues, particularly my two good friends, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

I do wish to raise a serious concern about the bill that has come out of the other body. That bill, creates more than $1 billion in new mandatory spending that I believe contradicts all the hard work that has been done in cutting the budget here in this House in the last 3 years.

In particular, section 301 of the Senate bill creates a new $780 million mandatory spending program for research; and I would point out that we already are spending annually about $1.6 billion in the two major agriculture research programs in the discretionary account.

Section 226 of the Senate bill adds $300 million to an existing mandatory program called ''The Fund for Rural America.'' About half of the annual $100 million of spending in that program goes to research which, as I have already pointed out, already gets substantial discretionary funding.

The other half of the annual $100 million goes to rural development activities. I would like to remind all my colleagues that, in the current fiscal year, we are supporting a program level of more than $6 billion in rural development through discretionary funding.

Again, I think the House bill is a good bill; and I commend the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) and

the authorizing committee for their work. I believe, however, that in conference the conferees must eliminate the costly and unnecessary mandatory programs in the Senate bill in order for the conference report to have sufficient support to pass.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Let me simply say that I have mixed feelings about this bill. I certainly have no objection to the bill as it is leaving the House. I think the House bill is a responsible bill. But as both gentlemen know who are managing the bill, I have three major concerns with the Senate bill with which this bill will be conferenced.

As the gentleman from Louisiana just indicated, first of all, that Senate bill creates new mandatory spending for agriculture research. While I certainly support an expansion of agriculture research, I strongly oppose making ag research an entitlement program. Research is inherently a discretionary function of the budget, whether it is cancer research or energy research or agriculture research, and there is no reason to elevate agricultural research to a different standard.

I would also say that creating new mandatory programs in the ag research area will not add to a net gain in spending for the agricultural research community because, if a new mandatory program is created, you can bet your last dollar that when the 302 allocations are made in the appropriations process, that that new mandatory research will be taken into account and discretionary research will be reduced accordingly by the majority party when they establish their 302 allocations. So there will be, in the practical world, no net gain for ag research.

My second objection is that the source of the savings in the mandatory spending is the food stamp program. And while I certainly agree that States should not be able to double bill the Federal Government for food stamp administrative costs, there are other pressing needs in the food stamp arena that ought to be met, including restoring food stamp benefits to legal refugees, including the Hmong veterans who fought side-by-side with American troops during the Vietnam war.

Thirdly, even if full savings were not needed to restore food stamp benefits to immigrants or refugees, there are other mandatory spending issues that the authorizing committee ought to be addressing, in my view, rather than raiding the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations.

I would point out that spending $200 million a year for sales commissions in the crop insurance program means that there will be less discretionary money spent for important agricultural research programs, and I think that the authorizing committee ought to fix that problem before they set up new mandatory spending programs.

So I would simply say to Members who have asked me about whether they should vote for this bill or not, I have no problem voting for this resolution at this time. But I hope that Members who talk about holding spending caps will, if this bill comes back from conference with new mandatory spending, I hope they will be prepared to vote against that conference report and deep-six it, as it will justifiably deserve to be deep-sixed, if it adopts the approach taken by the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT), chairman of the Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in full support of the Agricultural Research, Extension and Education Reauthorization bill.

I think it is a very well-reasoned and responsible bill that will make sure that vital agriculture and related research will, in fact, continue through the year 2002, including reform provisions which ensure peer and merit review of agricultural research. It also includes provisions which will provide for input into the priority setting process by those who benefit from agricultural research.

I think it is important for us to remember that the bill has already been passed. It is important for us to know that this is a clean resolution that will simply substitute our language for the other body's language and will simply allow us to go to conference on this issue.

Strong agricultural research programs have certainly enabled our farmers and ranchers to produce the highest quality food and fiber in the world at competitive prices. This resolution simply reauthorizes our agricultural research. It updates and modernizes our research program so that American farmers will, in fact, maintain their competitive edge in an increasingly global marketplace.

As the current Asian crisis is teaching us, our ability to ensure a stable export market is tenuous at best. Therefore, we need to continually work at expending our ag markets in every region of the world. This requires, among other things, the ability to be on the cutting edge of agricultural research, to provide agricultural products that these markets demand.

In addition, for my very agricultural district in Nebraska, this reauthorization is, in fact, critical. Among the many provisions of the bill that are key to Nebraska agriculture are provisions for research on wheat scab, precision agriculture, ethanol, animal waste and management, and methyl bromide.

The reauthorization provides a new direction in ag research. I think it is reform at its best, and I encourage all Members to vote ''yes'' on the resolution.

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I appreciate this opportunity.

I am in strong support of H.R. 2534 as written by the House and, has been stated already, it has been passed by the House. This piece of legislation needs to go forward to conference.

The problem is not with this bill. The problem is with S. 1150, the Senate version of agriculture research, which uses a considerable amount of saving from the food stamp administration for other purposes in the majority, other than responding to the needs of the hungry and for which food stamp monies are authorized for. Therefore, the conference needs to proceed very carefully.

While this legislation contains very important items, many of those I support, such as authorization of the use of research in extension grants to study the impact of pfiesteria and other microorganisms that pose threats to human and animal health upon our waterways; increasing the priority of finding alternative resources to methyl bromide; animal waste management; and significantly increasing the funding for historically black colleges and universities for research.

All of these, indeed, I support. And this bill, again as stated, is a wonderful bill; and it is much needed in the agricultural community.

I am gravely concerned and I urge the conferees as they go forward to please consider the needs of the hungry and that the food stamp savings will be there; that they should, in fact, go for those purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this, but I also urge the conferees to understand what my reservation would be, and I look forward to seeing how the conference turns out.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING), who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Risk Management and Specialty Crops.

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I support the legislation before us; and the conference committee, I hope, will take note of what is said here today as they do their deliberations on this legislation.

First of all, this is the first comprehensive overhaul of the agricultural research program in 20 years. This legislation is a crucial step toward meeting an increasing demand for world food and, yes, the commitment which we made to our farmers when we passed the Freedom to Farm Act: the Federal Government's responsibility for research.

The bill improves the ability and capacity of participants in the U.S. food and agricultural sector to meet consumer needs for high-quality, safe, nutritious, affordable and convenient food.

H.R. 2534 will help those participants compete in a global market and produce products in an environmentally sound manner. The legislation is vital in ensuring the United States remains at the forefront of producing the world's highest quality food and fiber at competitive prices.

This bill creates an exciting new food genome research initiative which is fundamental in developing new and improved uses.

□ 1515

It also establishes an animal waste management research initiative, which is very important across the country as we have many, many controversies in America and in Illinois over waste from animal facilities. Mr. Speaker, this is really a piece of legislation whose time has come. I am very pleased to have the opportunity to support it.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. Mr. Speaker, I come here with some reservations about this bill, but with some confidence. This bill as it will leave this House and go to conference will not contain a provision which when it comes back from conference I guarantee you it will have, and that is a provision that will take, it is not clear how much, it is somewhere between perhaps $1 billion to $2 billion, from the food stamp program, which are considered administrative savings, and those moneys will be used for which programs we do not know. But the concern that a number of us have is that if we are going to take money out of food stamps, and we took a whole lot of money out of food stamps two years ago when we passed the welfare reform law, that we should put the money back into services for the hundreds of thousands of families, including mostly families with children that were now as a result of this bill denied access to food stamps.

As I said before, I have reservations but I have confidence from speaking to many of my colleagues that a serious effort will be made to address this concern if in fact we have moneys that comes out of the food stamp account. I trust that the members of the Committee on Agriculture will remember that the moneys in these savings should go into those programs from where the money came. If that is done, then certainly when this bill comes back after conference, all of us could say that we could support the programs.

I support those ag programs, the ag research programs that are there. If it were a straight bill on agriculture research, it would have my vote. But I express my reservation at this stage because it is unclear to me where we will head. But as I said before, I do have confidence, especially because of my colleagues the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), that an effort will be made to ensure that if we take money from food stamps, it will be used to help the thousands of families who are in great need of providing nutrition to their children. With some reservations I say this is a bill that we should see go to conference, and with confidence I do say that I believe at the end we will all be able to vote for it.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), a former member of the Committee on Agriculture, now on the powerful Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this very good bill. I would congratulate the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) and all the members of the Committee on Agriculture for putting together a very responsible bill. My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that the Senate bill takes $1.2 billion in savings from the food stamp administrative savings and then creates two new mandatory programs, one for ag research, which I support but we are already spending $1.6 billion on it, and another for rural development, a program we are spending $6 billion on. The House did the right thing. The Senate has not. My concern is if this goes to conference, the temptation will be too great to spend that money on other programs that do not, quite frankly, need the funds. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, over 900,000 legal immigrants, including over 150,000 children, have lost food stamp benefits. I think most of us would agree that that is wrong and that these funds need to be put back into the program to help to feed those people. In addition, there are many elderly and disabled persons who have lost food stamp benefits and I think we need to correct that wrong, too.

Mr. Speaker, I would again reluctantly oppose the bill, ask that we return it to the committee and allow them to put some language into the bill that directs the committee bill to provide for language that would keep those funds within the food stamps program. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the bill.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) faces a difficult conference, as does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and their colleagues. I am here simply to express my fervent hope that in conference they will take a look at the President's proposal on food stamps for legal immigrants. We are talking about in no way undoing welfare reform. I worked for and voted for the ultimate product. This is about hungry kids and this is about hungry elderly people, many of them refugees. The cuts in food stamps were very, very large and no one is suggesting at this point the restoration of most of them. But the President's proposal focuses on those most vulnerable, kids, most of them citizens themselves. Their parents are not yet. And the elderly, many of them, as I said, refugees and asylees. So I am here simply to say as they deal with the complexities, please do not forget these very vulnerable people who are here in our midst legally.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), chairman of the Subcommittee on Forestry, Resource Conservation, and Research, whose subcommittee drew this bill.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution. I would like to thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) for their hard work and cooperation in bringing this bill to the floor. As chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over agricultural research programs, I presided over a series of hearings last summer and through the fall to prepare for this bill. We worked diligently to improve upon the current research, education and extension structure by increasing coordination, communications and competition among the public and private sectors and across State lines. This bill represents a significant step toward that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for our colleagues who may be watching or for their staffs who may be watching to make for certain that they understand what this is. The House has passed this bill. All we are simply trying to do is to go to conference. We had the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. We had the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. We had the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), a subcommittee chairman of appropriations, who the one common thing throughout their statements was what a great bill this was.

Mr. Speaker, we did not make any changes in the food stamp program in this bill. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). We need to fix the crop insurance program. Nothing about crop insurance is in this bill. I agree with the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), who is a member of our committee about her concerns on food stamps. Nothing in this bill has anything to do with food

stamps. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), all expressed their concerns about what the Senate has done. We cannot even talk to the Senate if we do not get this bill out of here under this resolution and go to conference.

So I want to make for certain that people understand, everybody loves this bill. But if the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is correct in his efforts, as he said reluctantly, to defeat the bill, nothing he is trying to do in regards to the money for food stamps is done. I want to make for sure that we understand where we are and I want to make for sure that Members understand that all we are doing is going to conference on a bill that has passed the House and all of the concern that has been raised on the floor today is about the Senate bill. We have got to go to conference before we can even begin to cure the problems. Let us not get caught up in these other things that are of legitimate concern to us as well in a bill that has nothing to do with it and keep from American agriculture the opportunity to move forward with a research bill that has not been reauthorized in, I believe, 15 years, and is vitally important to the future of agriculture and to all of our producers and to all of those people involved in it. All we are doing today is trying to go to conference.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, many of us are talking about the debate that we had last year, actually in November. At the time there were serious concerns, not with the House bill itself but with major funding decisions at stake in the conference committee. Those same concerns remain, and I would repeat them. Unlike the House bill, the Senate bill creates over $1.2 billion in new mandatory spending, offset by administrative savings from the food stamp program. Programs to be funded with those savings, however worthy, should not take precedence over feeding hungry people. The food stamp program has already been drastically cut, and it is only fair that a substantial share of any food stamp savings should be reinvested in addressing the critical food and nutrition needs, in particular restoring food stamp benefits to vulnerable groups of legal immigrants, including the elderly, the handicapped and families with children.

We did not have an opportunity to offer a motion to instruct conferees on this important concern. So if we pass this resolution, we will send this bill to conference with no firm assurance that a fair share of food stamp savings will be reinvested in feeding the hungry.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to pass this resolution, but send a very strong signal to conferees that many of us will work to defeat a conference agreement that does not invest at least half the Senate bill's food stamp savings in feeding hungry people, specifically vulnerable groups of legal immigrants and refugees facing hunger and hardships as a result of losing food stamps.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am confident that both the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) have heard enough comments and concerns today so that they will go into that conference doing what needs to be done on behalf of people who are hungry and who are in need of the food stamp program. I would like to echo the comments made by other Members here today, the fact that this is a very difficult situation. On one hand, we want to be supportive of agricultural research. On the other hand, we know that so much good can come of the food stamp program, more so than we have had up to now, especially in the area of legal immigrants. And so my role today here is again to echo what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) said before. I will do nothing to stop this resolution from leaving the House. I will be supportive of its passage, in the hope that we come back with a conference report that I will not have to oppose, a conference report that will take into consideration the balance that is needed in this issue.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of sending this bill to conference. I think that many of us have heard the comments of many of the Members who have raised some concerns, not about the House bill but about the Senate bill. I think all of us who played a major role in crafting the bill that was passed, the ag research bill that was passed by the House, were motivated by some primary objectives. One is we have to ensure that the taxpayer dollars which are invested in agriculture research are going to obtain the maximum benefit to all of our society, all members of our economy. I think the bill that we passed made some major improvements to ensure that we will be getting the best return on behalf of the taxpayers. I would also state that many of us are sympathetic and sensitive to the issues in terms of how we will allocate any dollars that might have been saved in the food and nutrition side of this bill.

□ 1530

But I would also point out that when we look at the major advocates in this country who spend so much time in trying to ensure that the needs of some of the most impoverished of our country will be met are supporting this bill going to conference.

We can look at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, who are asking this Congress to vote, yes, to send the bill to conference, the National Council of La Raza, the Food Research and Action Committee, and the Sustainable Agriculture Coalition. We have a broad coalition of people, advocates on behalf of food stamp recipients and advocates on behalf of making the most appropriate investment of research dollars to benefit the ag industry are saying let us send this bill to conference in order that we can develop the compromises and the resolution with the Senate version so that we can bring it back so that we can have a bill that is going to be in the best interests not only of the agriculture sector through increased investments in ag research, but also on the interests of ensuring that we are going to help the most impoverished in our country.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) for their work in the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) for his work in bringing us here today, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. Let us go to conference and try to work out these issues in the best way that we possibly can for all concerned.

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

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) especially who have been side by side with us in a very cooperative fashion putting together a research program that has not been reauthorized since 1977. So it is time, I think, that we did act and we are acting.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we are not guilty of raiding the Committee on Appropriations. We are not guilty of starving children. We are not guilty of making all of these horrible choices. We are guilty of bringing our colleagues a straightforward bill that addresses research in America. And I remind those Members, and we have heard them all, that if there are concerns that they have should this bill survive conference, there would be many chances for them to be heard on this floor. This is not their last opportunity to express their thoughts.

So in the meantime, please help us pass this bill, and let us move forward with research for American agriculture.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution, which will move the agriculture research reauthorization bill one step closer to enactment. This resolution strikes the Senate language and moves the House bill to conference.

I would like to thank Chairman SMITH, Chairman COMBEST, ranking member DOOLEY, and

the committee staff for their hard work on this important bill. I am particularly pleased that this bill includes the essential part of legislation I authored: The Precision Agriculture Research, Education, and Information Dissemination Act.

Several new technologies make up precision agriculture. These include global positioning satellites, digital field mapping, grid soil sampling, and the list continues to grow as technologies develop.

If our farmers are to remain the most productive and most efficient growers and producers in the world, precision technology must be made available to them. This technology is just as revolutionary as moving from the horse to the tractor, or from plow to conservation tillage.

Let's not deny our farmers the opportunity to remain the best in the world. Today's vote is just another step in bringing our farmers into the 21st century.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the House Resolution 365, which would order the House to go to conference with the Senate on the Agricultural Research bill.

The House version of the research bill, HR 2534, which I supported and voted for last year, was a good bill. When we acted on that bill, it did not contain the $1.25 billion food stamp administrative savings contained in the Senate version of the bill.

The issue of how these savings should be divvied up, between nutrition program needs, agricultural research, rural development and crop insurance is the only outstanding issue holding up a good bill from becoming law.

I urge the House to proceed to conference with the Senate and on this bill, in order to settle the differences over this matter. I trust that the goals of all parties can be addressed in conference, and the traditional strong alliance between the agricultural and nutrition programs can be rekindled.

Mr. Speaker, I recently saw first hand the importance of agricultural research at the dedication of the National Environmentally Sound Production Agriculture Laboratory (NESPAL).

This new facility is an exciting addition to the other outstanding research and educational facilities located across southwest Georgia. It is important to our state and, in fact, to the whole country. This is one more reason why that area of Georgia is recognized as a center of cutting-edge agricultural research—the kind of research we must have if we are to meet the awesome challenges in the years ahead.

NESPAL is a shining example of how business, the academic community, and government are working together to achieve the level of scientific research and development needed to sustain agricultural leadership in an increasingly-competitive world.

The Georgia Research Alliance, made up of agribusiness and agricultural and environmental sciences researchers and educators, provided the non-federal funds to match USDA's $3.6 million grant, as well as key leadership support, that gave Georgia the edge in the competition for this facility. This is a great thing for Georgia—but it is just one of many things the Alliance has done to boost research and development in Georgia, including raising $50 million a year to help create new programs and enhance existing ones at Georgia's research universities. The Alliance has played a major part in building the foundation that has made Georgia the number one state in high-tech growth.

Agriculture faces challenges of historic magnitude in the years ahead. For one thing, there will be many more people to feed in the world, and much less arable land to grow the food and fiber they will need. Over the next 50 years, the world's population is expected to jump from the current figure of between 5 and 6 billion people to more than 9 billion—not quite double the current population, but close to it. The land available for planting is already decreasing at an alarming rate as developing countries expand and provide housing for growing populations. As farm land disappears, people throughout the world will continue to destroy timber resources and even rain forests as they try to find the last acre on which they can plant. Without adequate scientific advances, these conditions pose an extremely-dire threat to the world's environmental well-being.

Another factor is the rise in the standard of living which is occurring throughout much of the world, including Southeast Asia and China, where food consumption is already sharply increasing. As income rises, so does the demand for food and fiber—in terms of both quantity and quality.

To meet these demands, the United States will be called upon to increase production three-fold over the next 50 years. If our country is prepared to meet this demand, we have the potential to provide an unprecedented level of prosperity for our farmers and our agricultural economy in general. This is both a responsibility and an opportunity. It is also something that will not be attained easily.

A corn producer, for example, will have to increase per-acre yields from 130 bushels to more than 300 bushels to meet this projected demand. This seems like an insurmountable goal. But current research indicates it can be done. Research projects that are underway in several states are routinely producing yields of 200 bushels an acre—and occasionally yields of more than 300 bushels.

U.S. farmers could not have tripled the country's corn production over the past 60 years, as they have done, if it has not been for the research done by both the public and the private sectors. This is an impressive achievement. But we know it isn't the end of the story. Current research suggests that we have the potential to make even more dramatic gains. We are not there yet—but we can, in fact, develop new and improved ways to meet the needs that are projected for the years ahead.

Without a sufficient investment in research, we will almost surely fail. But, as long as we keep our diverse research efforts going strong, I have no doubt our farmers and agri-businesses will have the tools they need to seize the exhilarating new opportunities that are opening before them as the new century approaches. Thanks to visionary citizens like those in the Alliance, we are headed in the right direction.

One of the things we need to do to fulfill our agricultural potential in an environmentally-progressive way, I believe, is to make greater use of farm materials in the production of industrial goods.

We're talking about making non-food products out of renewable, earth-friendly commodities grown on the farm rather than depletable, environmentally troublesome resources like petroleum.

The number of trailblazing farm utilization companies that are emerging all over the country is rapidly growing—companies that transform soybeans into ink, canola into hydraulic fluid; cotton gin waste into cleansers; beets into a heart transplant medication; corn and potatoes into lubricants, paint and plastic products ranging from packing material to disposable diapers.

Most people know about ethanol, the motor fuel made mostly from corn, which as captured 7 percent of the petroleum market over the past 20 years. But many people are not as aware of the fact that plastic was originally developed from vegetable starches when discovered in the late 1800's. After the turn of the century, it was found that plastic made from petroleum had a big advantage in both quality and cost—and by the end of World War II petro-based plastic had taken over the entire market.

Now, veggie-based plastic is making a comeback. It still costs less to make plastic from petroleum. But research has narrowed the gap, and the demand for the biodegradable kind is increasing. In just the past 15 years, the amount of plastic produced in the U.S. from vegetables has climbed from virtually nothing to more than 100 million pounds a year. While this is just a drop in the bucket compared to the 60 billion pounds of petroplastic produced every year, it represents a secure foothold in the market—a foothold that's growing every year.

Cotton is another example of the country's shift back to farm materials. Cotton production went into a tailspin in the 1950's, when synthetic fabrics that require less ironing took over the market. This changed when researchers developed wrinkle-resistant cotton and cotton-blend fabrics—triggering a new boom for cotton in Georgia and much of the South.

Not coincidentally, I understand some portions of the NESPAL building's floor is covered by linoleum—a farm-based product made from linseed oil.

Two farm utilization companies can be found in the Second Congressional District of Georgia—BioPlus, Incorporated of Ashburn and Scientific Ag Industries of Blakely. Both of these companies are using peanut hulls as their basic resource—buying the hulls for just a few dollars a ton and transforming them into products like cat litter, cleansing absorbents, and activated carbon used in air and water filters that sell for $120 or more a ton.

They are marketing the breakthroughs that came from our research universities, from government, and from their own research efforts. While both are still relatively small companies, with 30 employees or less, their potential for spurring commercial growth in rural areas, while helping improve the environment, is tremendous.

BioPlus and Scientific Ag are improving the environment by diverting many thousands of tons of peanut hulls from landfills. They are also providing a new source of income for farmers and shellers, And, as they become commercially successful, other industrial investors are sure to follow their lead—creating a chain-reaction of new industrial development. BioPlus is already a success. After operating in the red for about eight years, the company turned the corner two years ago and is now earning a nice annual profit. The firm

got substantial start-up advice and assistance from the University of Georgia. More recently, it received federal venture capital to finance the expansion that helped break into the black. Most of all, it did intensive research on its own—acquiring four patents while substantially improving its product and making it more desirable and profitable.

Scientific Ag is the 2-year-old creation of a group of Georgia Tech researchers, who plan to put about as much emphasis on doing research on new industrial uses for farm materials as they do in selling the peanut hull-based activated carbon they have perfected and are producing for sale. This new firm, which has also relied on the country's whole spectrum of research programs, is just now getting to the production stage, and I believe its future is also very promising.

These companies are fairly representative of this whole movement. They are the end result of the partnership between the public and private sectors—that wide range of research programs that are collectively providing the scientific advances and the business assistance that make our farmers and manufacturers competitive in the world.

This is a partnership we must nurture and build upon. It would be catastrophic if we ever let our research infrastructure break down. Inadequate research would be a disaster for our economic future just as it would be for our national defense. If we failed to maintain a lead in military weaponry, you know what would happen—the country's influence would be weakened and our national interests would become more vulnerable throughout the world. If we failed to maintain our economic lead, our position in the world would also be weakened—as would as our standard of living.

Overall, this Ag Research Reauthorization bill strengthens the role of government in ag research—not just in terms of authorizing funds, but by ensuring that the inseparable bond between the public and private sectors involved in ag research is reinforced in the funding formulas themselves.

When we preserve this partnership, we are preserving something that is historic. Early in the nation's history, the federal government got involved in agriculture by collecting seeds from throughout much of the world and distributing them to farmers so they could experiment with new crops. This activity was managed by the Patent Office, which began to expand its farm research role in the 1840's by publishing new discoveries by our farmers for use by other farmers. In 1887, the Hatch Act greatly expanded the federal government's agricultural research activities by setting up the first experiment stations at a number of colleges in the 13 states.

Out of this beginning grew the collaboration that now exists. The private sector is the biggest part of this partnership. But the public contribution is not far behind. According to the National Research Council, private expenditures account for about 57 percent of our agricultural research and government about 43 percent. We need both.

The Georgia Research Alliance does a great job of promoting a sound, responsible, innovative, highly-diversified research infrastructure, and I commend them for what you are doing to enhance the quality of life for everyone. They are certainly doing its part to maintain this partnership, and it is up to us in Congress to make sure the federal government continues to contribute its share.

Government must stand shoulder-to-shoulder with the business and educational communities to produce the healthiest and most abundant food and fiber supply in the world; achieve our potential in agricultural exports and restore the balance of trade; reduce our dependence on oil imports; protect the environment; and keep the country economically secure for our generation and for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in sending this bill to conference.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 365.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 365, the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

RE-REFERRAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION 6736 TO COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from the consideration of Executive Communication 6736, an Environmental Protection Agency rule on State Implementation Plans under the Clean Air Act, and that Executive Communication 6736 be re-referred to the Committee on Commerce.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair intends to postpone appointment of conferees on S. 1150 until after 5 p.m. today in order to preserve the motion to instruct the conferees.

HOWARD C. NIELSON POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3120) to designate the United States Post Office located at 95 West 100 South Street in Provo, Utah as the ''Howard C. Nielson Post Office Building,'' as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3120

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States Post Office located at 95 West #100 South in Provo, Utah, shall be known and designated as the ''Howard C. Nielson Post Office Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States Post Office referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Howard C. Nielson Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) 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, the legislation before us was introduced on January 28, 1998, by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) and cosponsored by all Members of the House delegation from the State of Utah pursuant to the policy of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. This legislation was before the committee on February 12, at which time it was amended to reflect the correct address of the facility. The address of the postal facility in the original bill read 95 West 100 South Street. The committee unanimously passed the bill with an amendment correcting the address to read 95 West Number 100 South.

The amended bill designates the U.S. Post Office located at that location as the Howard C. Nielson Post Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, we have a number of representatives who have cosponsored this bill. I know they will take the opportunity to expound upon Mr. Nielson's great history and his service to this country so, therefore, I would simply note that, as has happened in many occasions in the past, this recipient, I think, reflects very favorably on the kind of individual that we have historically honored with the designation of the United States Postal Service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) who has been the prime motivator and mover of this legislation for comments that he might have.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, when my office and I considered honoring one of the great Americans who has had an impact not only on my own district, but at the national level, our thoughts turned almost immediately to Howard Nielson.

I approached several of Howard's former colleagues including the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Commerce, on which Howard sat. They wholeheartedly supported this tribute and recalled fond memories.

Elected in 1983 to this great body to be the first to represent my district, the Third District of Utah, after reapportionment, Howard is probably best known as a relentless public servant, a brilliant man who legislates honesty and integrity.

A native of Utah, Howard Curtis Nielson was born on September 12, 1924, in the city of Richfield in Sevier County, Utah. In 1947, after attending Richfield High School, he graduated with a Bachelor of Science from the University of Utah in Salt Lake City. He went on to receive a Master of Science from the University of Oregon at Eugene, and an MBA and Ph.D. from Stanford University in Palo Alto, California.

Howard served in the United States Air Force during World War II. Then, after graduating from the University of Oregon in 1949, Howard accepted a position as a statistician with C&H Sugar. From 1951 until 1957, he worked as an economist at the Stanford Research Institute and then obtained a professorship at Brigham Young University where he taught statistics, economics and business management from 1957 to 1976.

In 1960, Howard became active in politics and after spending 6 years as a district GOP committeeman in Provo, Utah, he was elected to the State House.

Quickly earning a reputation as a man who knew how to read the fine legislative print, Howard became Majority Leader in 1971, and 2 years later was elected Speaker. In this capacity Howard fought hard to see that a State budget surplus was used for tax relief rather than new programs.

When the speakership came to an end, Howard retired from the legislature, but remained active in State politics serving as a party chairman in Utah County from 1979 to 1981.

So, with this background, when Howard was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, his first assignment was on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

In the 99th Congress, he also secured a position on the Government Operations Committee, and by 1986, was ranking member of the Government Activities and Transportation Subcommittee of this committee.

Most notably, Howard was active throughout these committee assignments on several issues ranging from the deregulation of broadcast, telephone and the natural gas industries, to the commercial interests of the motion picture industry.

Howard was also integral in spotlighting the problem of waste dumping by Amtrak and by focusing on the health consequences he urged the railroad to take corrective measures. At the completion of his fourth term in Congress, Howard decided not to run again. Instead, he and his wife, Julia, moved first to Sidney, Australia, for 18 months and then to Budapest, Hungary, for 2 years where they served as missionaries for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.

I am proud to be joined today not only by several of Howard's colleagues here on the floor, but with all of Congress in expressing our gratitude. Those of us who have had the opportunity and privilege of serving with Howard Nielson know him as an honorable man, a good friend, and in the words of Doris Wilson, a friend and former staffer, Howard was a model of what the Founding Fathers envisioned legislators to be.

Both sides of the aisle respected his integrity and willingness to make the tough decisions with fairness to everybody. Today, Howard continues this dedication to his community serving as a member of the Utah State Senate.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in bringing before the House legislation naming United States Post Offices after a number of fine individuals. All of these measures have met the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight cosponsorship requirement and enjoy the support of their respective State congregation national delegations. I am proud that my colleagues have sought to honor such a diverse and distinguished group of people and urge swift adoption of these bills.

Before I yield time, I would like to acknowledge the efforts of the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and his staff, particularly Robert Taub, the new staff director, and the committee counsel for their hard work in moving these measures forward.

I join the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) in support of H.R. 3120, legislation introduced by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) which designates the United States Post Office located at 95 West 100 South Street in Provo, Utah, as the Howard C. Nielson Post Office Building.

A former Member of Congress elected in 1991 to represent the Third District of Utah, Representative Nielson served on the former Committee on Government Operations during the 99th Congress and on the former House Committee on Energy and Commerce. It must be noted that Representative Nielson, after spending 6 years as a district Republican committeeman in Provo, Utah, became a member of the Utah State House where he was elected Speaker. After serving in Congress and later as a missionary, Representative Nielson has returned to the Utah State legislature. Naming a post office in his hometown is a very fine and fitting tribute to a man who is, once again, representing his neighbors, friends and constituents

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank the gentleman from New York and the sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from Utah, my good friend (Mr. CANNON). I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3120, a bill to designate the United States Post Office in Provo, Utah, as the Howard C. Nielson Post Office. By the time I made it to the House as an elected Member, Congressman Nielson had already established himself as an active member of this body.

His rise to the position as the representative from Utah of the Third Congressional District did not come as a surprise to those who knew him. Prior to coming to Congress, Howard Nielson was elected as Majority Leader of the Utah House, and 2 years later elected to the position of Speaker of the State House of Representatives, and it was from that position that he was elected to the Congress.

As a ranking member of the Government Activities and Transportation Committee, Congressman Nielson played an important role in the National Debate on Transportation, which was going on during that time. And as important to me, Mr. Speaker, his interest in improving the health of our country's American Indians. I want to commend him for his efforts.

To his credit, Mr. Speaker, he continues to serve the public, currently as a member of the Utah State legislature, and I can think of no more fitting tribute to him than to name the United States Post Office in Provo, Utah, after him. I commend, again, my good friend from Utah (Mr. CANNON) for proposing this bill and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1545

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in 1972, I ran for the state legislature, and at the time a gentleman from Provo, Utah, came up to see me to tell me he was running for Speaker of the House. His name was Howard Curtis Nielson. I voted for the gentleman and he became Speaker of the House, and it was a great two years with him.

I was impressed with how well he understood the legislation, how he read the bills, how his knowledge of figures and understanding was awesome. He could come into our caucuses or on the floor, he could come up with figures faster than anyone I ever met, but then I found out he was Dr. Nielson, Professor of Statistics at the BYU, and I could understand that.

As my colleague from Utah talked about, Howard Nielson is a well-educated man, bachelors, masters, doctorate degree. Around here, whenever you wanted to know something on the floor about a bill, you would see Howard Nielson and ask him. He could give you chapter and verse, both sides of the argument, and he was a real resource, and I always noticed a lot of people huddling around him because he had

such a great understanding of what was going on.

I ran for Congress in 1980, and in 1982 Howard Nielson elected to run for Congress, as Utah was reapportioned and we got a third Congressional seat. Howard was successful and served for eight years here. He served on the Committee on Commerce and a few other committees, and was well-known on both sides of the aisle as a man of fairness and integrity and a man who would be helpful to every Member.

He had some funny things happen to him while he was here, as we all do. He loved taking dome tours, and on one occasion he was taking a bunch of BYU students up to the dome, and the place where the door opens and goes up to the roof and goes up, he was the last in line.

Surprisingly enough, the door was open. He walked out on to the top of the Capitol, and the wind blew it shut, and no one knew that he was not with the group. So he started yelling at the police down below, and everyone thought somebody was suicidal up there and was going to jump off the roof of the Capitol. But Howard was written up in all of the papers in America on that little adventure, and, to this day, he still enjoys telling that story.

Howard, after leaving this body at his own volition after eight years, served a mission for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. In fact he served two missions. And, like Howard, you would expect, he also learned two additional languages, which is one of the things about Utah, there are more bilingual and trilingual people in Utah than anyplace in America, and now Howard joins that group.

I expected he would retire, but Howard is very healthy and very active and has a great mind, and Howard elected to again get back into politics, and ran successfully as a state senator in the State of Utah.

I think it is only fitting and I compliment my colleague from the third district, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) for introducing legislation that would give some recognition to a person who truly believes in public service.

If I may wax a little Ecclesiastical, in the Scriptures it says the greatest of all will be the servant of all. In this instance, Howard Nielson, all of his life, as an educator, as a church leader, as a political man, has been a servant of many people; never aspiring to anything for himself, but in helping other people.

So with this humble man, with a great family of seven children and well over 25 grandchildren, it will now be emblazoned in stone that it is the Howard C. Nielson Post Office.

Let me point out one of his sons, Curtis, worked for me for a while, and last year Curtis graduated number one from Chicago law school, which is a real tribute to the Nielsons and to Curtis.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. 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. MCHUGH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, before I yield back, I would just briefly state that I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and all the committee staff members on both the minority and majority side for their efforts. What we heard today is descriptive of really an extraordinary man. I would ask all of my colleagues to support this measure and give a very justified honor to a very special person.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and 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. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3120, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to designate the United States Post Office located at 95 West #100 South in Provo, Utah, as the 'Howard C. Nielson Post Office Building'.''

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 3120, a bill to name the U.S. Post Office in Provo, Utah after my friend Howard C. Nielson. Howard has been active in Provo and Utah politics since 1960. A longtime resident of Provo, he worked his way up from District Voting Chairman to Speaker of the Utah State Legislature. By vocation, a statistician, Howard used his aptitude for numbers to fight for tax relief for Utah citizens during his tenure in the legislature during the 1960s and 1970s. He was well-known for his ability to understand and explain complicated economic and budget documents.

Howard was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1982, where he served four terms. He continued his practice of providing unbiased economic analyses to members on both sides of the aisle. He was always happy to help anyone understand the budgetary and economic legislation that came before Congress. During his time in the House he fought for the Trade Readjustment Act legislation which helped retrain workers who lost their jobs as a result of overseas trade deficits. He highlighted the problem of waste dumping by Amtrak, fought for Indian health care and worked on the deregulation of the broadcast, telephone and natural gas industries.

But, Howard has not confined his efforts to politics. As a professor at Brigham Young University and Dean of the Statistics Department, he has passed along his love of numbers to his students. He is much sought after by think tanks like the Ford Foundation and has worked in places like Lebanon doing economic development studies.

An active member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Howard and his wife have served as missionaries to Australia and Hungary. He is a family man and the proud father of seven children.

It is fitting, therefore, that the U.S. Post Office in Provo, should be named in his honor.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3120.

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

There was no objection.

KARL BERNAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2766) to designate the United States Post Office located at 215 East Jackson Street in Painsville, Ohio, as the ''Karl Bernal Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2766

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States Post Office located at 215 East Jackson Street in Painesville, Ohio, as the ''Karl Bernal Post Office Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States Post Office referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Karl Bernal Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2766 was introduced on October 29, 1997, by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), and it is cosponsored by the entire House delegation of the State of Ohio, as required under committee policy. The legislation was unanimously voted out of the committee on February 12, 1998, by a voice vote.

H.R. 2766 honors Mr. Karl Bernal, a civic and community leader in Painesville, Ohio. Mr. Bernal was a life member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit for the record a complete statement on the achievements of this very special individual. I know the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and I presume others will want to make further comments upon that.

I think it is worth noting that the Ohio House of Representatives and the Ohio Senate have recognized Mr. Bernal's volunteer work and his work in mental health services.

The gentleman died at the age of 76 after a full life of service to his community. It is worthy of note that the people of Lake County considered Mr. Bernal more than a leader amongst the black community. His obituary stated, ''It would be more accurate to portray him as possibly the most influential person in all the county, without consigning him to a subdivision based on race or other limiting factors.''

Mr. Speaker, I think it is entirely fitting that we designate the Post Office at 215 East Jack Street in Painsville, Ohio, as the Karl Bernal Post Office Building, to honor a man who dedicated his life to his community.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2766 was introduced on October 29, 1997 by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. LATOURETTE, and it is cosponsored by the entire House Delegation of the State of Ohio pursuant to the policy of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. The legislation was unanimously voted out by the Committee on February 12, 1998 by voice vote.

H.R. 2766 honors Karl Bernal, a civic and community leader in Painesville, Ohio. Mr. Bernal was a life member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). He was probably best known for his two terms as president of the Lake County Branch of the NAACP. Mr. Bernal was founder of the Lake County NAACP Scholarship Program and was a fundraiser for numerous other organizations. He attended the St. James Episcopal Church for many years. He was a member of the Painesville Area Chamber of Commerce and received its Outstanding Citizen of the Year award in 1989. Additionally, he received the distinguished service award of the Lake County Mental Health Board, distinguished service award of Lakeland Community College, the United Way of Lake County's Good Neighbor Award, the United Way of Lake County's Good Neighbor Award, among many other honors. The Ohio House of Representatives and the Ohio Senate recognized Mr. Bernal's volunteer work and for his work in mental health services.

Mr. Bernal died at the age of 76 after a full life of service to his community. People of Lake County consider Mr. Bernal more than a leader among the black community; his obituary stated that "[I]t would be more accurate to portray him as possibly the most influential person in all the country without consigning him to a subdivision based on race or other limiting factors."

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting to designate the post office at 215 East Jackson Street, Painesville, Ohio as the "Karl Bernal Post Office Building" to honor a man who dedicated his life to this community.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge our colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), who has been the driving force on this particular piece of legislation.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman MCHUGH), and also the ranking member of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), and his able stand-in, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), and the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and also our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), for allowing this bill to come forward to the floor in such a timely fashion.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) stated, Karl Bernal did so much for the community in which I live, and it is more than fitting that his legacy be permanent with the addition of the Karl Bernal Post Office.

Karl Bernal was not one who simply paid lip service to a cause, but rather one who embraced so many causes and did not let go until he had affected some positive change. He was a giant in Lake County, Ohio, and with his passing last May, he is an individual who is sorely missed.

He was active in the Lake County Salvation Army, the United Way, where he was awarded with the Lake County's Good Neighbor Award. He was named the Painesville Chamber of Commerce Outstanding Citizen of the Year in 1989 and the recipient of the Distinguished Service Award from the Lake County Mental Health Board. He received a Distinguished Service Award from Lakeland Community College, and he was also given the Outstanding Pacesetter Award from the Ohio NAACP, and, probably most important to him, he was elected as a member of the Lake County Senior Citizen Hall of Fame.

I only had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Bernal during the last 20 years of his life. As the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) stated, he died when he was 76, but his was a rich life, and, through his life, he made the community that I have the honor of representing richer for all of our citizens, and, for that reason, I respectfully ask all of our colleagues to support the naming of this Post Office in his memory, the Karl Bernal Post Office in Painesville, Ohio.

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

Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from New York (Chairman MCHUGH), in support of H.R. 2766, legislation introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) designating the United States Post Office located at 215 East Jackson Street in Painesville, Ohio, as the Karl Bernal Post Office Building.

Mr. Bernal, as already noted, although deceased, was in the words of the News Herald Newspaper, truly one of a kind. His notion of civic responsibility was to totally immerse himself in organizations, projects, ventures and good deeds designed to make life better for others.

Mr. Karl Bernal was the recipient of numerous awards attesting to his dedication to his family and community. He received the Distinguished Service Award of the Lake County Mental Health Board, the Outstanding Pacesetter Award of the Ohio NAACP, the Distinguished Citizen Award of the Painesville Chamber of Commerce, and recognition from the Ohio House and Senate for his volunteer efforts.

By all accounts, designating the East Jackson Post Office in honor of Mr. Karl Bernal is indeed only a small token of the appreciation that we can bestow for his efforts to make life better for people throughout his community and throughout the State of Ohio.

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, with a final thank you to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and his staff, and also to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), who is not just a sponsor of this bill, but is also a valued member of the Postal Subcommittee, I would urge all my colleagues to support this very worthy designation of an extraordinary man.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and 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. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2766.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2766.

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

There was no objection.

BLAINE H. EATON POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 916) to designate the United States Post Office building located at 750 Highway 28 East in Taylorsville, Mississippi, as the ''Blaine H. Eaton Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF BLAINE H. EATON POST OFFICE BUILDING.

The United States Post Office building located at 750 Highway 28 East in Taylorsville,

Mississippi, shall be known and designated as the ''Blaine H. Eaton Post Office Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States Post Office building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Blaine H. Eaton Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH).

□ 1600

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us, S. 916, was introduced by the senior Senator from Mississippi, Senator COCHRAN on June 17, 1997, and cosponsored by the junior Senator from Mississippi, the majority leader, Senator LOTT.

On October 9 the measure was called up by unanimous consent, discharging the Senate Committee on Government Affairs. It was considered in the Senate without amendment and passed the same day. The legislation designates the United States Post Office located at 750 Highway 28 East in Taylorsville, Mississippi, be known as the ''Blaine H. Eaton Post Office Building''.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Eaton started his professional career as a farmer and cotton buyer from Anderson-Clayton Company. He was executive secretary to U.S. Senator James Eastland before joining the U.S. Navy from 1944 to 1946. After returning from World War II he was elected to the Mississippi State House of Representatives, where he served for 12 years. The bills he passed in Mississippi, such as the farm-to-market legislation, are still benefiting the people of that State today.

He left public office in 1958 and became the manager of the Southern Pine Electric Power Association. He was recognized for his outstanding service by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and was presented with the Clyde T. Ellis Award for distinguished service and outstanding leadership.

Mr. Eaton retired from his professional career in 1982, but remained active in community service. He taught Sunday school classes for 25 years at the First Baptist Church of Taylorsville, where he was a member until his death in 1995.

Mr. Speaker, here, too, I think we see a very fitting individual, fully deserving of having a United States Post Office Building dedicated to his name. This is a man who, like so many others, represents the values, represents the kind of personal qualifications that all of Americans can look toward with a great deal of honor and a great deal of respect.

I would certainly urge all of my colleagues to join in supporting the entire State delegation, including Mr. Pickering, who is not able to be with us on the floor today, but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, was very, very instrumental in ensuring full and fast consideration of this bill in the House, and he would urge its passage as well.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us, S. 916, was introduced by the Senior Senator from Mississippi (Senator COCHRAN) on June 17, 1997 and cosponsored by the Junior Senator from Mississippi (Senator LOTT). On October 9, 1997, the measure was called up by unanimous consent discharging the Senate Committee on Government Affairs. It was considered in the Senate without amendment and passed the same day. This legislation designates the United States Post Office Building located at 750 Highway 28 East in Taylorsville, Mississippi be known as the ''Blaine H. Eaton Post Office Building''.

S. 916 honors Blaine H. Eaton, a native of Smith County, Mississippi. He attended Jones Junior College in the 1930's and was named Alumni of the Year in 1984. He also attended the University of Mississippi and George Washington Law School.

Mr. Blaine Eaton started his professional career as a farmer and cotton buyer for Anderson-Clayton Co. He was executive secretary to U.S. Senator James O. Eastland before joining the U.S. Navy from 1944 to 1946. After returning from World War II he was elected to the Mississippi State House of Representatives where he served 12 years. The bills he passed in Mississippi, such as the Farm-to-Market legislation, are still benefiting the people of Mississippi today. He left public office in 1958 and became the manager of the Southern Pine Electric Power Association. He was recognized for his outstanding service by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and was presented the Clyde T. Ellis Award for distinguished service and outstanding leadership.

Mr. Eaton retired from his professional career in 1982 but remained active in community service. He taught Sunday School classes for 25 years at the First Baptist Church of Taylorsville where he was a member until his death in 1995.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fitting tribute to Blaine H. Eaton to have the U.S. Post Office Building located at 750 Highway 28 East in Taylorsville, Mississippi, named after this extraordinary Mississippian.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support S. 916.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with the gentleman from New York (Chairman MCHUGH) in support of Senate bill 916, legislation introduced by Senator THAD COCHRAN from Mississippi which names a United States Post Office building in Taylorsville, Mississippi, as the ''Blaine H. Eaton Post Office Building''.

Mr. Eaton, as we have already heard, although deceased, had a very illustrious career. He served in the Navy, the Mississippi State House of Representatives, worked for the Southern Pine Electric Power Association, and was active in many civic organizations, including his church. I think his neighbors and friends continue to remember his long legacy of community service, and S. 916 commemorates Mr. Eaton's public service and dedication to his community, State, and country. Therefore, I am pleased to join in support of this legislation.

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

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of legislation designating the U.S. Post Office facility located in Taylorsville, Mississippi, as the ''Blaine H. Eaton Post Office Building.''

A native of Smith County, Mississippi, Mr. Eaton attended Jones Junior College from 1932–1934 and was named ''Alumni of the Year in 1984.'' He also attended the University of Mississippi and George Washington Law School.

He began his professional career as a farmer and cotton buyer from Anderson-Clayton Company and in 1942, he became the first executive secretary to former U.S. Senator James O. Eastland (D–MS). Mr Eaton served our Nation in the U.S. Navy from 1944 to 1946. Upon returning home from world War II, he was elected to serve in the Mississippi House of Representatives, and he effectively served the people of Smith County for 12 years. His leadership as chairman of the Highway and Highway Finance Committee resulted in the successful passage of the ''Farm-to-Market'' legislation that is still benefiting Mississippi today as the ''State Aid Road Program.'' After leaving public office in 1958, Mr. Eaton became the manager of the Southern Pine Electric Power Association. His outstanding service and accomplishments were recognized by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association with the ''Clyde T. Ellis Award'' for distinguished service and outstanding leadership.

Although retiring from his professional career in 1982, Mr. Eaton remained active in community service and enriched the lives of many by volunteering his time and leadership abilities to such organizations as the Lions Club International, the Hiram Masonic Lodge, the Southeast Mississippi Livestock Association, and the Economic Development Foundation. He was also a loyal member of the First Baptist Church of Taylorsville where he taught Sunday School classes for 25 years.

With the death of Blaine Eaton in 1995, our State lost one of its finest citizens. Designating the Taylorsville Post Office as the ''Blaine H. Eaton Post Office Building'' will commemorate the public service of their extraordinary Mississippian who dedicated his life to the betterment of the community and State he loved so much.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, with a final urging of all our colleagues to support this legislation and give a very fitting tribute to a very fitting person, I would urge its passage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 916.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 916, the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

EUGENE J. MCCARTHY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2836) to designate the building of the United States Postal Service located at 180 East Kellogg Boulevard in Saint Paul, Minnesota, as the ''Eugene J. McCarthy Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2836

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The building of the United States Postal Service located at 180 East Kellogg Boulevard in Saint Paul, Minnesota, shall be known and designated as the ''Eugene J. McCarthy Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the building referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Eugene J. McCarthy Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) 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, the bill, H.R. 2836, was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) on November 6, 1997, and was favorably voted on a voice vote by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight on February 12. The legislation is cosponsored by the entire House delegation of the State of Minnesota, pursuant to committee policy.

As the Clerk read, Mr. Speaker, this legislation designates the building of the United States Postal Service located at 180 East Kellogg Boulevard in St. Paul, Minnesota as the ''Eugene J. McCarthy Post Office Building''.

Obviously, as we have seen here today, Mr. Speaker, we are accustomed to honor individuals who are fully worthy but often don't have the kind of national reputation for achievement that the subject matter of H.R. 2836 does. Mr. McCarthy has had a long and storied career in government and politics, one that I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) and others will share with us.

I can only say that clearly this gentleman, who is still in his 81st year and residing here in the Washington area, continues to care about this country and to contribute in very special ways. So I would clearly urge the passage of this bill, and extend my appreciation to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) and the other members of the entire Minnesota delegation for their work on behalf of this very worthy piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker. H.R. 2836 was introduced by Representative VENTO on November 6, 1997 and was favorably voted on by voice vote by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight on February 12. The legislation is cosponsored by the entire House Delegation of the State of Minnesota pursuant to Committee policy.

The legislation designates the building of the United States Postal Service located at 180 East Kellogg Boulevard in Saint Paul, Minnesota, as the ''Eugene J. McCarthy Post Office Building.''

H.R. 2836 honors Eugene J. McCarthy who served as both a U.S. Representative and Senator from Minnesota for more than two decades. Eugene McCarthy was elected to Congress from Minnesota's 4th District in 1948 and served in the House for 10 years. He was then elected to serve in the U.S. Senate, where he served until 1970.

He declared his candidacy for the Democrat nomination for President of the United States in 1968 while he was still in the Senate. He called for an immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops in Vietnam, the first anti-war candidate.

Mr. McCarthy, now 81, left politics in 1970 and presently resides in Washington, D.C. However, it would be an suitable tribute to have a post office named after him in his home state.

I urge our colleagues to support H.R. 2836.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from New York (Chairman MCHUGH) in support of H.R. 2836, legislation introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BRUCE VENTO) which designates the United States Postal Service Building located at 180 East Kellogg Boulevard in St. Paul, Minnesota, as the ''Eugene J. McCarthy Post Office Building''.

Former Senator Eugene J. McCarthy has a unique and distinguished background, both as a leader and public servant. He served as both a U.S. Representative and Senator from the great State of Minnesota for more than two decades and was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President of the United States in 1968.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HENRY A. WAXMAN), the ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and I are pleased to honor this great political leader, and thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) for sponsoring legislation naming a post office in downtown St. Paul, Minnesota, after Senator McCarthy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, of course, I rise in support of the bill that enjoys the support of the Minnesota delegation and I daresay the resounding support of this Congress and of this Nation for the outstanding service that Senator and Representative Gene McCarthy provided to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Gene McCarthy started out in a rural county in Minnesota, Meeker County, in the small town of Watkins, Minnesota. From there, with a good education, a public education, he went on to St. John's College a renowned education institution in our State. He eventually taught public school in Minnesota and in North Dakota, and from that background went on to teach at St. John's College, where he had attended, and at St. Thomas in St. Paul, both in economics and sociology and literature.

Of course, from St. Paul he went to the United States Congress and in 1958 to the United States Senate, and to national prominence and electrifying this Nation in terms of the issues of social justice and many other problems that faced our Nation.

Of course, one of the outstanding characteristics of Gene McCarthy was his wit and wisdom. He sort of had little patience for those of us in politics, who took ourselves so serious, there was a great deal of self-deprecating humor that characterized his statements. He said, ''Being in politics is like being in a football game. You have to be smart enough to know the game and stupid enough to think it is important.''

Mr. Chairman, on a more serious vein, though, I think that Gene McCarthy, in his work in public service and his role as an educator, really there is another story and side to him. That is the story that is told that Senator McCarthy stated that ''Politics is the responsibility of everyone. If you don't do politics, someone else will do it for you.'' That view, I think, is more characteristic and an insight into this renowned American.

Mr. Speaker, I remember as a young student, I believe it was at St. Patrick's grade school, I was raised Irish, they tried as hard as they could with me, it didn't always work, Mr. Speaker, but the fact was I was a pretty good Irish tenor at that point.

I remember reading my Catholic Messenger at St. Paul's. On the front of the Messenger was this profile of a young new congressman from Minnesota that I was reading about. I can't remember if it was in the late forties or early fifties.

But I remember how we all, at that time, looked up to him because obviously coming from a Scandinavian State, a State in which we weren't always probably very successful, either Irish or Italians, in terms of getting elected to public office in the 1940's and 1950's clearly Gene McCarthy's aspiration motivated us then and now.

But, clearly, he epitomized and set for a generation of Americans a great motivation to be involved along with others that he worked with, including the Bobby Kennedys and of course his great support from Minnesota and his fellow Senator, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, of course, who went on to be Vice President and who of course the high profile, the great competition between these two Minnesota son's for many years.

But I am very pleased to have had the support that I have here today for this measure to recognize, actually, the work of Senator McCarthy, and especially for his leadership in his Nation and for his work in terms of expression, both in the manner in which he has conducted his life and the impact that he has left on this Congress, nation and world yesterday and most importantly today.

A few of us, when we leave these hallowed halls, this Chamber, can point to the types of achievements and the mark that he has made inside this Congress and in this country and in this world. We wish him well. He has been, as most Members know, not well these past days. But we trust that his fighting spirit will prevail.

I hope and trust my colleagues will support this measure. I look forward to its passage in the Senate as it has the sponsorship of both of our United States Senators from Minnesota, and to designate this building on Kellogg Boulevard, another good name, Kellogg, one of our Supreme Court Justices from Minnesota, Mr. Speaker, but to designate this important art deco postal building in Gene J. McCarthy's honor.

I thank my colleagues, especially the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), for his consideration and that of the committee and the ranking member for their support in this manner.

Eugene McCarthy was a teacher in the public schools in Minnesota and a Professor at St. John's University in Collegeville, Minnesota. He was also an instructor of Economics at the College of St. Thomas in St. Paul and a distinguished author of numerous books on subjects ranging from children's literature to history and most renowned for his poetry.

The State of Minnesota is the home of many great leaders, however, few have touched as many lives as Minnesota's Eugene McCarthy. Senator McCarthy is a tireless leader and throughout his recent illness that many of us have followed, Gene's fighting spirit persists. Therefore I, as well as, the Minnesota delegation and the people of the great State of Minnesota want to honor the accomplishments and service of this historic Minnesota leader from the area of St. Paul, Minnesota that catapulted him onto the national stage and into the U.S. Congress.

I would like to express my thanks to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, as well as, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Postal Service for their support in moving this legislation promptly in through the committees.

I urge the support of all my colleagues regarding this legislation.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. And with a final thank you to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) for his hard work on this measure and of course the support of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the entire minority, we would urge our colleagues to adopt this legislation and honor a very remarkable man in this country's history and one who is extraordinarily deserving of the honor contemplated in this bill, and urge its passage.

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

Mr. MCHUGH. 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. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2836.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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. 2836, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

DANIEL J. DOFFYN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2773) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3750 North Kedzie Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''Daniel J. Doffyn Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2773

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3750 North Kedzie Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the ''Daniel J. Doffyn Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States Post Office building referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Daniel J. Doffyn Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) 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. 2773 was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH) on October 30, 1997. The measure is cosponsored by the House delegation, the State of Illinois, pursuant to the policy of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

□ 1615

The committee unanimously voted to favorably pass this measure by voice vote on February 12. As the Clerk has designated, Mr. Speaker, this bill would seek to name the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3750 North Kedzie Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, to be known as the Daniel J. Doffyn Post Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation honors a very young man of 40 years old, a Chicago police officer who was shot to death by gang members while investigating a routine burglary call. His life, his career is really one that I think exemplifies the sacrifices that police officers across this land make on our behalf each and every day; make on our behalf, rarely thinking of the consequences to their own lives, but simply wishing to be of help and of assistance to their communities.

Mr. Speaker, this is a special bill. I feel all of these pieces of legislation are, but this one particularly in that it honors a law enforcement officer and, therefore, it honors all law enforcement officers who have been killed in the line of duty. We are, indeed, irrevocably indebted to these brave men and women who try, at risk of their lives, simply to make our lives better.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH) for his work on behalf of an extraordinarily brave person, and I certainly urge my colleagues to endorse this measure unanimously in support of a very, very worthy individual.

Mr. Speaker. H.R. 2773 was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, on October 30, 1997. The measure is cosponsored by the House Delegation of the State of Illinois, pursuant to the policy of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. The Committee unanimously voted to favorably pass this measure by voice vote on February 12.

H.R. 2773 designates that the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3750 North Kedzie Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, be known as the ''Daniel J. Doffyn Post Office Building''.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation honors Daniel J. Doffyn, a 40-year-old Chicago police officer

who was shot to death by gang members while investigating a routine burglary call. Officer Doffyn's long time dream was to be a police officer. That opportunity came just eight months before he was killed.

Mr. Speaker, this is a special bill—it honors a law enforcement officer and, therefore, it honors all law enforcement officers who have been killed in the line of duty. We are indebted to these brave men and women who try, at the risk of their lives, to bring order to disorderly situations.

An estimated 2,000 police officers traveled from neighboring states and as far away as New York to mourn Officer Doffyn's untimely death and attend his funeral in Chicago. He received the Police Medal of valor for his ultimate sacrifice. His survivors include his 8-year-old daughter, Brittany and his parents.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Illinois for introducing this important legislation and urge our colleagues to support the measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) in support of H.R. 2773, legislation which has been introduced by the gentleman from Chicago, Illinois, (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH), which would designate the post office located at 3750 north Kedzie Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, as the Daniel J. Doffyn Post Office.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH), himself a champion of the promotion of public safety, is indeed to be commended for seeking to honor a slain Chicago police officer, Daniel Doffyn, who was killed in the line of duty.

Officer Doffyn, shot in 1995 while investigating a routine burglary, left behind his parents, Roger and Lea Doffyn, and his daughter, Brittany.

I also would associate myself with the remarks made by Chairman MCHUGH when he suggested that we do all of ourselves an honor when we pay tribute and give honor to those who, on a daily basis, serve and protect and give their best so that the rest of us can enjoy safe lives and safe communities.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH) who introduced this legislation.

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

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) very much for his kind remarks and his support for this effort. I also thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for his kind remarks and his support.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to support a bill I introduced last year to designate the post office located at 3750 north Kedzie Avenue in my Congressional District in Chicago as the Daniel J. Doffyn Post Office Building.

As required under House rules, and as the gentleman from New York mentioned moments ago, this bipartisan bill has been cosponsored by all 19 members of the Illinois House Congressional Delegation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased also that the House is taking up this measure today because this legislation is designed to honor a very special man: Chicago police officer Daniel J. Doffyn, a man who gave his life protecting and serving his neighbors and who exemplified the values of honor, heroism and community service that make us all proud.

On the afternoon of March 8, 1995, Daniel J. Doffyn, then a 40-year-old rookie police officer, and his partner, Officer Michael Bubalo, had just finished their regular shift when they answered a burglary call in the Austin Police District of the City of Chicago. In the course of investigating what appeared to be a routine call, both officers were suddenly fired upon by gun-wielding gang members, who believed that the officers were there to arrest them.

In the course of the gun battle, Officer Bubalo and Officer Daniel J. Doffyn were seriously wounded. Officer Doffyn later passed away at the hospital from wounds he received in that gunfight. He left behind an 8-year-old daughter, Brittany, and two loving parents, Roger and Lea Doffyn. He received the police Medal of Valor for his ultimate sacrifice.

Daniel Doffyn was a model of what a public servant ought to be. He worked hard his entire life, but never really found a job he liked completely until he became a Chicago police officer. Serving and protecting the citizens of Chicago was a job that Officer Doffyn performed with distinction. He was known by people who knew him as a wonderful father, a caring man, and as fine a person as anyone could hope to know.

While I realize it is not common for Congress to designate a post office for a slain law enforcement officer, I hope that my colleagues will agree that in this case it is an appropriate honor and a fitting testament to the bravery and heroism of Officer Doffyn and to the thousands of brave men and women who work every single day in law enforcement to keep our families and our communities safe.

Mr. Speaker, I would like again to express my sincere appreciation to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FATTAH) and also to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), chairman of the full committee, for bringing H.R. 2773 to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to support this very worthy tribute.

Mr. Speaker, having no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I do not have any further requests for time. I would again extend my appreciation to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH) for his hard work on behalf of this very, very worthy tribute to a gentleman who represents the very best of what is good in America today, and I urge its unanimous passage.

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. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2773.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 2773.

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

There was no objection.

LARRY DOBY POST OFFICE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 985) to designate the post office located at 194 Ward Street in Paterson, New Jersey, as the ''Larry Doby Post Office''.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 985

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Larry Eugene Doby was born in Camden, South Carolina, on December 12, 1923, and moved to Paterson, New Jersey, in 1938.

(2) After playing the 1946 season in the Negro League for the Newark Eagles, Larry Doby's contract was purchased by the Cleveland Indians of the American League on July 3, 1947.

(3) On July 5, 1947, Larry Doby became the first African-American to play in the American League.

(4) Larry Doby played in the American League for 13 years, appearing in 1,533 games and batting .283, with 253 home runs and 969 runs batted in.

(5) Larry Doby was voted to 7 all-star teams, led the American League in home runs twice, and played in 2 World Series. He was the first African-American to play in the World Series and to hit a home run in a World Series game, both in 1948.

(6) After his stellar playing career ended, Larry Doby continued to make a significant contribution to his community. He has been a pioneer in the cause of civil rights and has received honorary doctorate degrees from Long Island University, Princeton University, and Fairfield University.

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF LARRY DOBY POST OFFICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The post office located at 194 Ward Street in Paterson, New Jersey,

shall be known and designated as the ''Larry Doby Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the post office referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Larry Doby Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) 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, S. 985 was introduced by the junior Senator from New Jersey, Senator TORRICELLI, on June 27, 1997, and referred to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

On October 9, the committee discharged the measure by unanimous consent and it was laid before the Senate by unanimous consent. The Senate agreed to an amendment and S. 985, as amended, passed the Senate. The House received the legislation on October 21, and it was referred to the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. The committee unanimously passed S. 985 on voice vote on February 12.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) introduced similar legislation, H.R. 2116, on June 8, 1997, which was cosponsored by the Members of the House delegation from the State of New Jersey, pursuant to the committee policy, and 45 other Members of Congress.

S. 985 honors Larry Doby, the first African-American to play in the American League. Mr. Speaker, Larry Doby was born in Camden, South Carolina, but moved to Paterson, New Jersey, with his mother when he was 8 years old. So I think we can understand why the great people of the great State of New Jersey take great pride in the fact of calling Mr. Doby a resident of their State.

He was a gentleman who obviously excelled in sports while in high school and attended Long Island University briefly on a basketball scholarship before he heard his Nation's call in another way and went into service in the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, after World War II ended, he returned to play for the Negro League Newark Eagles and there history truly began. His was a storied career; one of high achievement; one of playing as the first African-American on a world championship team, helping the Indians to that championship victory. He later played 13 seasons in the majors with the Cleveland Indians, the Chicago White Sox and the Detroit Tigers. He had a career average of .283 with 253 home runs.

Mr. Speaker, Larry Doby, by any measure, had a remarkable career in baseball. But he had placed upon him an additional challenge, one of his ethnic background. Many of us think, very rightfully so, of the incredible achievements of Jackie Robinson, the first African-American to play in the major leagues, and some of us very incorrectly somehow assume at times that after Jackie Robinson, everything was easy. That was anything but the case and Larry Doby, in his own way, took on that challenge in every bit as an effective fashion as the great Jackie Robinson, and I know they consider each other as colleagues and co-pioneers in doing some remarkable things.

The designation of this post office, I think, is a very, very fitting tribute to a remarkable man with a remarkable career, facing equally remarkable challenges. And I would urge all of my colleagues to unanimously join in passing this worthy piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would again thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for his efforts in working with his colleagues in the Senate in bringing this bill to the floor here today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with Chairman MCHUGH in support of Senate Bill 985, legislation which was introduced by Senator ROBERT TORRICELLI of New Jersey, which designates the post office located at 154 Ward Street in Paterson, New Jersey, as the Larry Doby Post Office.

Mr. Speaker, I must confess that growing up I was a Brooklyn Dodger fan, and Jackie Robinson, Don Newcombe, Roy Campanetta, Junior Gilliam, Pee Wee Reese, Carl Furillo, Andy Pafko and all of those were my main men. But I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) sponsor of an identical House bill, H.R. 2116, when he stated that Larry Doby is an exceptional man and athlete. Of course, the first African-American to play baseball in the American League. Larry is the only black major leaguer from 1947 still alive.

As we have heard, he was born in Camden, South Carolina. Larry Doby moved with his mother to Paterson, New Jersey. He starred in four sports in high school, a real feat, and attended Long Island University on a basketball scholarship before enlisting in the Navy.

After World War II, he played for the Negro League, the Newark Eagles, with a batting average of .458, that is, until the Cleveland Indians owner, Bill Veeck, signed him up. Larry played 13 seasons in the majors: Cleveland Indians, Chicago White Sox and Detroit Tigers, with a career batting average of .283 with 253 home runs.

But Larry Doby was more than an athlete, more than a player. He was, indeed, a leader and was tagged and tapped to become the manager of the Chicago White Sox in 1978, becoming only the second African-American manager in the major leagues. He has not yet been elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame, and I certainly do not know why. But I am indeed pleased to join with Senator TORRICELLI and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) to commend Larry Doby. And, Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlemen for their foresight and for giving an honor to this great American.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

□ 1630

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

I want to begin by thanking the members of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and, in particular, the distinguished Subcommittee on Postal Service chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH); the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH); and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for their assistance in bringing this bill to the floor.

I would also like to thank my colleagues from New Jersey, each of whom is cosponsor of this legislation, and Senator TORRICELLI, the sponsor of the bill on the Senate side.

I think it is more than appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that we bring this bill to the floor today as we are in the midst of celebrating Black History Month. Few people are more deserving than Larry Eugene Doby to be honored by this Congress during this Black History Month.

The impact Larry Doby had on the integration of professional baseball should not be underestimated or diminished. As the first African American to play in the American League, and only the second African American to play in the major leagues, Larry Doby is in no small part responsible for opening doors for thousands upon thousands of African American ball players.

After playing in 1946 in the Negro League for the Newark Eagles, Larry Doby's contract was purchased by the Cleveland Indians of the American League on July 3rd, 1947. Two days later, on July 5th, he became the first African American to play in the American League. Larry Doby's debut came 11 weeks after that of Jackie Robinson in Brooklyn for the Brooklyn Dodgers.

Many have discounted his achievement on the basis that he was not the first African American but rather the second. That, I think, is foolish. In fact, there is much reason to believe that what Larry Doby did was more special because he was second.

He stepped onto the field at a time when Jackie Robinson, a man who would be a great Major League baseball player, was struggling to find his game, struggling to the point that many wondered whether or not he would make it. Robinson's struggles could have been more than enough to keep other African Americans from seizing the opportunity to integrate the American

League, but not Larry Doby. He was a very special, special person.

We honor him not only for his feats in professional baseball but this is truly a family man, a large family, a great family, an extended family. This is what Larry Doby was about. Not only in Cleveland, not only where he came from, Paterson, New Jersey, but all of northern Jersey and New Jersey knew of his feats. The silk city.

Mr. Speaker, Larry Doby was from another time but very appropriate to our time. Today, when professional athletes hold up sneakers made in foreign lands with less than reasonable wages, we think of Larry Doby and his professionalism and his character that he brought to the field and off the field.

Mr. Speaker, he is a special person because he loved children; still, to this day, working with them in his own community of Montclair, which is a few miles from Paterson, New Jersey.

The naming of this post office is very fitting, very apropos. It should make us think about sports, which is all around us today. Every time we turn to the tube or turn to our own children or our children's children, it is around us and we are submerged. But that athlete, and particularly Larry Doby, was an individual who made sports more than a profession. He made sports his life.

And, yes, he helped integrate the sport. But as significant as that was, he helped elevate the character of what it was to be in professional sports. He is a very special person, very special indeed. Not only as a long-time resident of our State, the silk city slugger has certainly been a hero to everyone. Naming this post office will not only be an appropriate honor for Larry Doby, it is an honor for the people of Paterson. From another time, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, but appropriate for our time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), the chairman, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking member, for their leadership in bringing all of these bills to the floor for consideration today. I think, as usual, they have done a magnificent job; and I certainly appreciate their efforts.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to Larry Doby. More than just a good professional baseball player, Mr. Doby was the first African American to play for the American League Cleveland Indians.

Like his counterpart Jackie Robinson playing for the National League Brooklyn Dodgers, Larry Doby proved to any doubting fan of the game that baseball's color barrier had nothing to do with ability and heart and everything to do with ignorance and fear.

The American men who played for the Negro Leagues should be commended for their grace and grit, showing world class athleticism to a country still coming to terms with race. In spite of being kept from the Major League teams, the men of the Negro Leagues, men like Jackie Robinson, Larry Doby and Satchel Page, played the game just as well as their white counterparts, men like Babe Ruth, Joe DiMaggio, and Stan Musial.

Larry Doby played for the Newark Eagles in my home state of New Jersey. There is another man I would like to mention who played for the Eagles, and his name is John Drakeford. Although Mr. Drakeford played for the Eagles long after Larry Doby departed, his role as a player in the Negro Leagues should not be forgotten. John Drakeford loved the game as much as any Major League baseball player and showed it every time he took the field. His son, Theodore Drakeford, works in my district office in Long Branch. Theodore talks proudly of his dad, his uncle Steve Stephenson who played alongside John Drakeford, as well as his grandfather, John Stephenson, who played for the Philadelphia Hilldales. John Stephenson was an All-Star second baseman and played when Doby played.

Men like John Stephenson, Steve Stephenson, John Drakeford and Larry Doby not only contributed to America's pastime by playing good baseball, but also provided a valuable lesson to America's understanding of race. They showed us all that arbitrary labels and discriminatory barriers can do nothing to weaken the heart of a champion.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and echo the words of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) and note the very worthy individual we are about to honor on this last piece of legislation and urge its unanimous acceptance by the body.

I would also like to return the very gracious remarks of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and also extend my deep appreciation to him, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the entire membership on the minority side of the subcommittee, and the staff who have worked with us to bring these six bills to the floor and, in anticipation of passage of the final one, for a fairly successful afternoon.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 985.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 985, the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

INCREASED MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCES FOR CRIMINALS POSSESSING FIREARMS

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 424) to provide for increased mandatory minimum sentences for criminals possessing firearms, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 424

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

SECTION 1. MANDATORY PRISON TERMS FOR POSSESSING, BRANDISHING, OR DISCHARGING A FIREARM OR DESTRUCTIVE DEVICE DURING A FEDERAL CRIME THAT IS A CRIME OF VIOLENCE OR A DRUG TRAFFICKING CRIME.

Section 924(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) A person who, during and in relation to any crime of violence or drug trafficking crime (including a crime of violence or drug trafficking crime which provides for an enhanced punishment if committed by the use of a deadly or dangerous weapon or device) for which the person may be prosecuted in a court of the United States—

''(A) possesses a firearm in furtherance of the crime, shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for the crime of violence or drug trafficking crime, be sentenced to imprisonment for 10 years;

''(B) brandishes a firearm, shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for the crime of violence or drug trafficking crime, be sentenced to imprisonment for 15 years; or

''(C) discharges a firearm, shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for the crime of violence or drug trafficking crime, be sentenced to imprisonment for 20 years;

except that if the firearm is a machinegun or destructive device or is equipped with a firearm silencer or firearm muffler, such additional sentence shall be imprisonment for 30 years.

''(2) In the case of the second or subsequent conviction of a person under this subsection—

''(A) if the conviction is for possession of a firearm as described in paragraph (1), the person shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for the crime of violence or drug trafficking crime involved, be sentenced to imprisonment for not less than 20 years;

''(B) if the conviction is for brandishing a firearm as described in paragraph (1), the person shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for the crime of violence or drug trafficking crime involved, be sentenced to imprisonment for not less than 25 years; or

''(C) if the conviction is for discharging a firearm as described in paragraph (1), the person shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for the crime of violence or drug trafficking crime involved, be sentenced to imprisonment for not less than 30 years;

except that if the firearm is a machinegun or destructive device or is equipped with a firearm silencer or firearm muffler, the person shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for the crime of violence or drug trafficking crime involved, be sentenced to life imprisonment.

''(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not impose a probationary sentence on any person convicted of a violation of this subsection, nor shall a term of imprisonment imposed under this subsection run concurrently with any other term of imprisonment including that imposed for the crime of violence or

drug trafficking crime in which the firearm was used.

''(4) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'brandish' means, with respect to a firearm, to display all or part of the firearm so as to intimidate or threaten, regardless of whether the firearm is visible.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 424, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today we take an important step in the battle against firearm violence in America. With the bill that we have before us, this House will send a clear message to violent predators that the criminal use of guns will not be tolerated.

Criminals who use firearms to commit violent crimes and drug trafficking offenses are demonstrating the ultimate indifference to human life. The risks for law enforcement and the potential for harm to innocents are dramatically increased when criminals wield guns. Criminals who carry guns while committing serious crimes are making a clear and unequivocal statement to the world: I will hurt you or kill you if you get in my way. Such persons should be punished severely, and that is what this legislation will ensure.

Why do we need this bill so desperately? We need it because three young Starbucks employees were shot in execution style in Georgetown, very near Washington, DC, simply because, as police now believe, the manager could not open the safe in the back office. We need it because dedicated law enforcement officers across the country are being gunned down for the mere thrill of the kill. And unless we make it the law of the land that criminal gun use will put you in prison for a long, long time, we and all of our loved ones will continue to remain in grave danger any time some young thug decides to pull the trigger. For the time being, Congress must look at the laws as they exist and should intervene now.

Mr. Speaker, consider these frightening facts: The National Institute of Justice released a study earlier this year in which arrestees in 11 major urban areas across the country were interviewed regarding their propensity for gun use. Thirty-seven percent of all arrestees admitted to owning a gun. Even more astonishing and terrifying for the country is that a whopping 42 percent of admitted drug sellers and 50 percent of admitted gang members further confessed to using a gun to commit a crime. Mr. Speaker, these are just the ones that are willing to admit to such criminal behavior.

H.R. 424 amends section 924(c) of Title 18 of the United States Code. Currently, that section allows for additional time in prison for any person who ''uses or carries'' a firearm during and in relation to the commission of a Federal crime of violence or drug trafficking crime. Section 924(c) is a very significant and frequently used tool for Federal criminal prosecutors. According to the U.S. Sentencing Commission, there were 10,576 defendants sentenced from 1991 to 1996 under this section.

In December of 1995, the Supreme Court significantly limited the effective use of this Federal statute. The court held in the case of Bailey v. United States that in order to receive the penalty enhancement for use of a firearm under section 924(c), the government must demonstrate ''active employment'' of the firearm. In so stating, the Supreme Court overturned the Justice Department's long-standing practice of applying this penalty to dangerous criminals whose firearms further or advance their criminal activities.

The impact caused by the Bailey decision was immediate. Federal prosecutors have been less able to utilize this section of the code. Moreover, drug dealers and other bad actors have been successful in having their convictions overturned on the basis of erroneous jury instructions regarding the ''use'' prong of the ''use or carry'' test.

It is important to note the court observed in Bailey if Congress had intended possession alone to trigger liability under the statute it could have so provided. This legislation thus clarifies Congress' intent as to the type of criminal conduct which should trigger the statute's application.

The bill passed out of committee strikes the now unworkable ''use and carry'' element of the statute and replaces it with a structure that allows a penalty enhancement for ''possessing, brandishing or discharging'' a firearm during and in relation to a Federal crime of violence or drug trafficking crime. Possessing will result in a 10-year mandatory sentence, brandishing will bring 15 years, and discharging will lead to a mandatory 20 years in Federal prison. The legislation retains current law which allows for higher penalties for machine guns, destructive devices, firearm mufflers and firearm silencers.

For those who ask whether this bill will unintentionally affect someone who merely possesses a firearm in the general vicinity of a crime or someone who might use a gun in self-defense, the answer is no. The government must prove that the gun furthered or was used during and in relation to the commission of a Federal violent crime or drug trafficking offense. In other words, the government must prove as an element of the offense that the person with the gun committed a Federal drug or violent crime.

A bill containing nearly identical provisions to H.R. 424 passed the House in the last Congress and this proposal was included in the Contract With America. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) introduced this legislation during the first days of the 105th Congress, and I am very grateful to her for her continued dedication to ensuring the passage of this legislation.

Section 924(c) is a critical tool in our fight against gun-toting criminals. The Supreme Court's Bailey decision has put this issue squarely in Congress' lap, and we must act before more violent criminals escape accountability for their life-threatening conduct. Certainly this bill is tough, but I believe it is exactly what we need in response to the menacing threat of vicious gun crimes.

When someone possesses a gun in a crime of violence that is a Federal crime or a crime of drug trafficking, that is a Federal drug-trafficking crime, that person should get an additional, on top of whatever the underlying crime is, 10-year mandatory sentence. Lock them up for that period of time and throw away the key. That is an incredibly strong deterrent message. If they are going to brandish or point that gun at somebody, they should get the 15 years additional mandatory sentence on top of the underlying crime. And, by golly, if they pull the trigger under this bill, they should get an additional 20-year mandatory sentence for pulling the trigger as well as possessing the gun.

The administration has no problem with this legislation, and the Fraternal Order of Police endorses this bill. I am very pleased that we are here today offering it and supporting it.

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

□ 1645

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

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation for several reasons, the most important of which is the fact that the penalties are out of proportion to the crimes committed. Let us compare these penalties to the penalties for other violent crimes: Aggravated assault, 2 years; assault with intent to murder, 3½ years; kidnapping, 4 years; voluntary manslaughter, 5 years; rape, 6 years. Does this make sense, all these sums, and add 10 years for possession of a gun in connection with a drug offense where no one was injured?

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for enhancements. The gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the subcommittee, mentioned many of the heinous crimes. For those crimes, robbery, murder, you would get the penalty for that crime and these would be enhancements. Obviously they will serve many years in

jail just for the underlying crime. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice has strongly urged us to amend Title 18, section 924, in response to the Bailey decision, as the gentleman has indicated, but they have not requested any change in the gun sentencing penalty. In fact, they sent a letter to the Committee on the Judiciary declaring the existing penalty structure appropriate. The American Bar Association has opposed the changes in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, in 1984 we established the Sentencing Commission to avoid the disparate sentencing, as is evidenced in this bill, 5 years for murder, 6 years for rape, and 10 years for possession of a firearm in a routine drug deal as an enhancement over the underlying crime. The Sentencing Commission should review these crimes and deliberate without politics and without political considerations to assess a reasonable penalty. That is obviously not what we are doing today.

Mr. Speaker, we should also be aware of the cost of this legislation before we pass it. The Department of Justice estimates that over 30 years this new gun penalty will cost the American taxpayers between $3.9 billion and $4.2 billion and will require the construction of 4 new prisons. That is $100 million to $150 million a year. Last year the Rand Corporation studied many strategies for crime reduction and found that mandatory minimums such as those in this bill were one of the least cost effective ways to reduce crime. So that is another $100 million a year that could have been put to better use.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides penalties out of proportion to the crimes. It bypasses the Sentencing Commission and wastes the taxpayers' money. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 424.

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), the author of this bill.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) for all the hard work and the effort he has put into bringing this bill to the floor. As mayor of Charlotte, I spent far too much time attending funerals of young people that were senseless because of the scourge that drugs have brought on this country. Day after day we hear of more and more people being victimized by drug traffickers. Today we have got the opportunity to fight back and fight back for our children and for our communities.

Throughout North Carolina and the Nation, citizens routinely claim that crime is one of their greatest fears and concerns. Nothing is scarier or more dangerous than a criminal possessing or brandishing a gun during the commission of a crime. We do not have to put up with it and we will not.

H.R. 424 provides for longer mandatory minimum sentences and clarifies Federal law so that convicted criminals will spend a long time behind bars where they cannot hurt anyone else. Crime victims across the country deserve to know that Congress has dealt harshly with reckless criminals and those criminals need to know that the law is clear, commit a Federal drug trafficking crime while possessing or brandishing a firearm and you will be in prison for a very, very long time. We cannot send that message too strongly or too often. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 424.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 424, a bill that would dramatically increase mandatory minimum sentencing. Let me make it clear. I do not like guns. I abhor crime, but this is not about sensible ways to deal with crime. This is about mandatory minimum sentencing, taking away the discretion of judges to make decisions about the varied situations that they may be confronted with. What are we doing with our criminal justice system, where we are spending, what, $3.5 billion in the Federal system alone, where we perhaps have the highest rate of incarceration of any industrialized nation? We may have people believe that somehow we are making the streets safer for them with this incarceration, but let me tell my colleagues, the recidivism rate does not prove in any way that this incarceration is doing anything to make our streets safer. We should not take away the discretion of judges who have to walk through these situations to be able to make decisions. I am very, very concerned that when we start to increase the sentencing mandatory minimums that we distort the criminal justice system.

We heard my colleague talk about other penalties and try and do some comparison. Let me reiterate. Aggravated assault, less than 2 years. Assault with intent to murder, less than 4 years. Voluntary manslaughter, 5 years. Criminal sexual abuse, under 6 years. It does not make good sense to distort sentencing in this manner. Let me give my colleagues an example of what I think is absolutely crazy. We have a 19-year-old, maybe they are stupid but they are not criminals, they end up with 5 grams of crack cocaine in their possession. First-time offense. An automatic 5-year mandatory minimum sentence in Federal prison. We add to that an unloaded gun that they may have in their possession that happens to be under a coat that may be brandished. This does not say anything about it having to be loaded. So now they have 15 years minimum. 19 years old, stupid, your son, who is not a criminal, who if sentenced appropriately will have a chance to go on and straighten out their lives and do something with it. But we want to put them in prison for 15 years? I do not think we want to do that.

What is wrong with creating these sentences from the floor of Congress is this: We all have these different ideas. We have a Sentencing Commission who studies this and makes recommendations. I suppose we could all get up and look as if we are tough on crime and we could give 20 and 30 and 40 years and I guess it just spins out of control. I do not think it is sensible, I do not think it is logical. I think this increase in mandatory minimums for crimes that could end up not being violent crimes at all with the simple possession is harmful to our system and should not be done.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) for bringing this legislation to the floor in this timely manner. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), my colleague on the Committee on Rules, introduced this bill last year along with my cosponsorship and others and we almost got this bill considered as the final item of business last year. But nothing could be done on the floor at that time on that last day of the session without unanimous consent, and of course the Democrats blocked unanimous consent and we could not pass it as the last bill of the day. That is just too bad. As a result, this crucial piece of legislation was delayed for many months now. We may never know for certain how many lives could have been saved if this bill had been passed earlier. What I do know is that the sooner we enact this legislation, the sooner we can toughen mandatory minimum penalties on those who commit crimes involving guns. In the long run this is a bill to save lives by getting criminals with guns off the street.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that aggravates me more than the real cause for drug use in America. Seventy-five percent of all the drug use in America is not used by these poor people in the inner cores of our country, it is used by the upper middle class in suburban America. Seventy-five percent of them are the ones that use drugs recreationally. They are the ones that prop up the price of these drugs because of so much use. We just need to go after these people. The only difference between this democracy and democracies that have failed all across this world is the fact that we are law-abiding citizens, and we have to send that word that we insist that people obey the laws of this land. One can fight to change the law, but one has to obey the law. If one does not, he ought to be penalized.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the gentleman a scenario.

If a young man 19 or 20 years old maybe goes out to hunt and they have got a hunting rifle and they happen to have 5 ounces of crack cocaine inside their jacket pocket, they have a gun, it is there for you to see, they are in possession of drugs, first-time offense on the possession of the cocaine, 5 years minimum in Federal prison added to this with a gun, the hunting gun, now 15 years. Is that what the gentleman understands this bill to be?

Mr. SOLOMON. Not at all. I understand it has to be in the furtherance of a crime. Be that as it may, and I cannot yield any further because I have to get upstairs to a meeting, but let me tell the gentlewoman what I told my 5 children: If you are out there with cocaine in your possession, damn it, I want you to go to jail and I want everybody else's kid in America to go to jail if you are using these kinds of drugs and committing these kinds of crimes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I just outlined a possibility, a scenario that was not responded to. It was not responded to because I do not think that any reasonable legislator, public policymaker would intend to do this. I am as tough on crime as anybody. I am in the forefront of trying to do something about crime. I happen to be honest enough to admit that our children oftentimes are getting involved with drugs and we are not doing enough to prevent it, to rehabilitate them, to discourage them and create the kind of society where we can essentially be drug-free. I think we make a mistake by putting these small drug dealers in prison or by having simple possession, causes them to go to prison. I think this bill, despite the fact of what has been represented, would take the kind of situation where a young man out with a hunting rifle and a small amount of drugs could end up with 15 to 30 years in prison. I do not think that is what is intended, but that is the problem when we have mandatory minimums being created by legislators from the floor rather than working in an organized way with the Sentencing Commission.

Yes, drugs are bad. We are working very hard to do something about it. I have gone to every appropriations committee that has got anything to do with appropriating funds to get rid of drug abuse in our society. I put myself on the line. It is the number one priority of the Congressional Black Caucus, to get rid of drugs in our society. We do not just use this as a political issue. We are really working very hard. We have this ''lock them up and throw the key away'' for young people with small amounts of drugs when we should be rehabilitating them, have more prevention in our schools and in our community. We should be thinking about what we can do to reduce the cost of incarceration and ruining lives.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to get to the floor and vote against this legislation. This legislation does America no good. It sounds good, it maybe will make many of our constituents feel good. It may make some legislators look as if they are against drugs and that they are tough law and order legislators. But this is misdirected, misunderstood perhaps by many, and will do more harm than good.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying that this gives us an opportunity to sound tough on crime but this mandatory minimum strategy has been studied, and it is one of the least cost effective ways of reducing crime. The highest risk offenders do not get enough. The lowest risk offenders get too much. This will provide more time for this offense than those who are convicted of rape, voluntary manslaughter, and kidnapping.

□ 1700

The money that will be spent in this bill could be put to better use. It is 100 to $150 million a year that could be put to crime prevention programs, enhanced police protection, drug rehabilitation and a lot better uses than this sound bite that is in this bill, and I would hope we would defeat it.

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and then I am going to yield, if I can, to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), a member of the committee, who just walked in.

I want to make a response at this point to the gentlewoman's concerns expressed with regard to the issue of whether or not somebody in possession of a small amount of crack cocaine or cocaine period, out hunting with a rifle could indeed be found to be guilty of a crime that would result in the enhanced punishments under this bill, and the answer is they could not. And the reason why they could not is because the crime under the bill, the enhancement provisions for the crime, requires that it be committed, that a crime be the possession or the brandishing or the discharging of the gun be committed during and in relationship to a crime of violence or drug trafficking, and it has to be in furtherance of that crime.

And in our report, the committee report, we define all of that in quite a lengthy time, talking about both Webster's New International Dictionary and Black' Law Dictionary, defining furtherance as the act of furthering, helping, forwarding, promoting, advancement or progress, and we go on to say the mere possession of a firearm in an area where a criminal act occurs is not a sufficient basis for imposing this particular mandatory sentence. Rather, the government must illustrate through specific facts which tie the defendant to the firearm that the firearm was possessed to advance or promote the criminal activity.

Somebody out hunting who simply happens to have possession of narcotics would not be somebody that this would apply to because the gun would not be in furtherance of a criminal enterprise, the violent crime of drug trafficking.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, that is the trouble with this kind of mandatory minimum sentencing making. If, for example, the gentleman was in possession of a small amount of drugs, crack cocaine, had a gun, and while he was out there said to his friend, oh, I will sell you half of it, two 19-year-olds, that is the furtherance of a crime. They have got the drug trafficking.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time and tell the gentlewoman that the gun is not being used in that case in the furtherance of the crime. The gun is not. We have got to have that gun in the furtherance of the crime itself, not simply possess it on their person.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) a member of the committee.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us, H.R. 424, which will increase the penalties when thugs have firearms while committing federal crimes of violence or drug trafficking offenses. This debate is about sincere and fundamental differences in addressing violent crime.

The other side believes with all their heart that if we get the guns off the streets, there will not be crime in our society. Then, there is the alternative, in which camp I place myself, that believes gun control is not crime control and that law-abiding, free citizens have the right to own and bear arms.

Under this bill, the thug who uses a firearm in the commission of a crime receives a mandatory minimum sentence of 5 years above the sentence for the crime itself. If this same thug brandishes a weapon to incite fear in victims, it increases the sentence to 10 years. If a thug discharges the firearm, then the mandatory minimum is 20 years. The opponents of this measure believe these sentences are harsh. Yes, they are harsh, but many of us also believe that if a firearm is used in the commission of violent crime, the penalty should be harsh.

This bill is about achieving a proper balance in punishment that upholds the needs of victims in society, and I urge the adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) did not respond to the question. What

he did was to confirm that this is triggered not simply by violent crime, but so-called drug trafficking. He did not respond to the scenario that I built for him where a small possession of drugs may trigger a mandatory minimum sentence already.

On top of having this hunting gun in one's possession and to exacerbate it, to even make it worse, or even to try and answer what he said, I said, and he may say to a friend who is hunting with him, I will give him half for $5.

Now, what he is saying to us is this: Mothers and fathers should go out and hire the best lawyer that can be hired and spend all of the money that they have got to prove, in fact, that this gun was not used in the commission of a crime. I do not want to heap that on anybody's head.

I do not like drugs; I do not like guns. If I had my druthers, I would have complete gun control. I would take guns out of the hands of everybody. I do not like drugs. We fight very hard against them.

So I do not want anybody to think I am covering anybody. What I dislike is mandatory minimum sentencing. I want the judges that we appoint to the bench to be able to look at each of these situations and decide. In some cases they have got to be very tough; in other cases, they know the difference, when we just have a stupid kid who has fallen into an ill-conceived law like this one and will not allow them to have their lives thrown away simply because they are stupid.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleague that he has just set up a scenario where he tells me that if, in fact, they fall in these gray areas, let them go and prove, or let somebody prove, that they, in fact, did not come into having this law take effect for them.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to be respectful to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS). I do not know if the example of a hunter with crack cocaine is the right example to use. Hunters in Indiana with crack cocaine are not out hunting game, they are out hunting to sell their product. So I do not know if that is appropriate.

I have been listening to the gentlewoman about the mandatory minimums. We just met with our Federal judges. Even in Indiana they wish they had some discretion in certain areas. But as my colleagues know, society, we are moving this and being tough on these judges because of some lenient sentences, and we have to make these decisions on the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to explain before we go into the closing of this the relative words with regard to the possession of a firearm that might trigger the mandatory 10-year sentence.

We have brandishing, which is pointing the gun, which gets 15, and pulling the trigger, which gets 20. That is pretty apparent. The gentlewoman from California has discussed a potential scenario involving a cocaine dealing or trafficking situation.

Let us assume that it, in fact, is a crime of cocaine trafficking that is going on. If indeed the person possesses a gun, the simple possession of it during the course of while that is going on, if it is not in furtherance of that crime, it is not going to trigger the additional mandatory minimum. And it is not a gray area at all. It would require, in all of the experts that we have had look at this and the way the Justice Department has interpreted, and I think the courts have, too, that the person who is dealing in that drug have to say since he is just possessing the gun, hey, I have got a gun here, and by golly, if these people do not do whatever I say do, then they are going to likely see me use that gun and words to that effect, something that is active, some furtherance in relationship to the crime, not the mere passive possession of the gun on the person during the course of the transaction.

I think that is pretty clear, and it also has to be clearly on the person. It cannot be sitting over on some other side of the room somewhere. That is why, for example, the National Rifle Association has not expressed any problem with this bill. I am quite confident they would oppose this bill if they thought simple possession of a gun would get somebody into trouble, and they do not.

What we are dealing with here is minimum mandatory hard message sentences for people who are out there committing crimes and are using guns in the furtherance of those crimes, and I think that is the important part.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just say that when we talk about possession as less than brandishing, I am not sure how we are ever going to get to prove simple possession that was not brandishing. As the gentlewoman from California indicated, I guess that is for the family that spent all their money on lawyers to protect themselves from this falling on them.

The bottom line, though, is that mandatory minimums have been studied and are the least, one of the least effective ways to reduce crime. If we are serious about reducing crime, if we are serious about it, we should not pass the mandatory minimums. We should use the money for something constructive.

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would just simply like to conclude this debate by making the point of why this bill is out here. This bill is out here to send a message, a message to anybody who is going to think about using a gun in the commission of a crime, to tell them they better think twice, three times or four times because if they are out there using a gun in the commission of a Federal violent crime or drug trafficking offense, they are going to pay an extraordinary price, 10 more years in addition to the underlying sentence, minimum 10 more years in Federal prison for possession, 15 more years in Federal prison for brandishing the gun, pointing at somebody, and 20 years more if they actually pull the trigger while they are committing a Federal crime of violence or drug trafficking.

The idea is to deter people from using guns in the commission of violent and drug trafficking crimes to say, no, and believe me, they talk about it. Hoodlums on the street, young people who are involved, there is a whole chain of conversation that goes on, most of them are very much in the know, and the idea of why we need this legislation is to send that message to them so we have far less violent crime with drugs than we have in America today.

So, kids, do not use guns, and if that message is sent out there, if we really can send that message home, there is hope of truly reducing violence in America. This is one, in my opinion, one of the most important pieces of legislation that this Congress has passed in the years I have been here, and I hope it is passed today, and I urge the passage of H.R. 424 today.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to opposition to H.R. 424 for the following reason. Crime control and crime-related sentencing, the stated reason for enacting gun control legislation in the first place, was never intended to be a function of the federal government. Rather, it is a responsibility belonging to the states.

This country's founders recognized the genius of dividing power amongst federal, state and local governments as a means to maximize individual liberty and make government most responsive to those persons who might most responsibly influence it. This division of power strictly limited the role of the federal government and, at the same time, anticipated that law enforcement would almost exclusively be the province and responsibility of state and local governments.

Constitutionally, there are only three federal crimes. These are treason against the United States, piracy on the high seas, and counterfeiting. Despite the various pleas for the federal government's correction of all societal wrongs, a national police force and mandatory sentencing laws which violate the ninth and tenth amendments to the U.S. are neither prudent nor constitutional.

For this reason I oppose H.R. 424 and the federal government's attempt to usurp the police power which properly rests with state governments.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 424, providing for mandatory minimum sentences for criminals who use guns in the commission of a crime.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a strong supporter of the Second Amendment, which guarantees the right of law-abiding Americans to keep and bear arms. I have opposed gun control laws because they infringe upon this right. Instead,

I have strongly supported tough prison sentences for criminals who use firearms in the commission of a crime. I believe that this is the correct way to deal with gun violence—punish the criminals.

H.R. 424 imposes increasingly stiff penalties for crooks with guns, depending on how the weapon is used in the crime. The bill mandates a 10-year jail term for possessing a firearm in the commission of a crime. If a gun is brandished, the criminal will face a 15-year sentence. If a gun is discharged during the crime, he will receive a 20 year prison term. In addition, the bill provides 20, 25, and 30-year sentences, respectively, for subsequent convictions of the three categories of crimes. Furthermore, the bill prohibits courts from weakening these sentences by eliminating the possibility for probation as well as allowing the sentences to be served concurrently.

Gun control laws prevent law-abiding citizens from owning guns, not criminals. Rather than laws which do not discriminate between peaceful gun owners and gun toting crooks, H.R. 424 gets tough on the right people, criminals.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 424.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of HR 424, which increases the mandatory minimum penalty for possessing a firearm while committing a crime, and imposes tough, new penalties based on how a firearm is used in the commission of a crime.

The Second Amendment of our Constitution protects the right of law-abiding Americans to bear arms. It does not extend this solemn right to criminals. Nor does it extend this right to those individuals who use firearms in the commission of crimes.

In response to Americans' concern with violent crime, the Federal government, and several States, have pursued policies which fail to distinguish between two widely disparate interests: the law-abiding citizens who wish to acquire firearms for protection, hunting, recreation or any other lawful purpose; and criminals, who, by definition, seeking to obtain firearms for purposes contrary to the law, and who are dangerous to our communities. Unfortunately, this policy of targeting both law-abiding citizens and criminals is not succeeding. Criminals can be relied upon to obtain firearms outside lawful channels. Americans understand that waiting periods and other hindrances to the acquisition of firearms that fail to differentiate between law-abiding citizens and criminals simply do not reduce crime, and do not make our communities safer. Such policies do injustice to our Constitutional liberty for citizens to bear arms. Just as importantly, such policies do not target the cause of violent gun crimes. The cause of violent gun crimes is violent gun criminals.

In the best interests of crime victims, and of men, women and children who want safe communities, let us send a strong message to the criminals: If you use a firearm in the commission of a crime, you will go to jail for a long time.

I am pleased today to support HR 424 because this important legislation targets firearms crimes by targeting criminals who use firearms, while protecting the Constitutional rights of lawful firearms owners. It is based on a simply, easily-understood principle: penalty escalation. If an individual commits a crime while possessing a firearm, he gets 10 years in jail. If he brandishes that weapon in such a way that it aids in the criminal act, that's a 15-year sentence. If he discharges that weapon, count on 20 years in jail. And those penalties are for the first offense. Second or subsequent offenses demand greater penalties. Additional penalties are provided if the crime was committed with a machine gun, or a firearm with a silencer or muffler.

My congratulations go to my colleague, Rep. SUE MYRICK (R–NC), who wrote this bill, and to Chairmen BILL MCCOLLUM and HENRY HYDE for reporting HR 424 to the floor today. I also want to express my appreciation to the leadership of this Republican Congress, which is thoroughly and fully committed to making every American community safer for families and for freedom.

I encourage my colleagues to stand for safer communities, to stand for the rights and liberties of law-abiding citizens who are gun owners and those who are not, and to stand against the criminal element in this country, by voting in favor of HR 424. I hope that the Senate and the President will follow through as well, by promptly adopting this important anti-crime measure.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. 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 Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 424, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1150, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION REFORM ACT of 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on the Senate bill (S 1150) to ensure that federally funded agricultural research, extension, and education address high-priority concerns with national multistate significance, to reform, extend, and eliminate certain agricultural research programs, and for other purposes:

Messrs. SMITH of Oregon,
COMBEST,
BARRETT of Nebraska,
STENHOLM, and
DOOLEY of California.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on the motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

INCREASED MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCES FOR CRIMINALS POSSESSING FIREARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 424, 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 Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 424, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 350, nays 59, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—350

Abercrombie	Danner	Hobson
Ackerman	Davis (FL)	Hoekstra
Aderholt	Davis (VA)	Holden
Allen	Deal	Hooley
Andrews	DeFazio	Horn
Archer	DeLauro	Hostettler
Armey	DeLay	Houghton
Bachus	Deutsch	Hoyer
Baesler	Diaz-Balart	Hulshof
Baker	Dickey	Hunter
Baldacci	Dicks	Hutchinson
Ballenger	Dingell	Hyde
Barcia	Doggett	Inglis
Barr	Dooley	Istook
Barrett (NE)	Doolittle	Jefferson
Barrett (WI)	Doyle	Jenkins
Bartlett	Dreier	John
Barton	Duncan	Johnson (CT)
Bass	Dunn	Johnson (WI)
Bateman	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Becerra	Ehlers	Johnson, Sam
Bentsen	Ehrlich	Jones
Bereuter	Emerson	Kanjorski
Berry	Engel	Kaptur
Bilbray	English	Kasich
Bilirakis	Ensign	Kelly
Bishop	Eshoo	Kennedy (MA)
Blagojevich	Etheridge	Kennedy (RI)
Bliley	Evans	Kennelly
Blumenauer	Everett	Kildee
Blunt	Ewing	Kim
Boehlert	Farr	Kind (WI)
Boehner	Fawell	King (NY)
Bonilla	Foley	Kingston
Borski	Forbes	Kleczka
Boswell	Fossella	Klug
Boucher	Fowler	Knollenberg
Boyd	Fox	Kolbe
Brady	Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Bryant	Franks (NJ)	LaHood
Bunning	Frelinghuysen	Largent
Burr	Frost	Latham
Burton	Gallegly	LaTourette
Buyer	Ganske	Lazio
Callahan	Gejdenson	Leach
Calvert	Gekas	Levin
Camp	Gephardt	Lewis (CA)
Campbell	Gibbons	Lewis (KY)
Canady	Gilchrest	Linder
Cannon	Gillmor	Livingston
Cardin	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Castle	Goodling	Lowey
Chabot	Gordon	Lucas
Chambliss	Goss	Luther
Chenoweth	Graham	Maloney (CT)
Christensen	Granger	Maloney (NY)
Clement	Green	Manton
Clyburn	Greenwood	Manzullo
Coble	Gutknecht	Markey
Coburn	Hall (OH)	Mascara
Collins	Hall (TX)	Matsui
Combest	Hamilton	McCarthy (NY)
Condit	Hansen	McCollum
Cook	Harman	McCrery
Cooksey	Hastert	McDade
Costello	Hastings (WA)	McGovern
Cox	Hayworth	McHale
Cramer	Hefley	McHugh
Crane	Herger	McInnis
Crapo	Hill	McIntosh
Cubin	Hilleary	McKeon
Cunningham	Hinojosa	Meehan

Menendez	Regula	Spence
Metcalf	Reyes	Spratt
Mica	Riggs	Stabenow
Miller (CA)	Riley	Stark
Miller (FL)	Rivers	Stearns
Moran (KS)	Rodriguez	Stenholm
Moran (VA)	Roemer	Strickland
Morella	Rogan	Stump
Murtha	Rogers	Sununu
Myrick	Rohrabacher	Talent
Neal	Ros-Lehtinen	Tanner
Nethercutt	Rothman	Tauscher
Neumann	Roukema	Tauzin
Ney	Royce	Taylor (MS)
Northup	Ryun	Taylor (NC)
Norwood	Salmon	Thomas
Nussle	Sanchez	Thompson
Obey	Sanders	Thornberry
Ortiz	Sandlin	Thune
Owens	Sanford	Thurman
Oxley	Saxton	Tiahrt
Packard	Schaefer, Dan	Tierney
Pallone	Schaffer, Bob	Torres
Pappas	Schumer	Towns
Parker	Sensenbrenner	Traficant
Pascrell	Sessions	Turner
Pastor	Shadegg	Upton
Paxon	Shaw	Velazquez
Pease	Shays	Visclosky
Peterson (PA)	Sherman	Walsh
Petri	Shimkus	Wamp
Pickering	Shuster	Watkins
Pickett	Sisisky	Weldon (FL)
Pitts	Skeen	Weldon (PA)
Pombo	Skelton	Weller
Pomeroy	Slaughter	Wexler
Porter	Smith (MI)	Weygand
Portman	Smith (NJ)	White
Price (NC)	Smith (OR)	Whitfield
Pryce (OH)	Smith (TX)	Wicker
Quinn	Smith, Adam	Wise
Radanovich	Snowbarger	Wolf
Rahall	Snyder	Woolsey
Ramstad	Solomon	Young (FL)
Redmond	Souder	

NAYS—59

Berman	Jackson (IL)	Paul
Bonior	Kilpatrick	Payne
Brown (FL)	LaFalce	Peterson (MN)
Carson	Lewis (GA)	Rangel
Clay	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Martinez	Sabo
Conyers	McDermott	Sawyer
Coyne	McKinney	Scarborough
Cummings	McNulty	Scott
Davis (IL)	Meek (FL)	Serrano
DeGette	Meeks (NY)	Skaggs
Delahunt	Millender-McDonald	Smith, Linda
Dixon	Minge	Stokes
Fattah	Mink	Vento
Fazio	Moakley	Waters
Filner	Mollohan	Watt (NC)
Goode	Nadler	Watts (OK)
Hastings (FL)	Oberstar	Waxman
Hilliard	Olver	Wynn
Hinchey		Yates

NOT VOTING—21

Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pelosi
Brown (OH)	Klink	Poshard
Ford	Lampson	Rush
Furse	Lantos	Schiff
Gilman	Lipinski	Stupak
Gonzalez	McCarthy (MO)	Young (AK)
Gutierrez	McIntyre	
Hefner		

□ 1735

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. CUBIN, and Messrs. CLYBURN, DEFAZIO, STARK, and OWENS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall no. 18, passage of H.R. 424, I was detained in transit on US Airway Flight #6 out of Pittsburgh which had multiple mechanical problems. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2181, WITNESS PROTECTION AND INTERSTATE RELOCATION ACT

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–419) on the resolution (H. Res. 366) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2181) to ensure the safety of witnesses and to promote notification of the interstate relocation of witnesses by States and localities engaging in that relocation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1544, FEDERAL AGENCY COMPLIANCE ACT

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–420) on the resolution (H. Res. 367) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1544) to prevent Federal agencies from pursuing policies of unjustifiable nonacquiescence in, and relitigation of, precedents established in the Federal judicial circuits, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3073

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3073.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 358

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of House Resolution 358.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE HARRIS W. FAWELL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable Harris W. Fawell, Member of Congress:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 18, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois seeking the right to inspect and copy documents in a file of two constituents maintained by my congressional office.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena to allow inspection and copy of such file is appropriate.

Sincerely,

HARRIS W. FAWELL,
Member of Congress.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1748

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 1748.

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

There was no objection.

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.

TRIBUTE TO U.S. NAVY ASIATIC FLEET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in recognition of the sailors and marines who served in the United States Navy Asiatic fleet and in support of legislation that Senator JOHN WARNER and I have introduced in their honor.

Although many of my colleagues may not be familiar with the efforts waged by the Asiatic fleet, these brave men played a critical role in protecting American security interests.

From the early 1900s until just after Pearl Harbor, the Fleet sailed courageously across the coastal waters between China and the Philippines as well as in Russian waters and in the straits and narrows of Malaysia and Indonesia during the very dynamic period in history.

The Asiatic fleet had originally been established in August of 1910 as a successor of the Asiatic station to protect American lives and property in the Philippines and in China.

□ 1745

It sailed the seas in defense of American interests and in Southeast Asian waters until 1942.

In the final years of the Asiatic Fleet operations, these sailors and marines

distinguished themselves by defending against the tidal wave of Japanese aggression. Fighting against the larger modern Japanese naval forces were the fleet's three cruisers, 13 World War I-vintage destroyers, 29 submarines and a handful of gunboats and patrol aircraft. In all, the fleet lost 22 ships.

More importantly and most gravely, 1,826 men were killed and over 500 were said to be placed in prison camps. Sadly, many of these sailors taken prisoners were beaten, tortured, and killed in the most gruesome of manners.

They made the supreme sacrifice for their country, but regrettably, Congress and the American people have never risen to recognize the valiant actions of the Asiatic Fleet, the precursor to today's Seventh Fleet.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today dedicated to granting long overdue recognition of the heartbreaking struggles of the fleet that fought alone against the overwhelming modern Japanese Navy. It is altogether fitting and appropriate that this Nation pause and reflect upon the noble action of these fine sailors and marines of the Asiatic Fleet.

It is for these reasons that I have joined my colleague in the Senate, Senator WARNER, to introduce a resolution calling for the recognition of the 56th anniversary of the sinking of the Asiatic Fleet flagship, the USS *Houston*. This resolution supports the efforts of the Senate to designate March 1, 1988, as the ''United States Navy Asiatic Fleet Memorial Day.''

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to join me today in this effort to give these forgotten heroes Congress' support for long-awaited and much-deserved recognition by joining me in cosponsoring H.J. Res. 100.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY MUST COOPERATE TO RESOLVE NONCUSTODIAL PARENT KIDNAPPING CASES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the kidnapping of a child is a terrible crime that should not be tolerated. However, it is something that happens all too often with the perpetrator actually being rewarded in some cases.

There are hundreds of unresolved cases in which children have been abducted by a noncustodial parent and taken to a foreign country. Some of these countries are allowing the kidnappers to illegally keep the children without fear of prosecution or ever having to face extradition.

Our legal system makes decisions involving the custody of children based on what is in the best interest of the child. Once such arrangements are made, no one should ever be rewarded for the illegal abduction of a child from our country by being able to keep the child and thumb their nose at authority.

Such crime imposes horrible grief and suffering upon the parent from whom the child is taken. Tomorrow I will be introducing a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the international community must work together to resolve cases where kidnapped children are taken abroad.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious problem that should be treated as a high priority issue by the United States Government in its relations with other countries. By giving this resolution our full consideration and support, we will be sending a strong signal of our support for the rights of children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WILLIAM D. GLOVER, JR.: HUSBAND, OFFICER, HERO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to pay tribute to Officer William Glover, of the Ashtabula Police Department. On November 17, 1997, William Glover was senselessly killed in the line of duty, shot execution style by a 21-year-old man wanted by police for aggravated robbery.

It was a Monday afternoon and Bill Glover was responding to a call when he spotted the suspect on West 43rd Street in Ashtabula. Knowing that an arrest warrant had been issued, Patrolman Glover radioed in that he was pursuing the suspect on foot. Seconds later police received a 911 call saying that shots had been fired in the area.

Fellow officers found Officer Glover lying in the snow critically injured, his service revolver still in its holster. He had been shot three times, once in the torso and twice in the head. He was flown by medical helicopter to Cleveland's MetroHealth Medical Center, where he died early the next day.

Bill Glover, age 30, left behind a wife, Marianne, and three small children and a community and department in mourning. It had been four decades, Mr. Speaker, since another Ashtabula officer had been shot and killed in the line of duty.

Bill Glover had been a police officer since 1988, and had worked as chief of police for the Roaming Shores Village before joining the Ashtabula Police Department just 6 months before his death. His death deeply affected the citizens of Ashtabula and particularly the residents of the city's public housing complexes.

Bill Glover had been hired by the Ashtabula department as part of a drug elimination grant awarded to the Ashtabula Metropolitan Housing Authority. In the short time that he patrolled the city's housing complexes, he had become well-known and well-liked. His efforts to eradicate the area of drugs and crime were genuinely appreciated by residents.

Since his death, Mr. Speaker, every resident of one of the public housing complexes he patrolled, Bonniewood Estates, has signed a petition to rename Bonniewood Drive to Glover's Lane and hope to establish a recreation center in his name. Perhaps only in death will Patrolman Glover's family, friends, and community truly understand the impact that he had on the city's residents.

One Bonniewood resident summed it up this way: To a lot of kids here, Officer Glover was the only male role model they had and they are going to miss him.

While renaming Bonniewood Drive in Bill Glover's memory is undoubtedly appreciated by his widow, it cannot fully ease her pain or diminish her loss, nor should it be expected to. For Marianne Glover, Bill Glover was not just one of Ashtabula's cherished ''Men in Blue,'' he was her beloved husband and the father of her three children, Philip, 10, Sean, 7, and Amanda, 5.

Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that a profession as important as law enforcement is so fraught with danger. A law enforcement officer dies in this country every 54 hours, a rate of about three a week nationwide. That, Mr. Speaker, is unconscionable.

I have submitted Bill Glover's name for inclusion in the National Law Enforcement Memorial in Washington, D.C., which honors the more than 14,000 law enforcement officers who have been killed in the line of duty during our Nation's history. It is my hope that Bill Glover's name will be added to the memorial's walls where the names of fallen officers are displayed in random order.

Each May during an annual candlelight vigil the new names of fallen officers are added to coincide with the National Police Week. With the addition of each name, the theme of the memorial is reinforced: It is not how these officers died that made them heroes, it is how they lived.

As we pay tribute to Ashtabula Patrolman William D. Glover, Jr., I hope that we will all remember the heroism that marked his life, the infectious joy and enthusiasm that he brought to his work, and the tremendous pride that he felt in being part of that elite corps of men and women in blue.

Words, Mr. Speaker, cannot adequately convey all that he did in his life nor how his death has affected so many. While we mourn the senseless passing of the life of yet another good cop, we can take comfort knowing that Officer Bill Glover left his mark on this world and he left this world a safer, better place.

To his wife, Marianne, to his children, to his family, his community, and his department and his brethren in law enforcement, our most heartfelt sympathies are offered. In his sacrifice, he was able to leave earth and join hands with God. And I know that his watchful, caring eyes will continue to watch over and protect the family, department, and community that he loved so much.

Mr. Speaker, may God bless Ashtabula Patrolman William D. Glover, Jr., and may God rest his soul.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IS TURNING AROUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening with some good news, and let me report it from a more objective observer. The Washington Times, in an editorial, said the following: The District is looking good. There is a $186 million surplus from fiscal 1997. People are buying homes in the District and businesses are expanding and setting up shop.

I know that everyone on both sides of the aisle greets this good news about our Nation's Capital in the same spirit I do. Yes, a surplus. The District is turning around. It has balanced its budget, more than balanced it now 2 years ahead of the congressionally mandated year. How has this been done? Through prudent budgeting, Mr. Speaker, through fiscal discipline, and through preserving the fruits of an excellent economy rather than spending that money.

The highlights are quite extraordinary, and I am sure to many Members, unexpected. Vendors are now being paid ahead of time rather than behind time. We have, Mr. Speaker, a clean opinion from an outside independent auditor, which means an unqualified opinion looking at the books and records of the District of Columbia, that the District is revitalizing itself financially.

We have a general fund surplus of almost $186 million. This is a city that was close to bankruptcy just a few years ago. And the District is reaping increased revenue from taxes, not because it has raised taxes, but because improved operations have allowed the city to collect taxes from those who should have been paying taxes all along.

Mr. Speaker, the District's problems have not been entirely self-inflicted, but the city's repair must be completely self-generated. I think that we now have evidence that that self-generation is occurring, and it is occurring for a combination of reasons. It is occurring because this Congress set up a Control Board. It is occurring because the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), chair of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, and I, the ranking member, have worked collaboratively and in a bipartisan fashion on the District ever since the Control Board was set up 2 years ago.

It is occurring because of the work of the Control Board, and yes, Mr. Speaker, it is occurring because of the work of the mayor and the members of the city council. They deserve our congratulations, even as they have gotten the criticism of this body when they have deserved it. And I must say, sometimes even when they have not.

Mr. Speaker, the District's Government is now multilayered. The Congress seeks an efficient government from the District, but the fact is that the Congress has imposed a highly inefficient structure to do the job. The District needs better collaboration among its many layers until the Control Board sets and Congress will be hearing from me about streamlining its oversight as it requires the District to streamline its operations.

Mr. Speaker, I began with editorial comment praising the District from the Washington Times. The Washington Post said as much when this audit was reported: The District is not enjoying a $185.9 million general fund surplus and a clean fiscal year 1997 annual audit by accident. It took hard work and a stiff spine to bring unchecked and irresponsible spending under control.

That is exactly what has happened. I have been as impatient as many Members to see this day. Now it has come in spades, not little by little, but with a buildup of improvements that is now showing itself in a way that I think none of us anticipated seeing in this fashion.

The District, knowing that this is no time to sit down, that there is much work to be done. The District has revved itself up to work now on its services and operations. It knows that those services and operations must improve and improve quickly. And that is not, Mr. Speaker, because of what this body wants, although that is part of it.

First and foremost, it is because the residents of the District of Columbia, among the highest taxpaying citizens of the United States, deserve no less. My congratulations to the Control Board, to the chief financial officer, to the mayor, and to the city council for a job that is beginning to be well done.

□ 1800

IS THERE A MEDIA BIAS? ASK BOB ZELNICK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, is there a liberal bias in the nation's media? Just ask a prominent member of that media.

Bob Zelnick had been a respected member of ABC's news division for 21 years. He was fired because he wanted to write a book on Vice President AL GORE. The head of ABC news had first granted him permission to write such a book, but then changed his mind when it became clear that Zelnick was not going to write a puff piece about Mr. GORE.

In my own experience, ABC News has a liberal bias. I recently traveled to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, to investigate whether the accusations of sweatshops and other labor abuses were true. At a reception hosted by the Governor of the CNMI, a member of my staff noticed that a film crew was spying on us from a clump of bushes. When the staff asked this film crew whom they represented, they would not identify themselves. Later, they admitted that they were from ABC News.

When someone is spying on you from a nearby bush, it's hard to believe that they will do a fair story. I tried to accommodate them in their story later on. For example, I made certain that they had a chance to follow me as I inspected various garment factories and workers housing units on the island of Saipan. But I have every expectation that the story will be unfair and unbalanced when it ultimately comes out next month.

Bob Zelnick's experience with ABC News just further goes to show the true bias at that news division. I urge my colleagues to read this illuminating piece that appeared in the Wall Street Journal today, entitled ''ABC: Anyone but Conservatives.''

ABC: ANYONE BUT CONSERVATIVES

By Bob Zelnick

Last week I was forced to leave my position as a correspondent for ABC News. What happened to me illustrates something of what is wrong with TV news today.

In December 1996, following a dinner conversation with my publisher, Alfred Regnery, I agreed to undertake a biography of Vice President Al Gore. Early the following month I phoned Richard C. Wald, the ABC News executive who tends to the business of editorial standards, to describe the project and secure his permission to proceed.

Mr. Wald asked if I intended to write a ''straightforward'' biography or one with a distinct point of view. I replied that except for opinions I might develop during my research, the book would be reasonably straightforward. Mr. Wald then inquired what I thought of Mr. Gore. I replied that I knew the vice president only slightly, but had a generally favorable impression of him, shaped by his pro-defense views in the Senate and his critical support for the 1991 Gulf War resolution. I added that my sense was that his environmental views might be a bit extreme.

'YOU HAVE MY PERMISSION'

Late in the conversation, Mr. Wald remarked: ''If you write a book about him, you probably can't cover him for us.'' I told him I thought that writing a book on the vice president would enhance my credentials to cover him. ''Now that I think of it, you may be right,'' said Mr. Wald. ''We'll have to see. In any event, you have my permission.''

I conducted scores of interviews. I hired a researcher who performed more than four months of full-time work. I traveled to Harvard, where Mr. Gore went to school, and to Tennessee. I came up with fascinating, previously unpublished material on both Mr. Gore and his father, also a former Tennessee senator, and mined a rich lode of background material on Tennessee politics. My sense was that the project would prove helpful not only to my own career as a television correspondent but also to ABC's coverage of the 2000 presidential campaign.

But last September, just days before my contract with ABC was to expire, the network informed me that if I wished to sign a new one, I would have to break my contract with Regnery, return the advance and discontinue all work on the Gore book. ABC's new position was that there was an inherent conflict between writing a book on a subject and covering that subject.

In a written appeal to Roone Arledge and David Westin, respectively chairman and president of the news division, I objected to the ruling as unjust, contrary to ABC's own standards and procedures, and repugnant to the First Amendment values we all endorse. I pointed out that the decision was wildly excessive as regards any valid interest of ABC News, in that I was willing to submit the manuscript months before publication in order to address any editorial problems the company perceived. I noted that most news organizations encourage their correspondents to write books on subjects they cover, then point to them with pride as indicating staff depth, scholarship and authority. Examples from the print press are legion, but even in television, where a career spent writing 90-second spots can erode the ability to think and write in depth, correspondents such as Marvin Kalb, Bernard Kalb, Dan Rather, Sam Donaldson and I have published books on subjects close to our beats.

Nonetheless, Mr. Westin's written reply explained that ''we cannot have a Washington correspondent writing a book about one of our national leaders whom that correspondent will undoubtedly have to cover.'' Otherwise, we could be ''held up to ridicule that our reporting is influenced by views you/we have formed about the individual involved.''

I eventually decided to complete the book and to leave ABC News after 21 years. Mr. Wald, asked by a newspaper reporter why he had granted permission in the first place, concocted a tale that I was about to be fired when I approached him, and he didn't want to impede my earning a living by writing books. Thanks, Dick.

Would I have faced the same problem if I were an avowedly liberal journalist undertaking a book that made conservatives mildly uncomfortable rather than a moderately conservative one writing about a liberal icon? Had the proposed title been ''Gingrich: A Critical Look at the Man and His Climb to Power,'' would I have been forced to choose between my book and my career? I rather doubt it.

Nor does the double standard stop with books. My friend and former colleague Sam Donaldson is again covering the White House six days a week. On the seventh day he does not rest, but rather appears on ''This Week With Sam and Cokie,'' where he is free with his concededly liberal opinions. Sam is a gifted reporter, and in 21 years I have never seen evidence of deliberate bias in his work. I think ABC is wisely using his talents. But where is his conservative counterpart, licensed both to report and to ruminate?

My original sin may have been my earlier book, ''Backfire: A Reporter's Look at Affirmative Action,'' also published by Regnery. In 1996, when ''This Week'' decided to interview Gary Aldrich—author of yet another Regnery book, ''Unlimited Access: An FBI Agent Inside the Clinton White House''—and I was asked to prepare the setup piece, George Stephanopoulos, then a White House spinmeister (now an ABC commentator), blasted ABC News for anti-Clinton bias, specifically citing my limited involvement with the program. Months later, Jane Mayer, a New Yorker reporter, did the same. Is this what Mr. Westin had in mind when he said he feared ''ridicule''?

Like others at ABC News, I committed my life, my fortune and my sacred honor to the furtherance of the First Amendment and the pursuit of truth. Along with a brave and resourceful crew, I was thrown into a Moscow prison for refusing to stop interviewing a dissident on her way to court. I accompanied soldiers who came under fire in South Lebanon and Somalia. In these times I was conscious of the far greater physical dangers that other correspondents had faced in times and places as different as Gettysburg, Normandy, Khe Sanh and Srebrenica.

But the principal dangers that threaten television journalists today are not those of an errant bullet, or even a well-aimed one. Rather, they spring on the one hand from the merciless demands of the news cycle, the dumbing down of public affairs programming and the belief in viewers' shrinking attention span. The end results of these dangers are poorly sourced, factually insubstantial, overly sensational stories that, in the end, harm our credibility and make us easy targets for political demagogues.

IDEOLOGICAL ORTHODOXY

The other danger—the one that led to my departure from the industry—involves ideological orthodoxy, political correctness and complete lack of self-confidence regarding the management of a news organization, partly because so many of those at the top have little or no background as working journalists.

For most of my career I felt honored to serve as a correspondent for ABC News. But the ABC News I served did not practice prior restraint.

The ABC News I served did not demand that its reporters shatter their integrity by breaching contracts.

The ABC News I served did not look for a rock to crawl under when the Jane Mayers of the world attacked.

The ABC News I served did not seek to destroy correspondents who had performed for the company over two decades with dignity, integrity and excellence.

The ABC News I served did not break its word, ignore its standards or brazenly lie to explain its actions.

Sad to say, the ABC News I served is not the ABC News I left.

ASTHMA AND AIR POLLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, in a week-long special series in New York this week, the New York Daily News is documenting what we in the South Bronx district that I represent have been saying for years: The concentration of waste treatment facilities and their fleets of diesel trucks are killing our children, our families, our older folks with asthma and respiratory illness.

One-half million New Yorkers suffer from asthma. Six percent of the population. The worst rate in the country. New York City's asthma hospitalization rate is three times the national average. More than 35,000 residents are treated at city hospitals for severe asthma attacks each year, a 24 percent rise over the last decade. Deaths accountable to asthma are up 50 percent since 1980. 284 died of asthma in 1995.

The asthma epidemic hits children the hardest. More than 10 percent of New York City's one million students, 130,000, suffer from asthma. 15,000 are admitted to the hospital each year, which is twice the national average. The hardest hit of all the children are those with families in the Hunts Point area of the South Bronx in my district and East Harlem in the district of my colleague (Mr. RANGEL).

New York City's asthma admission rates are highest in the Bronx, along with Harlem. Almost 13 percent of Bronx children under the age of 17 were estimated to suffer from asthma several years ago. Children in poor New York City neighborhoods are five times more likely to be hospitalized than their better-off neighbors.

Lincoln Hospital, the primary medical center in the South Bronx, recorded 14,300 asthma emergency room visits last year; 4,500 of these involved children. Lincoln Hospital now operates two, 24-hour emergency rooms devoted exclusively to dealing with the problem of asthma, one for children and one for adults. Eleven died there last year, more than double the usual number. The youngest was only 5 years old.

Now, listen to this fact. There is a school in my congressional district where 30 percent of the children in Public School 48 in Hunts Point have asthma. Asthma threatens our children's chance of success as well. Asthma has become the leading cause of children who are absent among New York City schoolchildren.

Now, while researchers debate the root causes of asthma and New York public health officials focus on every theory other than pollution, our communities continue to breathe foul air and continue to sicken and die from respiratory illness.

Like neighborhood residents who spend their time dealing with these issues, take, for instance, a woman by the name of Lora Lucks, who is the principal at Public School 48 in the Hunts Point area of the Bronx. She blames the area's poor air quality. She says her students get sicker and sicker every year and that the air sometimes smells bad enough to make you sick to your stomach.

Now, what is really interesting here is that 200 of Public School 48's 800 students required emergency treatment last year at the same Lincoln Hospital.

And perhaps the best test that something is terribly wrong with the air quality in that community is the fact that teachers that come from outside the South Bronx neighborhood, upon spending the 8 months or whatever time they spend in the school during the year, not counting weekends, they complain that the condition under which they live, their inability to breathe properly, the tearing of the eyes, the sick stomach, all the asthmatic conditions that prevail, happen not when they are living during the summer months outside the South Bronx area but only when they come into the South Bronx.

Now, where could the problem be? Well, the South Bronx area of the

Bronx now has over 40 sitings for waste transfer stations. One of the big mysteries in New York City is why one community got to the point to where over 40 waste recycling centers appear only in that community. New York City's Department of Sanitation currently licenses at least 85 private waste transfer stations in New York City, handling at least 13,000 to 14,000 tons per day of commercial solid waste.

Today I begin to introduce this series which the New York Daily News has been working on all week long; and I will close with this, Mr. Speaker: 500,000 New Yorkers have asthma, the silent killer, and there is a child trying to breathe. This may look dramatic and some people may think in some way it is grandstanding by a newspaper, but this is the truth. This is a condition not in a foreign country. This is a condition in the Sixteenth Congressional District in New York.

THE HAYWORTH EDUCATION LAND GRANT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to report to my colleagues and to the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Arizona and, indeed, Mr. Speaker, to those who watch us across the country on C-SPAN of the latest progress on what I believe can form a firm foundation for educational improvement across America but especially in rural America. For this morning, Mr. Speaker, a subcommittee of the Committee on Resources held hearings on H.R. 2223, what my staff has taken to calling HELGA, the Hayworth Education Land Grant Act.

I think this is very important, Mr. Speaker, because this legislation is borne out of two historical achievements, one small and little noticed, the other of momentous import in our Nation's history vis-a-vis education.

The first feature was a little-known bill that was passed into law in the final days of the 104th Congress, in my first term representing the people of the Sixth District of Arizona, that had to do with the tiny Alpine School District located on the Arizona-New Mexico border.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the people of Alpine came to me and they said, we do not have much of a tax base. We no longer are able to really harvest the timber in this area. But we have been able to scrimp and save and we think we have enough money to build a new school building.

Now, we should note that the people of Alpine and the students there in that school district were holding classes in a small building that was formerly a church facility, and these people desperately needed a new school. They came and they said, Congressman, we have the money to build a new school, but we do not have the money to buy the land on which the school would be situated. It would cost us some, well, almost one quarter of a million dollars. That is too much for us to handle.

But the irony is that Alpine sits on the edge of a national forest. A federally controlled land. So they asked, would it be possible for the Congress to grant a conveyance of 30 acres of land for the construction of new athletic and academic facilities to educate the children of the Alpine School District? And the good news is that that passed on the final day of the 104th Congress; and the people of Alpine, Arizona, are building their new school facility.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have often pointed out, one of the most accurate observations of life in these United States, indeed of what has transpired on the historical stage worldwide, was the observation of Mark Twain that history does not repeat itself but it rhymes. And in the wake of what transpired with the Alpine School District, I got to thinking about what else had been done similarly in American education, and I looked back to something that had happened really over one century ago when another Member of Congress and another member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Justin Smith Morrill of Vermont, revolutionized, I do not think that is too strong a term, Madam Speaker, revolutionized the whole notion of higher education in this country by working for and achieving passage of the Federal Land Grant Act, the process of ceding federally controlled land back to the States with a promise that those respective States would establish institutions of higher learning with a concentration in the agricultural and mechanical arts.

Congressman Morrill looked back at his own life and, more importantly, the life of his father. He talked about the fact that his father was a blacksmith, a laborer, who spent all of about 6 months receiving instruction within the classroom. And he thought it was important for the sons and daughters of farmers and laborers to have an opportunity to go on to college.

Passage of the Federal Land Grant Act brought down the barriers to higher education one century ago. What had formerly been something only for the elite was now available to many.

In that same spirit, I have introduced the Federal Land Grant Act of this 105th Congress that would allow for a uniform procedure for school districts to apply for conveyances of land for the construction of new school facilities. It carries no budget impact because the land already belongs to the Federal Government. But what it can mean to the education of schoolchildren in rural America is priceless.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to speaking more about this perhaps later tonight and in further proceedings of this Congress but, Madam Speaker, I would also urge Members to actively support H.R. 2223.

TORNADOES WREAK DEVASTATION IN FLORIDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Northup). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I come tonight before this body to express my deep concern for what has happened in my congressional district this past day. We had one of the great tragedies in the State of Florida in three tornadoes that touched down in that area, two of them in my district, one in the Kissimmee area, one in Winter Garden, one in the district of my colleague (Mr. Mica) in the Sanford area, which wreaked deaths that are almost 40 in number, and maybe more, we just do not know.

There were more people I believe killed in those three tornadoes that occurred two nights ago in my area than died in Hurricane Andrew, which was a huge natural disaster many people are aware of that hit the State of Florida a couple years back and caused millions and millions of dollars worth of damage.

It is hard to express the feelings that one sees when you walk out into the areas where those tragedies occur. I spent most of the day yesterday with our Governor and Senator MACK and others walking through the devastation in three counties, Osceola, Orange and Seminole in Florida.

The amount of damage we see in the photographs are probably just as real on television or in the newspapers that the Nation can see as indeed exists there, but it is very, very hard to express in the written words or even over the communicated radio or television word the feelings and the emotions that you feel yourself when you go out there and see all of that that has been wreaked by God and when you see the feelings of the people and you empathize with those who have lost loved ones or whose loved ones have been badly injured or who have lost possessions that were their life's savings, their life's possessions, things that cannot be replaced.

I know that one of the tornadoes, the most serious one that killed the most people, sat down just a short distance from the Silver Spurs Rodeo in Kissimmee, where I attended with a German exchange student living with me on Saturday. I looked yesterday across the field where that was and realized the calmness of that, where little or nothing had been disturbed where the Houston Astros have their spring training and their ballpark, the stadium where the radio takes place, the area where they had a State fair, an open field between where I was standing in there, and then right at the moment where I was standing this tornado had come down to start a 10-mile rampage across that county.

It came down and destroyed a convenience store. It left, leaving nothing but a handful of concrete blocks. It

took down the power lines along this road on one side, clipping them off about two feet or so above, taking the entire lines and the power poles across into the woods on the other side.

□ 1815

Then as it crossed that street, just immediately across almost an idyllic setting that I described where the rodeo took place and the ballpark is, here was this recreational vehicle park where people come with their RVs, these big RVs, and they were shredded, they were torn apart, just like many mobile home communities in the area were. People say things looked like match boxes. That is not an adequate description. Trees were shredded like a shredder shreds them at the top. Destruction of these vehicles as well as many of the homes in the area were terribly devastated, indescribable, even though one may see pictures of them, to see what has actually happened in this setting.

The bad news was that 10 people or so were killed in that recreational vehicle park. Over in a neighborhood a short distance away from that of regular single-family homes, there was the same type of destruction I had seen from the air after Hurricane Andrew, a narrower swath but very similar where the homes were literally destroyed. These were well-built, modern homes and people lost everything. Some people lost their lives. Not far from there, there was a strip mall shopping center with a grocery store, with a McDonald's, with a lot of other things in it totally wiped out.

Fortunately, the tornado occurred at night and so the devastation of all of this block and concrete that came down did not kill anyone in that mall other than I understand two people in a pub that was still open that night in the area. A mobile home park wiped out with a lot more people killed. In Orange County, I talked to a couple in a mobile home park where the devastation was terrible, another park near Winter Garden. They had been very fortunate. Nothing had happened to their mobile home. The inside had not been damaged, nothing had fallen off the shelves. But you walked right outside to their carport and the cars under that carport, which was no longer there, had been crushed, a large Ford vehicle whose axle and frame just bent over like some giant block had been set on top of it and immediately next door to them, which was in a mobile home park only a very short distance of a few feet, was another mobile home that had been shredded apart, just totally destroyed and a body had been flung in there from a mobile home 5 or 6 homes down from them where this horrible wreaking had come through but God for whatever reason had spared them and their mobile home but not someone else.

I just want to say that all of the people who have helped in that, all the compassionate workers need to be thanked, all the people whose outpouring of sympathy and concern have been given and the hours and hours of work that were put in in the aftermath of that storm deserve a lot of thanks and praise. Thank God more people were not killed.

EDUCATION, TAXES AND RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Northup). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I wanted to tonight touch base on 3 issues very quickly, but first I want to say, representing the Third Infantry Division in Hinesville, Georgia, Fort Stewart-Hunter, I had the opportunity on Friday to go say good-bye to many of the troops who were leaving to go to Kuwait. They were on the tarmac, they had already said good-bye to their families, they had already gotten their paperwork in order. They had guns in hand, canteens loaded, rucksacks on their back, they were sitting in their fuel trucks, in their communication trucks and Jeeps and so forth, getting ready to get on a C–5 and go to Germany or to Spain, then on to Kuwait. The men and women who were about to go in harm's way on behalf of not only the United States of America but the entire world were standing tall. They were confident but not cocky, they were proud but not arrogant and to a person brave and sure of themselves. They are well-trained.

I told them that the American people are behind them. I was excited as everybody else was when I read about the potential peace agreement. I hope that it stands. However, I do think that this administration needs to clearly outline to Congress, this week, exactly what that agreement means to our foreign policy in Iraq and the Middle East. What will be the long-term ramifications? Do we have a lasting peace, what will be involved, and can our troops come home? Can we bring down the 25,000 troops that we have? I am very interested to hear from the administration on that. I, like many Members of Congress, again would ask this administration to tell us exactly what is going on.

To touch base on a couple of issues, real quickly. Education. This year we need to do everything we can to decentralize education and put it back in the hands of the local people. I was talking to a woman in Brunswick, Georgia whose mother was a teacher in Gray, Georgia, one of the great teachers that introduces all the kids to all the wonderful subjects and has taught most of the kids in the small town of Gray. She said that not long ago, a Harvard federally funded education consultant went down to Gray, Georgia and told this 30-year veteran of teaching that she needed to start pointing to the other side of the chalkboard because kids learn cognitively better on one side of the brain than the other and if the teacher would only start pointing to the other side of the chalkboard, these kids would learn a lot more. That kind of absurd busybodiness out of Washington, we do not need.

The second issue, taxes. We need to continue to be mindful that the average American family pays 38 percent in taxes. That means every Monday, you are working for the government and most of Tuesday you are working for the government. We need to reduce our tax burden to the 25 percent range. We need to simplify our Tax Code. If we go to a sales tax or a flat tax, whichever, it is better than the Tax Code that we have now. Then we need to change the attitude of the IRS. They work for us, the American people. We do not work for them. You should be considered innocent until proven guilty.

Finally, we need to have a mature dialogue on retirement. We really do not have a zero balanced budget. We have a Social Security surplus that we are applying to the general fund. If we want to protect Social Security and put it first, we have to say absolutely no new spending programs.

Madam Speaker, the President has committed to over $100 billion in new spending programs for this year in his budget. That money comes right out of the surplus in Social Security. We need to personalize Social Security, but we need to protect it. The first step is not spending the money. In these things, education, taxes and retirement, I hope that this Congress makes them the top priority.

10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NAGORNO KARABAGH MOVEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I have come to the floor of the House tonight to pay tribute to a very important milestone for the Armenian people and for people everywhere who care about the values of freedom, human rights and self-determination.

Last Friday, February 20, marked the 10th anniversary of the liberation struggle of Nagorno Karabagh. Nagorno Karabagh, or Artsakh as it is known to the Armenian people, is an independent Nation populated primarily by ethnic Armenians and located between the Republic of Armenia and the Republic of Azerbaijan. The Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin consigned Nagorno Karabagh to Azerbaijan despite the fact that this land has been continuously inhabited by Armenians for centuries. Armenia was the first Nation to embrace Christianity, and Karabagh was an integral part of the ancient land of Armenia. Under the Soviet system Nagorno Karabagh was recognized as an autonomous region because of its distinct Armenian identity.

Madam Speaker, in 1988 as Soviet central authority was breaking down, the Armenian people living in Azerbaijan were subjected to harassment, deportation and pogroms, massacres. On February 20, 1988, thousands of Armenians marched in Stepanakert, the capital of Karabagh, inspired by public protests in Armenia the day before. Eventually the people of Karabagh prevailed in their struggle, fighting and winning a war of independence. A cease-fire was signed in 1994, but persistent violations by Azerbaijan continue to make that cease-fire shaky at best.

The cause of Karabagh became a rallying cry for the entire Armenian nation and the Diaspora, including 1 million Armenian-Americans. The establishment of the Republic of Armenia and the Republic of Karabagh also helped focus American attention on this previously ignored part of the world.

Madam Speaker, Nagorno Karabagh's declaration of independence on September 2, 1991 and a referendum which passed shortly afterward were all conducted within the requirements of international law. Yet 10 years into their independence movement, Nagorno Karabagh still has not achieved the international recognition to which it is entitled. I am sorry to say, Madam Speaker, that the United States is among the countries that still refuse to recognize the Nagorno Karabagh republic. In his speech to the national assembly last Friday, President Ghukasian of Karabagh stated that Karabagh has its own state symbols and is able to conduct its foreign and home policies by itself. He expressed certainty that international recognition would only be a matter of time.

Madam Speaker, having twice visited Nagorno Karabagh, I can attest to the fact that Karabagh is indeed a functioning state. The sense of cohesion and mission among its citizens is inspiring. I wish I could share President Ghukasian's optimism about international recognition, although I do want to reiterate the fact that the foreign operations appropriations bill for this fiscal year does provide $12.5 million in aid targeted at Nagorno Karabagh. I want to express my admiration for the members of the foreign ops subcommittee who made that happen. I see one of the members is actually on the floor there, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

I am also concerned that U.S. policy, though, is headed in the wrong direction. The fact that the United States is a cochair of the OSCE's Minsk Group, which was formed to achieve a negotiated settlement of the Karabagh conflict, offers a great opportunity for us to take a stand in support of democracy and the right of peoples to determine their own future. Unfortunately, the United States' negotiating position places far too much importance on the principle of territorial integrity, keeping Karabagh under Azerbaijan's authority. The U.S.-supported negotiating position essentially forces Karabagh to surrender the gains it made on the battlefield with no binding security guarantees in exchange. The Karabagh Armenians would once again be at the mercy of Azerbaijan.

I cannot help but conclude that the lure of the potential oil reserves in the Caspian Sea off the shores of Azerbaijan is influencing our policy in this region. Madam Speaker, last Friday I sent a letter of congratulations to President Ghukasian. I wrote that seeing the brave people of Artsakh and the dedicated officials serving in the government and armed forces of the NKR, I was reminded of the founding of our United States. Our Founding Fathers also had to fight for their independence and international recognition. I said I hoped that the United States and the West will base our policies in the Caucasus on the respect for self-determination and human rights on which our own nations are founded.

The progress the people of Karabagh have made in 10 years is nothing short of miraculous. In the decade since 1988, the elected government has proven to be worthy of recognition as the legitimate government of the land and the people of Artsakh. In a step that I hope will spur further progress towards that goal, I am pleased to announce that the foreign minister of Nagorno Karabagh, Mrs. Naira Melkoumian, will be in Washington next week and we plan to have a briefing next Wednesday under the auspices of our Armenia Caucus to allow her an opportunity to interact with Members of Congress. It is my hope, Madam Speaker, that future anniversaries of Karabagh will be marked by strong expressions of congratulations from the American people and from our government.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Republic of Nagorno Karabagh on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of its struggle for independence. I extend my congratulations to the people of Nagorno Karabagh on this truly historic occasion.

Ten years ago as the Soviet Union was falling apart and Armenians faced a new cycle of deportation and violence, Nagorno Karabagh took a brave step forward. With extraordinary sacrifice and courage, the people of Nagorno Karabagh affirmed their right of self-determination and began their struggle for independence. The Republic of Nagorno Karabagh emerged as a newly independent state.

It is now time for the United States and the international community to recognize the legitimate government of the Republic of Nagorno Karabagh. It is now time for the independence of the Republic of Nagorno Karabagh to be secured with a lasting peace. Only direct talks between the parties to the conflict can secure that peace. I regret that to date the OSCE negotiations, co-chaired by the United States, have not produced workable and acceptable solutions.

I will continue to fight along with the Armenian community in the diaspora for assistance to the people of Nagorno Karabagh and for a lasting peace. I am gratified that my original proposals for aid to Nagorno Karabagh were adopted by my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations who allocated $12.5 million in U.S. assistance. I urge the Administration to move expeditiously to distribute this aid to the needy people of Nagorno Karabagh.

I would like to bring your attention to the "Caucasus Peace and Stability Act" which I introduced last session to support the peace process in Nagorno Karabagh and to deter renewed Azerbaijani aggression. This bill calls upon the United States to act as an impartial mediator in the peace negotiations and to foster confidence building measures to create incentives for peace leading to a lasting and equitable long-term settlement to the conflict. In the case of renewed aggression by Azerbaijan on Nagorno Karabagh, it calls for the imposition of trade and investment sanctions on Azerbaijan and a ban on commercial arms sales. These provisions are intended to increase the security of Nagorno Karabagh and to provide an economic incentive for peace.

I pledge that I will continue to uphold the sovereignty of Nagorno Karabagh and U.S. support for democracy, economic development and a secure future for the people of Nagorno Karabagh. I look forward to celebrating the 20th anniversary of a free and independent Republic of Nagorno Karabagh.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of ten years of struggle and determination by the people of Nagorno Karabagh to gain their independence.

For ten years, the people of Nagorno Karabagh have aspired to create a republic where human rights and democracy are respected and cherished.

The people of Nagorno Karabagh, mainly ethnic Armenians, have survived and overcome the horrors and destruction of war. For ten years they have resisted efforts to bring about another Armenian Genocide in the Caucasus. Today, they continue to bravely face the threat of violence and deprivation from their surrounding neighbor, the Republic of Azerbaijan.

For ten years the people of Nagorno Karabagh have fought in defense of their homeland. In support of their efforts, I call upon the international community and the United States, as co-chair of the Minsk Group, to ensure that a peaceful resolution to the conflict in the region respects the self-determination and democratic aspirations of the people of Nagorno Karabagh.

Mr. Speaker, our own nation was founded on the struggle and hope for a free and democratic nation, free from tyranny, free from oppression, free to determine our own future, free to honor the basic dignity of every human being. As an American, this is my wish for the people of Nagorno Karabagh—that next year will see a free and independent Republic of Nagorno Karabagh.

I want to thank my colleagues from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] and from California [Mr. SHERMAN] for their strong and capable leadership on these issues, and for coordinating this time today to recognize and celebrate the tenth anniversary of the independence movement in Nagorno Karabagh.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within

which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the 10th anniversary of the Nagorno Karabagh movement.

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

There was no objection.

TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGGS. Madam Speaker, earlier today I rose during morning hour to talk about how we can increase take-home pay and improve retirement security in America. I want to elaborate on those earlier comments this morning during this special order tonight. I am talking about the Congress leading our country to a new level of freedom and opportunity for every single American worker and taxpayer.

First of all, let me stipulate that I am not talking about wage and price controls. I am not talking about another government mandate. I am not talking about Washington and the Federal Government through the Congress trying to dictate to the marketplace. I do not support a further increase in the minimum wage. But I do very much favor reducing taxes further for working Americans. We can start in the area of tax reduction by addressing the marriage penalty, which is a very, very unfair, very punitive section of our Tax Code. We ought to eliminate that, because the marriage penalty affects working-class individuals, those on limited or modest incomes, those who are earning a fixed wage or salary the most.

An example that was given on this floor earlier today during morning hour by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) was a teacher, or a police officer living in your community who is married and whose spouse is of necessity working. If we can eliminate the marriage penalty in the Tax Code, that couple will be able to keep more of their own hard-earned tax dollars.

Second, earlier today, promoted the Middle Class Tax Relief Act and the Taxpayer Choice Act, both introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE). This is good legislation because the net effect would be to raise the income levels for the 28 percent tax bracket, thereby putting more people in the 15-percent, the lowest tax bracket, and for those who are already in the 15-percent tax bracket, Congressman THUNE and I propose to increase the personal exemption.

This is a bottom-up approach, if you will, a bubble-up approach to lowering taxes in America. It is broad-based, real tax relief. It gets away from this notion back here in Washington that we can only do targeted tax relief that picks winners and losers from certain segments of the American people, and it is a Republican solution, if I might be so bold to say, on Democratic terms. This legislation will be difficult for the practitioners of class warfare and what I call the politics of envy to oppose.

Let me further say that if President Clinton has more money to pay for more social spending, as he suggested from in this Chamber during the State of the Union address for a host of new programs, many of them so-called mandatory entitlement programs, then I respectfully submit that we have the money for tax cuts.

But we should not do tax relief without real tax reform. We need fundamental tax reform in this country today right now to put a stop to the collection abuses by the IRS and to effectively end the IRS as we know it. That is why I and many of my Republican colleagues have already signed a public pledge and we have cosponsored legislation to sunset the Tax Code, the current tax system, by the year 2001.

This is a death sentence for the Tax Code, and it would move the country, as Congressman KINGSTON was just suggesting, in the direction of a fairer, a flatter, and a simpler tax system, one that embraces a single rate of taxation. That single rate of Federal taxation, though, when combined with State and local taxes, should not exceed 25 percent total, 25 percent in the aggregate for taxes at all levels; Federal, State and local. Today, the median family, the average family of four, is paying 38 percent of their income in taxes at all levels, and that is more than what they pay for food, clothing, housing and transportation combined.

Now, the other point I want to talk about is giving taxpayers more choice. We can let taxpayers today choose between paying a flat tax or the current system. It is just that simple. We could give taxpayers that option, that choice that says we would be empowering taxpayers because they would have the right to decide whether they prefer a flat tax or reporting all their income, and after they have declared that income, simply paying a flat rate of tax on that income or staying under the current system.

Furthermore, we could let taxpayers today decide to give them the right, again the choice and the option, to choose to invest a portion of their own hard-earned money, what they pay in payroll taxes or what are called FICA contributions into a directed IRA, which would earn a better return on their money than Social Security.

So imagine that we let taxpayers check off now a flat tax versus the current system, check off now to put their own money, at least a portion of their payroll taxes into Social Security. The net effect again, higher take-home pay, better retirement security, more freedom, and opportunity for every American worker and taxpayer.

REQUEST FOR REINSTATEMENT OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time and to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Northup). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, for purposes of trying to understand how the rules work, I object.

What happens under the 5-minute rule? Do we entertain 5-minute presentations for as long as unanimous consent is not objected to?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. It takes unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Is there a possibility of all of those who keep coming with their 5 minutes to do it following the time that I have reserved on the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York was already on the 5-minute list. She came back to reclaim her time. Unanimous consent is required for anyone to reclaim or to add their name to the list.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I do not want to interfere with the gentlewoman being able to address the House, but I need to know how long this can go on tonight if I do not object to unanimous consent. How many more could come? I have been here for almost 40 minutes.

So is the Chair saying that if I never object, people could keep coming and doing this?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. By the Rules of the House, as long as unanimous consent is obtained, a member may speak for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. If I do object, do they have the opportunity to do it following my reserved 1 hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, they could come back later tonight.

Ms. WATERS. Then, Madam Speaker, I must proceed, and those who have not been here must know I have to get out of here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PLIGHT OF BLACK FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of the House a problem and a situation that has lingered for far too long. I rise this evening to talk about the plight of black farmers and others in our Nation who have not been able to receive fair treatment at the United States Department of Agriculture.

What I am about to describe is one of the most unfortunate situations I have encountered since I have been a Member of this House. I have been working

on this problem with other Members who represent agricultural districts, and I thought at one point we would be able to deal with bringing about some fairness and justice to black farmers and others who have been denied the ability to have their concerns addressed at USDA.

In order to make this presentation, I would like to ask my colleague from Mississippi if he would join me in a colloquy regarding the inability for black farmers and others to have their problems dealt with.

Mr. THOMPSON, I understand that it is planting season, we are nearing planting season, in many of our States where agriculture is a leading part of the economy. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON. You are absolutely correct.

The other problem associated with the timing is how our farmers put their applications for support into the United States Department of Agriculture. And if they are late in putting the applications in or if there are complaints outstanding, then they are prohibited from putting applications in for operating loans for their farms.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. THOMPSON, as I understand it, many of these farmers who have lost their land, lost their homes, who have been trying to file complaints with the U.S. Department of Agriculture thought that this year that there was a break, that there was finally an opportunity to get some justice to have their complaints heard. They had great hope that this planting season, despite the fact that many of them have for years been denied access to the Department and their ability to resolve their complaints, would finally have the chance to do some planting and get on with the business of farming. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON. Absolutely correct. The most astounding thing associated with your comments is that the Department of Agriculture agreed that in effect they had discriminated against African-American and other small farmers, put it in writing and ultimately said we are going to do better.

The Civil Rights Action Team Report, which was produced in January of last year, documented it. We talked about over 1500 complaints from farmers all over the country having been mistreated by our government, documented by our government, now all of a sudden here we are over 1 year later and we are still dealing with the same problem.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. THOMPSON, are you referring to what is known as the crack report labeled Civil Rights at the United States Department of Agriculture, where there is documented discrimination of the documented filing of claims that went unaddressed where the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Glickman, and everybody else agreed that the Civil Rights Department had literally been dismantled and that the complaints had not been worked on; all of that in this report. Is this the report that you are referring to?

Mr. THOMPSON. That is absolutely correct and the fact that to my knowledge no one disputed the findings of the report. It was a very thorough report, but also it really crystallized the problems that small and minority farmers have.

The most egregious situation with the report, Madam Speaker, is the fact that one farmer in the report has been trying for 20 years to get his claims settled, and I want to enter into the record a copy of a letter dated February 17 from Mr. Gary R. Grant from Tillery, North Carolina, and he is yet to get his problem settled that was documented in the Civil Rights Action Team Report as something that they should, in fact, settle.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. THOMPSON, I know the letter that you speak of. I, too, have a copy, and I think it is wise to enter that into the record, and maybe if we have time this evening, we can read it right into the record. It is so absolutely typical of what has been happening, and it spells out, in no uncertain terms, the trauma and the harm that has been fostered on many of our farmers who have attempted to get some justice at the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. THOMPSON, we also have here Mr. HILLIARD from Alabama, and I would like to ask Mr. HILLIARD if he would join us in this colloquy where we are describing what has happened to the black farmer and what we have been trying to do.

Mr. HILLIARD, as you know, those of you who represent agricultural areas have been working so hard with your constituents, you have been working with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, you have been working with the Justice Department, you have been working with the President of the United States of America. You asked the Black Caucus to take this up as an issue; we did. We had hearings. Those hearings went out over America. All of us agreed. We got more calls about the hearings where farmers came forth and talked about what had happened to them than perhaps on any other issue that we are dealing with.

I am from an urban area. I do not have agricultural interests in my district. But my urban constituents called me about this issue because many of them left the South, they left Alabama and Mississippi and other places after they determined they could no longer farm, that they could not be heard.

So would you please join us, Mr. HILLIARD, in helping the Nation to understand what has taken place with the black farmer in America.

Mr. HILLIARD. Madam Speaker, you know it is extremely difficult for me to believe that my government would sanction what the States have done for so long in this area. I find it contemptuous that the government would set up administrative rules to block those farmers from having their grievance addressed, and let me tell you how they did it.

While we in good faith have been talking to the administration, have been having hearings and have been discussing the problems hoping to have some resolution, the Justice Department decided that although those farmers had filed complaints, that those complaints would be barred by the statute of limitations if, in fact, they had not filed any court action.

□ 1845

Well, prior to that administrative rule being made, the rule in force was you file your complaint, and if you receive justice that you did not like or no justice, then you go to court.

What happened that made it so bad in terms of what the government has done, neither the government, our government, the Agriculture Department nor the Department of Justice addressed any of those complaints or even discussed them or looked at them or resolved them. So they just stayed on somebody's desk, in some cases for 10 years.

Then they come back with the rule that if it has not been filed in court it is barred by the statute of limitations. This is our government, not Russia.

Ms. WATERS. You are absolutely right. I want you to, if you would spend a moment further explaining to us, Mr. THOMPSON, what Congressman HILLIARD just started to talk about. America needs to understand the details of this.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, Madam Chairman, the notion of the statute of limitation in effect says that if you filed a discrimination complaint against the Department of Agriculture before 1994, then in effect you have lost your right to complain, because our government did not perform its required duties within the period of time that the law required. Therefore, as a person complaining, you have now lost your right to any redress or any monetary reward for having a legitimate complaint.

It is inconceivable that an agency charged with the responsibility of conducting an investigation now jumps behind the statute of limitation veil by saying, look, we did not do our job; now, I am sorry, we cannot do anything for you.

I refuse to believe that in this country, when the government clearly is at fault, that we cannot find some remedy for our taxpaying citizens who have been aggrieved by this government.

Mr. HILLIARD. If I may, Madam Chairlady, let me even go further. This was a part of an agency or a department of the Agriculture Department that had the power to look into these grievances and these complaints and make a finding. It was set up sort of like an equal opportunity commission just for the Department of Agriculture.

Now we come back and say that, even though they filed the complaint, because they did not file suit then they are barred by the statute of limitation.

But let me go one step further.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the gentleman will yield, let me share one point.

On our stationery from the Department of Agriculture it says that if you feel that you have been discriminated against, you may file a complaint with the Civil Rights Division of the United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. Our investigation found out that this department had been disbanded in 1983.

Ms. WATERS. I think that is what the Nation needs to understand. Ronald Reagan dismantled the Civil Rights Division of the United States Department of Agriculture. So when an innocent farmer who had been discriminated against was aggrieved, went to that department, followed the rules and filed the complaint, they had no reason to believe that these complaints would not be investigated.

But the fact of the matter is, they went in a cardboard box, and they sat there for years, and nothing was done.

Mr. HILLIARD. The government deceived them.

Ms. WATERS. They were misled. That is right.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now they say it is too late. We waited too long in the deception. I am sorry. You have to take your complaint elsewhere.

Mr. HILLIARD. There is no elsewhere.

Ms. WATERS. We have just been joined by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), who has been working on this issue for a long time.

We were just describing this unbelievable situation where the farmers had filed the complaint, there was no Civil Rights Division, the complaints went into a cardboard box. Now they are being told by the Justice Department, sorry, they were not filed in a timely manner, and the statute of limitations has run, and we cannot resolve your complaint.

So I know that you have been involved in discussions with both the Department of Agriculture and the administration about this, and we have some examples of people who are now not able to get them resolved unless we do something extraordinary, such as get waivers by way of legislation perhaps.

Could the gentlewoman share with us your experiences in working with all of this?

Mrs. CLAYTON. Well, we have a number of farmers in North Carolina who have filed not only part of a class action, but we have a number of farmers who have filed administrative complaints, and some of them have been 17 years old, 20 years old, and now they are being told they are barred until 2 years. So that means 22 years of their being barred will have no recourse. They are not able to get assistance from that.

What is so devastating about this is that this is our government doing it to us, not so much that this is a place where you think you would come and get some consideration or remuneration for your suffering and pain. And these farmers are being told, not only were they deceived and ignored, but there is no sense of equity. There was no sense on the part of the Justice Department in saying that the estoppel of the statute of limitations should not have been put in place because of the acts of the government itself.

The government was saying they were investigating and did not do it. The government was saying they were going to find a remedy and did not do it.

You would think the acts would bar the statute of limitations. Even if the law requires it, equity requires it, and people put in such pain and disadvantage, the equity of the case would prevail. This is what we call justice. The rule of law is based on having equity and fairness, in addition to the statute.

Now, I know they can invoke the statute of limitation. They can invoke what they call res judicata, meaning it has been adjudicated before. Those are legal bars to prevent the government from doing what they should do.

Mr. HILLIARD. I am not so sure they can legally invoke the statute of limitations at this point. You see, what happened, it had been set up by our government according to the law, a procedure, and now the government, because of what it had done in disbanding the procedure, is saying it is a bar. Because they say it does not necessarily mean that is the last word or that is the fact.

But what it does mean is that each one of those farmers must now go to another forum just to get back on the procedural track, which means they will probably have to go to the court system in order to have them rule that the statute of limitations is not applicable.

Mrs. CLAYTON. If the gentleman will yield, the fear I have is that the decision from the Justice Department is treated like a rule of law. I may disagree with it, but if everybody is treating it as a rule, it means the farmers are not getting anything. I want to find a way where we remove that. So whether I agree with it, I respect it. It is having the same effect as if it is the right thing. So we have to find a way to overcome it.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the gentlewoman will yield, the problem I have is, given the visibility of this issue, why can people of good will not come together and craft a response to this dilemma, rather than put blocks up to prevent solutions from happening?

Mr. HILLIARD. If the gentleman will yield, if we had good will, if our government had had good will, we would not have the problems we are having. We would not have had 20 years of no resolutions, no resolve. We would not have had 5 and 10 years of complaints just stacking up.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, can the gentleman, for the viewing public, explain the statute of limitations and the government not doing its job in conducting an investigation and telling that farmer that either your complaint has validity or it does not? But the fact that our government did nothing in the administrative conduct of hearing and now falls behind a statute of limitations issue, to me it is a false notion.

Mr. HILLIARD. Deception.

Ms. WATERS. Misled. They were absolutely misled.

Correct me if I am wrong, for the lawyers who are here, I am told by some attorneys that I have talked to that if, in fact, the Justice Department is telling us, despite the fact that farmers were misled, if they are saying to us they cannot in any way deal with this issue of the statute of limitations and put it aside in the interests of justice and fairness and equality, then they are not doing their job.

This is our Justice Department, where we are supposed to go and get justice. I am not happy with the way the Justice Department has sidestepped this issue.

I would say to you, if there is a way to get into court, and maybe there is a way by way of the class action maybe that has been filed or something, that this government ought to be sued.

Now, I know there are those in the administration that are saying, well, we will try and come to Congress and fashion legislation by which we can get a waiver. And while I am not going to turn down any way by which we can get justice for these farmers, I suggest to you that if we give up on the struggle for righting this wrong based on this argument, that what we are doing is allowing them for other cases and other instances to use the same kind of argument to deny justice. I am not sure we should do that.

Mrs. CLAYTON. If the gentlewoman will yield, I agree. We have to fight on every front. And the gentlewoman's point is we cannot just depend on the legislative route to do this, because this is such an important issue that we allow the statute of limitations to be the bar for justice and fairness. We have given away the very principle that is so fundamental to our democracy. I agree with that. But I would think, I would hope as you have said, we will fight on every front.

Now, I think the U.S. Department of Agriculture is beginning to try to go around the statute, but the problem with that is that is each individual case, and that is such a difficult process. We almost have 800 cases we need settled immediately. So if they are going to settle one and go around, we ought to have the law that applies to everybody. It would make it so much easier.

I know USDA is trying to find ways creatively, and I commend them for that, because I know today they are in that process with some clients that come from North Carolina doing that. But the pain of that is that you have to do 700 of those, those families and the costs.

If we could find a remedy, Madam Chairman of our caucus, if you could think of a remedy where we could go

into court and have standing, I think that is an option we ought to look at. I also think we need to find legislation that could also make that point.

I would hope there is still enough goodwill, as the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) said, of people who see the inequity of this and the visibility. And as many people understand how these farmers have suffered, they will say it is now time for Congress to do something and we should put this behind us and go forward.

□ 1900

Mr. THOMPSON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. THOMPSON. Many of our farmers have gone through bankruptcy, have gone through some real health problems. Now for our government to say to them, if you seek relief you now have to go hire a lawyer to fight the government, the notion that our Civil Rights Division in the United States Department of Justice cannot take this on as an issue and say look, I understand the ruling, but it is not right because you have in effect denied certain liberties of people in this country who should have had their concerns addressed. So why should we require people who now have been dealing with the lender of last resort to make crops come now and hire lawyers to fight the government again?

Ms. WATERS. That is right.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am not so convinced that if they did challenge the law, that our government would not try to defend the law. So in essence, we would be in court another 5 years trying to get clarification on that.

Ms. WATERS. The gentleman is absolutely right. I would say to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD), if I may just for a moment, yes, if that happened and we did find a way to get in court, the Justice Department would defend its position. So we would be fighting the very department that is supposed to be getting justice for the farmers.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD).

Mr. HILLIARD. And the devastating part of what our government has done and will do, if it takes another 5 years, is in effect eradicate the few farmers of African-American descent that are left.

After all, if we look at the period of the last 15 to 25 years, the period of time when most of these complaints originated, Members will find that we have lost tens of thousands of black farmers. There are very few left. If we take another 5 or 10 years, there will be even less. I am beginning to wonder whether this is a pattern of our government, whether this is in fact what it is trying to do.

Mr. THOMPSON. Your comments, I would say to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD), go clearly and factually to the notion that there just might be a conspiracy which our government is participating in to do away with African-American farmers in this country. If I had to look at the facts in this situation, I believe they are irrefutable.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD), I have learned so much about this issue. Members have put so much work into this, those the Members representing agricultural districts, and the entire Black Caucus is engaged in trying to get justice for farmers.

One of the things we all know is that we have lost black farmers in America who would have been perfectly happy to farm their land, raise their families, purchase their homes. They have lost the ability to do that because they had no support. As a matter of fact, in many cases they were undermined.

The Members have taught me about the systems that have worked in these communities and the boards that are set up, and how on those boards you have people who have supported each other in not only getting the loans and the subsidies, but they have indeed sat there making decisions that worked against farmers, and then they were part of foreclosing on the farms, and they ended up in the hands of some of the very people who had in fact made decisions against their ability to get some assistance from their government.

It is outrageous, it cannot be tolerated. Before I yield back my time, I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter that we did as a Congressional Black Caucus, dated January 13th, 1998, that took issue with the way they were handling Mr. Ross before he finally got a settlement.

I would like to submit a letter of February 20 that confronts the Justice Department about the way they have dealt with the statute of limitations issue, and I would like to submit for the RECORD the report that identifies the systematic discrimination of farmers who have been trying to get some assistance from their government.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following correspondence:

GARY R. GRANT,
Tillery, NC, February 17, 1998.

Re: Discrimination Complaints: Matthew Grant, Richard D. Grant, Gary R. Grant.

Secretary DAN GLICKMAN,
US Department of Agriculture
Washington, DC

DEAR MR. GLICKMAN: At the invitation of the USDA, my family and I made the long trip to Washington, DC for a meeting scheduled with Mr. Lloyd Wright, Monday, February 9. We agreed to come for what we were led to believe would be the final settlement of the negotiations process over the discrimination complaints filed by my father Matthew Grant, my brother Richard D. Grant and by me.

We took our children out of school so that they would have a first hand experience of how our government works.

Matthew Grant has filed complaints against USDA for over 20 years. Because of the severe stress and anxiety he has endured and the impossible odds set against him by the officials at USDA, he is now suffering from congestive heart failure. My father is a man who has never consumed alcoholic beverages, never smoked, and has led a life unencumbered by unhealthy habits and practices. My brothers and sisters and I painfully watch as this strong indefatigable man deteriorates. We lament the stress and worry he continues to endure because of USDA.

As we made plans to travel to Washington, and to bring our father, he lastly committed, ''I just can't make it. I honestly don't think I can survive another face to face experience with these people.'' (Meaning the USDA and DOJ)

After being delayed in Washington for three (3) days of non-negotiations, we finally bulldozed our way to speak to you on Wednesday, February 11. We were directed by you to go immediately to Acting Secretary Pearlie Reed's office. There we met with Mr. Wright, Mr. Reed, Judge Ramsey and the new attorney from DOJ, Mr. Charles Rauls, Acting General Counsel.

After another day of waiting for negotiations to begin, nothing substantive transpired at this meeting. At this point, we decided to go home because we had already made too many sacrifices to be there nor could we afford the continued personal expenses of these unproductive meetings and delays.

We needed to come home to see about our father and mother, to get back to our jobs and to get our children back to school.

We left the meeting with the understanding that we would go home and USDA would contact us within 24 hours to bring resolution to our complaints.

To date we have had no response from Mr. Wright, Mr. Reed, nor Mr. Rauls.

We are not going away. We will fight for our rights and for justice to the death. Our children got the history lesson that no classroom could provide. They learned first hand how racist, unfair, prejudicial and tyrannical the USDA continues to treat our family.

We await your immediate response.

For justice and equality,

GARY R. GRANT.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, January 13, 1998.

Hon. JANET RENO,
Attorney General, Department of Justice,
Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL: Once again I must take time out from my busy schedule to ask that the Department of Justice (DOJ) stop denying justice to black farmers.

As you are aware, black farmers have endured generations of well-documented and continuing discrimination at the hands of this government. This discrimination has caused black farmers to lose their land, their livelihood, and their homes.

Secretary Dan Glickman of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and other top level government officials have pledged to remedy this discrimination and to immediately resolve the backlog of over 700 claims which have been languishing at the USDA without any action.

However, now that the USDA is finally attempting to resolve some of these cases, the DOJ has constructed roadblock after roadblock to scuttle the settlement agreements made by senior USDA officials.

The latest roadblock comes in Mr. Eddie Ross' case. The USDA settled his case by a Resolution Agreement on November 19, 1997, with full agreement by the Secretary, the USDA Office of Civil Rights, and the Office of General Counsel. The Farmer Service Agency was instructed to issue Mr. Ross' check under the terms of the settlement agreement.

Yet, the day before Mr. Ross was to receive this check, the Civil Division of the DOJ

inexplicably halted the distribution of his check and refused to honor the terms of this executed settlement agreement.

Not only are the DOJ's actions in Mr. Ross' case contrary to United States District Court Judge Paul Friedman's Order of December 24, 1997, they also raise serious questions about the DOJ's willingness to remedy the long-standing pattern and practice of insidious discrimination by this government.

On December 24, 1997, Judge Friedman specifically stated that Mr. Ross is ''not precluded'' from ''completing the administrative settlement of his case with the Department of Agriculture.'' I have attached a copy of this order.

It is outrageous that the DOJ wound put Mr. Ross through the USDA's administrative settlement process allowed by the Court, raise his hopes that a resolution had finally been reached, and then at the eleventh hour, dash those hopes in such a cowardly and heartless manner.

I do not know why the DOJ chose to ignore a Court Order in this instance and insist that the USDA renege on its legal obligations to Mr. Ross.

The DOJ legal tactics are dilatory and mean-spirited. They only serve to reinforce black farmers' belief that this government is not interested in remedying its admitted discrimination.

Indeed, my office has received several other complaints about the DOJ heaping more injury and harm on the black farmers by engaging in questionable legal tactics that deny them the justice they deserve.

Yes, the DOJ must do its job. However, there is a fine line between the DOJ doing its job and it acting in bad faith by engaging in questionable legal tactics that deny justice to those whom this government has admitted harming.

This government should be embarrassed and ashamed at how it has treated black farmers. I demand an immediate release of Mr. Eddie Ross' check and that the DOJ start negotiating in good faith to resolve each and every black farmer claim.

Sincerely,

MAXINE WATERS,
Chair, Congressional Black Caucus.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, February 20, 1998.

Hon. JANET RENO,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL RENO: This letter is a follow-up to our conversation last week concerning the United States Department of Justice's (DOJ) position regarding the black farmers' discrimination claims.

Despite the fact that many black farmers timely filed civil rights claims with the United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Office of Civil Rights, the DOJ now asserts that many of these claims are barred by the statute of limitations. The DOJ's position ignores decades of documented class discrimination.

As you are aware, the USDA dismantled its Civil Rights Division in 1983 without notice to black farmers, Members of Congress, or anyone else. Subsequently, the black farmers did not know, and could not have known, that the USDA decided to ignore and let languish their timely filed claims.

As we understand it, the DOJ's Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) has issued a legal/policy memorandum (the ''OLC Memo'') that essentially concludes that many black farmers' claims are barred by the statute of limitations. The OLC Memo apparently states that timely filed administrative claims cannot go forward in the administrative process simply because such claims arguably would be barred by the statute of limitations if filed in a court action. It also apparently states that equitable doctrines which could be asserted to overcome the statute of limitations defense rarely are applied against the United States.

Although the OLC Memo provides the sole basis for the policy used to deny many black farmers' claims, the DOJ continues to deny the Congressional Black Caucus' (CBC) request for a copy of this memo. We can only speculate about whether the DOJ's unwillingness to provide us with a copy is because the conclusions contained in the OLC Memo cannot withstand public scrutiny.

While timely filed administrative claims subsequently filed in court may raise statute of limitation defenses, it is absurd to stretch that defense to also mean that timely filed administrative claims are also barred in the administrative process simply because such claims may be barred by the statute of limitations if filed in a court action. Indeed, many of these black farmers have not filed court actions.

In essence, the DOJ's conclusions mean that, because the federal government sat on timely filed complaints for years, black farmers are now prohibited by the statute of limitations from receiving any money to compensate them for their injuries. This is indefensible.

Black farmers also relied on Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman's promise to resolve these complaints. Neither the black farmers nor the Members of the CBC understood Secretary Glickman's commitment to ''resolve quickly'' the black farmers' complaints to mean that the DOJ would hide behind unsupportable and far-fetched theories to unilaterally dismiss hundreds of timely filed administrative actions.

Again, we insist that you intervene and correct this travesty of justice.

Sincerely,

MAXINE WATERS,
Chair, Congressional Black Caucus.

Before I yield back my time, I would ask the Members' indulgence before we complete this hour to read this letter that will be entered into the RECORD. America needs to hear the letter of this farmer and how he and his family were treated when they came to Washington, D.C. one more time to try to address their government.

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON. What I would like to do, since the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) has joined us, is ask the gentlewoman to talk about the Grant family and the dilemma that they have gone through for the last 20 years, and how expectations have been elevated, only to be deflated, and as recently as last week brought family members here.

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Members, this is a family which has had a lot of struggles, a very prominent family in our community in my district; that is, in Halifax County. I know the father has been ill. By the way, the family—I will tell the Members, with the costs and the sharing, the family is back here today and we have just talked with them, and I want to tell the Members that this family has undergone all kinds of stress and pain over the years.

There are two particular cases. Now, the father has a case and the brother has a case. Mr. Grant's brother is Richard, and there is Gary Grant, who we know is over the black farmers. His brother Richard is very bitter about this, and understandably. His father has been very ill. They feel threatened over his health about this whole issue.

They brought about 16 members of the family last week at their expense to make sure that their family could experience what was going on. There was on the front page of the Boston Globe a whole profile of this family, and their contribution to the community and their desire to farm, and what they have been fighting over for a number of years.

They came for a settlement, and because of this big issue of the statute of limitations, really, obviously that was kind of a bar for that. I want to tell the Members I am aware, as we speak, that there is a settlement going on, but it is because the Caucus indeed got involved and brought that issue. But what that means is that we have to do each individual case just like that, Madam Speaker. So the gentlewoman's point is well-taken. I do want to read part of this, because if there is a response to this family, there are 700 other families that are right behind them that we have to speak to.

''At the invitation of USDA, my family and I made the long trip to Washington, D.C. for meetings scheduled with Mr. Lloyd Wright Monday, February 9th. We agreed to come for what we were led to believe would be a final settlement of the negotiations process over the discrimination complaint filed by my father, Matthew,'' and by the way, I saw him Saturday, ''and my brother, Richard Grant, and by me. We took our children out of school so they would have a firsthand experience of how our government works,'' how our government worked.

''Matthew Grant had filed complaints against the USDA for over 20 years. Because of the severe stress and anxiety he has endured and the impossible odds set against him by the officials at USDA, he is now suffering from congestive heart failure. My father is a man who has never consumed alcoholic beverages, never smoked, and has led a life unencumbered by other unhealthy habits and practices. My brothers and sisters and I painfully watch as this strong, indefatigable man deteriorates. We lament the stress and the worry he continues to endure because of USDA.

''As we made plans to travel to Washington to bring my father, he lastly commented, 'I just can't make it. I honestly don't think I can survive another face-to-face experience with these people.'

''After being delayed in Washington for 3 days of non-negotiations, we finally bulldozed our way to speak to you on Wednesday, February 11. We were directed by you to go immediately to the Acting Secretary Pearlie Reed's office. There we met with Mr.

Wright, Mr. Reed, Judge Ramsey, and the new lead attorney for DOJ, Mr. Charles Rauls, Acting General Counsel.

''After another day of waiting for negotiations to begin, nothing substantive transpired at this meeting. At this point, we decided to go home because we had already made too many sacrifices to be there'' and to have nothing happen.

''We needed to come home to see about our father and mother, to get back to our jobs and to get our children back to school.

''We left the meeting with the understanding that we would go home and USDA would contact us within 24 hours to bring resolution to our complaints.

''To date we have had no response from Mr. Wright, Mr. Reed, or Mr. Rauls.

''We are not going away. We will fight for our rights and for justice to the death. Our children got the history lesson that no classroom could provide. They learned firsthand how racist, unfair, and prejudicial and tyrannical the USDA continues to treat our family.

''We await your immediate response.

''With justice and equality, Gary Grant.''

And he sent to all of us, and the President, in terms of that. I think his effort and certainly the efforts of the Black Caucus and the intervention of that certainly means that this family is coming to some resolution, and they are feeling comfortable.

The point to be made is that they speak for so many families that stand in line, so we need to have a resolution. This is so critical.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, if the gentlewoman will yield, with an abundance of caution, Mr. Eddie Ross from Vicksburg, Mississippi was in a similar situation. He signed a settlement agreement in November of last year, and we only got his check last Friday.

Mrs. CLAYTON. That is right.

Mr. THOMPSON. So even though you sign the settlement agreement, the ink is dry, it is not over until the check is received.

Mr. HILLIARD. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WATERS. If the gentleman will wait for one moment, my understanding is that Mr. Ross was not fully compensated. He was the case that helped to highlight this.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Statute of limitations.

Ms. WATERS. Statute of limitations.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Absolutely.

Ms. WATERS. And while they were able to do some compensation, they sidestepped the issue of the statute of limitations.

Mrs. CLAYTON. You have it right. Absolutely.

Ms. WATERS. And if the truth be told, he has not been fully compensated even though he has some compensation, is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON. That is right.

Mr. HILLIARD. That is the point I wanted to bring out. Is this also the gentleman that had thought that his complaint had been settled some time back and that everything was perfect and everything was fine and had received certain mailers from another governmental agency?

Mr. THOMPSON. You are absolutely correct.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Taxes.

Mr. HILLIARD. And what agency was that?

Mr. THOMPSON. Let me tell you, this gentleman received a 1099 for $523,000.

Ms. WATERS. Is that IRS?

Mr. HILLIARD. Which is the amount of the settlement.

Mr. THOMPSON. For the amount of the settlement, which he had not received.

Mr. HILLIARD. But he received that, which meant that, theoretically, he was supposed to pay taxes on that for the year 1997.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are absolutely correct.

Mr. HILLIARD. And he just received a check last week.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is correct.

Ms. WATERS. If the gentleman will yield back to me. After it was decided that the money was owed, the check was cut.

Mrs. CLAYTON. That is right.

Ms. WATERS. He had to sign the check within four hours. And a memorandum went from USDA to the Justice Department that talked about all of the ways they could deny the check. In the final analysis, they found the good old statute of limitations and ruled that they could not go forward.

Mr. HILLIARD. Madam Speaker, would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WATERS. Yes.

Mr. HILLIARD. Because I want to make sure I understand her.

Ms. WATERS. Yes.

Mr. HILLIARD. Is the gentlewoman saying that agreement had been reached?

Ms. WATERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HILLIARD. And a check had been cut?

Ms. WATERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HILLIARD. And they held that check?

Ms. WATERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HILLIARD. After our government has signed the agreement?

Ms. WATERS. That is right, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is right.

Mr. HILLIARD. And said what?

Ms. WATERS. Said, uh-oh, the statute of limitations.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is right.

Ms. WATERS. The memorandum discussed a way by which they could deny the check that had already been cut, and they did it within 24 hours. See, the reason the gentleman got his 1099 from the IRS was because the check was cut, and the form went over to notify Internal Revenue that he had been paid.

So when you send that notification, then IRS takes, of course, a look at the additional dollars or compensation or whatever you have so that they can tax you. That is why he got the notice from IRS because they assumed, given they had been given the notice, that he had the money.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, Madam Speaker, what happened, they told the people that processed the check, but then they did not go back and tell them but we are not going to mail it, do not send the statement out, because if you do, you let the cat out of the bag.

So what happened when Mr. Ross got the 1099, it was obvious that they were moving so fast to cover their tracks that they missed one scenario to cover it. And that was the issuance of the 1099. And that is what brought all of this to light.

So, to the Grant family and the public, we want them to understand that we are still having a difficult time getting our government to be sensitive to the problems that our farmers are having. We should not have to fight our government to make it right.

Mr. HILLIARD. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Does it not go further than that? Does it not show that our government is really maneuvering and trying not to keep their word, not to compensate these people for the wrongs that have been heaped on them?

Mr. THOMPSON. Oh, absolutely. And the civil rights action team report documents all the wrongs.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Absolutely.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would say that Secretary Glickman had the novel idea that, now that we have the problems documented, we can move and solve them right away.

□ 1915

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam Speaker, the systemic problem within that agency is so deep, the good old boy network.

Mr. HILLIARD. But there also has to be in Justice, too.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I submit that the Justice Department has said no matter what we move to do in USDA, they have got the final word. We can go through the administrative process all we want and resolve these cases, but they are going to look at each one of them and they are going to determine whether or not they will let it go through and will let these payments be made.

I really do believe that the Secretary is doing the best that he can do and he is acting in good faith. I do not think that Secretary Glickman ever anticipated that some lawyer sitting over in DOJ would have the audacity to stop these payments. Because as we all understood, and the Secretary thought, when all is said and done, once the Secretary signs off: Done. None of us anticipated that DOJ would interfere in the way that they are doing.

And so we have now 864 cases still to be resolved. All of the work that you have been doing for the time that you

have been in Congress, only 224 have been resolved. It is planting season and we have farmers that are bare. In this 864 have been waiting 10, 15, 20 years. We have people who have died waiting. We have people who have had heart attacks who have died brokenhearted waiting for their government to look at these cases to investigate them, to give them just a modicum of justice.

And so let me just say to all of my colleagues, despite this difficulty, I cannot use a better example than Winnie Mandela when they had to confront the past laws of an apartheid system. She said, ''Now that you have touched the women, you have struck a rock.''

Well, now that they have engaged the Congressional Black Caucus, they have struck a rock. This is our ''40 acres and a mule.'' We are not going anywhere. Eight hundred sixty-four cases to be resolved. We are committed to resolving each one of them by any means necessary. We will try to resolve them administratively. We will attempt to do whatever we can do to pass legislation. But we will not go away.

Madam Speaker, I say to all of those farmers who are out there whose voices have gone unheard, all of the farmers that my colleagues have been working so hard for, that they have been knocking on the doors of USDA and Department of Justice and Congress, they need to know this evening that we are joined as a strong team with good Members of this Congress who want to help us. Members who I understand may come from both sides of the aisle. Members who have watched as we have been engaged in this struggle who have said how can I help?

They may get a chance to vote on some legislation to waive the decision about the statute of limitation. But we are determined that whatever it takes, we are going to win justice for these farmers. Not only will the farmers be proud, but all of their relatives who went up North because they could not farm; all of them who live up in my district and live in New York and who live in St. Louis and other places who could not continue their farming and who are fighting for their relatives down South. We stand here today committed to the proposition: We are not going anywhere. We are going to work these cases one by one, two by two, three by three, four by four. We are going to get justice for all of these 864 cases. Am I correct?

Mr. HILLIARD. Madam Speaker, yes, absolutely correct.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam Speaker, to the question of fundamental fairness, I am convinced that if this proposition is put before this body, that if, in fact, the record says that these individuals have, in fact, been aggrieved by an Agency of the United States Government, and we cannot provide relief to them because of a little something called the statute of limitations, and we have provided relief in other situations for other individuals. I look at this as a similar position.

Farmers have been done wrong. We have documented the wrongdoings of the Department of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture would like to resolve the problems. Now, another branch of government decides that they know more about agriculture than the Department of Agriculture and they will become, if we please, ''the new plantation'' which is about the business of making black farmers extinct in this country.

So in the interest of fairness, we can resolve it, Madam Speaker, but it will take people of goodwill, as I said earlier, sitting down, reviewing the facts. And the record is clear. Mr. Eddie Ross' case was 7,500 pages long. One little small farmer who was renting land to farm. And here we have wasted thousands of dollars before we came to a partial settlement in his case.

Let us cut the red tape. Let us quit spending money. Let us put our lawyers to work to fighting the druggies and folk who bring in drugs in this country. We should not be fighting hard-working farmers in this country with our tax dollars. Let us fight crime. Let us fight the problems that tear communities down. Let us not fight the people who work by the sweat of their brow trying to make something out of this country that we call America.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD) if he would like to have our closing statement.

Mr. HILLIARD. Madam Speaker, basically I want to make one point. That the results of our government's action or inaction, whether intentional or unintentional, has caused continuous discrimination against African-American farmers to the detriment of their very existence. We must continue to help them.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, this is an opportunity, I think, that we have to acknowledge that a great injustice has been done. And I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), we ought to just say we should not have done that, government. We understand we did wrong, and try to make amends. We have done this in this country before. And the pain and suffering that is continuously happening need not happen.

But more importantly, we ought to say something about the sincerity of this democracy when we acknowledge that people have been aggrieved and harmed; that is what the rule of law is about. It is about justice and equity. And this is a small, narrow group. We are not talking about a large group. We are talking about a small narrow group. In fact, only 3 percent of the Americans provide the food and fiber anyhow. And of that 3 percent, we have less than 16,000 African-American farmers.

So we need to find how we increase the number of farmers. Not only for opportunities, but increase of number of farmers, period. And not put them at a disadvantage. They are providing food and fiber for all of us as Americans. They do not discriminate. They put their sweat and their brow to produce good food at affordable rates. We ought to at least say they ought to have an even break and their justice should be in their making an honest living, providing products that are worthy and that government should say that they will do these things without any regard to discrimination of race or equity or physical disability.

And if they have erred, usually our government would be big enough to say we have erred and we have documented that we have erred, and now that we have admitted, as the report says, and in each of the cases that we talk about we are not talking about rewarding people who just claim to have been discriminated, we are talking about rewarding people that the government said they discriminated against. So we are asking them to acknowledge and pay for their acknowledgment and not just say, uh-oh, I am sorry; it is too late.

Our government is too great. What makes our government great is its compassion and its rule of law and the rule of law has the confidence of its people when there is a sense of justice and a sense of fairness.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for having this special order that we could talk about. I am pleading with our other Members who I think on both sides understand the inequity that has happened here, and we will need them to reinforce that the rule of law does prevail and it does prevail for black farmers as it does for any other American. I thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman is certainly welcome. And I would like to thank her for the education that she has provided for all of the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus. Those who have struggled with this issue have taught us not only the importance of the black farmer, but really have opened our eyes to the discrimination that they have been confronted with, and the harm and the detriment, the loss of property that they have experienced.

We know this issue now. We understand it very deeply and we are very much committed to justice and fairness. And I want to thank them for all the work that they have been doing on behalf of the farmers and the way that they have moved this issue forward.

I have been here in the government long enough to understand and witness, just before I came, the bailout of the banks. I am now here when I am watching us be involved in an issue where we are being asked for $18 billion for the International Monetary Fund where, again, we are going to bail out banks.

We bailed out savings and loans, we are going to bail out banks who made loans in countries where the money was at risk. Countries where there are

dictators, countries where the economy is not stable. Countries that are on the verge of civil war. We have watched our government bail out and come to the aid of those who oftentimes have not been deserving.

Banks have not been discriminated against; they have been embraced. S&Ls were not discriminated against. They were embraced. And here we have the little people, the little people who are trying to eke out a living, good hard-working, God-fearing people who came before our committee and cried real tears. People who pray to their God every night, who rise up early in the morning and go to work, who send their children to school, who played by the rules who have been harmed. People who are just asking for a little justice.

I know we have spent a lot of hours on this issue. I know how much time my colleagues have spent. But I know that in the final analysis we are going to win on this issue. And I do believe that even those Members who may have not paid attention who come from a different philosophical point of view on most issues, will understand the harm and injustice of this issue.

I am confident, as a matter of fact, that when we pursue the legislative remedy, that we are going to be able to prevail on this floor because in the final analysis, most people understand simple and basic fairness. And most people want the little people to receive justice from their government.

So I say to all of my colleagues, our work continues. But in many ways we have just begun. No matter how many hours we have put into it until the race is run, it has not been done. And as we stand here today, we can be proud, the Congressional Caucus can stand proud because we are representing the black farmers of America from every nook and cranny throughout the South, throughout the Midwest, wherever they are, we stand tall in representing them and we are going to fight for justice. We will not stop until this ill is cured.

□ 1930

Mrs. CLAYTON. I want to say the fight that we are making for the black farmers is also yielding for the betterment of small farmers and other minorities. I want to tell my colleagues that the farmers who are Indian that have come from their reservations saying they got no help are now joining with the black farmers. White women who have been discriminated in New Jersey are coming to our Committee on Agriculture saying, because of the fight, they saw the hearing and called and asked if they could participate.

So fighting for little people has united our effort and our leadership to fight for all rural farmers in that area.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the gentlewoman will yield one last time, one of the things perhaps tomorrow night we can talk about, in addition to expanding more on this issue, is the notion that the settlement would adversely impact the budget. The gentlewoman from North Carolina and I are on the Committee on the Budget, but the reality is we already have monies set aside to settle the notion.

So if there are any people wondering, saying if we settle all those cases, what will it do to the budget? Zero. Because we have a judgment fund created within our government to handle situations like this when we do wrong.

So, clearly, we will expand a little more tomorrow night on it, but just the notion that if relief is to come, who will write the check. Gladly, somebody had the foresight to know that we are not perfect, so we have a judgment fund available to us that clearly has money in it and we can resolve these issues and get on with the business of running the government.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Members very much.

CONTINUED REPRESSION IN CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, today, February 24th, is a very important day in the history of Cuba. It is the day that in 1895 the war of independence of the Republic of Cuba began. After almost a century of fighting, the Cuban people began the war of independence of 1895 on February 24th, a war that was ultimately successful.

And names that already had become not only part of martyrdom but of history, names like Cespedes and Agramonte and Aguilera, the founding fathers of the Cuban republic that had launched the first war of independence in 1868, a war that lasted 10 years, that caused hundreds of thousands of casualties, those names were added in the war that began in 1895 on this date to many others that also became part of martyrdom and of history, names like Marti and Banderas and some names from the prior war that again that took part in the war of independence that was successful in 1895, names like Gomez and Maceo. So this is a very important date in the history of Cuba, and it is important to remember it.

It is also a very important date, Madam Speaker, now in the history of the United States, a date that is already not only part of history but has been bloodied just 2 years ago, on the 24th of February, 1996, when the Brothers to the Rescue airplanes were on a humanitarian mission over the Straits of Florida and were shot down and four innocent civilians were killed.

I would like to, if I may, Madam Speaker, read a part of an opinion issued just a few weeks ago, a final judgment by the United States District Court of the Southern District of Florida, specifically written by Federal Judge James Lawrence King, where this incident of just 2 years ago is detailed. Not only is it described in all its brutality but some of the most, I think, extraordinary characteristics of this brutal incident are laid out.

Judge King writes in his order of just a few weeks ago, the government of Cuba on February 24, 1996, in outrageous contempt for international law and basic human rights, murdered four human beings in international airspace over the Florida Straits. The victims were Brothers to the Rescue pilots flying two civilian unarmed planes on a routine humanitarian mission searching for rafters in the waters between Cuba and the Florida Keys.

As the civilian planes flew over international waters, a Russian-built MiG–29 of the Cuban Air Force, without warning, reason or provocation blasted the defenseless planes out of the sky with sophisticated air-to-air missiles in two separate attacks.

The pilots and their aircraft disintegrated in the midair explosions following the impact of the missiles. The destruction was so complete that the four bodies were never recovered.

One of the victims, Armando Alejandre, was 45 years old at the time of his death. Although born in Cuba, Alejandre made Miami, Florida, his home at an early age and became a citizen of the United States. Alejandre served an active tour of duty for 8 months in Vietnam, completed his college education at Florida International University and worked as a consultant to the Metro Dade County Transit Authority at the time of his death. He is survived by his wife of 21 years, Marlene Alejandre, and his daughter Marlene, a college student.

Carlos Costa was born in the United States in 1966 and resided in Miami. He was only 29 years old when the Cuban government ended his life. Always interested in aviation and hoping to some day oversee the operations of a major airport, Costa earned his Bachelor's Degree at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University and worked as a training specialist for the Dade County Aviation Department. He is survived by his parents, Mirta Costa and Osvaldo Costa, and by his sister Mirta Mendez.

Mario De la Pena was also born in the United States and was 24 years old at the time of his death. Working toward his goal of being an airline pilot, De la Pena was in his last semester at Embry-Riddle when he was killed. During that semester he had obtained a coveted and highly competitive internship with American Airlines. Embry-Riddle granted De la Pena a bachelor's degree in professional aeronautics posthumously. He is survived by a younger brother, Michael De la Pena, and his parents, Mario and Miriam De la Pena.

Pablo Morales was the fourth victim. His survivors are not part of this court case. That is why Pablo, a marvelous young man also, who himself had been rescued by Brothers to the Rescue, is

not mentioned in this opinion by the Federal Court.

The court then describes the shootdown.

Alejandre, Costa and De la Pena were all members of a Miami-based organization known as Hermanos al Rescate, or Brothers to the Rescue. The organization's principal mission was to search the Florida Straits for rafters, Cuban refugees, who had fled the island nation on precarious inner tubes or makeshift rafts, often perishing at sea. Brothers to the Rescue would locate the rafters and provide them with lifesaving assistance by informing the Coast Guard of their location and condition.

On the morning of February 24, 1996, Brothers to the Rescue's civilian Cessna 337 aircraft departed from Opa-Locka in South Florida. Costa piloted one plane, accompanied by Pablo Morales; De la Pena piloted the second plane, with Alejandre as his passenger.

Before departing, the planes notified both Miami and Havana traffic controllers of their flight plans, which were to take them south of the 24th parallel. The 24th parallel, well north of Cuba's 12-mile territorial sea, is the northernmost boundary of the Havana flight information region. Commercial and civilian aircraft routinely fly in this area, and aviation practice requires that they notify Havana's traffic controllers when crossing south through the 24th parallel.

Both Brothers to the Rescue planes complied with this custom by contacting Havana, identifying themselves and stating their position and altitude.

While the planes were still north of the 24th parallel which, as the judge stated, is well north of the 12-mile territorial limit, the Cuban Air Force launched two military aircraft, a MiG–29 and a MiG–23, operating under the control of Cuba's military ground station. The MiGs carried guns, close-range missiles, bombs and rockets and were piloted by members of the Cuban Air Force experienced in combat.

Excerpts from radio communications between the MiG–29 and Havana military control detailed what transpired next.

The MiG–29: Okay, the target is in sight; the target is in sight. It's a small aircraft. Copied, small aircraft in sight.

We have it in sight.

Target is in sight.

Military Control: Go ahead.

MiG–29: The target is in sight.

Military Control: Aircraft in sight.

MiG–29: Come again?

It's a small aircraft.

It's white. White.

Military Control: Color and registration of the aircraft?

MiG–29: Listen, the registration also?

Military Control: What kind and color?

MiG–29: It's white and blue.

White and blue, at a low altitude, small aircraft.

Give me instructions.

Authorize me.

If we pass it, it will complicate things. We're going to give it a pass because some vessels are approaching there. I'm going to give it a pass.

Talk. Talk.

I have it on lock-on. I have it on lock-on.

I have it on lock-on. Give us authorization.

It's a Cessna 337. Give us authorization, damn it.

Military Control: Fire.

MiG–29: Give us authorization. We have it.

Military Control: Authorized to destroy.

MiG–29: I'm going to pass it.

Military Control: Authorized to destroy.

MiG–29: We already copied. We already copied.

Military Control: Authorized to destroy.

MiG–29: Understood, already received. Leave us alone for now.

Military Control: Don't lose it.

MiG–29: First launch.

We hit him. Damn, we hit him. We hit him. We retired him.

Wait to see where it falls.

Come on. Come on in. Come on in. Obscenities.

Mark the place where we took it out.

We are over it. This one won't mess around anymore.

Military Control: Congratulations to the two of you.

MiG–29: Mark the spot.

We're climbing and returning home.

Military Control: Stand by. Stand by there circling above.

MiG–29: Over the target?

Military Control: Correct.

MiG–29: Obscenities. We did tell you, buddy.

Military Control: Correct, the target is marked.

MiG–29: Go ahead.

Military Control: Okay, climb to 3,200, 4,000 meters above the destroyed target and maintain economical speed.

MiG–29: Go ahead.

Military Control: I need you to stand by. What heading did the launch have?

MiG–29: I have another aircraft in sight.

We have another aircraft in sight.

Military Control: Follow it. Don't lose the other small aircraft.

MiG–29: We have another aircraft in sight. It is in the area where the other one fell. It's in the area where it fell.

We have the aircraft in sight.

Military Control: Stand by.

MiG–29: Comrade, it's in the area of the event.

Did you copy?

Okay, this one's heading 90 degrees now.

It's in the area of the event, where the target fell. They are going to have to authorize us.

Military Control: Correct, keep following the aircraft. You are going to have to stay above it.

MiG–29: We're above it.

Military Control: Correct.

MiG–29: For what? Is the other authorized?

Military Control: Correct.

MiG–29: Great. Let's go, Alberto.

Understood. Now we're going to destroy it.

Military Control: Do you have it in sight?

MiG–29: We have it. We have it. We're working. Let us work.

The other one is destroyed. The other one is destroyed. Fatherland or death. Obscenities. The other one is destroyed. It's down also.

The judge continues: The missiles disintegrated the Brothers to the Rescue planes, killing their occupants instantly and leaving almost no recoverable debris. Only a large oil slick marked the spots where the planes went down. The Cuban Air Force never notified or warned the civilian planes, never attempted other methods of interception, and never gave them the opportunity to land.

□ 1945

The MiG's first and only response was the intentional and malicious destruction of the Brothers to the Rescue planes and their 4 innocent occupants. Such behavior violated clearly established international norms requiring the exhaustion of all measures before resort to aggression against any aircraft and banning the use of force against civilian aircraft altogether.

The international community, the judge writes, moved quickly to condemn the murders. The United Nations Security Council, the European Union, and the International Civil Aviation Organization were among the many to issue statements deploring the Cuban regime's unjustifiable use of force. The Congress characterized the shootdown as a blatant and barbaric violation of international law, tantamount to cold-blooded murder. Congress concluded, ''The Congress strongly condemns the act of terrorism by the Castro regime in shooting down the Brothers to the Rescue aircraft on February 24, 1996.''

The court in its opinion rightly found both the Cuban Air Force and the Cuban government are liable for the murders of Alejandre, Costa, and De la Pena.

The court writes, Cuba's extrajudicial killings of Mario De la Pena, Carlos Costa, and Armando Alejandre, and Pablo Morales, which is not part of this action.

Cuba's extrajudicial killings of these innocent civilians violated clearly established principles of international law. More importantly, they were inhumane acts against innocent civilians. The fact that the killings were premeditated and intentional, outside of Cuban territory, wholly disproportionate and executed without warning or process, makes this act unique in its brazen flouting of international norms. There appears to be no precedent, writes Judge King, no precedent for a military aircraft intentionally shooting down unarmed civilian planes.

The only conceivable parallel may be the shootdown of KAL Flight 007 by the former Soviet Union in 1983. That incident can be distinguished from this case, however, by two key facts. First, the Soviets were arguably under the impression that the KAL plane was a military aircraft. Second, the plane had strayed into Soviet airspace. Neither of these facts is true in this case. Yet despite the fact that the KAL plane was in Soviet airspace, a commentator studying the incident concluded that the lethal use of force was completely inappropriate.

So I think it is important, Madam Speaker, to realize that there is no precedent for the terrorist action committed just 2 years ago today by the Castro regime killing 4 unarmed civilians over international waters. This kind of extrajudicial killing constituted an act of state terrorism, not state-sponsored terrorism but rather state-committed terrorism that must be, and I commend at this point Judge King and the court, the Federal District Court for the Southern District of Florida for this very erudite and responsible and obviously fair and humane final judgment.

I think it is important that despite the great courage required to do so, out of a Cuban political prison there has been sent out, smuggled, if you will, surreptitiously sent, a statement by 8 political prisoners. They managed to get this statement out of the Ariza prison in Cienfuegos, Cuba just a few days ago with regard to this date. These prisoners, risking their lives in sending this statement out, wrote the following:

''The dictatorship has stained another date in the history of Cuba with blood, injustice and profound pain with the shootdown of the aircraft of Brothers to the Rescue in 1996, the second anniversary of which is commemorated on February 24.

''As will so many Cubans, we will never forget the victims of that day who because of the love of justice became doves of peace who offered their lives to try to bring freedom to their humiliated people.

''To those who did not take death seriously when the nation was discussed, because of their example, we are willing to equal their measure of devotion.

''In memory of those who fell in flights of peace, the political prisoners of Las Villas in Ariza, Cienfuegos, manifesting our repudiation of the massacre and our heartfelt condolences to their families, will be fasting and in prayer during the entire day of February 28, 1998.

''Decided for the nation.''

Signed by Vladimiro Roca, Bernardo Arevalo, Augusto Cesar San Martin, Jorge Felix Canosa, Israel Hidalgo-Gato, Benito Pojaco, Jose Ramon Lopez and Pedro Genaro Barreras.

This is an example of extreme courage and typical of the kinds of statements and actions that are being taken by the internal opposition within Cuba day in and day out, even in the midst and while they suffer as a consequence grave repression from the dictatorship.

Madam Speaker, I try to utilize this position of great honor granted to me at 2-year intervals by the 600,000 residents of the 21st Congressional District of Florida to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the American people facts and realities that the majority of the communications media and the press often ignore. All too often the reality of Cuba, the reality facing the Cuban people fits into that category. To use the analogy of failing to see the forest while talking about trees, for one story by a journalist who sees the forest, we are forced to read 50 stories about trees, stories that are either completely one-sided, out of context or simply seem to be from another forest altogether. One of those few articles, one of those few examples by mass media that show that there are exceptions I read just yesterday in the Washington Times by a journalist named Tom Carter. Mr. Carter writes, in an article entitled Cuba's Forgotten Prisoners of Conscience:

''We knew Nelson Mandela's name long before he was released from the South African jail because reporters made his name known. All over the United States and Europe people prayed in synagogues and churches for the release of Natan Shcharansky and Andrei Sakaharov from Soviet imprisonment or exile.''

Amnesty International lists 600 prisoners of conscience. Those are people who have been sentenced for alleged crimes by Castro's regime which are totally nonviolent, even pursuant to the accusation made by the dictatorship. Because there are hundreds, thousands of others who are charged with so-called common crimes even though they are political prisoners.

''Amnesty International nevertheless lists 600 prisoners of conscience currently rotting in the Cuban Gulag. Pope John Paul II gave the government a list of 200 names pleading for their release. Some were released in a government amnesty earlier this month. Nonetheless, the State Department's 1998 report on human rights lists Cuba as one of the world's most egregious violators of human rights.''

''Why then with some 3,000 American reporters credentialed to cover the Pope's visit to Cuba was there so little news from those opposed to Castro's Communist paradise?''

''One theory on the media's silence is that the Cuban regime has cowed the U.S. press in much the same way it has subdued much of its 11 million people, with fear. For years, getting permission to report in Cuba has been coveted like a brass ring, visas awarded only to reporters deemed reliable by the Cuban government and some reporters hoping to make return trips purposely tailor their coverage so as to not offend anyone in government.''

''On my first visit to Cuba 6 years ago, a well respected reporter who is still reporting from Cuba schooled me on what the authorities would permit and what was out of bounds: It was permitted to interview government-approved dissidents, most notably Elizardo Sanchez, a former Marxist professor who has spent 8 years in jail. The head of the Cuban Commission for Human Rights and Reconciliation has suffered enormously and has jackboot prints on his front door to prove it, and reporters have beat a well worn path to his house. Perhaps coincidentally, Mr. Sanchez is by his own count one of the minority of opposition figures who, like the Cuban government, also opposes the U.S. embargo on Cuba.''

''Other opposition figures I asked about were considered sensitive and way off limits, only to be interviewed on the way to the airport and only if a return visa was unimportant.''

''Despite the so-called openness of the Cuban government for the Pope's visit, it refused visas to at least 60 reporters from the Miami Herald, the St. Petersburg Times and several European and Latin American newspapers. Many denied entry were old Cuba hands who had written unflattering reports about the deterioration of the revolution in recent years.''

''So many who received the coveted tickets to Havana were Cuban novices, first-time visitors to the island with no time to peer behind the public mask of the revolution. Others apparently in sync with the, quote, gains of the revolution, end quote, and opposed to the U.S. Cuba policy simply choose to ignore the other side of the story.''

''While I cannot comment on all of CNN's coverage, I did see Christiane Amanpour's 1-hour special on Cuba and the Pope that was aired on CNN's international channel.''

''Masquerading as news, it was little more than a song of praise to the revolution and a political commercial against the U.S. embargo. I kept waiting in vain for someone, anyone, to say something that didn't sound like it was straight out of the government newspaper Granma.''

''It is not as though opposition figures in Cuba are unknown. Two phone calls before I left the United States for Cuba got me 4 pages of names, addresses and phone numbers. Time prevented me from visiting more than one, Dr. Hilda Molina, who said American reporters rarely stop by.''

''Asked if my visit put her in danger, she was defiant. 'I don't care if you're State security, I'll say the same thing,' she said.''

''Before that kind of courage, I find it cowardly that some news organizations simply recycle regime propaganda as news.''

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, that is all too often the reality of news reporting with regard to Cuba. The reality of Cuba is ignored and very often if it is not ignored, it is part of disinformation and even misinformation.

I attempt to update, and I will use this opportunity to update my colleagues about recent arrests and acts of repression against dissidents and independent journalists in Cuba. I guess we could call it a plaque of human rights update on the situation there because I think that it is important as Mr. Carter writes, for human rights support groups and international organizations and parliaments throughout the world and especially in this greatest of all democratic parliaments in the world, for those brave human rights activists and freedom fighters to be mentioned, to be supported, to be given solidarity. It is very telling that despite the repression, despite the great obstacles faced by the internal opposition, that internal opposition is an ever growing, brave opposition movement within Cuba that is actively working to achieve a transition to democracy and freedom in that long-suffering island.

I have before me just a very incomplete, I recognize, list of obvious and direct human rights violations, and I would like to read out the names of just a few of these incidents that have come to my attention in recent months, and most of them I have actual dates for.

On July 23, Pascual Escalona, a well-known human rights activist, was charged with dangerousness and arrested.

July 24, Aguilleo Cancio Chong, President of the Cuban National Alliance, was arrested by Cuban State Security and subjected to intense interrogation and threats.

On July 24, Pascaul Escalona Naranjo was sentenced to one year's imprisonment on a charge of dangerousness. It is believed that the charge stems from his and his wife's advocacy of freedom of expression for Cuba through the Agencia de Prensa Independiente, the Cuban independent press agency.

On July 25, Ramon Morejon Castillo's house was searched from 7 in the morning until 12 noon and he was later arrested. Morejon Castillo is not a member of any opposition group but was arrested 2 years ago under the charge of suspicion of sabotaging Cuban elections. He is still imprisoned in the Villa Marista state security center.

On July 28, Raul Rivero, head of the Independent Press Group, Cuba Press, was detained.

□ 2000

He was detained again on August 12.

On July 29 Luis Lopez Prendes, reporter with the Independent Press Bureau, was arrested after speaking with members of the New York based Committee to Protect Journalists.

July 31 Rafael Fonseca, Yordys Garcia, Juan Rodiles, Carlos Herrera, Jackelin Caballero and Dr. Walter Estrada, members of the Cuban Democratic Youth Movement, all from Guantanamo, were warned by State security not to show themselves in public while delegates of the XIV World Youth and Students Festival were visiting Guantanamo. In spite of this, a peaceful rally demanding the release of Nestor Rodriguez Lobaina was held and broken up by State security.

Also in July 1997, date unknown Reinaldo Soto from the Cuba Press was sentenced to 5 years in a maximum security prison. He was found guilty of distributing enemy propaganda to foreign states.

Also July 1997, date unknown, Heriberto Leyva Rodriguez, vice president of Youth for Democracy, was convicted of contempt for the authority of the Santiago courts, based on his testimony given at the hearing of Garcia de la Vega, another member of Youth for Democracy.

July 1997, date unknown, Lorenzo Paez Nunez, a journalist with the Habana Press Agency, was sentenced to 18 months for, ''contempt and defamation of national policy,'' based on allegations that he reported on police abuses.

August 2, Juan Carlos Herrera was arrested and kept in isolation for 2 days for attempting to contact foreign delegates at Cuba's youth festival who were in Guantanamo at the time. He was told by Manuel Ceballos, who was in charge of interrogation, that he would be charged with disorderly conduct and enemy propaganda because he had a copy of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights when he was arrested. He was released when the delegates left Guantanamo.

August 2, Mauri Chaviano Mesa, executive with the Cuban National Alliance, was arrested in Santa Clara and submitted to interrogations, harassment and threats by State security.

August 12, Raul Rivero, President of the Cuba Press was detained by Cuban officials. The agents confiscated materials from his domicile, and after hours of detention he was released.

August 14 Raul Rivero, was again detained on charges of possessing enemy propaganda. His house was searched without warrant.

August 15, David Norman Dorm, Director of International Affairs for the American Federation of Teachers here in the United States, visiting Cuba, was deported allegedly for contacting the internal opposition on behalf of the Freedom House Cuban Rights organization here in the United States.

August 15 Maritza Lugo Fernandez, vice president of the Thirtieth of November Party, was arrested for informing foreigners about human rights abuses in Cuba. She started a hunger strike when informed that she would be tried by a military court.

August 19, State security agent known as Pepin and other agents in an act of continuing psychological torture, went to the home of Professor Reinaldo Cosano Allen and told him to gather his belongings because he was being arrested.

August 20, Zohiris Aguilar, activist and president of the Popular Democratic Alliance, ADEPO, was detained by Cuban State police without being given cause. Her husband Leonel Morejon Almagro, lawyer and founder of Concilio Cubano, well known human rights umbrella group, was also questioned by police. Police threatened to take away their child to be raised by the State unless they ceased their activities advocating free and fair elections.

August 20, Nery Gorotiza Campoalegre, executive of the Cuban National Alliance, was detained by State Security Agent Pepin, interrogated and threatened for 24 hours.

August 20, opposition activist Sergio Quiro, secretary for Leonel Morejon Almagro, was arrested. While being interrogated and threatened, State security agents played audio tapes with phone conversations opposition members had had with international human rights support groups.

August 21, Roberto Gonzalez Tibanear, who had been deported from Sweden to Cuba early in 1997, was arrested. His defense lawyer was given 48 hours to prepare his case. The charges against him were instigation and contempt.

August 21, Vicente Escobar Barreiro, director of the Cuban Unionism Studies Institute and a leader of the Cuban Workers Council, an independent union, was called in for questioning by the Singular Vigilance System. The Singular Vigilance System is one of the many repressive organs of the Cuban dictatorship.

August 23, Odilia Collazo, while traveling in a car with her husband, was rammed by a government-owned bus and received severe life-threatening injuries. In addition to being President of the Cuban Pro Human Rights Party, Collazo had just assumed the Presidency of the Dissidents Task Force Support Committee after the task force members, well known dissidents, Vladimiro Roca, Felix Bonne Carcasses, Dr. Rene Gomez Manzano and economist Marta Beatriz Roque, were incarcerated the previous month.

Throughout the month of August 1997, Jesus Chamber Ramirez, sentenced to 10 years in prison for enemy propaganda and disrespect against government authority, was regularly denied family visits because he insisted on being treated as a political prisoner rather than as a common prisoner. He was tried and sentenced to an additional 4 years for demanding better conditions with yet another trial still pending.

August 1997, date unknown, Luis Mario Pared Estrada, a leader of the Thirtieth November Party, Frank Pais, was convicted of dangerousness and sentenced to one year in prison.

September 8, three leaders of the Democratic Federation of Workers in Cuba, Ana Maria Ortega Gimenez, Nacional Coordinator; Gustavo Toirac Gonzalez, Secretary General; and Ramon Gonzalez Fonseca, Secretary of Transportation were arrested. Jose Orlando Gonzalez Brindon, President of

the organization was placed under house arrest.

September 9, Cuban State police arrested the President of the Democratic Solidarity Party, Hector Palacio Ruiz, for commenting on Castro's lack of mental stability in an interview with a German journalist. We certainly could do an entire special order on Castro's lack of mental stability.

September 10, Jorge Luis Garcia Perez Antunez, Nestor Rodriguez Lobaina, and Francisco Herodes Diaz Echemendia were beaten by over 30 guards in the prison where they were being kept and still are today on charges of enemy propaganda, attempted sabotage and acts against State security.

September 10, Raul Ernesto Cruz Leon, a citizen of El Salvador, was arrested and charged with being a material author of seven hotel bombings in Cuba.

September 13, Lazaro Fernandez Valdez and Rodolfo Valdez Perez were detained at their homes after attending a mass given by Cardinal Jaime Ortega. They had shouted, Long live Cardinal Ortega.

September 15, Cecilio Monteagudo Sanchez, member of the Democratic Solidarity Party, was charged with enemy propaganda and detained. He allegedly distributed a flyer encouraging people to boycott voting in the one-party election run by the regime.

September 16, U.S. citizen Walter Van de Veer, who had been arrested in Cuba in August of 1996, was tried as a high risk mercenary, and on that date was sentenced to 15 years in prison.

September 23 Alexander Hernandez Lago, reportedly a contributor to Vitral, an officially sanctioned religious magazine, was beaten in his home by police for allegedly failing to pay a utility bill of 41 pesos. Lago then protested by wearing a placard in public stating we are fed up with so much arbitrariness and injustice, Human Rights, Article 19, Respect Them, for which he was arrested.

September 24, Cecilio Ruiz Rivero, member of the Association for Struggle Against Injustice, was arrested and charged with disrespect, assault and resistance.

September 24, Efrain Rodriguez Santos, member of the Club Pueblos Cautivos de Cuba, Captive Towns of Cuba Club, because there are entire towns in Cuba that are in effect prisons, and that is a subject that we will have to treat in detail at some point. Efrain Rodriguez Santos, member of the Captive Towns of Cuba Club was sentenced to 18 months imprisonment on charges of disrespect of Fidel Castro. He allegedly shouted from his home's balcony, Down with Fidel Castro.

September 27 Maritza Lugo Fernandez, was convicted of bribery for allegedly attempting to convince a prison guard to give prisoners belonging to the Thirtieth of November Party a tape recorder.

October 23, 11 members of the Pro Human Rights Party of Cuba, PPDH, were convicted of associating to commit criminal acts and disobedience after conducting a hunger strike to protest the government's detention of another PPDH member, Daula Carpio Mata. Sentences ranged from 1 year of house arrest, Maria Felicia Machad, to 1½ years in prison camp for Jose Antonio Alvarado Almeida, Ileana Penalver Duque, Roxana Alina Carpio Mata, Lilian Meneses Martinez, Arelis Fleites Mendez, Marlis Velazquez Aparicio, Ivan Lema Romero, Danilo Santos Mendez, Vicente Garcia Ramos, and Jose Manuel Yera Meneses.

October 29 Luis Lopez Prendes, with the Bureau of Independent Journalists, was severely beaten for speaking to Radio Marti by phone.

October 29, Daula Carpio Matas of the Pro Human Rights Party, PPDH, was sentenced to 16 months in the prison work camp for her outspoken criticism of an earlier trial. She was initially arrested on charges that she verbally criticized a prison doctor at the trial of a fellow PPDH member.

November 11, Orestes Rodriguez Urrutinier, acting President of the Followers of Chibas Movement, Movimiento Seguidores de Chibas, was brought to trial on charges of enemy propaganda and sentenced to 4 years imprisonment.

November 18, Dr. Desi Mendoza Rivero, this is amazing, President of the Santiago de Cuba Independent Medical Association, was sentenced to 8 years imprisonment for, quote, ''using the mass media to spread enemy propaganda,'' end quote. Rivero accused the regime on Radio Marti of covering up the extent of danger, he is a physician speaking, of covering up the extent of danger to the public during an epidemic of dengue fever and of not taking sufficient measures to control the epidemic.

November 28, Bernardo Arevalo Padron, director of the Independent Press Agency Linea Sur Press, was sentenced to 6 years imprisonment for enemy propaganda.

December 17, Ileana Penalver Duque, was sentenced to 18 months correctional work without internment, ordered to report to work despite physical illnesses from which she is still suffering, including memory and vision disturbances and loss of feeling in her legs, ordered to report to work.

January 9, Jose Angel Pena, president of the Pro Human Rights Party Chico Oriental, was detained for visiting activist, Silvano Duarto.

January 15, Frank Fernandez Lobaina, president of the union, the National Union of Opposition Members, UNO, was arrested for signing The Agreement for Democracy, which is an incredible document that the opposition has come together and not only drafted, but agreed to the opposition in Cuba and outside of Cuba. He spoke on its behalf on January 14 publicly, and he was arrested the next day, January 15.

January 1998, date unknown, numerous people were arrested at papal services during the Pope's visit, the 4-day trip, which was a marvelous visit where the Cuban people had a ray of hope for 4 days with the visit of that incredible, not only one of the greatest figures of this century, but of the millenium and leader of the Catholic Church, John Paul, II. Numerous people were arrested at the papal services for speaking to foreign journalists or holding up pro democracy signs or other activities that bothered the dictatorship.

I personally witnessed two young women who were filmed by Univision and CBS tele noticias, and none of our networks here in the English language or especially CNN, I did not see any of those networks show that film that they had access to because I saw it on Univision and tele noticias, two young women being dragged away for holding up a sign that said, Down with the dictatorship of the Castro brother. That is during the papal masses.

February 17, dictatorship prosecutors requested a 15-year sentence in prison for the vice president of the Association for Struggle Against National Injustice Reynaldo Alfaro Garcia. His crime, speaking out for the release of political prisoners.

February 18, the regime announced that Benito Fojaco, Israel Garcia, Jose R. Lopez, Angel Gonzalez and Reynaldo Sardinas will be tried for acts against the security of the State.

February 22, Castro's joke of a Foreign Minister fellow named Roberto Robaina, warned that the release of a few dozen prisoners that the regime has recently announced as a gesture to Pope John Paul does not mean that those dissidents can engage in antigovernment activities when they are out of prison.

February 1998 Jose Miranda Acosta, considered a prisoner of conscience by Amnesty International, was previously sentenced to 15 years in prison even though a Mexican national who was charged along with him served 9 months before being released. Numerous human rights advocacy groups have called for his immediate release because of his extremely delicate health condition. The regime is denying him medical treatment as a form of torture. Jose Miranda Acosta was included in the list of prisoners that the Catholic Church gave to the regime for release, but Castro has refused to release him as he has refused to release countless others.

The denial of medical care by the dictatorship to political opponents as a form of torture is widespread. Yesterday, I called for the resignation of Cesar Gaviria, a secretary general of the Organization of American States, for his systematic ignoring of multiple requests made by Sebastian Arcos for condemnation by the Human Rights Commission of the OAS of that practice by the regime, denying of medical care as a form of torture for political prisoners.

□ 2015

One of the most well-known dissidents in Cuba, he died last December here in exile after he had received cancer while in prison and being denied medical treatment for years. That, in addition to the highest incidence of cancer in the Cuban prisons, in the entire world, and many reports point out that that is too much of a coincidence, is one of the realities that not only has to be analyzed but definitely is going to be made known in all its magnitude when Cuba is freed and the files are opened with regard to inconceivable techniques of torture, like the ones that are used on a daily basis by the regime.

But the reality of the matter is that, despite those techniques of torture and the repression, the internal opposition is working harder than ever.

Just before coming to the floor this evening, I received notification, I had been told that numerous internal opposition groups within Cuba were planning to attend a mass this evening around 6 o'clock commemorating the 24th of February, the massacre of the four Brothers to the Rescue, their murder 2 years ago.

Well, about 20 of them made it to the church in Havana. Over 20 of them apparently made it to the church. When they left the church after the mass, just about a little over an hour ago, they started walking toward the waterfront. They were met by 80 state security gestapo types, and apparently they have been arrested.

What they wanted me to know and to say was that it does not matter if they are arrested, it does not matter how many of them are thrown in the dungeon, they will continue fighting peacefully until freedom and democracy are restored to Cuba. And they wanted me to make a point of the fact that it does not matter how many of them are thrown in the dungeon, the fight will continue, and that every day there are more and more members of the internal opposition and members of the pro-democracy movement in Cuba.

The fact that the Cuban people's hands are tied at this point and that they are unarmed does not mean that they will not triumph. It does not mean that they will not continue fighting until freedom is achieved.

I mentioned briefly that the world had witnessed those great days of hope in January, the four days of hope with Pope John Paul's visit to Cuba just a few weeks ago.

Even before John Paul had completed his visit to Cuba, TV anchormen and analysts and editorial writers were at work interpreting the message, the intention, the agenda behind his words. What exactly did the Pope say in Cuba?

I want to point to a marvelous analysis done by the Center for a Free Cuba, run by Mr. Frank Calzon here in Washington, a tremendous human rights activist.

In the analysis that the Center for a Free Cuba made public, ''The Pope said his journey was 'a pastoral visit,' 'an apostolic trip,' though, judging by some media reports, the lifting of the Washington trade sanctions against Havana was the most important issue of the visit. And yet, a word search of the 21,094 words pronounced by Pope John Paul II in 14 speeches and homilies while in Cuba indicates the following:

The Pope used the word ''truth'' 74 times; ''freedom'' 53 times; ''family'' 42 times; ''justice,'' 31 times; ''moral values'' 32 times; ''solidarity'' 16 times; ''education'' 11 times; ''civil society'' 9 times; ''do not be afraid'' 5 times.

I am sure those words to the Cuban people, ''do not be afraid,'' are having a tremendous impact and will have every day even a greater impact.

The Pope mentioned ''Our Lady of Charity,'' Cuba's patroness, 13 times; ''Jesus and God'' 129 times. He used the word ''prisoner'' 3 times, referred to Cuban exiles around the world 4 times; and he mentioned the embargo once, before getting on the plane to leave Cuba. And he did not mention the United States by name at all.

I want to commend Frank Calzon and the Center for a Free Cuba, because this analysis shows us the kind of campaign that we are facing by the majority of the media and the means of communication day in and day out, where they have their agenda. And none of those arrests, human rights violations and abuses that I mentioned did I see reported in the mainstream media in the United States or the international media, newspapers, that I had a chance to read.

You hear about the couple dozen prisoners that Castro releases as a gesture to the Pope. Most of them had served time as common criminals, not political prisoners, or who had already finished their terms, their sentences, in prison.

You read about the couple dozen being released, but you do not read about the hundreds and thousands when they are arrested. I think that Mr. Carter of the Washington Times pointed out to a certain extent why that is the case.

With regard to that so-called humanitarian gesture of the regime, of the couple of dozen people who were released from prison in the last few days, it is very important to point out the statement also made at the cost of great risk and demonstrating great courage by one of the leading opposition leaders within Cuba, Oswaldo Paya of the Christian Liberation Movement.

Mr. Paya states the release from prison of a few dozen prisoners cannot be seen as a sign of political opening. ''We cannot say this is an opening, when many remain in prison for their beliefs and when some are still waiting to be tried for political reasons.''

Even if you do not want to believe the opposition and the dissidents, read what Castro himself or his pathetic foreign minister says:

''The pardon was not made with the intention of stimulating activities of internal dissent,'' Foreign Minister Roberto Robaina said Sunday. ''He who returns to the street has the space we all have in the street.''

I do not think they have the space he has with his yachts. I have seen a photograph of him in a big capitalist yacht and having access to la dolce vita and, like Forbes Magazine says, Castro having over $1.5 billion in Swiss bank accounts. That is not the space he is referring to when he says, ''He who returns to the street has the space that we all have in the street. Not a space to bend over for those who, from abroad, want to destroy the country.''

No, no, no. I do not think he means everybody is going to have the kind of life he has, with his yachts and the hundreds of millions of dollars that Castro has in Swiss foreign accounts.

What they are talking about is that this is not, as has been stated, this is not a political opening. What this is is simply a token gesture, so that the world, that wants to find reasons and pretexts to justify the actions of Castro, will find another pretext for doing so.

The reality of Cuba is that there are thousands imprisoned. The reality of Cuba, and I commend to the viewers ''The Politics of Psychiatry in Revolutionary Cuba,'' I recommend it to the viewers, this is put out by Freedom House here in Washington, and it details example after example after example of the use of psychiatry, electroshock torture and psychotropic drugs against political prisoners and dissidents by the Cuban regime.

That is the reality of Cuba today, and anyone who wants to find out the reality of Cuba today should read books like this and, really, actually listen to the words of the dictator, listen to what happens when people want to commemorate in a mass the massacre of simply two years ago, just two years ago, against four Brothers to the Rescue who were shot and killed over the straits, over international waters, and the people who wanted to peacefully dedicate a mass in their memory are met by 80 gestapo thugs and thrown in prison. That is the reality of Cuba today.

The reality of Cuba today is, and I also recommend this report just released by Dr. Juan Clark, a Ph.D. in South Florida, Miami Dade Community College, ''Religious Oppression in Cuba.'' He goes in detail about what happens day in and day out to believers in Cuba, simply for peacefully trying to exercise the right of free worship. That is the reality of Cuba today.

Also though the reality of Cuba today is the fact that the internal opposition is more active than ever; that those words that the Pope said do not fear, do not fear, do not be afraid, are having a great effect, like they did in Poland and like they did everywhere that the Pope has visited, and the Cuban people are living in the tradition

that they have demonstrated throughout their history, including the entire 19th century, and if they will put an end to this barbaric regime, despite the fact that it has been in existence 39 years, it will come to an end and it will come to an end soon, because the Cuban people are going to see to it.

The reality of Cuba today is more than 70 opposition movements have already signed onto this extraordinary agreement called Agreement for Democracy, and many of the opposition movements in exile as well have signed on. I will not read it all, but I think it is a fundamental document to see where the Cuban people are going, where they wish to go and what they think, and to break through the disinformation and the misinformation and the lack of information that is provided or not provided by the international media.

This Agreement for Democracy states as follows. As I say, it has already been signed on to by more than 70 opposition groups, most within Cuba.

''We recognize as the fundamental principle of the new republic that Cuba has wanted independence whose sovereignty resides from the people and functions through the effective exercise of representative multiparty democracy, which is the government of the majority with absolute respect for the minority. All governments must respect the sovereignty of the people. Therefore, at the end of the current tyrannical regime, the provisional or transition government shall be obliged to return sovereignty to the people by way of the following measures.''

Then they list 10 specific measures through which sovereignty after the end of the Castro nightmare will be returned to the Cuban people, obviously in the holding of free and fair elections. Free and fair elections is the essence, and free and fair elections is the essence of what we seek in our policy in the United States for the Cuban people.

That is the purpose of our policy. That is why we deny access to the U.S. market to those who profit from the lack of freedom of the Cuban people. That is why we have an embargo against Castro.

We have an embargo on credits, on financing, on profits from the apartheid economy that Castro imposes on the people. We have an embargo on massive U.S. tourism to Cuba. We do not have an embargo on medicine. It is important that I repeat that, because there is so much disinformation and so much misinformation on this. We do not have an embargo on the sale of medicine. We do not have an embargo on the shipment of humanitarian aid to Cuba. More humanitarian aid is sent from the American people each year to the Cuban people than from all the other countries in the world combined.

□ 2030

$2.4 billion in humanitarian aid has been sent. That is not including the cash remittances that the Cuban people send to their family members on the island each year, not including the cash amounts of hundreds of millions per year, such as $2.4 million in humanitarian aid has been sent from the American people to the Cuban people in the last 5 years alone. That is more again than from all the other countries in the world combined.

And what we are saying with our policy is that yes, we will deny credits and we will deny financing and we will deny profits from those who want to invest in the lack of labor rights, in human rights in Cuba, until and unless there is a democratic opening, a transition to democracy in Cuba.

The only instrument that exists for the Cuban people to be taken into account when Castro dies, and he cannot last much longer, you have to look at him, they shot him up with cortisone for the Pope's trip. It will be a while, a year, 2 years, and thank God he is not immortal, he is going to die.

What instrument do the Cuban people have at that moment so that those in a situation of provisionality will take them into account and will agree to return sovereignty to the Cuban people, to have elections, the only instrument that exists is the U.S. embargo.

Those who find themselves in a situation of provisional power are going to want to lift the U.S. embargo, and we are going to say, ''Fine, we want to lift the U.S. embargo. The only thing we ask is that you, those who find themselves in a situation of provisional power when Castro dies, is that you hold elections. That is the only thing we are asking for.

Just like in 1898 the only country that stood by the Cuban people and said they deserve to be free was the United States of America. In 1998 we are the people, we are the Nation, who wants the Cuban people to be free, and who say, we will not permit access to the U.S. market until the Cuban people are allowed free and fair elections. The Cuban people will not continue to be the only people in this hemisphere to be denied free elections, to be condemned to live under tyranny. We do not accept that, and the Cuban people do not accept that. They deserve to live in freedom.

We will hold out and we will deny our market and we will maintain our embargo until three key conditions are met: Political legalization, all political parties have to be legalized; all political prisoners have to be freed; and there has to be a willingness to hold free and fair elections.

They are three very simple conditions, but they are conditions that are not going to waived. We will insist on political legalization, we will insist on freedom for all political prisoners, and we will insist on free elections. That is our commitment. That is the commitment of this Congress. That is why we obtained 80 percent of the votes, both in the Senate and in the House, for our sanctions legislation in 1996, and we are going to maintain that policy until there is a democratic transition.

So I end my remarks remembering the four martyrs from Brothers to the Rescue, remembering all the political prisoners, in solidarity with them, remembering as well the martyrs of the 13th of July of 1994, the over 40 men women and children who were murdered by the tyrant just a few years ago while trying to seek freedom, including more than 20 children.

In memory of them, on this historic date, I end my remarks and I guarantee that this Congress and the American people will stand with the Cuban people until they are free.

SOCIAL SECURITY'S BLEAK FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. NORTHUP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would ask everybody to hold onto their hats. I am going to spend the next 30 minutes talking about Social Security. And maybe the question should be, why should anybody be interested in what the situation is in this country with Social Security?

I suggest seniors that are now retired should be very concerned, because Social Security is going to have less money coming in in payroll taxes than is going to be required to meet the benefits as early as 2002.

I would suggest that young people should be very interested in Congress and the President facing up to the real issue of starting to solve the Social Security problem, because when they retire, their retirement is going to be at risk unless we do something.

I would certainly suggest that my grandkids, and Bonnie and I have seven grandkids, should be very concerned, because if we do nothing, they are going to be asked to pay huge amounts of their taxes, up to 85 percent of what they earn, just to cover the Social Security benefits. So something has to be done.

I wanted to start tonight with the President's budget. I think we start by getting rid of some misconceptions, if you will, hoodwinking of the American people, on the balanced budget. I think the American people know this. What we are doing is borrowing from Social Security to balance the budget.

If you take a look at the historical tables on the President's budget, and you were to turn to page 111, you would see that the national debt increases every year for the next 5 years. If the national debt increases, how can the budget be balanced? It is not. We are borrowing from Social Security.

I put this chart together very quickly, so please excuse the patchwork quilt here.

As you go down the fiscal years, starting in 1998, the national debt is

$5.5 trillion. That is an increase, by the way, of $174 billion over the previous year. In 1999, the national debt increases to $5.7 trillion. In the year 2000, it increases to $5.9 trillion. In the year 2001, the national debt increases to $6 trillion. In the year 2002, the national debt increases to $6.2 trillion, an increase of between $175 billion and $174 billion a year.

How can this be, you say, if the President of the United States and Congress is saying, well, we are reaching a balanced budget? Here is why. We are borrowing from the Social Security trust fund. That is the major borrowing that is allowing us to pretend that the budget is balanced. But what it is doing in the process is depriving Social Security of being solvent in the future years.

I have introduced the only bill in the United States Congress that is scored by the Social Security Administration to keep Social Security solvent for the next 75 years. I introduced my first bill when I first came to Congress in 1993. I introduced my second bill last session, and I introduced a bill this session.

That legislation says, for part of the solution, let individual workers have the option of taking part of their Social Security tax, and it would still be sent in to the government and still be deducted at the rate of 12.4 percent of taxable payroll, but they would have the option of investing that in certain safe investments. Safe investments in my bill are indexed stocks, indexed bonds, indexed global funds, indexed cap funds, and any other safe investment as determined by the Secretary of Treasury.

Okay. So here is the situation. We have got a system that was devised in 1935 to allow senior citizens money to make sure that they were socially stable, socially secure. It was a system in 1935 that was designed to use existing taxpayers' money to pay for existing benefits, sort of a pay-as-you-go program.

As we look at this bleak future for Social Security, what I was discussing on how much the Federal Government is borrowing from the Social Security trust fund to pretend that we have a balanced budget is the little amount in blue that goes from this year, 1997, over to about 2011. So every year because we raised taxes so high on workers in 1983, there is more tax revenues coming in than is required to pay out existing benefits. Remember, this is a pay-as-you-go program, where existing taxes pay for existing benefits. So as government borrows this money and spends it for other uses, as government borrows this money and uses it for other purposes, what we do is further jeopardize the solvency of Social Security.

This chart, because we have increased taxes so much on existing workers, this chart represents how many years a person is going to have to live after they retire simply to break even and get back what they and their employers paid into Social Security. So because it is sort of a chain letter, a Ponzi game, a pay-as-you-go system, if you retired early, then you were very, very well off and Social Security was very, very solvent.

If you happened to retire in 1940 it took 2 months to get everything back that you and your employer put in plus compounded interest. If you retired in 1960, it took 2 years. Going across the chart you see anybody that retires after the year 2005 is going to have to live 24 to 26 years after they retire simply to break even and get back what they and their employer put into Social Security.

Not a good investment. Not a good savings. The National Tax Foundation estimates that the average person retiring after the year 2000 will get a negative return on the amount of money that the employer and the employee put into Social Security. The employee now puts 6.2 percent. The employer puts 6.2 percent.

Really what we are talking about is a situation where it all comes out of the employee's pocket, because the employer would give that money to the employee. Obviously they are willing to pay that much. So it is really a tax on the employee, the whole 12.4 percent.

The National Tax Foundation says that you are going to get a negative one-half to a negative one and a half percent return on your money. So that is why everybody is suggesting let us use a little bit of private investment to allow workers to take some of this money and invest it in the stock market or the bond market so that they can realize the increase in wealth.

A lot of people suggest that there is a danger in allowing people to invest their own money because they might lose it all. Number one, it is optional. Number two, we are suggesting in our pilot program that you would only have a reduction in Social Security benefits if you make money on your private investment. In other words, for every $2 you make on the private investment, you would lose $1. $1 would be offset in the traditional Social Security benefits.

And that is going to help solve the whole Social Security problem. Because if your index stocks are average of what has happened over the last 90 years in this country, there is a 9 percent per year return on those index stocks, 9 percent per year. Remember, this compares to a negative one-half, to a negative one and a half return on your Social Security money.

Social Security is a bad investment. Stocks are continually going up. Even the economists suggest that even the 10 years surrounding one of our worst depressions around 1928, 1929, if you take any 10-year period around that depression, you still have a positive return that is going to be much better than what Social Security is going to give you.

So the point is we need to make some changes in Social Security. It is a bad investment. Let us look at other ways. Let us at least start a pilot program.

I am introducing a bill that is going to be a pilot program that will allow 18-year-olds to 30-year-olds to invest 2.5 percent of their payroll. This money will be sent in. That individual will have the option of saying I want this much in index stocks, this much in index bonds. There will be an offset; for every $2 you make, a $1 offset in your fixed benefits. Then you have the option at 10 years to say, look, I have decided I want to go back to the old fixed benefit plan.

I think it is so important that we allow American working families to experience the creation of wealth. We have taxed everybody so much in this country. You now pay 40 cents out of every dollar you make in taxes at the local, state, and national level. We have taxed so many people so much that it has taken away the ability to start saving and creating wealth.

Part of the wealth creation is the fact that, at 9 percent interest, I think your money doubles something like every 7 years. So that means, if you start with a dollar, 7 years from now, you will have two. And 14 years, you will have four.

That compounding, that magic of compounding interest is why the economists suggest that you are going to be so much better off if you have some private investment rather than a fixed benefit plan that is now going broke.

Look at this next chart. The number of seniors is increasing very dramatically. We see over the next 28 years, 29 years, there is going to be an increase of 4.7 percent for those people under 20 years old. For those people in the age of 20 to 64 years, there is going to be an increase in numbers of 20.6 percent. But look what happens to seniors. The senior population, over 65 population, is increasing at 79.5 percent, almost 80 percent.

When we started Social Security, the average life-span for an individual was 61 years old. That means most people never lived long enough to collect any Social Security. So the Social Security system worked very well then. It went spinning along very nicely.

We got into the late 1940s. We ran a little short of money. We increased taxes. In the 1950s, we increased taxes again. We kept increasing taxes on workers to keep the program solvent. And that is why it is going to be impossible for most workers in the future, unless we make some changes, to ever get back even what they and their employer put into Social Security.

□ 2045

Before I get to this next chart, if we were to look at the number of people working paying in their taxes to fund every single beneficiary, in 1942, there were 40 workers paying in their Social Security tax for every retiree. By 1950, that got down to 17 people working for each retiree. Today, there are three

people working, three people working for every retiree paying in that large increased number of tax.

This chart shows how we have increased taxes over the years on those workers. In fact, we have increased taxes 36 times since 1971. More often than once a year we have increased taxes on the American workers and there are people now suggesting the way to fix Social Security is to increase taxes again on those workers.

Look at this pie chart right now: 78 percent of Americans pay more in the FICA tax than they do in the income tax. That is because of Social Security taxes that have kept going up. Okay. That is the problem. Like I mentioned, in 1961, the average life span was 61 years old. In 1936, the average life span was 61 years old. Today, the average life span for a female is 76 years old; for a male it is 74 years old.

But if we live to 65, ready for retirement, then on the average we are going to live another 20 years. That is why the senior population is going up so dramatically. And after the baby boomers, after World War II, the birth rate went way down. So our birth rate is slow in relation to the number of seniors that need to be supported by those existing taxes.

There has got to be a way, there has got to be a system that will help us save Social Security. I want to suggest that I have got one proposal. I want to run it up the flag pole. But instead of burying our heads in the sand, let us face up to the fact that there is a problem. Let us face up to the fact that we do not want to cut benefits for any existing retirees or any of those individuals close to retiring and we want to have a system that is available for working families today and for our grandkids tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, every proposal that the President's Advisory Commission came up with included as part of the solution private investment, and that is what I am suggesting. But I am suggesting we start very gradually. That we start taking some of this surplus, this blue area, some of the $100 billion that the general fund is borrowing from the Social Security trust fund in the 1999 budget that we have just started working on, $100 billion that we are borrowing from the Social Security trust fund to balance this budget. Let us start taking some of that money and allowing some personal investment for some of these young people.

Of course, with the magic of compound interest, that means the doubling of that money is going to happen more often. If we can wait until one more doubling, then we are going to have benefits that are far in excess of what we ever can expect to get out of Social Security.

This blue portion means that we are going to continue to have more tax revenues coming in than is required for Social Security benefits. So in my proposal, in the pilot program proposal, we are suggesting that we allow that certain group of individuals to have the option to start seeing the creation of wealth, the magic of compounding interest, and to prove to the world that the American people are pretty smart.

We have now had the experience of going out and shopping for a car or a home; the experience of investing our own 401(k) plans or our Thrift Savings Plans or the IRAs that we are allowed to invest. People are going to invest that money and they are going to talk, they are going to study. It is going to mean increased investments that is going to help our economy. It means that we are going to have a Social Security system that can last forever, because we are starting to wisely have a fixed investment portion rather than a fixed revenue portion.

Now, where do we go from here? Number one, I invite all of my colleagues to join me in sponsoring a bill to use some of those surpluses, quote-unquote surpluses that we are going to have this year, for personal investment for some of these young workers in our country. And then we are hopefully going to expand that to more and more workers.

Mr. Speaker, we always have the option of saying well, I want to stay with the old system. I do not want to privately invest. Let me give a couple of examples of what has happened in some counties in Texas. County government has the option that their employees can have other pension investment plans rather than Social Security. In Texas, some of those counties took that option and now the retirees of those counties are receiving many times more than their counterparts that are receiving Social Security benefits. The Social Security system, the way it is designed now, shortchanges everybody.

Let me tell particularly who it shortchanges. Those people who have a life span that is less than some other individuals' life span. What was called to my attention is that the average life span at birth for a black male is go 63 years old. That means that they paid all of their lives into Social Security, subsidizing those individuals that might live a longer time. If a person dies before they start collecting Social Security, then other than for some burial funds that might be available, they lose all of that money that they and their employer have ever put into Social Security. It is gone.

Whereas on the private investment, if they die at 30 years old, or 40 years old, or 50 years old, it becomes part of their estate. It is their property. It is their private retirement savings plan. I think there should be a ground swell of support from working men and women around this country that says: Look, quit gypping us, United States Congress and Mr. President, on what you are doing for Social Security. Quit saying that Social Security is first and let us really make Social Security first. Let us use some of these surpluses to start saving the Social Security system.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHIFF (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today through March 6, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week, on account of sitting for the State of Tennessee bar exam.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of business in the district.

Mr. KLINK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of business in the district.

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 ENGEL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FARR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SERRANO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes each day, on today and February 25.

Mr. LATOURETTE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, on February 25.

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, on February 25.

Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOLLUM, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. KINGSTON, 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. ENGEL) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. LANTOS.

Ms. SANCHEZ.

Mr. PASCRELL.

Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. FAZIO of California.

Mr. BOYD.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. KUCINICH.

Mr. SABO.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

Mr. VENTO.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. NEAL.
Ms. BROWN of Florida.
Mr. KLECZKA.
Ms. SLAUGHTER.
Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. DOYLE.
Mr. TIERNEY.
Mr. CARDIN.
Mr. KIND.
Mr. MCGOVERN.
Mr. GEJDENSON.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. MCINTOSH.
Mr. RADANOVICH.
Mr. BOEHNER.
Mr. MCHUGH.
Mr. CRANE.
Mr. TALENT.
Mr. SHUSTER.
Mr. PAPPAS.
Mr. DELAY.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado.
Mr. GILMAN.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. SHERMAN.
Ms. BROWN of Florida.
Mr. BOYD.
Mr. CRANE.
Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
Mr. VENTO.
Mr. CONYERS.
Mr. MCGOVERN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 25, 1998, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the second, third and fourth quarters of 1997, by various Committees of the House of Representatives, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, as well as a consolidated report of foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-authorized official travel in the fourth quarter of 1997 are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPTEMBER 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Mark Foley	6/13	6/16	Haiti	[3] 651.60		542.45					[3] 1,194.05
Sean Peterson	9/21	9/25	Hong Kong	607.08		4,372.45					4,979.53
Committee total				1,258.68		4,914.90					6,173.58

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Amended.

JIM LEACH, Chairman, Oct. 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Bob Smith	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502.75
Hon. Bob Smith	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		(3)		156.25		2,235.25
Hon. Bill Barrett	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502.75
Hon. Bill Barrett	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		(3)		156.25		2,235.00
Hon. Richard Pombo	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502.75
Hon. Richard Pombo	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		(3)		156.25		2,235.25
Hon. Tom Ewing	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502.75
Hon. Tom Ewing	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		(3)		156.25		2,757.25
Hon. Frank Lucas	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502.75
Hon. Frank Lucas	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		(3)		156.25		2,235.25
Hon. Sam Farr	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502.75
Hon. Sam Farr	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		[4] 493.00		156.25		2,728.25
Hon. Eva Clayton	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502.75
Hon. Eva Clayton	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		(3)		156.25		2,235.25
Hon. Gary Condit	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502.75
Hon. Gary Condit	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		(3)		156.25		2,235.25
Hon. John Boehner	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502.75
Hon. John Boehner	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		(3)		156.25		2,235.25
Hon. Collin Peterson	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502.75
Hon. Collin Peterson	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		(3)		156.25		2,235.25
Paul Unger	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502.75
Paul Unger	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		(3)		156.25		2,235.25
Andrew Baker	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502,75
Andrew Baker	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		(3)		156.25		2,235.25
Lynn Gallagher	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502.75
Lynn Gallagher	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		(3)		156.25		2,235.25
Bryce Quick	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502.75
Bryce Quick	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		(3)		156.25		2,235.25
Jason Vaillancourt	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502.75
Jason Vaillancourt	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		(3)		156.25		2,235.25
William O'Conner	12/2	12/7	New Zealand		1,346.50		(3)		156.25		1,502.75
William O'Conner	12/7	12/14	Australia		2,079.00		(3)		156.25		2,235.25
Committee total					54,808.00		1,015.00		5,000.00		60,823.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] Military air transportation except for amount stated.

BOB SMITH, Chairman, Jan. 29, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Jesse Jackson, Jr	10/2	10/4	Spain		350.00		(3)				350.00
	10/4	10/6	Italy		650.00		(3)				650.00
Gregory Wierzynski	12/1	12/5	England		1,650.00		591.90				2,241.90
Ellen Kuo	12/10	12/14	Switzerland		1,423.73		973.20				2,396.93
Hon. Maurice Hinchey	12/17	12/20	Denmark		816.75		6,469.00				7,285.75
Committee total					4,890.48		8,034.10				12,924.58

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

JIM LEACH, Chairman, Jan. 30, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Dennis Fitzgibbons	12/4	12/11	Japan		1,794.00		5,460.00				7,254.00
Sue Sheridan	10/26	10/31	Germany		1,150.00		1,177.90				2,327.90
Troy Timmons	10/26	11/01	Germany		1,338.00		1,129.90				2,467.00
Linda Dallas Rich	12/10	12/14	Switzerland		992.00		1,139.90				2,131.90
Robert Gordon	12/10	12/14	Switzerland		992.00		1,139.90				2,131.90
Catherine Van Way	12/3	12/13	Japan		2,691.00		5,460.00				8,151.00
Hon. Ron Klink	10/2	10/4	Spain		350.00		(3)				350.00
	10/4	10/6	Italy		650.00		(3)				650.00
Committee total					9,957.00		15,506.70				25,463.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

TOM BLILEY, Chairman, Jan. 30, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Gary Ackerman	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		532.00						532.00
	8/10	8/13	China		753.00						753.00
	8/13	8/14	Thailand		217.00						217.00
	8/14	8/18	India		1,424.00						1,424.00
	8/18	8/19	Jordan		251.00						251.00
	8/19	8/22	Israel		1,075.00						1,075.00
Commercial airfare							2,339.95				2,339.95
David Adams	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		532.00						532.00
	8/10	8/13	China		753.00						753.00
	8/13	8/14	Thailand		217.00						217.00
	8/14	8/18	India		1,424.00						1,424.00
	8/18	8/19	Jordan		251.00						251.00
	8/19	8/22	Israel		1,075.00						1,075.00
	8/25	8/27	Panama		258.00						258.00
	8/27	8/29	Guatemala		278.00						278.00
Commercial airfare							1,874.95				1,874.95
Hon. Cass Ballenger	8/1	8/3	Venezuela		[3] 73.00						73.00
	8/3	8/5	Colombia		[3] 271.90						271.90
	8/5	8/8	Nicaragua		[3] 66.50						66.50
	8/8	8/11	Costa Rica		[3] 210.00						210.00
Paul Berkowitz	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		532.00						532.00
	8/10	8/13	China		753.00						753.00
	8/13	8/18	India		1,651.00						1,651.00
	8/18	8/19	Jordan		251.00						251.00
	8/19	8/22	Israel		1,075.00						1,075.00
Commercial airfare							1,136.00				1,136.00
	9/18	9/22	Cook Islands		817.00						817.00
Commercial airfare							4,049.45				4,049.45
Deborah Bodlander	8/12	8/17	Israel		[3] 1,391.00						1,391.00
	8/17	8/19	Jordan		[3] 442.00						442.00
	8/19	8/22	Israel		936.00						936.00
Commercial airfare							2,444.00				2,444.00
Paul Bonicelli	8/1	8/3	Venezuela		289.00						289.00
	8/3	8/5	Colombia		[3] 544.00						544.00
	8/5	8/8	Nicaragua		[3] 550.50						550.50
Commercial airfare							640.95				640.95
Parker Brent	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		532.00						532.00
	8/10	8/13	China		753.00						753.00
	8/13	8/14	Thailand		217.00						217.00
	8/14	8/18	India		[3] 1,324.00						1,324.00
	8/18	8/19	Jordon		251.00						251.00
	8/19	8/22	Israel		1,075.00						1,075.00
Elana Broitman	6/27	7/2	Thailand		835.00						835.00
Commercial airfare							4,135.95				4,135.95
Peter Brookes	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		532.00						532.00
	8/10	8/13	China		753.00						753.00
	8/13	8/14	Thailand		217.00						217.00
	8/14	8/18	India		1,424.00						1,424.00
	8/18	8/19	Jordan		251.00						251.00
	8/19	8/22	Israel		1,075.00						1,075.00
Hon. Tom Campbell	9/5	9/8	Haiti		434.50						434.50
	9/18	9/21	Canada		[3] 443.56				324.00		767.56
Commercial airfare							1,038.60				1,038.60
Jodi Christiansen	8/1	8/3	Venezuela		[3] 239.00						239.00
	8/3	8/5	Colombia		[3] 546.00						546.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1997—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	8/5	8/8	Nicaragua		[3] 592.00						592.00
	8/8	8/11	Costa Rica		[3] 274.00						274.00
Hon. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		532.00						532.00
	8/10	8/13	China		753.00						753.00
	8/13	8/14	Thailand		217.00						217.00
	8/14	8/18	India		1,424.00						1,424.00
	8/18	8/19	Jordan		251.00						251.00
	8/19	8/22	Israel		1,075.00						1,075.00
	9/18	9/22	Cook Islands		650.00						650.00
Commerical airfare							3,344.49				3,344.49
Martin Gage	6/29	7/4	Russia		[3] 1,410.00						1,410.00
	7/4	7/4	Poland		[3] 88.00						88.00
Commercial airfare							2,831.70				2,831.70
	8/4	8/14	Russia		[3] 2,385.00						2,385.00
Commercial airfare							6,469.68				6,469.68
Richard Garon	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		532.00						532.00
	8/10	8/13	China		753.00						753.00
	8/13	8/14	Thailand		217.00						217.00
	8/14	8/18	India		[3] 1,184.00						1,184.00
	8/18	8/19	Jordan		251.00						251.00
	8/19	8/22	Israel		1,075.00						1,075.00
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		532.00						532.00
	8/10	8/13	China		753.00						753.00
	8/13	8/14	Thailand		217.00						217.00
	8/14	8/18	India		1,424.00						1,424.00
	8/18	8/19	Jordan		251.00				1,573.22		1,824.22
	8/19	8/22	Israel		1,075.00				5,287.00		6,362.00
Hon. Alcee Hastings	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		532.00						532.00
	8/10	8/13	China		753.00						753.00
	8/13	8/14	Thailand		217.00						217.00
	8/14	8/18	India		1,424.00						1,424.00
	8/18	8/19	Jordan		251.00						251.00
	8/19	8/22	Israel		1,075.00						1,075.00
	9/19	9/25	Uzbekistan		1,750.00						1,750.00
Commercial airfare							6,508.65				6,508.65
Hon. Earl Hilliard	6/30	7/2	Haiti		351.00						351.00
Commercial airfare							708.95				708.95
	8/1	8/3	Venezuela		150.00						150.00
	8/3	8/5	Colombia		579.00						579.00
	8/5	8/8	Nicaragua		186.50						186.50
	8/8	8/11	Costa Rica		300.00						300.00
Amos Hochstein	8/14	8/17	Japan		861.00						861.00
	8/18	8/19	China		[3] 352.00						352.00
	8/20	8/26	North Korea		1,778.00						1,778.00
	8/27	8/27	China		251.00						251.00
Commercial airfare							4,624.95				4,624.95
Mark Kirk	8/14	8/17	Japan		861.00						861.00
	8/18	8/19	China		502.00						502.00
	8/20	8/26	North Korea		1,778.00						1,778.00
	8/27	8/27	China		251.00						251.00
	8/28	8/30	South Korea		867.00						867.00
Commercial airfare							4,817.95				4,817.95
Clifford Kupchan	6/29	7/4	Russia		[3] 1,480.00						1,480.00
Commercial airfare							2,831.70				2,831.70
	8/4	8/14	Russia		2,435.00						2,435.00
Commercial airfare							6,469.68				6,469.68
John Mackey	6/29	7/4	Russia		1,500.00						1,500.00
Commercial airfare							4,285.35				4,285.35
	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		532.00						532.00
	8/10	8/13	China		753.00						753.00
	8/13	8/14	Thailand		217.00						217.00
	8/14	8/17	India		1,424.00						1,424.00
	8/19	8/23	Italy		1,072.00						1,072.00
Commercial airfare							1,958.65				1,958.65
Caleb McCarry	9/5	9/8	Haiti		[3] 291.50						291.50
Denis McDonough	6/29	7/1	Haiti		[3] 306.00						306.00
	7/1	7/7	Mexico		[3] 1,187.50						1,187.50
Commercial airfare							553.80				553.80
	8/25	8/27	Panama		258.00						258.00
	8/27	8/29	Guatemala		278.00						278.00
Commercial airfare							1,874.95				1,874.95
Hon. Robert Menendez	8/1	8/3	Venezuela		[3] 125.00						125.00
	8/3	8/5	Colombia		[3] 379.00						379.00
	8/5	8/8	Nicaragua		[3] 161.50						161.50
	8/8	8/11	Costa Rica		[3] 250.00						250.00
Vincent Morelli	8/25	8/27	Panama		258.00						258.00
	8/27	8/29	Guatemala		278.00						278.00
Commercial airfare							1,874.95				1,874.95
Lester Munson	8/21	8/23	Cameroon		386.00						386.00
	8/23	8/25	Chad		328.00						328.00
	8/25	8/26	Cameroon		149.00						149.00
	8/26	8/29	Nigeria		852.00						852.00
	8/29	8/30	Cote d'Ivoire		[3] 162.00						162.00
	8/30	8/30	Senegal		185.00						185.00
Commercial airfare							5,492.75				5,492.75
Roger Noriega	6/29	7/1	Haiti		351.00						351.00
	7/1	7/7	Mexico		1,587.50						1,587.50
Commercial airfare							553.80				553.80
Hon. Donald Payne	7/4	7/8	Kenya		570.00						570.00
Commercial airfare							6,085.65				6,085.65
Grover Joseph Rees	6/27	7/2	Thailand		835.00						835.00
Commercial airfare							4,135.95				4,135.95
	8/9	8/16	Kenya		[3] 1,400.00						1,400.00
	8/16	8/17	Sudan								
	8/17	8/19	Kenya								
Commercial airfare							6,797.55				6,797.55
Thomas Sheehy	8/24	8/29	Nigeria		[3] 808.82						808.82
	8/29	8/30	Cote d'Ivoire		[3] 324.00						324.00
Commercial airfare							4,592.95				4,592.95
Gregory Simpkins	8/24	8/29	Nigeria		[3] 808.82						808.82
	8/29	8/30	Cote d'Ivoire		[3] 324.00						324.00
Commercial airfare							4,592.95				4,592.95
Committee total					85,036.10		99,066.90		7,184.22		191,287.22

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Represents refund of unused per diem.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Jan. 16, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Sheila Jackson Lee	5/26	5/28	South Africa		501.00		([3])				501.00
	5/28	5/30	Angola		688.00						688.00
	5/30	6/2	Zimbabwe		701.00						701.00
Committee total					1,890.00						1,890.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HENRY J. HYDE, Chairman, Jan. 13, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Visit to United Kingdom, Italy, Hungary, Bosnia and Germany, October 10–16, 1997:											
Hon. Gene Taylor	10/10	10/11	United Kingdom								
	10/11	10/12	Italy		163.00						163.00
	10/12	10/14	Hungary		404.00						404.00
	10/14	10/14	Bosnia								
	10/14	10/16	Germany		441.00						441.00
Commercial airfare							4,111.10				4,111.10
Dudley L. Tademy	10/10	10/11	United Kingdom								
	10/11	10/12	Italy		163.00						163.00
	10/12	10/14	Hungary		404.00						404.00
	10/14	10/14	Bosnia								
	10/14	10/16	Germany		441.00						441.00
Commercial airfare							4,111.10				4,111.10
Visit to Russia, October 12–16, 1997:											
Hon. Sonny Bono	10/12	10/16	Russia		1,400.00						1,400.00
Commercial airfare							6,924.20				6,924.20
Visit to Ukraine and Russia, October 14–19, 1997:											
Hon. Mac Thornberry	10/14	10/15	Ukraine		285.00						285.00
	10/15	10/19	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Commercial airfare							3,905.00				3,905.00
Hon. Vic Snyder	10/14	10/15	Ukraine		285.00						285.00
	10/15	10/19	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Commercial airfare							4,711.00				4,711.00
Visit to Turkey, Azerbaijan, Kazakstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Norway, November 15–25, 1997:											
Hon. Floyd D. Spence	11/15	11/17	Turkey		516.00						516.00
	11/17	11/19	Azerbaijan		645.00						645.00
	11/19	11/21	Kazakstan		606.00						606.00
	11/21	11/23	Uzbekistan		688.00						688.00
	11/23	11/24	Turkmenistan		241.00						241.00
	11/24	11/25	Norway		304.00						304.00
Visit to Russia, November 16–19, 1997:											
Hon. Curt Weldon	11/16	11/19	Russia		1,050.00						1,050.00
Commercial airfare							5,388.40				5,388.40
Visit to Japan, November 18–22, 1997:											
Hon. Norman Sisisky	11/18	11/22	Japan		796.35				6.00		802.35
Commercial airfare							7,876.77				7,876.77
Committee total					11,592.35		37,027.57		6.00		48,625.92

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD SPENCE, Chairman, Jan. 30, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Lloyd Jones	10/12	10/17	Turkey		1,250.00		5,344.54		350.00		6,944.54
William Simmons	10/12	10/17	Turkey		1,250.00		5,344.54		350.00		6,944.54
Jeffrey Petrich	10/12	10/17	Turkey		1,250.00		5,899.54		350.00		7,499.54
Bonnie Bruce	11/15	11/22	Spain		1,296.00		703.60				1,999.60
Jean Flemma	11/15	11/22	Spain		1,296.00		703.80				1,999.80
Daniel Weiss	12/05	12/11	Japan		1,494.00		5,454.00		300.00		7,248.00
Committee total					7,836.00		23,450.02		1,350.00		32,636.02

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Jan. 26, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 14 AND NOV. 25, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Gerald B.H. Solomon	11/15	11/17	Turkey		516.00						516.00
	11/17	11/19	Azerbaijan		645.00						645.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 14 AND NOV. 25, 1997—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	11/19	11/21	Kazakstan		606.00						606.00
	11/21	11/23	Uzbekistan		688.00						688.00
	11/23	11/24	Turkmenistan		241.00						241.00
	11/24	11/25	Norway		304.00						304.00
Bryan H. Roth	11/15	11/17	Turkey		516.00						516.00
	11/17	11/19	Azberbaijan		645.00						645.00
	11/19	11/21	Kazakstan		606.00						606.00
	11/21	11/23	Uzbekistan		688.00						688.00
	11/23	11/24	Turkmenistan		241.00						241.00
	11/24	11/25	Norway		304.00						304.00
Jim Dornan	11/15	11/17	Turkey		516.00						516.00
	11/17	11/18	Azerbaijan		322.00						322.00
David Hobbs	11/15	11/17	Turkey		516.00						516.00
	11/17	11/19	Azerbajian		645.00						645.00
	11/19	11/21	Kazakstan		606.00						606.00
	11/21	11/23	Uzbekistan		688.00						688.00
	11/23	11/24	Turkmenistan		241.00						241.00
	11/24	11/25	Norway		304.00						304.00
Scott Palmer	11/15	11/17	Turkey		516.00						516.00
	11/17	11/19	Azerbaijan		645.00						645.00
	11/19	11/21	Kazakstan		606.00						606.00
	11/21	11/23	Uzbekistan		688.00						688.00
	11/23	11/24	Turkmenistan		241.00						241.00
	11/24	11/25	Norway		304.00						304.00
Al Santoli	11/15	11/17	Turkey		516.00						516.00
	11/17	11/19	Azerbaijan		645.00						645.00
	11/19	11/21	Kazakstan		606.00						606.00
	11/21	11/23	Uzbekistan		688.00						688.00
	11/23	11/24	Turkmenistan		241.00						241.00
	11/24	11/25	Norway		304.00						304.00
Hon. Tony Hall (OH)	10/11	10/13	Japan		387.00						387.00
	10/14	10/17	DPRK		510.00						510.00
							(3)				
									879.00		879.00
Committee total					16,735.00				879.00		17,614.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

JERRY B.H. SOLOMON, Chairman, Jan. 5, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. AND DEC. 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Michael Rodemeyer	10/25	11/1	Germany		1,338.00		692.10				2,030.10
Harlan Watson	10/25	11/1	Germany		1,338.00		830.10				2,168.10
Todd Schultz	12/5	12/11	Japan		5,460.00		1,794.00				7,254.00
Bill Smith	12/5	12/11	Japan		4,345.00		1,794.00				6,139.00
Harlan Watson	11/29	12/12	Japan		4,924.00		4,186.00				9,110.00
Committee total					17,405.00		9,296.20				26,701.20

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr., Chairman, Dec. 22, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 17 AND NOV. 25, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Ziad Ojakli	11/18	11/19	Israel		624.00						624.00
	11/19	11/20	Kuwait	69,070	231.00					69,070	231.00
	11/20	11/21	Bahrain	139,075	369.00					139,075	369.00
	11/23	11/24	Turkey		258.00						258.00
	11/24	11/27	Greece	757,952	215.00					757,952	215.00
Committee total					1,697.00						1,697.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JIM TALENT, Chairman, Jan. 27, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Sam Johnson	11/15	11/17	Turkey		516.00		(3)				516.00
	11/17	11/19	Azerbaijan		645.00						645.00
	11/19	11/21	Kazakstan		606.00						606.00
	11/21	11/23	Uzbekistan		688.00						688.00
	11/23	11/24	Turkmenistan		241.00						241.00
	11/24	11/25	Norway		304.00						304.00
Angela Ellard	12/8	12/9	France		299.00						299.00
	12/9	12/13	Switzerland		1,218.72						1,218.72
Commercial airfare							4,150.90				4,150.90

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1997—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Committee total					4,517.72		4,150.90				8,668.62

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

BILL ARCHER, Chairman, Jan. 16, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Diane Roark	6/18	7/3	Europe		2,025.00						2,025.00
Commercial airfare							4,980.85				4,980.85
L. Christine Healey	6/30	7/6	Europe		1,240.00						1,240.00
Commercial airfare							4,153.15				4,153.15
Hon. Porter J. Goss	8/6	8/15	Asia		2,415.00						2,415.00
Hon. Bill McCollum	8/6	8/15	Asia		2,415.00						2,415.00
Hon. Charles F. Bass	8/6	8/15	Asia		2,415.00						2,415.00
Hon. Jim Gibbons	8/6	8/15	Asia		2,415.00						2,415.00
Hon. Sanford D. Bishop	8/6	8/15	Asia		2,415.00						2,415.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	8/8	8/14	Asia		1,624.00						1,624.00
Commercial airfare							5,262.75				5,262.75
Hon. Jane Harman	8/8	8/14	Asia		1,624.00						1,624.00
Commercial airfare							3,500.95				3,500.95
John Millis	8/6	8/15	Asia		2,415.00						2,415.00
Tom Newcomb	8/6	8/15	Asia		2,415.00						2,415.00
Wendy Selig	8/6	8/15	Asia		2,415.00						2,415.00
Calvin Humphrey	8/6	8/15	Asia		2,415.00						2,415.00
L. Christine Healey	8/7	8/15	Asia		2,164.00						2,164.00
Commercial airfare							2,024.00				2,024.00
Patrick Murray	8/6	8/15	Asia		2,415.00						2,415.00
Commercial airfare							1,790.00				1,790.00
Brett O'Brien	8/13	8/19	South America		1,467.00						1,467.00
Commercial airfare							3,532.95				3,532.95
Catherine Eberwein	8/17	8/26	Europe		1,890.00		34.00				1,924.00
Commercial airfare							3,215.09				3,215.09
Michael W. Sheehy	8/18	8/20	North America		400.00						400.00
Commercial airfare							1,080.70				1,080.70
Michael Meermans	8/18	8/20	North America		400.00						400.00
Commercial airfare							1,080.70				1,080.70
Committee total					36,984.00		30,655.14				65,615.14

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

PORTER J. GOSS.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO AFRICA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 21 AND AUG. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Jim Kolbe	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(3)				
Hon. Bernard Sanders	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(3)				
Hon. William Jefferson	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(3)				
Hon. Scott Klug	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(3)				
Hon. Jim Greenwood	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(3)				
Hon. Steve Chabot	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(3)				
Hon. Melvin Watt	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(3)				
Hon. Karen Thurman	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(3)				
Everett Eissenstat	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(3)				
Ron Lasch	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(3)				
Meredith Broadbent	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(3)				
Hon. Jim Kolbe	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(3)				
Hon. Bernard Sanders	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(3)				
Hon. William Jefferson	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(3)				
Hon. Scott Klug	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(3)				
Hon. Jim Greenwood	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(3)				
Hon. Steve Chabot	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(3)				
Hon. Melvin Watt	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(3)				
Hon. Karen Thurman	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(3)				
Everett Eissenstat	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(3)				
Ron Lasch	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(3)				
Meredith Broadbent	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(3)				
Hon. Jim Kolbe	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(3)				
Hon. Bernard Sanders	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(3)				
Hon. William Jefferson	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(3)				
Hon. Scott Klug	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(3)				
Hon. Jim Greenwood	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(3)				
Hon. Steve Chabot	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(3)				
Hon. Melvin Watt	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(3)				
Hon. Karen Thurman	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(3)				
Everett Eissenstat	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(3)				
Ron Lasch	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(3)				
Meredith Broadbent	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(3)				
Hon. Jim Kolbe	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		468.00		(3)				
Hon. Bernard Sanders	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		468.00		(3)				
Hon. William Jefferson	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		468.00		(3)				
Hon. Scott Klug	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		468.00		(3)				
Hon. Jim Greenwood	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		468.00		(3)				
Hon. Steve Chabot	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		468.00		(3)				
Hon. Melvin Watt	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		468.00		(3)				
Hon. Karen Thurman	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		468.00		(3)				
Everett Eissenstat	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		468.00		(3)				

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO AFRICA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 21 AND AUG. 31, 1997—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Ron Lasch	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		468.00		(3)				
Meredith Broadbent	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		468.00		(3)				
Hon. Jim Kolbe	8/28	8/29	Zimbabwe		223.00		(3)				
Hon. Bernard Sanders	8/28	8/29	Zimbabwe		223.00		(3)				
Hon. William Jefferson	8/28	8/29	Zimbabwe		223.00		(3)				
Hon. Scott Klug	8/28	8/29	Zimbabwe		223.00		(3)				
Hon. Jim Greenwood	8/28	8/29	Zimbabwe		223.00		(3)				
Hon. Steve Chabot	8/28	8/29	Zimbabwe		223.00		(3)				
Hon. Melvin Watt	8/28	8/29	Zimbabwe		223.00		(3)				
Hon. Karen Thurman	8/28	8/29	Zimbabwe		223.00		(3)				
Everett Eissenstat	8/28	8/29	Zimbabwe		223.00		(3)				
Ron Lasch	8/28	8/29	Zimbabwe		223.00		(3)				
Meredith Broadbent	8/28	8/29	Zimbabwe		223.00		(3)				
Hon. Jim Kolbe	8/29	8/31	Uganda		546.00		(3)				
Hon. Bernard Sanders	8/29	8/31	Uganda		546.00		(3)				
Hon. William Jefferson	8/29	8/31	Uganda		546.00		(3)				
Hon. Scott Klug	8/29	8/31	Uganda		546.00		(3)				
Hon. Jim Greenwood	8/29	8/31	Uganda		546.00		(3)				
Hon. Steve Chabot	8/29	8/31	Uganda		546.00		(3)				
Hon. Melvin Watt	8/29	8/31	Uganda		546.00		(3)				
Hon. Karen Thurman	8/29	8/31	Uganda		546.00		(3)				
Everett Eissenstat	8/29	8/31	Uganda		546.00		(3)				
Ron Lasch	8/29	8/31	Uganda		546.00		(3)				
Meredith Broadbent	8/29	8/31	Uganda		546.00		(3)				
Committee total					26,180.00						

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

JIM KOLBE, Sept. 29, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, AUSTRIA, BOSNIA, FRANCE, UNITED KINGDOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 30 AND SEPT. 11, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Gardner G. Peckham	9/1	9/1	Germany		200.00						200.00
	9/1	9/2	Austria	2,814.32	221.00						221.00
	9/2	9/7	Bosnia		1,755.00						1,755.00
	9/7	9/9	France	3,432.80	560.00						560.00
	9/9	9/11	United Kingdom	436.30	692.00						692.00
Commercial airfare							2,322.05				2,322.05
					[3] −475.00						−475.00
Charles G. Boyd	9/1	9/1	Germany		200.00						200.00
	9/1	9/2	Austria	2,814.32	221.00						221.00
	9/2	9/7	Bosnia		1,755.00						1,755.00
	9/7	9/9	France	3,432.80	560.00						560.00
	9/9	9/11	United Kingdom	436.30	692.00						692.00
Commercial airfare							2,322.05				2,322.05
Committee total					6,381.00		4,644.10				11,025.10

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Excess per diem; returned to the U.S. Treasury.

GARDNER G. PECKHAM, Sept. 29, 1997.
CHARLES G. BOYD, Nov. 23, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO OSLO, NORWAY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 6 AND SEPT. 8, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Jack Quinn	9/6	9/8	Norway		224.00		1,497.65				1,721.65
Dan Skopec	9/6	9/8	Norway		224.00		1,497.65				1,721.65
Committee total					448.00		2,995.00				3,443.30

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JACK QUINN.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO INDIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 12 AND SEPT. 15, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Christopher Cox	9/12	9/15	India		575.00						575.00
Hon. Jon D. Fox	9/12	9/15	India		575.00						575.00
Hon. Sue Myrick	9/12	9/15	India		575.00						575.00
Hon. Michael R. McNulty	9/12	9/15	India		575.00						575.00
Hon. Frank Pallone	9/12	9/15	India		575.00						575.00
Hon. Sherrod Brown	9/12	9/15	India		575.00						575.00
J. Dean McGrath	9/12	9/15	India		575.00						575.00
Committee total					4,025.00						4,025.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRIS COX, Oct. 8, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY VISIT TO BUCHAREST, ROMANIA AND LISBON, PORTUGAL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 9 AND OCT. 17, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Doug Bereuter	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Hon. Gerald Solomon	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Hon. Tom Bliley	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Hon. Ralph Regula	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Hon. Herb Bateman	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Hon. Marge Roukema	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Hon. Mike Bilirakis	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Hon. Porter Goss	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,230.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		680.00						1,910.00
Hon. Paul Gilmor	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Hon. Joel Hefley	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Hon. Dennis Hastert	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		512.00						1,892.00
Hon. Scott McInnis	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Hon. Vern Ehlers	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Susan Olson	10/19	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00		2,609.60				4,757.60
Jo Weber	10/9	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00		2,609.60				4,757.60
Michael Ennis	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Bill Cox	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Ronald Dasch	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00		2,609.60				4,757.60
Linda Pedigo	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Robin Evans	10/9	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00		2,609.60				4,757.60
Scott Palmer	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
Bob King	10/10	10/14	Romania		1,380.00						
	10/14	10/17	Portugal		768.00						2,148.00
John Walker Robert	10/10	10/13	Romania		1,035.00		1,035.00				
Total					49,945.00		10,438.40				60,383.40

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOUG BEREUTER, Nov. 20, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO UKRAINE AND RUSSIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 13 AND OCT. 19, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Jeffrey Clay Sell	14/10	15/10	Ukraine		285.00						
	15/10	19/10	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Commercial airfare							3,652.00				3,652.00
Committee total					1,665.00		3,652.00				5,317.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JEFFREY CLAY SELL, Nov. 18, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO IRELAND, SCOTLAND, ENGLAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 16 AND NOV. 23, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		196.00						196.00
Hon. James Walsh	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		196.00						196.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
Hon. Jennifer Dunn	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
Hon. Clifford Stearns	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
Hon. Michael McNulty	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
Hon. Richard Neal	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
Hon. Thomas Ewing	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00		2,066.33				3,178.33
Hon. James Moran	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO IRELAND, SCOTLAND, ENGLAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 16 AND NOV. 23, 1997—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
Hon. Peter King	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
Hon. Martin Meehan	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
Hon. Matt Salmon	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
Hon. Michael Doyle	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
John Mackey	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
Lester Munson	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
Allison Kiernan	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
James O'Connor		11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
John Feehery	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
		11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
Marti Thomas	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
Daniel Turton	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
William Tranghese	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
John Simmons	11/16	11/20	Ireland		1,112.00						1,112.00
	11/20	11/22	Scotland		688.00						688.00
	11/22	11/23	England		335.00						335.00
Committee total					42,158.00		2,066.33				44,224.33

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMES T. WALSH, Dec. 22, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO OTTAWA, CANADA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 2 AND DEC. 3, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Lane Evans	12/2	12/3	Canada	279.48	234.31		853.58			279.48	1,087.89
Tom O'Donnell	12/2	12/3	Canada	279.48	234.31		470.04			279.48	704.35
Hon. Jack Quinn	12/2	12/3	Canada	106.40	79.50		470.04				549.54
Dan Skopec	12/2	12/3	Canada	279.48	209.25		470.04				679.29
Committee total					757.37		2,263.70				3,021.07

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

LANE EVANS, Dec. 23, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO KYOTO, JAPAN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 5 AND DEC. 12, 1977

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner	12/5	12/11	Japan		1,794.00		5,460.00				7,254.00
Hon. Ralph Regula	12/5	12/11	Japan		1,794.00		5,373.00				7,167.00
Hon. Dan Schaefer	12/5	12/11	Japan		1,794.00		5,232.00				7,026.00
Hon. Joe Barton	12/6	12/10	Japan		1,495.00		5,567.00				7,062.00
Hon. Dennis Hastert	12/7	12/11	Japan		1,495.00		5,579.00				7.074.00
Hon. Ken Calvert	12/5	12/10	Japan		1,495.00		4,171.00				5,666.00
Hon. Joe Knollenberg	12/5	12/10	Japan		1,495.00		5,286.00				6,781.00
Hon. Jo Ann Emerson	12/5	12/11	Japan		1,794.00		5,454.00				7,248.00
Hon. John Dingell	12/7	12/11	Japan		1,196.00		5,286.00				6,482.00
Hon. George E. Brown	12/5	12/11	Japan		1,794.00		4,171.00				5,965.00
Hon. George Miller	12/5	12/11	Japan		1,794.00		4,171.00				5,965.00
Hon. Henry Waxman	12/5	12/11	Japan		1,794.00		4,171.00				5,965.00
Hon. Ron Klink	12/5	12/10	Japan		1,495.00		5,456.00				6,951.00
Hon. Karen McCarthy	12/5	12/11	Japan		1,794.00		5,284.00				7,078.00
Rob Hood	12/5	12/11	Japan		1,794.00		4,845.00				6,639.00
Andrew Weinstein	12/3	12/11	Japan		2,392.00		4,460.00				7,852.00
Jim Hawley	12/5	12/12	Japan		1,794.00		4,256.00				6,050.00
Committee total					29,003.00		85,222.00				114,225.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Dec. 22, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO HONG KONG, MACAU, SHENZHEN AND BEIJING, CHINA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 13 AND DEC. 20, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Doug Bereuter	12/13	12/17	Hong Kong, Macau		1,472.00						1,472.00
	12/17	12/20	China		671.00						671.00
Hon. Alcee Hastings	12/13	12/17	Hong Kong, Macau		1,422.00						1,422.00
	12/17	12/20	China		621.00						621.00
Hon. Donald Manzullo	12/13	12/17	Hong Kong, Macau		1,052.00						1,052.00
	12/17	12/20	China		362.00						362.00
Gardner Peckham	12/13	12/17	Hong Kong, Macau		1,477.00						1,477.00
	12/17	12/20	China		676.00						676.00
Richard Kessler	12/13	12/17	Hong Kong, Macau		1,477.00						1,477.00
	12/17	12/20	China		676.00						676.00
Daniel Martz	12/13	12/17	Hong Kong, Macau		1,492.00						1,492.00
	12/17	12/20	China		691.00						691.00
Total					12,089.00						12,089.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOUGLAS BEREUTER, Chairman, Feb. 5, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO SPAIN AND ITALY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND OCT 6, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Judith Wolverton	10/2	10/4	Spain		350.00						350.00
	10/4	10/6	Italy		650.00						650.00
Committee total					1,000.00						1,000.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JUDITH WOLVERTON, Oct. 8, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO GERMANY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 14 AND DEC. 17, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Mac Collins	12/14	12/17	Germany [3]		400.00		4,966.80				5,366.80
Committee total					400.00		4,966.80				5,366.80

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Includes day trip to Bosnia.

MAC COLLINS.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO ASIA PACIFIC PARLIAMENTARY FORUM, SEOUL, KOREA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 5 AND JAN. 10, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Robert Van Wicklin	1/6	1/10	Korea	1,545,840	912.00		4,180.00			1,545,840	5,092.00
Committee total					912.00		4,180.00				5,092.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ROBERT VAN WICKLIN, Feb. 10, 1998.

NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO REGULATIONS

U.S. CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,
Washington, DC, February 9, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 303 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, 2 U.S.C. §1383, I am transmitting the enclosed Notice of Adoption of Amendments (amending procedural rules previously adopted) for publication in the Congressional Record.

The Congressional Accountability Act specifies that the enclosed notices be published on the first day on which both Houses are in session following this transmittal.

Sincerely yours,

RICKY SILBERMAN,
Executive Director.

Enclosure.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995: Amendments to Procedural Rules.

NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS

Summary: The Executive Director of the Office of Compliance (''Office''), with the approval of the Board of Directors (''Board''), having considered comments received in response to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (''NPRM'') published on October 1, 1997, 143 Cong. Rec. S10291 (daily ed. Oct. 1, 1997), has amended the Procedural Rules of the Office of Compliance to cover the General Accounting Office (''GAO'') and the Library of Congress (''Library'') and their employees under the rules governing: *(1)* proceedings involving Occupational Safety and Health inspections, citations, and variances under section 215 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (''CAA''), and *(2) ex parte* communications.

The NPRM also proposed to extend the Procedural Rules to cover GAO and the Library and their employees for purposes of processing allegations of violation of sections 204–206 of the CAA, which apply rights and protections of the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988 (''EPPA''), the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (''WARN Act''), and the Uniformed Services

Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (''USERRA''), and of section 207 of the CAA, which prohibits employing offices from intimidating or taking reprisal against covered employees for exercising rights under the CAA. However, by a recently published Supplementary Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 143 Cong. Rec. S86 (daily ed. Jan. 28, 1998), the Office is requesting further comment on whether the Procedural Rules should be extended to cover GAO and the Library with respect to alleged violations of sections 204–207, and no final action will be taken on this question until the comments have been received and considered.

Availability of comments for public review: Copies of comments received by the Office in response to the NPRM are available for public review at the Law Library Reading Room, Room LM–201, Law Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, Washington, D.C., Monday through Friday, between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.

For further information contact: Executive Director, Office of Compliance, at (202) 724–9250 (voice), (202) 426–1912 (TTY). This notice will also be made available in large print or braille or on computer disk upon request to the Office of Compliance.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (''CAA'' or the ''Act''), Pub. L. 104–1, 2 U.S.C. §§ 1301–1438, applies the rights and protections of eleven labor, employment, and public access laws to certain defined ''covered employees'' and ''employing offices'' in the Legislative Branch. The CAA expressly includes GAO and the Library and their employees within the definitions of ''covered employees'' and ''employing offices'' for purposes of four sections of the Act: *(a)* section 204, making applicable the rights and protections of the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988 (''EPPA''); *(b)* section 205, making applicable the rights and protections of the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (''WARN Act''); *(c)* section 206, making applicable the rights and protections of section 2 of the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (''USERRA''); and *(d)* section 215, making applicable the rights and protections of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (''OSHAct''). These four sections go into effect by their own terms with respect to GAO and the Library one year after transmission to Congress of the study under section 230 of the CAA. The study was transmitted to Congress on December 30, 1996, and sections 204–206 and 215 therefore went into effect at GAO and the Library on December 30, 1997.

The purpose of the NPRM was to extend the Procedural Rules of the Office to cover GAO and the Library and their employees for purposes of any proceedings in which GAO or the Library or their employees may be involved. To accomplish this, the NPRM proposed to cover GAO and the Library and their employees in four respects: *(1)* Sections 401–408 of the CAA establish administrative and judicial procedures for considering alleged violations of part A of Title II of the CAA, which includes sections 204–206, and the NPRM proposed to extend the Procedural Rules to include GAO and the Library and their employees for the purpose of resolving any allegation of a violation of sections 204–206. *(2)* Section 207 prohibits employing offices from intimidating or taking reprisal against any covered employee for exercising rights under the CAA, and the NPRM proposed to extend the Procedural Rules to include GAO and the Library and their employees for the purpose of resolving any allegation of intimidation or reprisal prohibited under section 207. *(3)* Section 215 specifies the procedures by which the Office conducts inspections, issues citations, grants variances, and otherwise enforces section 215, and the NPRM proposed to extend the Procedural Rules to cover GAO and the Library and their employees for purposes of proceedings involving section 215. *(4)* Section 9.04 of the Procedural Rules governs *ex parte* communications, and the NPRM proposed to extend the Procedural Rules to cover these instrumentalities and employees for purposes of section 9.04.

In the only comment received in response to the NPRM, the library argued that ''Congress expressly excluded the Library and other instrumentalities of Congress from the application of Titles I, III, IV and V of the CAA,'' which include the administrative and judicial procedures established in sections 401–408. (The Office of Compliance has made the Library's entire submission available for public review in the Law Library Reading Room of the Law Library of Congress, at the address and times stated at the beginning of this Notice.) As to whether GAO and the Library and their employees are covered by the procedures mandated by sections 401–408 when a violation of sections 204–207 is alleged, the Library's comments raise issues of statutory construction upon which the Office seeks further comment. To solicit such comments, the Office recently published a Supplementary Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 143 Cong. Rec. S86 (daily ed. Jan. 28, 1998), and will make no decision as to whether the Procedural Rules will be amended to cover GAO and the Library and their employees for purposes of resolving allegations of violations of sections 204–207 until after the comments are received and considered.

The issues of statutory construction raised by the Library's comments are not pertinent, however, to proceedings under section 215 and to rules regarding *ex parte* communications. The procedures under section 215 expressly cover GAO and the Library and their employees because section 215(a)(2)(C)–(D) explicitly includes these instrumentalities and employees within the definitions of ''employing office'' and ''covered employee'' for purposes of applying the OSHAct ''under this section [215].'' As to *ex parte* communications, section 9.04 of the Procedural Rules includes within its coverage any covered employee and employing office ''who is or may reasonably be expected to be involved in a proceeding or rulemaking.'' The CAA explicitly authorizes GAO and the Library and their employees to be involved in proceedings under section 215(c), as described above, and the Library itself has exercised its right to be involved in the Office's rulemaking proceedings.

The Library further notes that the substantive regulations adopted by the Board to implement section 215 have not yet been approved by the House and Senate pursuant to section 304 of the CAA and argues: ''Since all OSHA regulations must follow the procedures for adopting substantive rules under section 304 of the Act, including approval by Congress, it would seem more appropriate to delete the reference to the coverage of the Library for purposes of section 215 of the CAA, in order to avoid confusion over the effect of possible Congressional approval of these proposed rules but not the underlying provisions applying to OSHA procedures.'' However, the Library's assumption that ''all OSHA regulations,'' including provisions of the Procedural Rules describing the Office's procedures under section 215, are subject to Congressional approval is incorrect. Congressional approval under section 304 is required only for the regulations adopted by the Board under section 215(d) of the CAA, which must generally be the same as the substantive regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor to implement section 5 of the OSHAct. The Board adopted such regulations for employing offices other than GAO and the Library and submitted the regulations to Congress for approval under section 304, *see* 143 Cong. Rec. S61 (daily ed. Jan. 7, 1997), and recently amended those regulations to cover GAO and the Library and submitted the amendments to Congress for approval, *see* 143 Cong. Rec. S11663 (daily ed. Nov. 4, 1997). However, the Procedural Rules, including provisions describing the Office's procedures under section 215 of the CAA, were adopted under section 303 of the CAA, which authorizes the Executive Director, subject to the approval of the Board, to adopt rules governing the procedures of the Office. *See* 143 Cong. Rec. H1879, H1879–90 (daily ed. Apr. 24, 1997). The amendments in this Notice are likewise adopted under section 303, so the Library's expressed concern is unfounded.

Finally, although no comments were received regarding the specific language of the proposed amendments to the rules, the final adopted rules differ slightly from the text of the proposed amendments. The preamble to the NPRM explained that the purpose of the rulemaking was to cover GAO and the Library and their employees ''for purposes of any proceedings in which GAO and the Library or their employees may be involved as employing offices or covered employees,'' and, with respect to section 215, the preamble stated that GAO and the Library would be covered ''for the purposes of proceedings involving section[] . . . 215 of the CAA . . . .'' 143 Cong. Rec. S10291, S10292 col. 1 (daily ed. Oct. 1, 1997). However, the proposed rules in the NPRM described specific kinds of proceedings under section 215, *i.e.*, enforcement of inspection and citation provisions of the CAA and the granting of variances, and stated that GAO and the Library would be covered for purposes of those specific proceedings. *Id.* at S10292 col. 2. To avoid any confusion, the final rules have been simplified and revised to make clear that they cover GAO and the Library for purposes of ''[a]ny proceeding under section 215.'' Section 102(q)(1) of the Procedural Rules, as amended by this Notice.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on this 9th day of February, 1998.

RICKY SILBERMAN,
Executive Director,
Office of Compliance.

The Executive Director of the Office of Compliance hereby amends section 1.02 of the Procedural Rules of the Office of Compliance by revising paragraphs (b) and (h) and by adding at the end of the section a new paragraph (q) to read as follows:

§ 1.02 Definitions.

''Except as otherwise specifically provided in these rules, for purposes of this Part:

* * * * *

''(b) *Covered employee.* The term 'covered employee' means any employee of

''(1) the House of Representatives;

''(2) the Senate;

''(3) the Capitol Guide Service;

''(4) the Capitol Police;

''(5) the Congressional Budget Office;

''(6) the Office of the Architect of the Capitol;

''(7) the Office of the Attending Physician;

''(8) the Office of Compliance; or

''(9) for the purposes stated in paragraph (q) of this section, the General Accounting Office or the Library of Congress.

* * * * *

''(h) *Employing Office.* The term 'employing office' means:

''(1) the personal office of a Member of the House of Representatives or a Senator;

''(2) a committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate or a joint committee;

''(3) any other office headed by a person with the final authority to appoint, hire, discharge, and set the terms, conditions, or privileges of the employment of an employee of the House of Representatives or the Senate;

''(4) the Capitol Guide Board, the Capitol Police Board, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Office of the Attending Physician, and the Office of Compliance; or

''(5) for the purposes stated in paragraph (q) of this section, the General Accounting Office and the Library of Congress.

* * * * *

''(q) *Coverage of the General Accounting Office and the Library of Congress and their Employees.* The term 'employing office' shall include the General Accounting Office and the Library of Congress, and the term 'covered employee' shall include employees of the General Accounting Office and the Library of Congress, for purposes of the proceedings and rulemakings described in subparagraphs (1) and (2):

''(1) Any proceeding under section 215 of the Act. Section 215 of the Act applies to covered employees and employing offices certain rights and protections of the Williams-Steiger Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.

''(2) Any proceeding or rulemaking, for purposes of section 9.04 of these rules.''

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7268. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Peanuts Marketed in the United States; Relaxation of Handling Regulations [Docket Nos. FV97–997–1 IFR and FV97–998–1 IFR] received February 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7269. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Bureau of Land Management, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Federal Timber Contract Payment Modification [WO–330–1030–02–24 1A] (RIN: 1004–AC69) received January 12, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7270. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Distribution of Risk Disclosure Statements By Futures Commission Merchants and Introducing Brokers [17 CFR Parts 1, 30, 33, and 190] received February 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7271. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Bifenthrin; Pesticide Tolerance; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5959–6] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7272. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Thiodicarb; Pesticides Tolerance [OPP–300541; FRL–5739–7] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7273. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bifenthrin; Pesticide Tolerance [PP 5F4485/R2232; FRL–5364–3] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7274. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bensulfuron Methyl (methyl-2[[[[[(4,6-dimethoxypyrimidin-2-yl) amino] carbonyl] amino] sulfonyl] methyl] Benzoate; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300603; FRL–5766–4] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7275. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Kaolin; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP–300614; FRL–5769–9] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7276. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Vinclozolin; Revocation of Certain Tolerances [OPP–300540A; FRL–5769–2] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 12, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7277. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Benoxacor; Pesticide Tolerances [OPP–300617; FRL–5771–1] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 12, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7278. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Lambda-cyhalothrin; Pesticide Tolerances [OPP–300608; FRL–5767–7] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 12, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7279. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Flammability Labeling Requirements for Total Release Fogger Pesticides [OPP–36189; FRL–5748–7] (RIN: 2070–AC60) received February 19, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7280. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule—Norflurazon; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300615; FRL–5770–8] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 19, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7281. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Thiabendazole; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300607; FRL–5767–6] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7282. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Special Combinations for Tobacco Allotments and Quotas (RIN: 0560–AE13) received February 19, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7283. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his requests for emergency and nonemergency FY 1998 appropriations for the Departments of Agriculture, Energy, the Interior, and the Treasury; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and, the National Transportation Safety Board, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107; (H. Doc. No. 105—216); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7284. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report of 24 proposed rescissions of budgetary resources, totaling $20 million, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 683(a)(1); (H. Doc. No. 105—215); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7285. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting the annual report detailing test and evaluation activities of the Foreign Comparative Testing Program during FY 1997, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2350a(g); to the Committee on National Security.

7286. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting the fiscal year 1997 annual report on operations of the National Defense Stockpile, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98h—5; to the Committee on National Security.

7287. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Restructuring Costs [DFARS Case 97–D313] received February 11, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

7288. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting a plan or directive that sets forth the specific procedures for the conduct of competitions among private and public sector entities for such depot-level maintenance and repair workloads, pursuant to Public Law 105—85, section 359(b); to the Committee on National Security.

7289. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting a report identifying the percentage of funds that were expanded during the preceding fiscal year for performance of depot-level maintenance and repair workloads by the public and private sectors, pursuant to Public Law 105—85, section 358; to the Committee on National Security.

7290. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting a report describing the proposed allocation of certain depot-level maintenance and repair workloads that were performed at the closed or realigned installations as of July 1, 1995, pursuant to Public Law 105—85, section 359(b) and (c); to the Committee on National Security.

7291. A letter from the Director, Administration and Management, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Technical Assistance for Public Participation in Defense Environmental Restoration Activities (RIN: 0790–AG14) received February 13, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

7292. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize military construction and related activities of the Department of Defense, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on National Security.

7293. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the annual certification of the nuclear weapons stockpile by the Secretaries of Defense and Energy and accompanying report; to the Committee on National Security.

7294. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a progress update report on the event-based decision making for the

F–22 aircraft program for the FY 1998 and FY 1999 decisions, pursuant to section 218 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 1997; to the Committee on National Security.

7295. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the five-year plan (FY99–FY03) for the Manufacturing Technology (ManTech) Program, pursuant to Public Law 105—85, section 211(b); to the Committee on National Security.

7296. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Organization and Operations of Federal Credit Unions [12 CFR Part 701] received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7297. A letter from the Administrator, Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Currency, transmitting the Office's final rule—Fiduciary Activities of National Banks [Docket No. 98–02] (RIN: 1557–AB63) received February 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7298. A letter from the Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule—Child and Adult Care Food Program: Improved Targeting of Day Care Home Reimbursements (RIN: 0584–AC42) received February 19, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7299. A letter from the Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule—Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act Amendments (RIN: 0584–AC20) received February 19, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7300. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Thirtieth Annual Report of the United States-Japan Cooperative Medical Science Program for the period of July 1995 to July 1996, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2103(h); to the Committee on Commerce.

7301. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Clean Air Act Promulgation of Extension of Attainment Date for Ozone Nonattainment Area; Ohio; Kentucky; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA)[FRL–5958–9] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7302. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Control of Air Pollution; Removal and Modification of Obsolete, Superfluous or Burdensome Rules; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5960–3] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7303. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Approval and Promulgation of Implementation of State Air Quality Plans for Disignated Facillities and Pollutants, New Mexico; Control of Landfill Gas Emissions From Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills; Correction for Same, Louisiana; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5961–3] received Februry 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7304. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5961–2] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7305. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan; Minnesota; Correction of Effective Date Under CongressionalReview Act (CRA) [FRL–5961–1] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7306. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Minor Amendments to Inspection/Maintenance Program Requirements; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5960–9] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7307. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Ohio; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5960–8] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7308. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: Washington; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5960–7] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7309. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5960–6] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7310. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Approval and Promulgation of Maintenance Plan Revisions; Ohio; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review (CRA) [FRL–5960–5] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7311. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Addition of Method 29 to Appendix A of Part 60 and Amendments to Method 101A of Appendix B of Part 61; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5960–4] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7312. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Clean Air Act Final Interim Approval of Operating Permits Program; Delegation of Section 112 Standards; State of Massachusetts; Correction; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5959–1] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7313. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Hydrochloric Acid; Toxic Chemical Release Reporting; Community Right-to-Know; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5959–7] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7314. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Cyclohexanecarbonitrile, 1,3,3-trimethyl-5oxo-; Revocation of a Significant New Use Rule; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5959–5] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7315. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Ethane, 1,1,1 Trifluoro-; Revocation of a Significant New Use Rule; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5959–4] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7316. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Thiodicarb; Pesticide Tolerance; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5959–3] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7317. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Alabama: Final Authorization to State's Hazardous Waste Management Program; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5959–2] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7318. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Acquisition Regulation; Coverage on Information Resources Management (IRM); Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5959–9 received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7319. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to West Virginia; Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5960–2] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7320. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical

Amendments to Acquisition Regulation; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL–5960–1] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7321. A letter from the Information Management Specialist, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Plans, Texas; Revision to the Texas State Implementation Plan (SIP); Alternative Reasonably Available Control Technology (ARACT) Demonstration for Raytheon TI Systems, Inc. [TX–85–1–7344a; FRL–5955–8] received February 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7322. A letter from the Information Management Specialist, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Ambient Air Quality Standard for Particulate Matter and Revised Requirements for Designation of Reference and Equivalent Methods for PM2.5 and Ambient Air Quality Surveillance for Particulate Matter [AD-FRL–5963–3] (RIN: 2060–AE66) received February 12, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7323. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Ethane, 1,1,1 Trifluoro-; Revocation of a Significant New Use Rule [OPPTS–50608D; FRL–5372–1] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7324. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Acquisition Regulation [FRL–5919–4] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7325. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Alabama: Final Authorization of Revisions to State's Hazardous Waste Management Program [FRL–5925–8] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7326. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Cyclohexanecarbonitrile, 1,3,3-trimethyl-5-oxo-; Revocation of a Significant New Use Rule [OPPTS–50601H; FRL–5371–7] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7327. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hydrochloric Acid; Toxic Chemical Release Reporting; Community Right-To-Know [OPPTS–400062A; FRL–5372–3] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7328. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Final Interim Approval of Operating Permits Program; Delegation of Section 112 Standards; State of Massachusetts [AD-FRL–5522–9] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7329. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Addition of Method 29 to Appendix A of Part 60 and Amendments to Method 101A of Appendix B of Part 61 [AD-FRL 5407–4] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7330. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Acquisition Regulation; Coverage on Information Resources Management (IRM) [FRL–5525–6] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7331. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—West Virginia; Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program [FRL–5896–7] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7332. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Control of Air Pollution; Removal and Modification of Obsolete, Superfluous or Burdensome Rules [FRL–5526–2] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7333. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants, New Mexico; Control of Landfill Gas Emissions From Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills; Correction for Same, Louisiana [NM–33–1–7331a; LA–39–1–7332; FRL–5910–9] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7334. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [MO 034–1034(a); FRL–5886–3] February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7335. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan: Minnesota [MN54–01–7279a; FRL–5913–3] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7336. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Minor Amendments to Inspection/Maintenance Program Requirements [FRL–5610–4] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7337. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Ohio [OH106–1a; FRL–5890–9] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7338. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: Washington [WA56–7131a; FRL–5603–7] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7339. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [MO–006–1006(a); FRL–5542–6] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7340. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Maintenance Plan Revisions; Ohio [OH104–1A; FRL–5877–9] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7341. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Addition of Method 29 to Appendix A of Part 60 and Amendments to Method 101A of Appendix B of Part 61 [AD-FRL–5407–4] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7342. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Indian Tribes: Air Quality Planning and Management [OAR-FRL–5964–2] (RIN: 2060–AF79) received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7343. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Sole Source Aquifer Designation of Poolesville Area Aquifer System, Lower Western Montgomery County, MD [FRL 5952–3] received February 6, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7344. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois [IL147–1a, IL156–1a; FRL–5965–1] received February 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7345. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Reclassification; Texas-Dallas/Fort Worth Nonattainment Area; Ozone [TX89–1–7370; FRL–5967–4] received February 12, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7346. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Michigan [MI58–01–7266; FRL–5967–3] received February 12, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7347. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Bay Area Air Quality Management District [CA 179–0066; FRL–5963–1] received February 12, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7348. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Acquisition Regulation: Administrative Amendments [FRL–5968–9] received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7349. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Organotin Lithium Compound; Final Significant New Use

Rule [OPPTS–50615C; FRL–5757–2] (RIN: 2070–AB27) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7350. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Finding of Failure to Submit Required State Implementation Plans for Particulate Matter; Arizona; Phoenix PM–10 Nonattainment Area [AZ–006–FON; FRL–5969–8] received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7351. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Significant New Uses of Certain Chemical Substances; Correction [OPPTS–50628A; FRL–5770–7] (RIN: 2070–AB27) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7352. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revocation of Significant New Use Rules for Certain Chemical Substances [OPPTS–50629A; FRL–5769–1] (RIN: 2070–AB27) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7353. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Recycled Used Oil Management Standards [FRL–5969–4] received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7354. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans (SIP) for Louisiana: Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) Program; Correction [LA–33–1–7374; FRL–5955–9] received January 23, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7355. A letter from the AMD-PERM, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rulemaking to Amend Parts 1, 2, 21, and 25 of the Commission's Rules to Redesignate the 27.5–29.5 GHz Frequency Band, to Reallocate the 29.5–30.0 GHz Frequency Band, to Establish Rules and Policies for Local Multipoint Distribution Service and for Fixed Satellite Services [CC Docket No. 92–297] received February 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7356. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule—Reallocation of Television Channels 60–69, the 746–806 MHz Band [ET Docket No. 97–157] received February 12, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7357. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Billed Party Preference for InterLATA 0 Calls [CC Docket No. 92–77] received February 23, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7358. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rules of Practice [16 CFR Part 3] received February 12, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7359. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Polymers [Docket No. 97F–0181] received February 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7360. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Direct and Secondary Direct Food Additives; Sodium Mono- and Dimethyl Naphthalene Sulfonates [Docket No. 96F–0076] received February 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7361. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Polymers [Docket No. 97N–0301] received February 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7362. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Investigational New Drug Applications and New Drug Applications [Docket No. 95N–0010] received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7363. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Medical Devices; Reclassification and Codification of Suction Lipoplasty System for Aesthetic Body Contouring [Docket No. 88P–0439] received February 23, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7364. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Spectrum Reallocation Report, as required under Title III of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997; to the Committee on Commerce.

7365. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule—Offshore Offers and Sales [RELEASE NO. 33–7505; 34–39668; FILE NO. 1118] (RIN: 3235–AG34) received February 18, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7366. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Commission Statement of Policy on the Establishment and Improvement of Standards Related to Auditor Independence [Release No. 33–7507; 34–39676; IC–23029; FR–50] received February 18, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7367. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Exemption of Issuance and Sale of Securities By Public Utility and Nonutility Subsidiary Companies of Registered Public Utility Holding Companies; Rescission of Statements of Policy [Release No. 35–26826, File No. S7–11–95] (RIN: 3235–AG45) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7368. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Commission Procedures for Filing Applications for Orders for Exemptive Relief Pursuant to Section 36 of the Exchange Act [Rel. No. 34–39624] received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7369. 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 Taiwan (Transmittal No. DTC–108–97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

7370. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the preliminary ''Report on U.S. Government Assistance to and Cooperative Activities with the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union,'' pursuant to Public Law 102—511, section 104; to the Committee on International Relations.

7371. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (Bureau of Political-Military Affairs) [22 CFR Part 121] received February 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

7372. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification terminating the suspensions pertaining to the Chinasat-8 satellite program, pursuant to Public Law 101—246, section 902(b)(2) (104 Stat. 85); to the Committee on International Relations.

7373. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Potomac Electric Power Company, transmitting a copy of the Balance Sheet of Potomac Electric Power Company as of December 31, 1997, pursuant to D.C. Code section 43—513; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7374. A letter from the Comptroller General, Government Accounting Office, transmitting a copy of his report for FY 1997 on each instance a Federal agency did not fully implement recommendations made by the GAO in connection with a bid protest decided during the fiscal year, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3554(e)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7375. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to and Deletions from the Procurement List [98–002] received February 12, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7376. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Exemption of Records Systems Under the Privacy Act [AAG/A Order No. 137–97] February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7377. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Privacy Act; Implementation [Docket No. OST–96–1472] (RIN: 2105–AC68) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7378. A letter from the Executive Director, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, transmitting a report entitled ''Graduating to a Better Future: Public Higher Education in the District of Columbia''; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7379. A letter from the Agency Freedom of Information Officer (1105), Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7380. A letter from the Active Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act for 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7381. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act for 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7382. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a monthly listing of new investigations, audits, and evaluations; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7383. A letter from the Director, National Counterintelligence Center, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7384. A letter from the President, National Endowment for Democracy, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7385. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, transmitting the Office's final rule—Implementation of the Privacy Act of 1974 (RIN: 2550–AA05) received February 19, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7386. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Office's performance plan for fiscal year 1999, pursuant to Public Law 103—62; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7387. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Orlando, FL, Appropriated Fund Wage Area (RIN: 3206–AI13) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7388. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting the FY 1997 report pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7389. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

7390. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice on leasing systems for the Central Gulf of Mexico, Sale 169, scheduled to be held in March 1998, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(8); to the Committee on Resources.

7391. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report regarding the authorization of the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity to establish a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr. in the District of Columbia, pursuant to Public Law 104—333, section 508; to the Committee on Resources.

7392. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Atka MACKerel in the Eastern Aleution District and Bering Sea subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 971208296–7296–01; I.D. 013098B] received February 11, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7393. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 [Docket No. 971208295–7295–01; I.D. 013098A] received February 11, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7394. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 18 [Docket No. 970829217–8025–02; I.D. 081597E] (RIN: 0648–AJ79) received February 18, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7395. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Multispecies Community Development Quota Program; Eastern Gulf of Alaska No Trawl Zone [Docket No. 970703166–8021–02; I.D. 060997A] (RIN: 0648–AH65) received February 18, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7396. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Catch Specifications [Docket No. 970930235–8028–02; I.D. 090397A] (RIN: 0648–AJ12) received February 18, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7397. A letter from the Director, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Final List of Fisheries for 1998 [Docket No. 970515117–8020–02; I.D. 040996D] (RIN: 0648–AJ85) received February 19, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7398. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, transmitting the Office's final rule—Oklahoma Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Plan [SPATS No. OK–023–FOR] received February 12, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7399. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the provisions of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Bankruptcy Act of 1986 which provide for the establishment of an electronic case management demonstration project; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7400. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Progress Reports: Triennial Preparation [BOP–1067–F] (RIN: 1120–AA63) received February 12, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7401. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's annual report on the progress in implementing the Coast Guard Environmental Compliance and Restoration Program for fiscal year 1996, pursuant to Public Law 101—225, section 222(a) (103 Stat. 1918); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7402. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 29122; Amdt. No. 1849] (RIN: 2120–AA65) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7403. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–100, -200, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 98–NM–09–AD; Amendment 39–10301; AD 98–03–09] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7404. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 and A340 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–320-ad; Amendment 39–10297; AD98–03–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7405. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328–100 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–114–AD; Amendment 39–10299; AD 98–03–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7406. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 and A300–600 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–178–AD; Amendment 39–10298; AD 98–03–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7407. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–600–1A11 and CL–600–2A12 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–256–AD; Amendment 39–10294; AD 98–03–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7408. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 and A340 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–3011–AD; Amendment 39–10296; AD 98–03–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7409. 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–334–AD; Amendment 39–10302; AD 98–03–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7410. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class D and Class E Airspace and Removal of Class E Airspace; Belleville, IL (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–AGL–42] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7411. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Bottineau, ND (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket

No. 97–AGL–43] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7412. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Mankato, MN (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–AGL–45] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7413. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Encino, TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–16] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7414. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modifications of the Legal Descriptions of Federal Airways in the Vicinity of Colorado Springs, CO (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ANM–9] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7415. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; New Braunfels Municipal, TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–21] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7416. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class D and E Airspace; McKinney, TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–22] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7417. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Camden, AR (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–20] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7418. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Regulated Transactions Involving Documented Vessels and Other Maritime Interests; Elimination of Mortgagee and Trustee Restrictions (Maritime Administration) [Docket No. R–170] (RIN: 2133–AB29) received February 5, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7419. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; EXTRA Flgzeugbau GmbH Models EA–300 and EA–300/S Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–CE–85–AD; Amendment 39–10307; AD 98–03–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7420. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revisions to Minimum IFR Altitudes & Change Over Points Amendment 407 (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 29123] (RIN: 2120–AA65) received February 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7421. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 29121; Amdt. No. 1848] (RIN: 2120–AA65) received February 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7422. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Model 172R Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 98–CE–06–AD] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7423. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300, A310, and A300–600 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–188–AD; Amdt 39–10303; AD 98–03–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7424. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328–10 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–154–AD; Amdt 39–10304; AD 98–03–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7425. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Short Brothers Model SD3–60 SHERPA and SD3 SHERPA Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–118–AD] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7426. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Primary Category Seaplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 27641; Amdt No. 21–75] (RIN: 2120–AG39) received February 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7427. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Stability and Control of Medium and Heavy Vehicles During Braking (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration) [Docket NHTSA–98–3345] (RIN: 2127–AG06) received February 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7428. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Hartzell Propeller Inc. ()HC-()(2,3)(X,V)()—() Series and HA-A2V20–1B Series Propellers with Aluminum Blades (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–ANE–40; Amdt. 39–10112; AD 97–18–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7429. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–25–AD; Amdt. 39–10093; AD 97–16–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7430. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF340A Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–NM–130–AD; Amdt. 39–10095; AD 97–16–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7431. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Model G–159 (G-I) Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–18–AD; Amdt. 39–10096; AD 97–16–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7432. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company Model R44 Helicopters (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–SW–19–AD; Amdt. 39–100–92; AD 97–16–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7433. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; AlliedSignal Inc. ALF502 and LF507 Series Turbofan Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–ANE–36; Amdt. 39–10091; AD 97–05–11R1] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7434. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Transport Category Airplanes, Technical Amendments and Other Miscellaneous Corrections (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 29147, Amdt. No. 25–94] (RIN: 2120–ZZ07) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7435. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Cumberland, WI (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–AGL–60] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7436. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Friendship (Adams), WI (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–AGL–51] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7437. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; St. Paul, MN (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–AGL–57] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7438. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Escanaba, MI (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–AGL–58] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7439. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modifications of the Houston Class B Airspace Area; TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 95–AWA–1] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7440. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Osceola, WI; Correction (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–AGL–49] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7441. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Alliance, NE (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ACE–29] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7442. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Realignment of VOR Federal Airway; Dallas/Fort Worth, TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–13] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7443. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft Corporation Models PA–23, PA–23–160, PA–23–235, PA–23–250, PA–30, PA–40, PA–31, PA–31–300, PA–31–325, PA–31–350, PA–34–200, PA–34–200T, PA–34–220T, PA–42, PA–42–720, PA–42–1000 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–CE–61–AD; Amdt. 39–10339; AD 98–04–27] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7444. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–215–1A10 and CL–215–6B11 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–332–AD; Amdt. 39–10321; AD 98–04–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7445. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fairchild Aircraft Incorporated Models SA226–TC, SA226–T, SA226–T(B), and SA226–AT Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–CE–58–AD; Amdt. 39–10318; AD 98–04–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7446. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 and A300–600 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–240–AD; Amdt. 39–10323; AD 98–04–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7447. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–NM–78–AD; Amdt. 39–10341; AD 98–04–29] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7448. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Limited Dart Series Turboprop Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 94–ANE–43; Amdt. 39–10325; AD 98–04–13] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7449. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320 and A321 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–150–AD; Amdt. 39–10324; AD 98–04–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7450. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Models T303, 310R, T310R, 335, 340A, 402B, 402C, 404, F406, 414, 414A, 421B, 421C, 425, and 441 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–CE–63–AD; Amdt. 39–10340; AD 98–04–28] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7451. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft Corporation Models Pa-46–310P and PA–46–350P Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–CE–60–AD; Amdt. 39–10338; AD 98–04–26] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7452. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Model 2000 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–CE–59–AD; Amdt. 39–10337; AD 98–04–25] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7453. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Models E55, E55A, 58, 58A, 58P, 58PA, 58TC, 58TCA Airplanes, and 60, 65–B80, 65–B90, 90, F90, 100, 300, and B300 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–CE–58–AD; Amdt. 39–10336; AD 98–04–24] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7454. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Aerostar Aircraft Corporation Models PA–60–600, PA–60–601, PA–60–601P, PA–60–602P, and PA–60–700P Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–CE–56AD; Amdt. 39–10355; AD 98–04–23] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7455. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA— Groupe AEROSPATIALE, Model TBM 700 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–CE–55–AD; Amdt. 39–10334; AD 98–04–22] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7456. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Britten-Norman Limited Models BN–2A, BN–2B, and BN–2T Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–CE–54–AD; Amdt. 39–10333; AD 98–04–21] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7457. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Partenavia Costruzioni Aeronauticas, S.p.A. Model P68, AP68TP 300, AP68TP 600 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–CE–51–AD; Amdt. 39–10332; AD 98–04–20] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7458. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Harbin Aircraft Manufacturing Corporation Model Y12 IV Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–CE–50–AD; Amdt. 39–10331; AD 98–04–19] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7459. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; AeroSpace Technologies of Australia Pty Ltd. Models N22B and N24A Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–CE–49–AD; Amdt. 39–10330; AD 98–04–18] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7460. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC–12 and PC–12/45 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–CE–45–AD; Amdt. 39–10328; AD 98–04–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7461. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Britten-Norman Ltd. BN–2, BN–2A, and BN–2B Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–CE–12–AD; Amdt. 39–10329; AD 98–04–17] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7462. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, North Carolina (Coast Guard) [CGD05–97–072] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7463. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Clarification and Rearrangement of Puget Sound Vessel Traffic Service Regulated Navigation Area (RNA) Regulations (Coast Guard) [CGD 13–98–002] (RIN: 2115–AE84) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7464. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Salvage and Firefighting Equipment; Vessel Response Plans (Coast Guard) [USCG 98–3417] (RIN: 2115–AF60) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7465. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Colorado River, Bluewater Marina to La Paz County Park, Parker, AZ [COTP San Diego, 98–001] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7466. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Standards for Traffic Control Devices; Revision of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices; Temporary Traffic Signals (Federal Highway Administration) [FHWA Docket No. FHWA–97–2314] (RIN: 2125–AD45) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7467. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's list of the foreign aviation authorities to which the Administrator provided services in the preceding fiscal year, pursuant to Public Law 103—305, section 202; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7468. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 1997 Annual Report of the Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), U.S. Department of Commerce, pursuant to Public Law 100—418, section 5131(b) (102 Stat. 1443); to the Committee on Science.

7469. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology, transmitting the Institute's final rule—Precision Measurement Grants [Docket No. 971201285–7285–01] (RIN: 0693–ZA18) received February 12, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

7470. A letter from the the Director, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the 79th National Convention of the American Legion, held in Orlando, Florida from September 2, 3 and 4, 1997 as well as a report on the Organization's activities for the year preceding the Convention, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 49; (H. Doc. No. 105—214); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

7471. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Rulings and determination letters [Rev. Proc. 98–21] received February 11, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7472. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Classification of taxes collected by the Internal Revenue Service [Rev. Proc. 98–18] received February 11, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7473. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit for abatement; determination of correct tax liability [Rev. Proc. 98–23] received February 19, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7474. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Conversion to the Euro by Members of the European Union [Announcement 98–18] received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7475. A letter from the Program Manager, Pentagon Renovation, Department of Defense, transmitting certification that the total cost for the planning, design, construction, and installation of equipment for the renovation of the Pentagon will not exceed $1,118,000,000, pursuant to Public Law 105—56, section 8070; jointly to the Committees on National Security and Appropriations.

7476. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the military requirements and costs of NATO enlargement pursuant to the FY98 Department of Defense Authorization and Appropriations Acts and the FY98 Military Construction Appropriations Act; jointly to the Committees on National Security and Appropriations.

7477. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule—Medicaid Program; State Allotments for Payment of Medicare Part B Premiums for Qualifying Individuals: Federal Fiscal Year 1998 [HCFA–2005–NC] (RIN: 0938–AI39) received February 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means.

7478. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report authorizing the transfer of up to $100M in defense articles and services to the Government of Bosnia-Herzegovina, pursuant to Public Law 104—107, section 540(c) (110 Stat. 736); jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

7479. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on allocation of funds the Executive Branch intends to make available from funding levels established in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1998 as enacted in Public Law 105–118, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2413(a); jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

7480. A letter from the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, transmitting notice of adoption of amendments to regulations under section 303 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 for publication in the Congressional RECORD, pursuant to Public Law 104—1, section 303(b) (109 Stat. 28); jointly to the Committees on House Oversight and Education and the Workforce.

7481. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting notification of the actions the Secretary has taken regarding security measures at Port-au-Prince International Airport, Port-au-Prince, Haiti, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44907(d)(3); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and International Relations.

7482. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule—Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Salary Equivalency Guidelines for Physical Therapy, Respiratory Therapy, Speech Language Pathology, and Occupational Therapy Services [HCFA–1808–F] (RIN: 0938–AG70) received February 10, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

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. LEACH. Committee on Banking and Financial Services. H.R. 3116. A bill to address the Year 2000 computer problems with regard to financial institutions, to extend examination parity to the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision and the National Credit Union Administration, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 105–417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2460. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to scanning receivers and similar devices; with an amendment (Rept. 105–418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 366. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2181) to ensure the safety of witnesses and to promote notification of the interstate relocation of witnesses by States and localities engaging in that relocation, and for other purposes (Rept. 105–419). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCINNIS. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 367. Resolution The title of this measure is not available (Rept. 105–420). 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. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. TALENT):

H.R. 3246. A bill to assist small businesses and labor organizations in defending themselves against government bureaucracy; to ensure that employees entitled to reinstatement get their jobs back quickly; to protect the right of employers to have a hearing to present their case in certain representation cases; and, to prevent the use of the National Labor Relations Act for the purpose of disrupting or inflicting economic harm on employers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NEY (for himself, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. HALL of Ohio):

H.R. 3247. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide a safe harbor under the anti-kickback statute for hospital restocking of certain ambulance drugs and supplies; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HILLEARY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. TALENT, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. RYUN, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROYCE, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. COOK, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. BAKER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SNOWBARGER,

Mr. LARGENT, Mr. DICKEY, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BASS, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 3248. A bill to provide dollars to the classroom; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. FORD):

H.R. 3249. A bill to provide for the rectification of certain retirement coverage errors affecting Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DICKEY:

H.R. 3250. A bill to designate a highway bypass in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, as the ''Wiley A. Branton, Sr. Memorial Highway''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FORD, Mr. WYNN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 3251. A bill to modify the conditions that must be met before certain alternative pay authorities may be exercised by the President with respect to Federal employees; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 3252. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish an advisory board to review requests for waivers of eligibility requirements for burial in Arlington National Cemetary submitted to the Secretary of the Army; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MANTON:

H.R. 3253. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for murders of armored car crew members; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIGGS:

H.R. 3254. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to clarify the requirements relating to reducing or withholding payments to States under that Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Mr. HOUGHTON):

H.R. 3255. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require universal product numbers on claims forms submitted for reimbursement of durable medical equipment and other items under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 3256. A bill to establish an index of economic freedom to evaluate on an annual basis the level of economic freedom of countries receiving United States development assistance and to provide for a phase-out of that assistance based on the index, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on 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. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. KIND of Wisconsin):

H. Con. Res. 223. Concurrent resolution honoring the sesquicentennial of Wisoncsin statehood; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. DOOLEY of California):

H. Res. 365. A resolution regarding the bill S. 1150, the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reauthorization Act of 1998; considered under suspension of the rules and agreed to.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

250. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Resolutions supporting the ''Charter for Change'' in Northern Ireland and recommending due consideration of its principles as part of the Anglo-Irish peace process; to the Committee on International Relations.

251. Also,a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to Resolution No. 196 calling upon Congress to expedite the return of the unused Federal land to the people of Guam and calling for the closure of the wildlife refuge overlay in Guam and the return of lands included therein to the people of Guam for immediate transfer to the original landowners; to the Committee on Resources.

252. Also,a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to urging the Congress of the United States to take action on the comprehensive multiyear transportation funding legislation; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

Mr. METCALF introduced A bill (H.R. 3257) for the relief of Richard W. Schaffert; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FORD, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 45: Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 54: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 192: Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

H.R. 198: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 334: Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 339: Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 371: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 372: Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 450: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 611: Mr. STRICKLAND and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 715: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 716: Mr. DELAY and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 758: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 815: Mr. BOEHLERT and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 859: Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 883: Mr. HILLEARY.

H.R. 884: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 900: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 919: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 979: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. OLVER, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 981: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1023: Mr. QUINN and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 1036: Mr. ENSIGN.

H.R. 1063: Mr. PEASE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. TALENT, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 1114: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1126: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 1151: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mrs. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 1166: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1173: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 1176: Mr. ROEMER.

H.R. 1231: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1283: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 1356: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. METCALF, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.R. 1361: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1371: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1375: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1387: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1401: Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 1415: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 1432: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1481: Ms. STABENOW and Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 1515: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1518: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1524: Mr. CANNON and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1539: Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 1549: Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1595: Mr. DELAY and Mr. SNOWBARGER.

H.R. 1601: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 1608: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 1679: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1689: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. FORD, and Mr. MCCRERY.

H.R. 1690: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1766: Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. STARK, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. YATES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 1812: Mr. ISTOOK and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 1872: Ms. DUNN of Washington.

H.R. 1951: Ms. DANNER and Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 1972: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2019: Mr. PORTER, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 2070: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 2094: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2145: Mr. POMBO and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 2173: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2183: Mr. GREENWOOD.
H.R. 2224: Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. DANNER, and Mr. COLLINS.
H.R. 2313: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 2365: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2374: Mr. SERRANO and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2409: Mr. FROST, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2449: Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 2460: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2474: Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. ENSIGN.
H.R. 2477: Mr. REDMOND.
H.R. 2478: Mr. REDMOND.
H.R. 2499: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PAUL, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. FROST, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 2500: Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2524: Mr. YATES and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 2541: Mr. HOYER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 2568: Mr. BUYER.
H.R. 2609: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. GOODLING.
H.R. 2611: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
H.R. 2713: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 2718: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 2720: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 2723: Ms. DUNN of Washington.
H.R. 2754: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. NEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2789: Mr. YATES, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FORD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.R. 2817: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. MATSUI.
H.R. 2819: Mr. EVANS and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 2821: Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 2836: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2854: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.R. 2870: Mr. LEACH and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 2884: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2885: Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 2891: Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 2908: Mr. THOMPSON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. OLVER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 2912 Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HAMILTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. GREEN, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 2923: Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 2955: Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 2960: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2970: Mr. NEUMANN and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2987: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. FURSE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 2990: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. JONES, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3014: Mr. DREIER.
H.R. 3016: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 3048: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. NORWEOD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BALGOJEVICH, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 3094: Mr. POMBO.
H.R. 3099: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3100: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 3107: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 3114: Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3120: Mr. LIVINGSTON.
H.R. 3127: Mr. TALENT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BRYANT, Ms. FURSE, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. FROST, and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.
H.R. 3131: Mr. FROST AND MR. DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 3152: Mr. WOLF, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. GOODE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELDON of Flroida, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 3153: Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 3155: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3156: Mr. WALSH, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. CARSON, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WYNN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. LAZIO of New York.
H.R. 3164: Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 3166: Mr. WICKER, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. EWING, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 3179: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 3181: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 3208: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 3218: Mr. COX of Califorina.
H.R. 3229: Mr. LARGENT, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 3230: Mr. LARGENT, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 3241: Mr. LARGENT.
H.J. Res. 100: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. PETRI.
H.J. Res. 102: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.
H. Con. Res. Mr. FRANKS of Massachusetts and Mr. ANDREWS.
H. Con. Res. 126: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. VENTO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOK, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.
H. Con. Res. 127: Mr. BRYANT.
H. Con. Res. 181: Mr. GREEN, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. RIVERS, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H. Con. Res. 188: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. PALLONE.
H. Con. Res. 203: Mr. BATEMAN and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H. Con. Res. 210: Mr. FOLEY.
H. Con. Res. 211: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
H. Res. 37: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PALLONE,1 AND MR. MATSUI.
H. Res. 279: Mr. RODRIGUEZ AND MS. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

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. 1748: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3073: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H. Res. 358: Mr. DOGGETT.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

41. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Military Order of the World Wars, Alexandria, Virginia, relative to urging Congress to vigorously investigate the lease of the Long Beach Naval Base to determine whether the national security interests of the United States might have been compromised or jeopardized; and to take appropriate action; to the Committee on National Security.

42. Also, a petition of the Military Order of the World Wars, Alexandria, Virginia, relative to urging the Congress and the Department of Defense to continue to fund collegiate ROTC and high school JROTC programs as being in the nation's best interests; to the Committee on National Security.

43. Also, a petition of the Military Order of the World Wars, Alexandria, Virginia, relative to urging Congressional action to assure that the Department of Defense limit the procurement of military equipment, supplies and weapons systems and their components to domestic manufacturing and assembly sources, so as to reduce U.S. reliance on foreign-produced defense items which might not be available during a global crisis; to the Committee on National Security.

44. Also, a petition of the Military Order of the World Wars, Alexandria, Virginia, relative to urging the Congress to assure that National Guard and Reserves are realistically manned, structured, equipped, trained, fully deployable and maintained at high readiness levels in order to accomplish their indispensable missions; to the Committee on National Security.

45. Also, a petition of the Military Order of the World Wars, Alexandria, Virginia, relative to urging the Congress to more adequately recognize the national defense requirements of the United States by significantly increasing defense budgets, force structures and military end strengths over those recommended in the Quadrennial Defense Review; to the Committee on National Security.

46. Also, a petition of the Military Order of the World Wars, Alexandria, Virginia, relative to urging the Administration and Congress to preserve America's defense industrial base by continuing to fund research, development and acquisition budgets so as to retain our technological edge in the 21st century and to ensure production can surge whenever U.S. military power is committed; to the Committee on National Security.

47. Also, a petition of the Military Order of the World Wars, Alexandria, Virginia, relative to reaffirming its position that the

President and the Congress, in order to assure military readiness, must fund operations, training and maintenance accounts so that material and personnel of the fighting forces are kept combat ready at sufficient levels, to include funds for modernization, so that vital weapons systems can be acquired to maintain technological advantage over potential enemies; to the Committee on National Security.

48. Also, a petition of the Military Order of the World Wars, Alexandria, Virginia, relative to urging the United States Government to honor its full obligations to all service members, veterans, military retirees, and their families, who have served the ideals of this nation through numerous sacrifices, often paying the ultimate price in defense of the United States and its vital national interests; to the Committee on National Security.

49. Also, a petition of the Military Order of the World Wars, Alexandria, Virginia, relative to urging the United States Government to adopt the following principles as an integral part of its national security and foreign policy decision-making process, when considering the commitment of U.S. military forces: a clear definition of vital national interests as they relate to all military operations; insisting that only Congress approve the commitment of U.S. troops to peacekeeping or humanitarian operations; and specifying that U.S. military personnel not be placed under foreign or United Nations operations control, except in those unusual to the Committee on International Relations.

50. Also, a petition of the Military Order of the World Wars, Alexandria, Virginia, relative to supporting legislation to amend the Soldiers and Sailor's Civil Relief Act of 1940 to guarantee the right of all active duty military personnel and their dependents to vote in Federal, State, and local elections, and, for the purposes of voting for an office of the United States or of an individual State, any person who is absent from a State in compliance with competent military or naval orders shall not be considered to have lost a residence or domicile solely by reason of that absence; to the Committee on House Oversight.

51. Also, a petition of the Military Order of the World Wars, Alexandria, Virginia, relative to reaffirming its support of the efforts of the American Battle Monuments Commission to create a World War II Memorial in accordance with decisions of site and design by competent and legal authority; to the Committee on Resources.

52. Also, a petition of the Military Order of the World Wars, Alexandria, Virgina, relative to urging the Administration and the Congress to fully fund the United States Coast Guard to carry out its numerous vital missions, including law enforcement, environmental protection, maritime safety, national security, and other missions as assigned; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.