

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. COATS. I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum on the 15 minutes on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I yield the balance of time in opposition to the Coats amendment. I understand the change is offset. Most people are happy with it. Therefore, there is no opposition at the moment. I am sure some will vote against it, but I yield whatever time this side might have. It is my understanding that we now go to Senator FEINGOLD for a statement as if in morning business.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized under the previous order.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, in late February the Senate considered campaign finance reform on the floor of the Senate for the second time in this Congress. Once again, we did not resolve the issue. Although a clear majority of this body now supports the McCain-Feingold bill, a determined minority once again prevented it from being adopted.

Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes today to try to put our debate in some perspective. This is a particularly good time to revisit the issue because of what has been happening just in the past few days in the other body, in the House of Representatives. In fact, the latest development on the other side of the Capitol has made it very clear that the defenders of the current system are on the run, and campaign finance reform is very much alive.

Last fall, the Speaker of the House promised an open debate on campaign finance reform by the end of March. The other body, of course, is supposed to be the place where the majority can work its will. There is no filibuster rule in the House of Representatives—in effect, no requirement that you have to get a three-fifths majority to pass legislation, as has long been the case in the Senate.

At the end of March, when a bipartisan majority began to clearly coalesce behind the McCain-Feingold bill, or the Shays-Meehan bill as it is called in the other body, the House leadership and other opponents of reform began looking for a way out. The House leadership decided to bring up campaign finance

reform under suspension of the rules. That is a procedure that is usually used to allow noncontroversial bills to pass quickly. It was used here for a very different purpose. It allows very limited debate and no amendments, and it requires a two-thirds vote for passage.

So the leadership of the other body brought up its own campaign finance bill under the suspension procedure that would guarantee, in effect, the defeat of its own bill. In the end, this bill of the leadership of the House got only 74 votes, and 337 Members of the House voted no.

Let's think about that. The major campaign finance bill offered by the chairman of the committee of jurisdiction received only 74 votes in the House of Representatives. The Democrats in the House were not even allowed to offer a substitute, which is customary in the other body. And here is the kicker. The main bipartisan reform bill which, by all accounts, actually had majority support in the House, did not even get a vote. The leadership of the House did everything in its power to make sure that the McCain-Feingold bill would not pass, and they succeeded, but only temporarily.

Supporters of reform in the House were understandably outraged. Just as the opponents of reform in this body relied on a filibuster and on parliamentary tactics such as filling the amendment tree to prevent a bipartisan majority from passing McCain-Feingold, opponents of reform in the House, the body that is supposed to reflect the will of majority, in effect rigged the procedure to make sure that reformers did not even get a vote on their bill.

Tactics of this kind can work for a while, but they cannot work forever. The American people are tired of tricks and tactics. They are tired of a partisan minority stopping the bipartisan majority from enacting reform. And now there are clear signs that public outrage over these kinds of tactics is having an effect. In the other body, reformers gathered 205 signatures on a discharge petition that would require the other body to consider campaign finance reform under a fair and open procedure. They needed just 13 more Members of the House to sign the discharge petition to force the issue to the House floor despite the opposition of the leadership. This would have been almost unprecedented.

It is clear that Members of the Congress are feeling the heat. Five Members agreed to sign the petition over the recess after they heard from their constituents how important it is to have a real vote on reform in the House this year, and four more announced in the last 2 days they will sign the petition.

Mr. President, what we found out today is that the leadership in the House reconsidered its hard line position because a meltdown was occurring. I was informed just a little bit earlier that there has been an an-

nouncement that the leadership of the other body will now bring campaign finance reform back to the House floor by May 15, and this time there at least supposedly is going to be an open rule and a bipartisan bill will get a vote.

This is very good news, and I congratulate the bipartisan reformers in the House for their persistence and effectiveness. They have shown that the will of the people can prevail if only we in the Congress have the courage to fight for it. If the House passes a bipartisan bill in the next few weeks, fortunately, the spotlight will come back here again.

The distinguished majority leader of our body was asked on Monday, what will he do if the House passes McCain-Feingold? His answer? "Nothing." And everyone laughed. I don't think they are laughing today, because the reformers in the House have succeeded in their effort to force a fair vote. We will see if the American people will stand for this kind of obstructionism if a bill comes back from the House. I do not think they will. I think the Senate will have to deal with this issue again this year and soon.

So I can say to the American people today as I have before, this fight is not over. The opponents of reform may be winning these parliamentary battles, but they are losing the legislative war. The American people know that our current system must be changed. A majority of this Senate, and now of the House, knows that our current system must be changed. Sooner or later, we will prevail. I am absolutely certain of that.

I have spent a great deal of time reviewing the debate on campaign finance reform from both this past February and last fall. As most people who watched the debate know, there was a lot of argument on this floor about whether the first amendment to the Constitution would be violated by the provisions of our bill in the Snowe-Jeffords amendment dealing with so-called issue advocacy by outside groups. I think these arguments based on the Constitution were grossly exaggerated and they will be shown to be inaccurate over time in the context of the actual state of constitutional law.

But there were a lot of other things said about our bill, a lot of other justifications offered for killing reform, and today I want to concentrate on what I call the three worst excuses for voting against the bipartisan McCain-Feingold bill. These arguments simply do not hold water. And since we will be back sooner or later—and I suspect sooner—to discuss these matters, let me say a bit about them today.

Here is the first poor excuse for voting against our bill. We heard time and time again, both last fall and last February, that we do not need changes in the law, we just have to enforce the current law. Now, that gave the opponents the opportunity to excoriate the Clinton administration for its fundraising excesses in 1996 and to try to dodge

responsibility as Senators to try to clean up the system.

But I have a number of responses. First, we have to remember that the McCain-Feingold bill actually had a whole lot of provisions that were designed to specifically deal with the alleged lawbreaking of the last election. Our bill makes it perfectly clear that fundraising for Federal campaigns cannot take place on Federal property. In other words, no more "no controlling legal authority," no more debate about whether dialing for dollars from your office is OK if you are asking for soft money rather than hard money. Under our bill, you cannot use your office, which is paid for by the taxpayers to raise money. Period.

In the McCain-Feingold bill, we also ban all foreign money from U.S. elections first by banning all soft money contributions to political parties. The legislation would prohibit any source, foreign or domestic, from contributing these unlimited and unregulated amounts of money to the national political party. But our bill also makes clear that foreign nationals are prohibited from making any sort of campaign expenditure—coordinated with a candidate or party or an independent expenditure—in connection with any Federal, State, or local election.

So while we will not put people in jail with this legislation or force prosecution of lawbreakers, we can make absolutely sure that the loopholes, or alleged loopholes, in the law that those accused of wrongdoing have fallen back on will, in fact, be permanently closed.

But beyond that, we reject the notion that the scandals we saw in 1996 were just due to lawbreaking. They were due to problems with the law itself. The biggest scandal stems not from what is illegal today but from what is perfectly legal—soft money.

Let me put it this way. Why was the White House charging \$100,000 a night for a night in the Lincoln bedroom? Why did coffee with the President or dinners with key leaders of the Congress cost people some \$50,000? Because it is legal to contribute \$50,000 or \$100,000 or even more to a political party in this country. Unless we change that law, the ever-increasing demand for money will lead our party leaders to stretch the bounds of propriety. We have to take responsibility. We have to do our part as lawmakers.

What about the huge amounts of money spent by groups on so-called issue ads that looked just like campaign ads but fell just outside the boundaries of the Federal election law? That is not a problem with illegal activities. It is a problem with the law, and we need to address it.

Mr. President, poor excuse No. 2 for opposing bipartisan reform. I heard a lot of people who oppose McCain-Feingold say that what we really need to do to solve the campaign finance issue is to have full and instantaneous disclosure of contributions and spending. My first response to that argument is that

McCain-Feingold includes the most extensive disclosure provisions of any campaign finance legislation introduced in the Senate in this Congress. But not a single Senator who argued against this bill and said that disclosure is what we really need would even acknowledge the important disclosure provisions in our bill.

What does it do? We require all candidates to file their disclosure reports electronically and require the FEC to post this information on the Internet within 24 hours of its receipt.

We prohibit campaigns from depositing campaign contributions of over \$200 into their treasuries until all required disclosure information has been collected. We step up the reporting of independent expenditures in the closing days of the campaign. We even lower the reporting threshold for campaign contributions from \$200 to \$50, and we require political advertisements to carry a tag line identifying who is responsible for the content of the advertising.

These provisions are very important and they are helpful and they do a great job, but they are not enough in themselves to restore the public's faith in our system and in us. We already know that \$262 million in soft money was contributed to the national political parties in 1996. We already know that Philip Morris gave over \$3 million in soft money in the 1996 cycle, and that RJR Nabisco, Joseph Seagram & Sons, Atlantic Richfield, and AT&T all gave over \$1 million. Federal Express gave almost a million.

It is still a scandal that the tobacco companies did contribute millions of dollars to our political parties while the Congress is considering extraordinarily important legislation that will decide the fate of that industry and of the children that its product kills, even if those contributions are disclosed. It is interesting that some of the same Senators who proclaim the miracle benefits of disclosure are unwilling to bring under the Federal election laws the activities of secretive groups funded by wealthy donors that run ads attacking candidates in the last weeks of the campaign.

So disclosure is not the answer. It is an answer, but it is not the answer.

How can we really expect a lot of hard-working Americans, many of whom do not even have a computer, to spend their free time examining FEC reports to make sure that we are not under the influence of special interest contributions? Who are we kidding with this idea that full disclosure alone will solve all our problems? Most people do not know who the richest people in America are and who they work for. Most people do not know what legislative agenda is pursued by the PACs that fund our campaigns. Most people will not be able to recognize a potentially corrupting contribution from just some name on a report.

So we still need reasonable limits on contributions. We still need a ban on

soft money. We still need to outlaw fundraising on Federal property. We still need to address the phony issue ads of unknown origin that attack candidates in the last day of a campaign and simply avoid the Federal election laws. Disclosure is a great thing and I am proud that our bill includes some tough new provisions, but disclosure alone is not the answer.

One very interesting thing about our debate last fall was that very few of the opponents of our bill ever wanted to discuss the central feature of our bill—a ban on soft money. I do not blame the opponents of our bill for not wanting to discuss it. Soft money is an embarrassment to the American political system. It should shame the defenders of the status quo. Soft money was at the very heart of the scandals of 1996. But a few hearty souls have ventured out onto the floor to defend soft money. I want to take my remaining time to address their arguments. They have given the absolute worst excuse for opposing our bill—that the soft money ban is either unconstitutional or a bad idea.

Soft money is the mother of all loopholes. It is the most ingenious money laundering scheme in American history. Corporations and labor unions are prohibited from giving money directly to candidates. It has been that way for most of the century. Instead, what they do is they give the money to the candidate's party. That means, instead of having to use a PAC, the corporation can reach into its shareholders' moneys and a union can reach into its members' dues.

The sky is truly the limit for these contributions. You can give \$5,000, you can give \$50,000, you can give \$500,000. There is no reason under this loophole why you could not give the party \$5 million by yourself. There are no limits on soft money—none at all.

This laundering scheme allows the parties to dump tens of millions of unregulated dollars into congressional elections and into Presidential elections. Just last fall the Republican Party ran an unprecedented issue ad campaign in the special congressional election for the seat vacated by former Representative Susan Molinari of New York. The party reportedly spent \$800,000 on ads attacking the Democratic candidate for that office. Much of that money was soft money, money that is supposed to be illegal in Federal elections.

In the 1996 cycle, the two political parties raised and spent over \$262 million in soft money. That is \$262 million that was raised and spent completely outside of the scope of Federal election law.

The trend with respect to soft money is frightening. In 1992, the two parties raised and spent a combined \$86 million in soft money. In just 4 years, that has gone from \$86 million to \$262 million. It tripled in just 4 years. And this year, even with the scandals and the very sharp attention to the issue, the money

machine just keeps churning away. The FEC just announced that the parties raised \$74 million in 1997, the most money ever raised in an off-election year, and more than twice as much as they raised in 1993, the year after the 1992 Presidential election.

Those are just the overall amounts of soft money, and the numbers are truly staggering. But what is most troubling about the soft money system is the shameless solicitation of these multi-hundred-thousand dollar contributions from corporations, labor unions, and wealthy individuals.

Both political parties are offering big contributors special access to high-ranking Government officials in exchange for a \$100,000, \$250,000, or a \$500,000 contribution. Maybe you get to sit at the head table with the President. Maybe you get to have a special meeting with a congressional committee chairman. Maybe you get to participate in a trade mission to a foreign land.

But let's not pretend that someone is making a \$500,000 contribution purely in the interest of good government and good democracy. Just this past year Philip Morris, facing the growing challenge of lawsuits around the country and possible congressional action on tobacco legislation, gave another \$450,000 to the Republican Party and \$60,000 to the Democrats. What is that all about? I think we know what it is all about.

Remember Roger Tamraz, one of the most colorful characters to appear before Senator THOMPSON's investigation last year? When asked if he felt he got his money's worth for his \$300,000 contribution, Tamraz told the Government Affairs Committee that next time he would give \$600,000. When asked if one of the reasons he made the contribution was to get special access, Tamraz responded by saying it wasn't one of the reasons, it was the only reason.

Mr. President, there is massive public support for a ban on soft money. Three former Presidents, over 200 former Members of Congress, countless editorial boards across the country, and even many people in the business community want to end this disgrace. Therefore, I am not surprised that virtually no one who is opposed to our legislation has stepped forward to offer a defense of this shameful system.

How can anyone defend a system that rewards the Roger Tamraz's of the world? How can anyone defend the \$500,000 contributions flowing into Federal elections and the auctioning off of special access to high-ranking Government officials?

What do the few supporters of this corrupt and corrupting system say? Well, a number of Senators complained that banning soft money would "federalize all elections." One even argued that the Supreme Court in Buckley had actually permitted the use of soft money by the political parties, and somehow enhanced its legitimacy in the Colorado case.

Actually, the Colorado case concerned hard money expenditures made by the parties, supposedly independent of its candidates. The Court did mention soft money, but assumed that it may not be used to influence Federal elections. The whole reason we need to ban soft money is that it is abundantly clear that it is being used to influence Federal elections. That is why 126 legal scholars wrote us to say that it would clearly be constitutional to ban soft money.

As for federalizing all elections, that argument is like the one made by a Senator who is worried that banning soft money will hurt State parties. He complained that State parties will have to use hard money for voter registration and things like bumper stickers and buttons. The soft money provision in McCain-Feingold does allow the State parties to continue to raise money from corporations and unions if their States allow it, but not for Federal election activities. They can use soft money for voter registration up to 4 months before a Federal election.

They can use soft money, non-Federal money to support State candidates. They just can't use it to run these ads that mention Federal candidates.

That is not "federalizing all elections." That is just making sure that money that would be illegal, if given to candidates, cannot be used to benefit their elections by doing an end run around the Federal election laws. What use is prohibiting the national parties from raising and spending this illegal money if it can simply be diverted to State parties to turn around and do exactly the same thing with it?

Mr. President, there were a few opponents of McCain-Feingold who had the candor last fall to admit that, of course, Congress can constitutionally ban soft money. The Senator from Washington, Senator GORTON, and the Senator from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, both fine lawyers, indicated that that was their position. But they argued that we shouldn't do it because it would hurt the political parties and create an "imbalance" in the system. They fear that without soft money, parties would be ineffective, and the most irresponsible ads, the ones run by independent groups, would be encouraged.

That is a pretty interesting argument. These Senators appear unwilling to address the evasion of the election laws by outside organizations, unwilling even to try to craft a provision dealing with the phony issue ads and let the Supreme Court finally address the issue advocacy versus express advocacy problem by letting the Court know what the Congress thinks the law should be and then, because they don't like these unaccountable ads, which they themselves refuse to do anything about, they want to leave open the biggest and most objectionable loophole of all in our Federal election law today—soft money.

Our great political parties and, indeed, our political system are soiled by this soft money system. We ought to be racing to get rid of it. We ought to be trying to clean up our reputation. We ought to try to redeem ourselves in the eyes of the American people.

Are we really going to take the position, as we head into the 1998 elections, that our political parties, with their rich and important histories in this country, cannot thrive, cannot survive, without soft money? Are the parties so divorced from what real people want that they have to rely for their financial support on huge contributions from corporations and wealthy individuals who seek special access to pursue their own special interests?

I, Mr. President, am one who believes that the parties can survive without soft money. They did it up until the late 1980s. Remember, the law permits the parties to raise up to \$20,000 per year in hard money from each contributor. But the parties have gotten lazy. They don't like having to raise money piece by piece, \$20,000 by \$20,000, voter by voter. They would rather hold dinners at big Washington hotels, send out invitations to lobbyists promising special access and then just sit back and collect a few big soft money checks. They are addicted to these huge sums of money and the nasty attack ads they can buy if the party lawyers are clever enough in how they spend the money.

That is right, Mr. President, I don't think our political parties are worth supporting anymore if they don't have anything to offer except fancy fundraisers for corporate lobbyists. If they can no longer appeal to the people of this country to fund their legitimate activity, maybe their time has come and gone. That is why protecting the political parties' ability to raise soft money is the very worst excuse for opposing the McCain-Feingold bill. It simply admits that our political system has utterly failed; that our parties are bankrupt morally and intellectually, even if they have full bank accounts; that our representative democracy has become a corporation democracy, where the amount of power you have depends on how much money you have.

I refuse to accept the judgment that we are doomed to have this kind of campaign finance system in America, the greatest democracy on Earth. That is why I am still fighting for campaign finance reform in this Congress. If the opportunity presents itself, if it looks like more of my colleagues are ready to reject the excuses—and I suspect there will be more—I will be ready to bring the McCain-Feingold bill, or any portion of it, before this Senate again.

I think the American people should know where this Senate stands on the issue of soft money. I think the people who sent us here deserve to know whether we think it is right that our

elections are dominated by this unlimited, unregulated money or not. Because we know that they don't think it is right, the time has come to act.

Most of the pundits say we lost in February, but I think we won a battle. We won because we showed that a bipartisan majority of the Senate wants reform, and a bipartisan majority of the Senate will stick together and fight for reform. The battle for reform on both sides of Capitol Hill is proceeding, and it will go forward until the American people win the war and get their Government back.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Senator from Georgia.

EDUCATION SAVINGS ACT FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2302, AS MODIFIED

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Kempthorne amendment No. 2302 be modified with the text which is now at the desk.

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

The text of the amendment (No. 2302), as modified, will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I now yield back all time remaining with respect to amendments Nos. 2297, 2302 and 2301.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO DR. RICHARD E. GREENLEAF

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a distinguished scholar and son of New Mexico. This year, Dr. Richard Greenleaf, Professor of Latin American History and Director of the Center for Latin American Studies at Tulane University, ends a remarkable career of more than a half century of research and teaching. Dr. Greenleaf has now returned to new Mexico to enjoy his retirement.

A few weeks ago, Dr. Greenleaf's students and colleagues gathered at Tulane University to honor their mentor and friend. One of Dr. Greenleaf's former students, Dr. Stanley Hordes of the Latin American Institute of the University of New Mexico, wrote an essay to commemorate that event. The essay recounts Dr. Greenleaf's extraor-

dinary career and warmly expresses the deep affection his students hold for him.

For all his accomplishments, I salute Dr. Greenleaf. I welcome him home to New Mexico, and I join all those who are indebted to him for his lifetime commitment to scholarship and teaching.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Hordes' tribute to Dr. Greenleaf be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEDICATION OF THE RICHARD E. GREENLEAF CONFERENCE ROOM, APRIL 3, 1998

Dr. Richard Edward Greenleaf, France Vinton Scholes Professor of Colonial Latin American History, and Director of the Center for Latin American Studies at Tulane University was born in Hot Springs, Arkansas on May 6, 1930. He grew up in Albuquerque, New Mexico, and took his Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral degrees at the University of New Mexico, where he studied under the dean of inquisition scholars, Professor France V. Scholes. Dr. Greenleaf's doctoral dissertation, "Zumárraga and the Mexican Inquisition 1536-1543," served as the basis for his many excellent publications on the history of the Holy Office in Latin America.

Dr. Greenleaf authored eleven major scholarly books, served as co-author of, or contributor to seventeen others, and published almost four dozen articles in the field of Latin American and Borderlands history. He has served on the editorial boards of several major publications, including the Handbook of Latin American Studies, The Americas and the Hispanic American Historical Review, and was the recipient of many distinguished awards, among them Silver Medal, Sahagún Prize: Mexican National History Award, and the Serra Award of the Academy of American Franciscan History for Distinguished Scholarship in Colonial Latin American History.

Richard Greenleaf began his teaching career at the University of Albuquerque in 1953. Shortly thereafter, he moved to Mexico City, where he taught at the University of the Americas, later serving as Chair of the Department of History and International Relations, Academic Vice-President and Dean of the Graduate School. In 1969, he accepted a faculty position at Tulane, assuming the directorship of the Center for Latin American Studies the following year, and the chairmanship of the History Department in 1978. In 1982, he was installed in the France Vinton Scholes Chair in Colonial Latin American History. In his long and distinguished teaching career, Dr. Greenleaf has served as mentor to numerous doctoral students, and countless master's and undergraduate students, all of whom are greatly indebted to him for his inspiration and guidance.

RECOGNITION OF YVONNE ULLAS, WASHINGTON STATE TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, today, as we debate the most important issue we will discuss all year on the Senate floor—our children's education—I would like to take a moment to recognize Washington State's Teacher of the Year, Ms. Yvonne Ullas. A first grade teacher at Naches Primary School in Yakima, Washington, Ms. Ullas is

being honored in Washington, DC to recognize her dedication to her profession and innovation in the classroom. We think we have a challenging job in the Senate, but every day Ms. Ullas is charged with stimulating the minds of 24 active first graders.

The Naches primary school has prepared this book with their advice for President Clinton and have asked that I send it over to the White House. Many of the children commented that if they were President they would make sure our kids have the best education. I will make sure the words of advice reach the President. I know Ms. Ullas serves as an example of excellence in education and of the dedication of many people in our local communities to ensuring a bright future for our children.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting a withdrawal and sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:10 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2691. An act to reauthorize and improve the operations of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

H.R. 2729. An act for the private relief of Ruth Hairston by waiver of a filing deadline for appeal from a ruling relating to her application for a survivor annuity.

H.R. 3528. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the use of alternative dispute resolution processes in United States district courts, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3565. An act to amend Part L of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2691. An act to reauthorize and improve the operations of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2729. An act for the private relief of Ruth Hairston by waiver of a filing deadline for appeal from a ruling relating to her application for a survivor annuity; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.