



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1998

No. 48

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 27, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, Jr., to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray using the words of Psalm 100.

Make a joyful noise to the Lord, all the lands. Serve the Lord with gladness. Come into his presence with singing. Know that the Lord is God. It is he that made us, and we are his. We are his people, and the sheep of his pasture. Enter his gates with thanksgiving, and his courts with praise. Give thanks to him, bless his name. For the Lord is good, his steadfast love endures forever, and his faithfulness to all generations. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MILLER of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution to acknowledge the Historic Northern Ireland Peace Agreement.

The message also announced that the Secretary of the Senate is directed to request the House to return to the Senate the official papers on S. 414, "An Act to amend the Shipping Act of 1984 to encourage competition in international shipping and growth of United States exports, and for other purposes," and upon return of the official papers from the House, the Secretary of the Senate is directed to make the following change in the text of the bill, viz:

In the amendment of section 8(f) of the Shipping Act of 1984 by section 106(e) of the bill, insert a comma and "including limitations of liability for cargo loss or damage," after "practices".

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 105-92, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, appoints John David Davenport, of Oklahoma, as a participant in the 1998 National Summit on Retirement Income Savings, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276h, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. KOLBE of Arizona, Chairman, and Mr. GILMAN of New York, Vice Chairman.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276d, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. HOUGHTON of New York, Chairman.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Joshua D. Cantor, staff member of Hon. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 20, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, 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 ad testificandum issued by the Pasadena Superior Court, in the case of *People v. Anthony Albert Jimenez*, Case No. GA 034516.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H2321

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

Sincerely,

JOSHUA D. CANTOR.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS CENTERED IN COLOMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-241)

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 International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report concerning the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

1. On October 21, 1995, I signed Executive Order 12978, "Blocking Assets and Prohibiting Transactions with Significant Narcotics Traffickers" (the "Order") (60 Fed. Reg. 54579, October 24, 1995). The Order blocks all property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of four significant foreign narcotics traffickers, one of whom is now deceased, who were principals in the so-called Cali drug cartel centered in Colombia. These persons are listed in the annex to the Order. The Order also blocks the property and interests in property of foreign persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, (a) to play a significant role in international narcotics trafficking centered in Colombia or (b) to materially assist in or provide financial or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, the narcotics trafficking activities of persons designated in or pursuant to the Order. In addition to the Order blocks all property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, persons designated in or pursuant to the Order (collectively "Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers" or "SDNTs").

The Order further prohibits any transaction or dealing by a United States person or within the United States in property or interests in property of SDNTs, and any transaction

that evades or avoids, has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, the prohibitions contained in the Order.

Designations of foreign persons blocked pursuant to the Order are effective upon the date of determination by the Director of the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Public notice of blocking is effective upon the date of filing with the Federal Register, or upon prior actual notice.

2. On October 24, 1995, the Department of the Treasury issued a notice containing 76 additional names of persons determined to meet the criteria set forth in Executive Order 12978 (60 Fed. Reg. 54582, October 24, 1995). Additional notices expanding and updating the list of SDNTs were published on November 29, 1995 (60 Fed. Reg. 61288), March 8, 1996 (61 Fed. Reg. 9523), and January 21, 1997 (62 Fed. Reg. 2903).

Effective February 28, 1997, OFAC issued the Narcotics Trafficking Sanctions Regulations ("NTSR" or the "Regulations"), 31 C.F.R. Part 536, to further implement my declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against significant foreign narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia (62 Fed. Reg. 9959, March 5, 1997).

On April 17, 1997 (62 Fed. Reg. 19500, April 22, 1997), July 30, 1997 (62 Fed. Reg. 41850, August 4, 1997), and September 9, 1997 (62 Fed. Reg. 48177, September 15, 1997), OFAC amended appendices A and B to 31 C.F.R. chapter V, revising information concerning individuals and entities who have been determined to play a significant role in international narcotics trafficking centered in Colombia or have been determined to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, or to be acting as fronts for the Cali cartel in Colombia. These actions are part of the ongoing interagency implementation of Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995. These changes to the previous SDNT list brought it to a total of 426 businesses and individuals with whom financial and business dealings are prohibited and whose assets are blocked under the Order.

3. OFAC has disseminated and routinely updated details of this program to the financial, securities, and international trade communities by both electronic and conventional media. In addition to bulletins to banking institutions via the Federal Reserve System and the Clearing House Interbank Payments System (CHIPS), individual notices were provided to all relevant State and Federal regulatory agencies, automated clearing houses, and State and independent banking associations across the country. OFAC contacted all major securities industry associations and regulators. It posted electronic notices on the Internet and over 10 computer bulletin boards and 2 fax-on-demand services, and provided the same

material to the U.S. Embassy in Bogotá for distribution to U.S. companies operating in Colombia.

4. As of March 25, 1998, OFAC had issued nine specific licenses pursuant to Executive Order 12978. These licenses were issued in accordance with established Treasury policy authorizing the completion of presanctions transactions and the provision of legal services to and payment of fees for representation of SDNTs in proceedings within the United States arising from the imposition of sanctions.

5. The narcotics trafficking sanctions have had a significant impact on the Cali drug cartel. Of the 133 business entities designated as SDNTs as of February 20, 1998, 41, or nearly a third, having a combined net worth estimated at more than \$45 million and a combined income of more than \$200 million, had been determined to have gone into liquidation. As a result of OFAC designations, 3 Colombian banks have closed about 300 SDNT accounts of nearly 100 designated individuals. One of the largest SDNT commercial entities, a discount drugstore with an annual income exceeding \$136 million, has been reduced to operating on a cash basis. These specific results augment the less quantifiable but significant impact of denying the designated individuals and entities of the cartel access to U.S. financial and commercial facilities.

Various enforcement actions carried over from prior reporting periods are continuing and new reports of violations are being aggressively pursued. Two criminal investigations are ongoing. Since my last report, OFAC has collected its first civil monetary penalty for violations of IEEPA and the Regulations under the program. OFAC collected \$2,625 from a commercial agent for ocean-going oil tankers for violative funds transfers.

6. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from October 21, 1997, through April 20, 1998, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency with respect to Significant Narcotics Traffickers are estimated at approximately \$620,000. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of Justice, and the Department of State. These data do not reflect certain costs of operations by the intelligence and law enforcement communities.

7. Executive Order 12978 provides my Administration with a tool for combating the actions of significant foreign narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia and the unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm that they cause in the United States and abroad. The Order is designed to deny these traffickers the benefit of any assets subject to the jurisdiction of the United States

and to prevent United States persons from engaging in any commercial dealings with them, their front companies, and their agents. Executive Order 12978 demonstrates the United States commitment to end the damage that such traffickers wreak upon society in the United States and abroad.

The magnitude and the dimension of the problem in Colombia—perhaps the most pivotal country of all in terms of the world's cocaine trade—are extremely grave. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against significant foreign narcotics traffickers and their violent and corrupting activities as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 24, 1998.

SPECIAL ORDERS

INDUSTRIAL GROUP PLANS TO BATTLE CLIMATE TREATY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday the American public was presented with a front-page article in the New York Times outlining a plan by an industrial group to battle the climate change treaty. This is a treaty that was arrived at in Kyoto, Japan earlier this year, which brought together the international community in a plan to fight against an increase in greenhouse gases that threaten this world with climate change.

It was a plan that was negotiated between all of the nations in attendance. Many nations signed on and many other nations have yet to sign on. It is a plan that is necessary if in fact we are going to prevent the worst impacts of global climate change.

What the New York Times article tells us is that a group of corporations, mainly large international oil companies, have put together a plan to spend millions of dollars to try to convince the American public that the overwhelming scientific evidence regarding global climate change is somehow shaky and not to be trusted, and that therefore we should not go forward with actions in this and other countries, and with efforts to bring developing countries on board the Kyoto treaty, that we should walk away from that treaty; and that certainly we should not attend the meetings in Buenos Aires later this year where we will attempt to bring on large developing countries such as China, Mexico, Brazil and other such nations that are contributing huge amounts of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere of our world.

But rather than work on that progressive agenda, rather than work in an effort to try to see how we can stem

greenhouse gases, these oil companies would rather try to convince people that in fact the science is not very good. Now that is contrary to the science itself and is contrary to the vast number of scientists around the world who have joined this effort to look at the science, to look at the data and try to help us predict what in fact is taking place with respect to greenhouse gases and global climate change.

But rather than participate in the serious scientific discourse, this group of oil companies has decided that they would take millions of dollars and try to convince the average citizen, under the portion of their plan that says victory will be achieved when the average citizen recognizes the uncertainties in climate science. Recognition of the uncertainties becomes part of conventional wisdom. So when you think about global climate change, about the threat of climate change, about warming, the oil companies want you to think, "well, the science is not very good so probably nothing much is going to happen."

Then they would like to move on and have the media recognize the uncertainties of climate science, so when the media presents stories about global change, about what is happening in our world, they would then say, "Well, we really do not know if this science is very good." Then they take more of their money and they would try to make the media balance out, try to get stories into the media about how the science is not very good, and they would hope that the media would then accept, if they spend enough money to convince the media, that they would accept that it is conventional wisdom that the science is not very good.

Now mind you, this all comes at a time, it is not a question whether the science is very good or not—the science is getting better and better. But unfortunately, what the science tells us is that the problem of global warming is becoming more and more a realistic problem for the future of the world and that steps must be taken.

But that is not what these oil companies do. They want to change the mind set of the media, of the American public, of industry and certainly of the government. And what they really want to do is arrive at a point where the Kyoto treaty is dead, there will be no further action on that treaty, as they spell out in their strategies and their tactics, and to make sure that we do not go forward, we do not go forward in Buenos Aires to bring other nations on to that treaty.

How would they measure this? They are going to track the percentage of media articles that raise questions about climate science. They are going to register the number of Members that they have been able to contact and send materials to change their mind about the climate science, the number of communications on climate science received by Members of Congress. So they are going to spend a few hundred thousand dollars tracking their efforts to see whether or not it is working.

You know, we have seen this all before, my colleagues. We saw it when the tobacco companies got together to try to convince the American public that there was no link between tobacco and cancer, that there was no link between the usage of tobacco and the incredible rate of lung cancer in this country and of other cancers.

They spent millions of dollars to undermine the scientists who were saying there is a link, to undermine the evidence. They told us more and more every year, and when the science came against their wishes, they paid scientists to keep it down, to not tell the American public. Now for the first time what we see are thousands, millions of pages of documents with the tobacco companies engaged in an effort to keep from the American public science that would tell them that tobacco and cancer are linked.

Now we see an effort where some industries do not like the scientists, independent scientists. They do not like what they have come up with on global warming. So what they want to do is, they want to establish what they would consider an independent global climate science data center, and from this center would flow information to Members of Congress, to the public, to State legislatures, to the mayors, city council people. But this independent center reportedly would be initially staffed, this is according to the memo from the public relations firm advising the oil companies, it will be staffed initially with professionals on loan from the various oil companies and associations of the major interests in climate change.

□ 1415

So here we are going to have a bunch of people who work for oil companies as scientists who are now going to tell us what the independent science is on global warming, as opposed to the independent scientists who have been out there now for a number of years working for universities and foundations and others to try to find out what is happening. They want to create the impression that they have scientists who radically disagree with the prevailing science about the harms of greenhouse gases and the consequential global warming.

Mr. Speaker, we have to understand that there is something going on in business in America. Many of us in Congress have had complaints from our constituents about the impacts of HMOs and managed care. People come into our offices because they cannot get care for their spouse who is very ill, and they cannot get care for their children because somebody who is supposed to give a second opinion, some 800 number, they have to call where they talk to somebody, and they say, oh, no, we do not allow that care under your insurance plan.

So the Congress got together on a bipartisan basis and decided that what they would do is they would try to have a patients' bill of rights so that patients knew what kind of coverage they had, they would know what kind of care they had, so they had access to specialists, so they had a right to sue managed care plans if some bureaucrat in another city was making a decision against a doctor's recommendation and somebody was harmed.

On a bipartisan basis, in the Senate and the House, many State legislatures are doing this, and what do we see? We see corporations in America coming together, raising millions of dollars to try to tell the Congress, "This is not a problem. These complaints from your constituents are not real. We have it all under control." They had a corporate fly-in where they had people fly in from all over the country to tell them we do not need to change anything with managed health care, it is just fine.

So we see the tobacco companies, they set up their spin organizations; the health care corporations, they set up their spin organizations; and now the oil companies are going to set up their spin organizations to tell us that all of this we have heard about climate change, greenhouse gases, global warming is nothing for us to be concerned about. Well, the fact is it is something for us to be very concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that not all oil companies apparently have joined this organization. In the article it suggested Shell Oil USA has not joined this organization. They do not see the merit to it. In fact, Shell Oil USA is one of those oil companies that believes that a good part of its future is going to be about clean energy, about renewable energy, wind energy, solar energy. It has joined companies like British Petroleum that have made major investments in solar energy. Billions of dollars of markets in solar energy are now recognizable, and we see those companies taking a different tack.

But yet there are a few companies that have decided that the best they can do is to try to confuse the American public on global warming, try to lobby their Representatives in the Congress not to accept, not to accept what the scientists are telling us now is the future of this planet if global warming continues.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Kyoto this year with the Chairman of the Science Committee, and I witnessed the U.S. delegation's diligence in forging a treaty that both protects the U.S. interests and at the same time sets important goals for slowing global warming.

The world is looking to the U.S. for leadership on this issue, and while clearly the solution must include participation from developing nations, there is much the United States can do to reduce global greenhouse gases, emissions that cause immediate health effects on our children and the elderly,

contaminate our air, water and land, and cost taxpayers dearly to clean up.

The truth is the steps necessary to curb global warming present an enormous economic opportunity for the people of the United States. The scientific evidence about global warming compels strong action, not a head-in-the-sand approach that characterizes the organized opposition to the Kyoto Protocol and U.S. energy efficiency measures.

To hear some critics describe the Administration's actions to try to push forward with renewable energy and energy efficiency and clean sources of energy, one would think that protecting the environment is a crime against humanity, and that President Clinton should be tried at the Hague. They are accusing the President of trying to use Federal tax dollars to spur public and private investment in energy efficiency and renewable energy.

We are seeing more and more countries, more and more companies looking at renewable energy sources as a path to the future. America ought to participate in that. We have the technology, we have the know-how, we have the products. We ought to recognize the economic opportunity that that provides.

In fact, the global market for energy efficiency products and services is \$80 billion per year and is expected to reach \$125 billion a year by the year 2015. Several studies estimated that job growth from energy efficiency and technology innovation will exceed 800,000 new jobs over the next 15 years.

I do not know where these critics live, but they do not live in the district that I represent.

Earlier this year, in fact, 71 percent of my constituents recently answered a questionnaire that they thought the U.S. should take strong steps against global warming, even if it cost taxpayers more in the beginning to do so. The same is true across the country. In January, Ohio State University conducted a national survey on the American opinion on global warming, finding that 77 percent of Americans believe that global warming has been happening, and 67 percent believe that steps should be taken to combat global warming, and that reducing air pollution is an effective way to do so. Eighty-eight percent thought the U.S. Government should limit air pollution for businesses, and 77 percent thought they were willing to pay more for electricity, gas and oil to reduce the amount of air pollution.

It is that poll that is driving the oil companies crazy. It is that poll that is causing the oil companies to consider spending \$5 million to change Americans' opinion about the urgency of global warming. It is that consortium that is coming together that recognizes that the American people understand what is going on, and now they want to change their mind.

It is too bad, because most of the last couple of decades, this country has

been built on greater and greater efficiencies. We see it in the computer industry, in telecommunications, in marketing, in transportation. We see it throughout the entire global economy. But somehow, when we get to energy, the coal companies and the oil companies, they do not want us to be efficient. They want us to burn more oil and more coal; it is just that simple, folks. If we can do it more efficiently and we can save the environment and we can save dollars in the cost of that electricity, and if we can provide jobs and new economic opportunities in the export of American products, they do not want us to hear about it, they do not want us to believe it. They want us just to go on burning the coal and burning the oil in the same old fashion we have been doing for the last 50 years.

The problem is if we all do that, and if the developing countries—China, Mexico, India, Indonesia, Brazil—who are increasing their use of oil and coal as their economies grow, if they just do it the same way we did it over the last 50 years, we will choke this planet to death. We will destroy the environment for our children and our grandchildren, and we will threaten the economic well-being of a good portion of the world.

That is what the American people understand. That is what is reflected in the polling data. They trust the independent scientists. They are not going to trust a bunch of scientists on the oil company payrolls to tell them that they are wrong about the science, that it is really shaky.

But we have to be diligent in this matter. We have to be aware of what is happening, because as we start to see attacks on the scientists who have studied global warming, attacks on this administration that is trying to bring developing countries on board a treaty to reduce those greenhouse gases—and hopefully at the end of this year in Buenos Aires some developing countries will sign on—as they are trying to do that, they are going to come under attack. They are going to come under attack by a consortium put together by oil companies and coal companies to say that we are all wrong, that global warming is not a problem.

Well, I think by now we have seen enough evidence to suggest that global warming is a problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that people would be alert to what is taking place and to what is proposed by these oil and coal companies to try and put their spin on the hard evidence that has been derived by independent scientists from many, many countries, from many, many disciplines, over many years, being very conservative about the changes that they have seen. But as scientists drill the ice cores, as they look at what has happened in the past, Nature magazine just reported that the Northern Hemisphere mean annual temperatures for 3 of the past 8 years were warmer than any year since

AD 1400. We have to understand the kind of changes that means for the American economy and for the environment of the world.

So I would hope that Members of Congress would not give credibility to this effort by the oil companies to put their spin on what is very good, even if incomplete evidence about the problems raised by the continuing burning of fossil fuels and creation of greenhouse gases.

I commend to my colleagues the article and memo, which I have enclosed here.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 26, 1998]

INDUSTRIAL GROUP PLANS TO BATTLE CLIMATE TREATY

DRAFT PROPOSAL SEEKS TO DEPICT GLOBAL WARMING THEORY AS A CASE OF BAD SCIENCE

(By John H. Cushman Jr.)

WASHINGTON, April 25—Industry opponents of a treaty to fight global warming have drafted an ambitious proposal to spend millions of dollars to convince the public that the environmental accord is based on shaky science.

Among their ideas is a campaign to recruit a cadre of scientists who share the industry's views of climate science and to train them in public relations so they can help convince journalists, politicians and the public that the risk of global warming is too uncertain to justify controls on greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide that trap the sun's heat near Earth.

An informal group of people working for big oil companies, trade associations and conservative policy research organizations that oppose the treaty have been meeting recently at the Washington office of the American Petroleum Institute to put the plan together.

Joe Walker, a public relations representative of the petroleum institute who is leading the project, said in an interview that the plan had been under consideration for about two months and was "very, very tentative." Mr. Walker said no industry executives had yet been approached to pay for it.

But an eight-page memorandum that he wrote shows in detail how some industry lobbyists are going about opposing the climate treaty.

It is a daunting public relations task. Whenever the treaty's advocates, including the Clinton Administration, discuss global warming, they present the science as essentially settled and unchallengeable, and they compare dissenting scientists to discredited apologists for the tobacco companies. That view has become widely accepted among reporters and the public.

Although mainstream scientists do identify considerable uncertainties in their climate predictions, which are based on computer models, they are increasingly confident that global warming is a serious problem and often say that the uncertainties do not justify inaction.

Based on the latest science, most of the world's nations agreed in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 that industrial nations should cut emissions of greenhouse gases, and the treaty was modified last year to require further reductions in emissions to levels well below those of 1990, over the next 10 to 15 years. But the United States Senate has not yet agreed to that treaty provision, which could require deep reductions in American consumption of fossil fuels.

Documents describing the proposal to undermine the mainstream view were given to The New York Times by the National Environmental Trust, whose work in support of

the global-warming treaty is financed by philanthropic organizations, including the Pew Charitable Trusts, the biggest of the nation's pro-environmental grant makers.

Phil Clapp, the president of the environmental trust, said he obtained the papers from an industry official. Exposing the plan at this stage, Mr. Clapp said, would probably ruin the effort to raise money to carry out the plan.

Industry representatives confirmed that the documents were authentic, but emphasized that the plans had not been formally approved by participating organizations. The document listed representatives of the Exxon Corporation, the Chevron Corporation and the Southern Company as being involved. Representatives of Chevron and Southern acknowledged attending meetings on the project; the Exxon representative could not be reached for comment.

The draft plan calls for recruiting scientists to argue against the Administration, and suggests that they include "individuals who do not have a long history of visibility and/or participation in the climate change debate."

But among the plan's advocates are groups already linked to the best-known critics of global-warming science.

They include the Science and Environment Policy Project, founded by Fred Singer, a physicist noted for opposing the mainstream view of climate science. Frederick Seitz, another prominent skeptic on global warming, is involved with two other groups mentioned in the plan: the George C. Marshall Institute, where Dr. Seitz is chairman, and the Advancement of Sound Science Coalition, where he is on the science advisory board.

On Monday, the National Academy of Sciences disassociated itself from the most recent effort to drum up support among skeptical scientists. That effort came in the form of a statement and petition on global warming circulated by Dr. Seitz, a physicist who was president of the academy in the 1960's.

The petition, attacking the scientific conclusions underlying the treaty on climate change, was accompanied by an article that was formatted to resemble one that might have been published in the academy's prestigious peer-reviewed journal. It was not.

The draft plan, recently discussed at the oil industry offices, calls for giving such dissenters on climate science "the logistical and moral support they have been lacking."

It also calls for spending \$5 million over two years to "maximize the impact of scientific views consistent with ours on Congress, the media and other key audiences."

It would measure progress by counting, among other things, the percentage of news articles that raise questions about climate science and the number of radio talk show appearances by scientists questioning the prevailing views.

The document says that industry's polling, conducted by Charlton Research, has found that while Americans see climate change as a serious threat, "public opinion is open to change on climate science."

Supporters of the plan want to raise money quickly to spend much of it between now and the November negotiating session in Buenos Aires, where important details of the international treaty are to be decided.

A proposed media-relations budget of \$600,000, not counting any money for advertising, would be directed at science writers, editors, columnists and television network correspondents, using as many as 20 "respected climate scientists" recruited expressly "to inject credible science and scientific accountability into the global climate debate, thereby raising questions about and undercutting the 'prevailing scientific wisdom.'"

Among the tasks, the petroleum institute's memorandum said, would be to "identify, recruit and train a team of five independent scientists to participate in media outreach."

What the industry group wanted to provide, the memorandum said, was "a one-stop resource on climate science for members of Congress, the media, industry and all others concerned."

The industry group said it wanted to develop "a sound scientific alternative" to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a large group of scientists advising the United Nations that has published the most authoritative scientific assessments of global warming. That panel has predicted that the next century will bring widespread climatic disruptions if actions are not taken to reverse the accumulation of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

The draft plan suggests that despite industry efforts to convince the public that the climate treaty would be costly to carry out and unfair to the United States, the treaty remains popular partly because environmentalists are winning the debate on the science.

"Indeed, the public has been highly receptive to the Clinton Administration's plans," the memorandum said. "There has been little, if any, public resistance or pressure applied to Congress to reject the treaty, except by those 'inside the Beltway' with vested interests."

To: Global Climate Science Team
Subject: Draft Global Climate Science Communications Plan

As promised, attached is the draft Global Climate Science Communications Plan that we developed during our workshop last Friday. Thanks especially to those of you who participated in the workshop, and in particular to John Adams for his very helpful thoughts following up our meeting, and Alan Caudill for turning around the notes from our workshop so quickly.

Please review the plan and get back to me with your comments as soon as possible.

As those of you who were at the workshop know, we have scheduled a follow-up team meeting to review the plan in person on Friday, April 17, from 1 to 3 p.m. at the API headquarters. After that, we hope to have a "plan champion" help us move it forward to potential funding sources, perhaps starting with the global climate "Coordinating Council." That will be an item for discussion on April 17.

Again, thanks for your hard work on this project. Please e-mail, call or fax me with your comments. Thanks.

Regards,

JOE WALKER.

APRIL 3, 1998.

GLOBAL CLIMATE SCIENCE COMMUNICATIONS ACTION PLAN

Situation analysis

In December 1997, the Clinton Administration agreed in Kyoto, Japan, to a treaty to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to prevent what it purports to be changes in the global climate caused by the continuing release of such emissions. The so-called greenhouse gases have many sources. For example, water vapor is a greenhouse gas. But the Clinton Administration's action, if eventually approved by the U.S. Senate, will mainly affect emissions from fossil fuel (gasoline, coal, natural gas, etc.) combustion.

As the climate change debate has evolved, those who oppose action have argued mainly that signing such a treaty will place the U.S. at a competitive disadvantage with most other nations, and will be extremely expensive to implement. Much of the cost will be

borne by American consumers who will pay higher prices for most energy and transportation.

The climate change theory being advanced by the treaty supporters is based primarily on forecasting models with a very high degree of uncertainty. In fact, it not known for sure whether (a) climate change actually is occurring or (b) if it is, whether humans really have any influence on it.

Despite these weaknesses in scientific understanding, those who oppose the treaty have done little to build a case against precipitous action on climate change based on the scientific uncertainty. As a result, the Clinton Administration and environmental groups essentially have had the field to themselves. They have conducted an effective public relations program to convince the American public that the climate is changing, we humans are at fault, and we must do something about it before calamity strikes.

The environmental groups know they have been successful. Commenting after the Kyoto negotiations about recent media coverage of climate change, Tom Wathen, executive vice president of the National Environmental Trust, wrote:

"... As important as the extent of the coverage was the tone and tenor of it. In a change from just six months ago, most media stories no longer presented global warming as just a theory over which reasonable scientists could differ. Most stories described predictions of global warming as the position of the overwhelming number of mainstream scientists. That the environmental community had, to a great extent, settled the scientific issue with the U.S. media is the other great success that began perhaps several months earlier but became apparent during Kyoto."

Because the science underpinning the global climate change theory has not been challenged effectively in the media or through other vehicles reaching the American public, there is widespread ignorance, which works in favor of the Kyoto treaty and against the best interests of the United States. Indeed, the public has been highly receptive to the Clinton Administration's plans. There has been little, if any, public resistance or pressure applied to Congress to reject the treaty, except by those "inside the Beltway" with vested interests.

Moreover, from the political viewpoint, it is difficult for the United States to oppose the treaty solely on economic grounds, valid as the economic issues are. It makes it too easy for others to portray the United States as putting preservation of its own lifestyle above the greater concerns of mankind. This argument, in turn, forces our negotiators to make concessions that have not been well thought through, and in the end may do far more harm than good. This is the process that unfolded at Kyoto, and is very likely to be repeated in Buenos Aires in November 1998.

The advocates of global warming have been successful on the basis of skillfully misrepresenting the science and the extent of agreement on the science, while industry and its partners ceded the science and fought on the economic issues. Yet if we can show that science does not support the Kyoto treaty—which most true climate scientists believe to be the case—this puts the United States in a stronger moral position and frees its negotiators from the need to make concessions as a defense against perceived selfish economic concerns.

Upon this tableau, the Global Climate Science Communications Team (GCSCCT) developed an action plan to inform the American public that science does not support the precipitous actions Kyoto would dictate,

thereby providing a climate for the right policy decisions to be made. The team considered results from a new public opinion survey in developing the plan.

Charlton Research's survey of 1,100 "informed Americans" suggests that while Americans currently perceive climate change to be a great threat, public opinion is open to change on climate science. When informed that "some scientists believe there is not enough evidence to suggest that [what is called global climate change] is a long-term change due to human behavior and activities," 58 percent of those surveyed said they were more likely to oppose the Kyoto treaty. Moreover, half the respondents harbored doubts about climate science.

GCSCCT members who contributed to the development of the plan are A. John Adams, John Adams Associates; Candace Crandall, Science and Environmental Policy Project; David Rothbard, Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow; Jeffrey Salmon, The Marshall Institute; Lee Garrigan, Environmental Issues Council; Lynn Bouchev and Myron Ebell, Frontiers of Freedom; Peter Cleary, Americans for Tax Reform; Randy Randol, Exxon Corp.; Robert Gehri, The Southern Company; Sharon Kneiss, Chevron Corp.; Steve Milloy, The Advancement of Sound Science Coalition; and Joseph Walker, American Petroleum Institute.

The action plan is detailed on the following pages.

GLOBAL CLIMATE SCIENCE COMMUNICATIONS ACTION PLAN

Project goal

A majority of the American public including industry leadership, recognizes that significant uncertainties exist in climate science, and therefore raises questions among those (e.g. Congress) who chart the future U.S. course on global climate change.

Progress will be measured toward the goal. A measurement of the public's perspective on climate science will be taken before the plan is launched, and the same measurement will be taken at one or more as-yet-to-be-determined intervals as the plan is implemented.

Victory will be achieved when

Average citizens "understand" (recognize) uncertainties in climate science; recognition of uncertainties becomes part of the "conventional wisdom"; media "understands" (recognizes) uncertainties in climate science; media coverage reflects balance on climate science and recognition of the validity of viewpoints that challenge the current "conventional wisdom"; industry senior leadership understands uncertainties in climate science, making them stronger ambassadors to those who shape climate policy; and those promoting the Kyoto treaty on the basis of extant science appear to be out of touch with reality.

Current reality

Unless "climate change" becomes a non-issue, meaning that the Kyoto proposal is defeated and there are no further initiatives to thwart the threat of climate change, there may be no moment when we can declare victory for our efforts. It will be necessary to establish measurements for the science effort to track progress toward achieving the goal and strategic success.

Strategies and tactics

I. National Media Relations Program: Develop and implement a national media relations program to inform the media about uncertainties in climate science; to generate national, regional and local media coverage on the scientific uncertainties, and thereby educate and inform the public, stimulating them to raise questions with policy makers.

Tactics: These tactics will be undertaken between now and the next climate meeting in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in November 1998, and will be continued thereafter, as appropriate. Activities will be launched as soon as the plan is approved, funding obtained, and the necessary resources (e.g., public relations counsel) arranged and deployed. In all cases, tactical implementation will be fully integrated with other elements of this action plan, most especially Strategy II (National Climate Science Data Center).

Identify, recruit and train a team of five independent scientists to participate in media outreach. These will be individuals who do not have a long history of visibility and/or participation in the climate change debate. Rather, this team will consist of new faces who will add their voices to those recognized scientists who already are vocal.

Develop a global climate science information kit for media including peer-reviewed papers that undercut the "conventional wisdom" on climate science. This kit also will include understandable communications, including simple fact sheets that present scientific uncertainties in language that the media and public can understand.

Conduct briefings by media-trained scientists for science writers in the top 20 media markets, using the information kits. Distribute the information kits to daily newspapers nationwide with offer of scientists to brief reporters at each paper. Develop, disseminate radio news releases scientists nationwide, and offer scientists to appear on radio talk shows across the country.

Produce, distribute a steady stream of climate science information via facsimile and e-mail to science writers around the country.

Produce, distribute via syndicate and directly to newspapers nationwide a steady stream of op-ed columns and letters to the editor authored by scientists.

Convince one of the major news national TV journalists (e.g., John Stossel) to produce a report examining the scientific underpinnings of the Kyoto treaty.

Organize, promote and conduct through grassroots organizations a series of campus/community workshops/debates on climate science in 10 most important states during the period mid-August through October, 1998.

Consider advertising the scientific uncertainties in select markets to support national, regional and local (e.g., workshops/debates), as appropriate.

National Media Program Budget—\$600,000 plus paid advertising

II. Global Climate Science Information Source: Develop and implement a program to inject credible science and scientific accountability into the global climate debate, thereby raising questions about and undercutting the "prevailing scientific wisdom." The strategy will have the added benefit of providing a platform for credible, constructive criticism of the opposition's position on the science.

Tactics: As with the National Media Relations Program, these activities will be undertaken between now and the next climate meeting in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in November 1998, and will continue thereafter. Initiatives will be launched as soon as the plan is approved, funding obtained, and the necessary resources arranged and deployed.

Establish a Global Climate Science Data Center. The GCSDC will be established in Washington as a non-profit educational foundation with an advisory board of respected climate scientists. It will be staffed initially with professionals on loan from various companies and associations with a major interest in the climate issue. These executives will bring with them knowledge and experience in the following areas: Overall history

of climate research and the IPCC process; congressional relations and knowledge of where individual Senators stand on the climate issue; knowledge of key climate scientists and where they stand; ability to identify and recruit as many as 20 respected climate scientists to serve on the science advisory board; knowledge and expertise in media relations and with established relationships with science and energy writers, columnists and editorial writers; expertise in grassroots organization; and campaign organization and administration.

The GCSDC will be led by a dynamic senior executive with a major personal commitment to the goals of the campaign and easy access to business leaders at the CEO level. The Center will be run on a day-to-day basis by an executive director with responsibility for ensuring targets are met. The Center will be funded at a level that will permit it to succeed, including funding for research contracts that may be deemed appropriate to fill gaps in climate science (e.g., a complete scientific critique of the IPCC research and its conclusions).

The GCSDC will become a one-stop resource on climate science for members of Congress, the media, industry and all others concerned. It will be in constant contact with the best climate scientists and ensure that their findings and views receive appropriate attention. It will provide them with the logistical and moral support they have been lacking. In short, it will be a sound scientific alternative to the IPCC. Its functions will include:

Providing as an easily accessible database (including a website) of all mainstream climate science information.

Identifying and establishing cooperative relationships with all major scientists whose research in this field supports our position.

Establishing cooperative relationships with other mainstream scientific organizations (e.g., meteorologists, geophysicists) to bring their perspectives to bear on the debate, as appropriate.

Developing opportunities to maximize the impact of scientific views consistent with ours with Congress, the media and other key audiences.

Monitoring and serving as an early warning system for scientific developments with the potential to impact on the climate science debate, pro and con.

Responding to claims from the scientific alarmists and media.

Providing grants for advocacy on climate science, as deemed appropriate.

Global Climate Science Data Center Budget—\$5,000,000 (spread over two years minimum)

III. National Direct Outreach and Education: Develop and implement a direct outreach program to inform and educate members of Congress, state officials, industry leadership, and school teachers/students about uncertainties in climate science. This strategy will enable Congress, state officials and industry leaders to be able to raise such serious questions about the Kyoto treaty's scientific underpinnings that American policy-makers not only will refuse to endorse it, they will seek to prevent progress toward implementation at the Buenos Aires meeting in November or through other ways. Informing teachers/students about uncertainties in climate science will begin to erect a barrier against further efforts to impose Kyoto-like measures in the future.

Tactics: Informing and educating members of Congress, state officials and industry leaders will be undertaken as soon as the plan is approved, funding is obtained, and the necessary resources are arrayed and will continue through Buenos Aires and for the fore-

seeable future. The teachers/students outreach program will be developed and launched in early 1999. In all cases, tactical implementation will be fully integrated with other elements of this action plan.

Develop and conduct through the Global Climate Science Data Center science briefings for Congress, governors, state legislators, and industry leaders by August 1998.

* * * * *

Organize under the GCSDC a "Science Education Task Group" that will serve as the point of outreach to the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) and other influential science education organizations. Work with NSTA to develop school materials that present a credible, balanced picture of climate science for use in classrooms nationwide.

Distribute educational materials directly to schools and through grassroots organizations of climate science partners (companies, organizations that participate in this effort).

National Direct Outreach Program Budget—\$300,000

IV. Funding/Fund Allocation: Develop and implement program to obtain funding, and to allocate funds to ensure that the program it is carried out effectively.

Tactics: This strategy will be implemented as soon as we have the go-ahead to proceed.

Potential funding source were identified as American Petroleum Institute (API) and its members; Business Round Table (BRT) and its members, Edison Electric Institute (EEI) and its members; Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA) and its members; and the National Mining Association (NMA) and its members.

Potential fund allocators were identified as the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT), Competitive Enterprise Institute, Frontiers of Freedom and The Marshall Institute.

Total Funds Required to Implement Program through November 1998—\$2,000,000 (A significant portion of funding for the GCSDC will be deferred until 1999 and beyond)

Measurements

Various metrics will be used to track progress. These measurements will have to be determined in fleshing out the action plan and may include:

Baseline public/government official opinion surveys and periodic follow-up surveys on the percentage of Americans and government officials who recognize significant uncertainties in climate science.

Tracking the percent of media articles that raise questions about climate science.

Number of Members of Congress exposed to our materials on climate science.

Number of communications on climate science received by Members of Congress from their constituents.

* * * * *

Number of school teachers/students reached with our information on climate science.

Number of science writers briefed and who report upon climate science uncertainties.

Total audience exposed to newspaper, radio, television coverage of science uncertainties.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STOKES.
Ms. SLAUGHTER.
Mr. SCHUMER.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution to acknowledge the Historic Northern Ireland Peace Agreement; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 28, 1998, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

8663. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area [Docket No. 97-056-9] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8664. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area [Docket No. 97-102-2] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8665. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Georgia [Docket No. 98-018-1] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8666. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Dairy Tariff-Rate Import Quota Licensing (7 CFR Part 6) received April 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8667. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Propiconazole; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300637; FRL-5783-5] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8668. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fenoxaprop-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-300635; FRL-5782-1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8669. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Canola Oil; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-3000623; FRL-5773-9] received April 14, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8670. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Spinosa; Pesticide Tolerances [OPP-300644; FRL-5785-7] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 14, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8671. A letter from the Acting Deputy Chief for Operations, Forest Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Notice, Comment, and Appeal Procedures for National Forest System Projects and Activities [36 CFR Part 215] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8672. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the Reserve Forces Policy Board for Fiscal Year 1997, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113 (c) and (e); to the Committee on National Security.

8673. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration (MARAD) for Fiscal Year 1997, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on National Security.

8674. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's certification that the survivability and lethality testing of the CH 47 Improved Cargo Helicopter (ICH) would be unreasonably expensive and impractical, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2313(c); to the Committee on National Security.

8675. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a delay in the report on Reserve retirement initiatives, pursuant to Public Law 104—201; to the Committee on National Security.

8676. A letter from the Acting Deputy Under Secretary (Logistics), Department of Defense, transmitting a request for deferment until August 1st off the report containing a plan to reduce overhead costs of the supply management activities of the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) and the military departments (known as Inventory Control Points (ICPs)) so that the overhead costs for each fiscal year after fiscal year 2000 do not exceed eight percent of net sales at standard price by Inventory Control Points during that year, pursuant to Public Law 105—85, section 394; to the Committee on National Security.

8677. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the review of the maintenance medication dispensing policy with a view towards modifying the current policy to dispense maintenance medications for a 90-day period; to the Committee on National Security.

8678. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the premium collection procedures for the dental insurance programs, pursuant to Public Law 105—85, Section 733(c); to the Committee on National Security.

8679. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report that specifies for each military treatment facility the amount collected from third party payers during the preceding fiscal year, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1095; to the Committee on National Security.

8680. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report detailing the

costs and savings attributable to base closures and realignments (BRAC), pursuant to Public Law 105—85, section 2824; to the Committee on National Security.

8681. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on enlistment waiver trends for Fiscal Years 1991–1997, pursuant to Public Law 105—85, section 531; to the Committee on National Security.

8682. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the determination 98-18 that it is in the national interest for the Export-Import Bank to extend a loan, guarantee, insure or lease any product to Vietnam, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(2)(D)(iv); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8683. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Unsafe and Unsound Banking Practices [Docket No. 97-02] (RIN: 1557-AB56) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8684. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Occupant Crash Protection [Docket No. NHTSA-97-2714] (RIN: 2127-AG17) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8685. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Side Impact Protection—Side Impact Dummy [Docket No. NHTSA-98-3668] (RIN: 2127-AG37) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8686. 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 Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Nebraska; Control of Landfill Gas Emissions From Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [NE 052-1052a; FRL-6002-4] received April 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8687. 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 Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Iowa; Control of Landfill Gas Emissions From Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [IA 051-1051a; FRL-6002-8] received April 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8688. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Fuel Fleet Program [FRL-5994-5] (RIN: 2060-AH56) received April 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8689. 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 042-1042(a); FRL-5979-4] received April 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8690. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amendments to the Test Procedures for Heavy-Duty Engines, and Light-Duty Vehicles and Trucks and Amendments to the Emission Standard Provisions for Gaseous Fueled Vehicles and Engines [FRL-5999-7] received April 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8691. 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; California—South Coast Air Quality Management District [CA-189-0059; FRL-5996-5] received April 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8692. 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 [WA 66-71741a; FRL-5998-3] received April 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8693. 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; California—Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [CA-203-0062; FRL-5996-4] received April 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8694. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Acid Rain Program: Revisions to Sulfur Dioxide Opt-Ins [FRL-5996-6] (RIN: 2060-AH36) received April 14, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8695. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "The Medicaid Quality of Care Medical Records Study," pursuant to Public Law 99—509, section 9432(c); to the Committee on Commerce.

8696. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1997 report on implementation of the support for East European Democracy Act (SEED) Program, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 5474; to the Committee on International Relations.

8697. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-323, "Real Property Tax Rates and Assessment Initiative Amendment Act of 1998" received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8698. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-317, "Sex Offender Register Immunity From Liability Temporary Amendment Act of 1998" received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8699. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-326, "Omnibus Personnel Reform Amendment Act of 1998" received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8700. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-319, "Solid Waste Facility Permit Temporary Amendment Act of 1998" received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8701. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-322, "Southeastern University Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 1998" received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8702. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a

copy of D.C. Act 12-324, "Real Property Tax Rates and Assessment Initiative Temporary Amendment Act of 1998" received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8703. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-316, "Omnibus Regulatory Reform Amendment Act of 1998 Temporary Repealer Act of 1998" received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8704. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-275, "Real Property Tax Reassessment Temporary Amendment Act of 1998" received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8705. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-318, "Mutual Holding Company Mergers and Acquisition Temporary Amendment Act of 1998" received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8706. A letter from the Chairman, Census Monitoring Board, transmitting a statement informing Congress that the Board cannot issue its first report by April 1, 1998 because the President has not yet appointed four members to the Census Monitoring Board, pursuant to Public Law 105-119; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8707. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Disclosure of Information (RIN: 3064-AC10) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8708. A letter from the Executive Director, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8709. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Government National Mortgage Association (Ginnie Mae) management report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1997, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8710. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Extension of Effective Date of Environmental Impact Assessment of Nongovernmental Activities in Antarctica [FRL-5994-2] received April 14, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8711. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Threatened Status for One Plant, *Arctostaphylos pallida* (*Pallid Manzanita*), from the Northern Diablo Range of California (RIN: 1018-AD35) received April 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8712. 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; Offshore Component Pacific Cod in the Central Regulatory Area [Docket No. 971208297-8054-02; I.D. 033098A] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8713. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforce-

ment, transmitting the Office's final rule—Maryland Regulatory Program [MD-042-FOR] received April 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8714. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting two reports on the 1997 Activities of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and the 1997 Judicial Business of the United States Courts, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 604(a)(4), (h)(2), and 2412(d)(5); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8715. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Federal Register Certifying Officer, Financial Management Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Transfer of Debts to Treasury for Collection (RIN: 1510-AA68) received March 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8716. A letter from the Director, Government Relations, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the Girl Scouts of the United States of America 1997 Annual Report, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 37; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8717. A letter from the Director, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting the Federal Judicial Center's Annual Report for 1997, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 623(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8718. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Explosives Detection Systems [Docket No. 28671] (RIN: 2120-AF95) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8719. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Apple Valley, CA [Airspace Docket No. 96-AWP-3] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8720. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Davis/Woodland/Winters, CA [Airspace Docket No. 97-AWP-20] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8721. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Globe, AZ [Airspace Docket No. 98-AWP-8] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8722. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. Models PA-31, PA-31-300, PA-31-325, PA-31-350, and PA-31P Airplanes [Docket No. 90-CE-65-AD; Amendment 39-10467; AD 98-08-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8723. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes Equipped with Pratt & Whitney JT9D-3 and -7 Series Engines [Docket No. 97-NM-267-AD; Amendment 39-10284; AD 98-02-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8724. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class E Airspace; McCall, ID [Airspace Dock-

et No. 97-ANM-16] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8725. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revocation of Class E Airspace; Blue Mesa, CO; and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Gunnison, CO [Airspace Docket No. 97-ANM-15] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8726. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification to the Gulf of Mexico High Offshore Airspace Area [Airspace Docket No. 96-ASW-30] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8727. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29186; Amdt. No. 1862] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8728. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures [Docket No. 29185; Amdt. No. 1861] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8729. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29187; Amdt. No. 1863] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8730. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce, plc RB211 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 94-ANE-39; Amendment 39-10426; AD 98-07-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8731. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Model 1329-23 and -25 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-93-AD; Amendment 39-10442; AD 98-07-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8732. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF 340A and SAAB Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-291-AD; Amendment 39-10465; AD 98-08-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8733. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, -200, and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-83-AD; Amendment 39-10464; AD 98-08-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8734. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Turbo-Propeller Powered General Dynamics (Convair) Model 240, 340, and 440

Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-69-AD; Amendment 39-10466; AD 98-08-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8735. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB 2000 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-97-AD; Amendment 39-10459; AD 98-08-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8736. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Twin Commander Aircraft Corporation 500, 600, and 700 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 95-CE-92-AD; Amendment 39-10468; AD 98-08-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8737. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 and 767 Series Airplanes Equipped with General Electric (GE) CF6-80C2 Engines [Docket No. 98-NM-79-AD; Amendment 39-10472; AD 98-08-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8738. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Model PC-7 Airplanes [Docket No. 97-CE-130-AD; Amendment 39-10471; AD 98-08-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8739. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, -20, -30, -40, and -50 Series Airplanes, and C-9 (Military) Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-40-AD; Amendment 39-10473; AD 98-08-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8740. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; AlliedSignal Aerospace Bendix/King Model KSA 470 Autopilot Servo Actuators, part numbers 065-0076-10 through 065-0076-15 [Docket No. 97-CE-74-AD; Amendment 39-10469; AD 98-08-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8741. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; SOCAT—Groupe AEROSPATIALE Models TB10 and TB200 Airplanes [Docket No. 95-CE-71-AD; Amendment 39-10470; AD 98-08-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8742. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA.315B, SA.316B, SA.316C, SA.319B, and SE.3160 Helicopters [Docket No. 98-SW-09-AD; Amendment 39-10479; AD 98-04-40] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8743. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Industrie Aeronautique e

Meccaniche Model Piaggio P-180 Airplanes [Docket No. 97-CE-142-AD; Amendment 39-10454; AD 98-08-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8744. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Vessel Identification System; Effective Date Change [CGD 89-050] (RIN: 2115-AD35) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8745. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—SAFETY ZONE: Bath / Woolwich Bridge Construction [CGD1-98-029] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8746. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Anacostia River, Washington D.C. [CGD05-98-017] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8747. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Unescorted Access Privilege; Address change [Docket No. 29193; Amendment No. 107-11; 108-16] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8748. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Improvements to Hazardous Materials Identification Systems; Editorial revisions and Responses to Petitions for Reconsideration and Appeal [Docket No. HM-206] (RIN: 2137-AB75) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8749. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; RAPCO, Inc. Filter, Part Numbers RA-1J4-4, RA-1J4-6, and RA-1J4-7 from Lot Numbers 05597, 07797, and 12597 [Docket No. 97-CE-71-AD; Amendment 39-10103; AD 97-16-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8750. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Proposed Amendment to Class E Airspace; Le Mars, IA [Airspace Docket No. 98-ACE-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8751. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class D and Class E Airspace; Poplar Bluff, MO; Correction [Airspace Docket No. 97-ACE-28] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8752. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Aurora, NE [Airspace Docket No. 98-ACE-13] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8753. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Norfolk, NE; Correction

[Airspace Docket No. 97-ACE-33] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8754. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Marshall Army Airfield, Fort Riley, KS [Airspace Docket No. 97-ACE-20] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8755. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Sabreliner Model NA-265-40, -60, -70, and -80 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-171-AD; Amendment 39-10349, AD 98-04-37] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8756. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320-111 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-22-AD; Amendment 39-10410] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8757. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amendment of the Provisions to Eliminate and Phase-out Mixing Zones for Bioaccumulative Chemicals of Concern and Amendment to Procedure 8.D. of Appendix F (Pollutant Minimization Program) for the Final Water Quality Guidance for the Great Lakes System [FRL-5999-8] received April 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8758. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the 36th Annual Report of the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 1997, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8759. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on the pipeline safety user fee assessment basis, pursuant to Public Law 104-34; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8760. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 07-98—received April 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8761. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report entitled "Evaluation of Short-Time Compensation Programs: Final Report," pursuant to Public Law 102-318, section 401; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8762. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's quarterly report on the Portfolio Reengineering Demonstration Program for the fourth quarter of Fiscal Year (FY) 1997, pursuant to Public Law 104-134; jointly to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services and Appropriations.

8763. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service [CC Docket No. 96-45] received April 15, 1998, pursuant to Public Law 105-119, 111 Stat. 2440; jointly to the Committees on Commerce and Appropriations.

8764. A letter from the Executive Director, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, transmitting a report on the second quarter

of Fiscal Year 1998, pursuant to Public Law 105—100; jointly to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight and Appropriations.

8765. A letter from the National Film Preservation Foundation, transmitting the first Annual Report of the National Film Preservation Foundation for the calendar year ending December 31, 1997, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 5706 Public Law 104—285, Title II; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and House Oversight.

8766. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting copies of the FY 1999 budget requests of the Federal Aviation Administration to the Department, including requests for "Facilities and Equipment" and "Research, Engineering, and Development," pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2205(f); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Science, and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 1872. A bill to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 105—494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker.

[The following action occurred on April 24, 1998]

H.R. 1965. Referral to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than May 8, 1998.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of Rule X and clause 4 of Rule XXII,

Mr. RYUN introduced a bill (H.R. 3733) to authorize the National Science Foundation to make grants for applied engineering and technology education equipment and capital improvements; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

290. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 151 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take certain actions regarding the implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996; to the Committee on Agriculture.

291. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Senate Resolution 2995 memorializing Congress to

amend title ten, United States Code relating to the compensation of retired military; to the Committee on National Security.

292. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, relative to Senate Resolution 766 memorializing the United States Congress to reject any legislation that would exempt health plans sponsored by associations and multiple employer welfare arrangements from state insurance standards and oversight; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

293. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of The Mariana Islands, relative to House Resolution No. 11-23 requesting the federal officials for a waiver on the Covenant matching fund to help expedite and foster infrastructure development in the CNMI; to the Committee on Resources.

294. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives for the Commonwealth of The Mariana Islands, relative to House Resolution No. 11-25 expressing full, undeniable and unquestionable support on the provisions of the Covenant by the people and their government of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and in particular under section 902 of said provisions; to the Committee on Resources.

295. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 97 memorializing Congress to authorize a ten-year extension of the Delaware and Lehigh Navigation Canal National Heritage Corridor Act and to authorize Federal support for Corridor projects; to the Committee on Resources.

296. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Resolution No. 106 memorializing the United States Congress to maintain the incentive grant approach to accomplishing shared public safety objectives and to refrain from imposing federal mandates to accomplish such objectives; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

297. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 211 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to raise the cap on mortgage revenue bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

298. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Maine, relative to Joint Resolution 871 memorializing Congress To Ensure The Viability of the United States Social Security System adopted by the 118th Maine Legislature; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

299. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, relative to Resolution No. 8 urging the President and the Congress of the United States to resolve differences that exist between the Province of Ontario and the State of Minnesota relating to the taking of fish in Canadian boundary waters by Americans staying in American resorts; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1047: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1375: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1531: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2009: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2189: Mr. CAMPBELL and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 2693: Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 2990: Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DIXON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3253: Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 3279: Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 3376: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 3400: Ms. KAPTUR and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 3494: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3531: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. YATES, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3571: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 3624: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MANTON, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. YATES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.J. Res. 102: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H. Con. Res. 203: Mr. BALDACCI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

58. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Office of the City Clerk, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, relative to Resolution No. 119 imploring the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate to pass H.R.1151; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

59. Also, a petition of the City Commission of the State of Florida, relative to Resolution 98-7 petitioning the United States Senate and House of Representatives to appropriate \$250,000 to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers so that the Corps can complete the plans and specifications for a much needed shore protection project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 6

OFFERED BY: MR. LAZIO OF NEW YORK

AMENDMENT No. 6: Page 192, after line 10, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 430. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section—

(1) to bring more highly trained individuals into the early child care profession; and

(2) to keep more highly trained child care providers in the early child care field for longer periods of time.

(b) LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.—Part B (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 428J (as added by section 432) (20 U.S.C. 1078-10) the following:

"SEC. 428K. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) CHILD CARE FACILITY.—The term 'child care facility' means a facility, including a home, that—

"(A) provides child care services; and

"(B) meets applicable State or local government licensing, certification, approval, or registration requirements, if any.

“(2) CHILD CARE SERVICES.—The term ‘child care services’ means activities and services provided for the education and care of children from birth through age 5 by an individual who has a degree in early childhood education.

“(3) DEGREE.—The term ‘degree’ means an associate’s or bachelor’s degree awarded by an institution of higher education.

“(4) EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.—The term ‘early childhood education’ means education in the areas of early child education, child care, or any other educational area related to child care that the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(b) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out a demonstration program of assuming the obligation to repay, pursuant to subsection (c), a loan made, insured or guaranteed under this part or part D (excluding loans made under sections 428B and 428C) for any new borrower after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, who—

“(A) completes a degree in early childhood education;

“(B) obtains employment in a child care facility; and

“(C) is working full-time and is earning an amount which does not exceed the greater of an amount equal to 100 percent of the poverty line for a family of 2 as determined in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act.

“(2) AWARD BASIS; PRIORITY.—

“(A) AWARD BASIS.—Subject to subparagraph (B), loan repayment under this section shall be on a first-come, first-served basis and subject to the availability of appropriations.

“(B) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall give priority in providing loan repayment under this section for a fiscal year to student borrowers who received loan repayment under this section for the preceding fiscal year.

“(3) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

“(c) LOAN REPAYMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall assume the obligation to repay—

“(A) after the second year of employment described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (b)(1), 20 percent of the total amount of all loans made after date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, to a student under this part or part D;

“(B) after the third year of such employment, 20 percent of the total amount of all such loans; and

“(C) after each of the fourth and fifth years of such employment, 30 percent of the total amount of all such loans.

“(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the refunding of any repayment of a loan made under this part or part D.

“(3) INTEREST.—If a portion of a loan is repaid by the Secretary under this section for any year, the proportionate amount of interest on such loan which accrues for such year shall be repaid by the Secretary.

“(4) SPECIAL RULE.—In the case where a student borrower who is not participating in loan repayment pursuant to this section returns to an institution of higher education after graduation from an institution of higher education for the purpose of obtaining a degree in early childhood education, the Secretary is authorized to assume the obligation to repay the total amount of loans made under this part or part D incurred for a maximum of two academic years in returning to an institution of higher education for the purpose of obtaining a degree in early child-

hood education. Such loans shall only be repaid for borrowers who qualify for loan repayment pursuant to the provisions of this section, and shall be repaid in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (1).

“(5) INELIGIBILITY OF NATIONAL SERVICE AWARD RECIPIENTS.—No student borrower may, for the same volunteer service, receive a benefit under both this section and subtitle D of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12601 et seq.).

“(d) REPAYMENT TO ELIGIBLE LENDERS.—The Secretary shall pay to each eligible lender or holder for each fiscal year an amount equal to the aggregate amount of loans which are subject to repayment pursuant to this section for such year.

“(e) APPLICATION FOR REPAYMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible individual desiring loan repayment under this section shall submit a complete and accurate application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(2) CONDITIONS.—An eligible individual may apply for loan repayment under this section after completing each year of qualifying employment. The borrower shall receive forbearance while engaged in qualifying employment unless the borrower is in deferment while so engaged.

“(f) EVALUATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct, by grant or contract, an independent national evaluation of the impact of the demonstration program assisted under this section on the field of early childhood education.

“(2) COMPETITIVE BASIS.—The grant or contract described in subsection (a) shall be awarded on a competitive basis.

“(3) CONTENTS.—The evaluation described in this subsection shall—

“(A) determine the number of individuals who were encouraged by the demonstration program assisted under this section to pursue early childhood education;

“(B) determine the number of individuals who remain employed in a child care facility as a result of participation in the program;

“(C) identify the barriers to the effectiveness of the program;

“(D) assess the cost-effectiveness of the program in improving the quality of—

“(i) early childhood education; and

“(ii) child care services;

“(E) identify the reasons why participants in the program have chosen to take part in the program;

“(F) identify the number of individuals participating in the program who received an associate’s degree and the number of such individuals who received a bachelor’s degree; and

“(G) identify the number of years each individual participates in the program.

“(4) INTERIM AND FINAL EVALUATION REPORTS.—The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President and the Congress such interim reports regarding the evaluation described in this subsection as the Secretary deems appropriate, and shall prepare and so submit a final report regarding the evaluation by January 1, 2002.

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.”

H.R. 6

OFFERED BY: MR. LAZIO OF NEW YORK

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 192, after line 10, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 430. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section—

(1) to bring more highly trained individuals into the early child care profession; and

(2) to keep more highly trained child care providers in the early child care field for longer periods of time.

(b) LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.—Part B (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 428J (as added by section 432) (20 U.S.C. 1078-10) the following:

“SEC. 428K. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CHILD CARE FACILITY.—The term ‘child care facility’ means a facility, including a home, that—

“(A) provides child care services; and

“(B) meets applicable State or local government licensing, certification, approval, or registration requirements, if any.

“(2) CHILD CARE SERVICES.—The term ‘child care services’ means activities and services provided for the education and care of children from birth through age 5 by an individual who has a degree in early childhood education.

“(3) DEGREE.—The term ‘degree’ means an associate’s or bachelor’s degree awarded by an institution of higher education.

“(4) EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.—The term ‘early childhood education’ means education in the areas of early child education, child care, or any other educational area related to child care that the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(b) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out a demonstration program of assuming the obligation to repay, pursuant to subsection (c), a loan made, insured or guaranteed under this part or part D (excluding loans made under sections 428B and 428C) for any new borrower after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, who—

“(A) completes a degree in early childhood education; and

“(B) obtains employment in a child care facility.

“(2) AWARD BASIS; PRIORITY.—

“(A) AWARD BASIS.—Subject to subparagraph (B), loan repayment under this section shall be on a first-come, first-served basis and subject to the availability of appropriations.

“(B) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall give priority in providing loan repayment under this section for a fiscal year to student borrowers who received loan repayment under this section for the preceding fiscal year.

“(3) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

“(c) LOAN REPAYMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall assume the obligation to repay—

“(A) after the second year of employment described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (b)(1), 20 percent of the total amount of all loans made after date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, to a student under this part or part D;

“(B) after the third year of such employment, 20 percent of the total amount of all such loans; and

“(C) after each of the fourth and fifth years of such employment, 30 percent of the total amount of all such loans.

“(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the refunding of any repayment of a loan made under this part or part D.

“(3) INTEREST.—If a portion of a loan is repaid by the Secretary under this section for

any year, the proportionate amount of interest on such loan which accrues for such year shall be repaid by the Secretary.

“(4) SPECIAL RULE.—In the case where a student borrower who is not participating in loan repayment pursuant to this section returns to an institution of higher education after graduation from an institution of higher education for the purpose of obtaining a degree in early childhood education, the Secretary is authorized to assume the obligation to repay the total amount of loans made under this part or part D incurred for a maximum of two academic years in returning to an institution of higher education for the purpose of obtaining a degree in early childhood education. Such loans shall only be repaid for borrowers who qualify for loan repayment pursuant to the provisions of this section, and shall be repaid in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (1).

“(5) INELIGIBILITY OF NATIONAL SERVICE AWARD RECIPIENTS.—No student borrower may, for the same volunteer service, receive a benefit under both this section and subtitle D of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12601 et seq.).

“(d) REPAYMENT TO ELIGIBLE LENDERS.—The Secretary shall pay to each eligible lender or holder for each fiscal year an amount equal to the aggregate amount of loans which are subject to repayment pursuant to this section for such year.

“(e) APPLICATION FOR REPAYMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible individual desiring loan repayment under this section shall submit a complete and accurate application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(2) CONDITIONS.—An eligible individual may apply for loan repayment under this section after completing each year of qualifying employment. The borrower shall receive forbearance while engaged in qualifying employment unless the borrower is in deferment while so engaged.

“(f) EVALUATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct, by grant or contract, an independent national evaluation of the impact of the demonstration program assisted under this section on the field of early childhood education.

“(2) COMPETITIVE BASIS.—The grant or contract described in subsection (a) shall be awarded on a competitive basis.

“(3) CONTENTS.—The evaluation described in this subsection shall—

“(A) determine the number of individuals who were encouraged by the demonstration program assisted under this section to pursue early childhood education;

“(B) determine the number of individuals who remain employed in a child care facility as a result of participation in the program;

“(C) identify the barriers to the effectiveness of the program;

“(D) assess the cost-effectiveness of the program in improving the quality of—

“(i) early childhood education; and

“(ii) child care services;

“(E) identify the reasons why participants in the program have chosen to take part in the program;

“(F) identify the number of individuals participating in the program who received an associate's degree and the number of such individuals who received a bachelor's degree; and

“(G) identify the number of years each individual participates in the program.

“(4) INTERIM AND FINAL EVALUATION REPORTS.—The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President and the Congress such interim reports regarding the evaluation described in this subsection as the Secretary deems appropriate, and shall prepare and so submit a final report regarding the evaluation by January 1, 2002.

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for fiscal

year 1999, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.”.

H.R. 6

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 246, line 23, after the period insert close quotation marks and “; and”, and strike line 24 and all that follows through line 5 on page 247.

H.R. 6

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the Bill, add the following new title:

TITLE XI—DISCRIMINATION AND PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT

SEC. 1101. PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION AND PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT.

(a) PROHIBITION.—No institution of higher education that participates in any program authorized under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) shall, in connection with admission to such institution, discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any person or group based on whole or in part on the race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin of such person or group.

(b) EXCEPTION.—This section does not apply to any institution of undergraduate higher education which is a private institution that traditionally and continually from its establishment has had a policy of admitting only students of one sex.

(c) OUTREACH ACTIVITIES PERMITTED.—Subsection (a) does not prohibit or limit any effort by an institution of higher education to encourage and recruit qualified women and minorities to seek admission to such institution if such recruitment or encouragement does not involve granting preferential treatment, in selecting any person for admission, that is based in whole or in part on race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin.