



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1998

No. 133

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 29, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable RICHARD BURR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray using words of the penitential Psalm 51:

Have mercy on me, O God, according to thy steadfast love; according to thy abundant mercy, blot out my transgressions. Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity and cleanse me from my sin.

Create in me a clean heart, O God, and put a new and right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence and take not thy holy Spirit from me. Restore to me the joy of thy salvation, and uphold me with a willing spirit. 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 Virginia (Mr. BATE-

MAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BATEMAN 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 SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3096. An act to correct a provision relating to termination of benefits for convicted persons.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2392. An act to encourage the disclosure and exchange of information about computer processing problems, solutions, test practices and test results, and related matters in connection with the transition to the year 2000.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1194

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this sounds a little crooked, but I will see if I can get it straight. Four years ago Republicans inherited a Congress run by liberals for 40 years.

Now, during that time, our friends on the other side of the aisle passed some pretty cute environmental laws. Well, most of these laws make about as much sense as letting the fox guard the hen house. So what has happened? Federal entities like my friends at the Savannah District of the Corps of Engineers claim sovereign immunity so they do not have to comply with environmental laws.

On the other hand, private industry just gets sued so groups like the Sierra Club can make ends meet. Pretty clever.

I think it is time that my friends at the Corps of Engineers and all other Federal entities, for that matter, abide by the laws they set for you and me. Then instead of sneaking out the back door like they do now with this large loophole, they will realize how frivolous some of these laws actually are.

Cosponsor H.R. 1194 and stay tuned.

TAX CUTS

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, it was last year that Republicans passed tax cuts as part of the bipartisan balanced budget agreement. The President signed that legislation last summer.

This year the Congress and especially the leadership of the Republicans passed another tax cut. But this year the Democrats are attacking these tax cuts, calling them an election year gimmick.

This is a very strange attitude, but one that speaks volumes about what liberal Democrats think about tax cuts. Liberal Democrats do not think that Americans are overtaxed. They see no problem with a government that requires average Americans to work until mid-May, Tax Freedom Day, before having the right to keep the fruits of their labor. In fact, they act as if politicians are actually doing you a favor by letting you keep what already belongs to you.

The money that people earn belongs to them, not to the politicians here in Washington. It is time that the liberals and the Democratic leadership understand that and show some respect for the hard-working people of America.

□ 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.

H9181

CONGRATULATIONS TO SOUTHEASTERN MINNESOTA HIGH SCHOOL HONORS CHOIR

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Southeastern Minnesota High School Honors Choir and their director, Richard Kvam, on the successful completion of their European concert tour.

As the American representatives to an international competition of high school choirs, these 73 high schoolers from across the First Congressional District represented the best our country has to offer. They did not disappoint us, taking first place in the competition over choirs from as far away as South Africa, Denmark and Japan.

More important than their award, however, was the way that the students conducted themselves in concerts and impromptu performances throughout Austria, Germany and the Czech Republic. Whether singing in historic churches or modern airport terminals, they were always respectful of their European hosts. Best of all, they made beautiful music.

We in Minnesota have been blessed with an unusually strong choral music heritage. Our Honors Choir follows in the tradition of such internationally-acclaimed groups as the St. Olaf College Choir and the Dale Warland Singers.

As someone who has heard the Honors Choir perform on more than one occasion, I can attest to the fact that they deserve to be called the best in the world.

Congratulations, once again.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY,
OCTOBER 1, 1998

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Thursday October 1, 1998.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STEARNS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ON THE DEATH OF MARY
MATHEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with exceeding regret that I advise my colleagues of the death of a great American and one of the most beloved Virginians of this era in the illustrious history of our Commonwealth.

My reference is to Mary Mathews, a Greek American who has been a towering example of patriotism. Mary had a love affair with her adopted country and, of all the people I have known, none surpassed her in her caring for those who serve our Nation in our military service.

Mary Mathews was the widow of Nick Mathews, himself a great American patriot. Together they founded and built Nick's Seafood Pavilion in Yorktown, Virginia and made it a highly successful and profitable restaurant operation. Their success, founded on their hard work and dedication to quality, was shared with their community, State and Nation. Their joint philanthropy while Nick lived and Mary's continued generosity after his death are legendary.

As a resident of Yorktown, which is the site of the battle that procured our Nation's independence, Mary had a special reverence for what Yorktown and the success of the American Revolution meant, not only to Americans but to people throughout the globe. Most appropriately, Mary Mathews was chosen by the Navy to be the sponsor of the Aegis Class Cruiser, U.S.S. Yorktown. She understood this to be a signal honor, and no ship or its crew were ever more generously recognized by their sponsor than the cruiser U.S.S. Yorktown by their sponsor Mary Mathews.

My wife, Laura, and I have had a warm, close relationship with Nick and Mary Mathews since at least May 29, 1954, when we stopped there for our first dinner as husband and wife following our wedding on that date. We were with Mary in Pascagoula, Mississippi when she, with great elan, christened the U.S.S. Yorktown, the day following the death of her beloved husband, Nick, before yielding to her grief.

We were with Mary when the U.S.S. Yorktown was sent by the Navy to Yorktown for its commissioning ceremony. You would have had to have been there to fully appreciate the joy that occasion gave to Mary Mathews and the special relationship between her and the crew of the U.S.S. Yorktown.

Finally, you needed to be on the site of the Battle of Yorktown, on October

19, 1981, when Mary Mathews, immigrant patriot, stood on the 200th anniversary of the surrender of Cornwallis, alongside President Reagan and President Mitterand of France, basking in the pride of being an American and living in one of America's special places, commemorating a very special event.

God bless Mary Mathews, and as she would say, God bless America, the land she so truly loved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DIXON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring the attention of the House to a veritable scandal occurring in our country today. Seniors on the central coast of California and throughout the country are paying outrageously high prices for their prescription drugs. Even worse, these inflated prices subsidize the discounts that high-profit HMOs get for the very same drugs.

Yesterday I released a report on the cost of prescription drugs for seniors in my district and, more importantly, a major reason that these costs are so high. The findings are startling.

Seniors in my district pay on average 133 percent more for the 10 most widely prescribed drugs than do HMOs buying the same drugs. These are drugs like Zocor for reducing cholesterol, Norvasc for reducing blood pressure, and Relafen for relief from arthritis, common prescription drugs.

Prescription drug companies give huge discounts to managed care companies for these and other drugs. Other buyers, like pharmacists, pay substantially more for the same drugs and must pass these higher costs on to seniors.

For example, my study found that Ticlid, one of the most widely prescribed medications for persons who have had strokes, sells to an HMO for around \$34 for 60 tablets. Yet in my district the average price for seniors who have to pay for this drug themselves is more than \$130, nearly a 300 percent markup over the price the HMO pays.

The huge difference in prices is not going to the retail pharmacist in Santa Barbara or Santa Maria or Arroyo

Grande. On average the local pharmacists on the central coast are themselves paying \$100 to \$110 for Ticlid. The final price seniors pay includes only a reasonable markup to the outrageous price pharmacists are forced to pay to the drug companies.

□ 1015

No, the extra money that seniors pay goes to the drug company so that it can continue to give big discounts to the HMOs and managed care companies.

That seniors should be paying more money for drugs than they should, while HMOs reap huge profits, is a very sad story. And these are profits that are based partly on the huge discounts that they get from the drug companies. But there is even a sadder element. Many seniors simply cannot afford

these high prices and so instead, because of their fixed incomes, they take half the prescribed dosage or they just do not buy these life-saving drugs because they cost too much.

For example, Clyde Vann, of Pismo Beach, told my staff that he pays over \$300 per month for seven prescription drugs on his fixed income, and he is not even taking two others because he cannot afford the extra \$150 a month. Harriet MacGregor of Santa Barbara told my staff that because of the high cost of her five prescriptions she must sometimes skip or reduce her dosage.

Mr. Speaker, this is intolerable. Senior citizens should not be subsidizing the big profits of HMOs, and they should not have to choose between filling their prescriptions or buying food or paying rent.

Last week I was proud to be an original cosponsor of legislation to address this issue. H.R. 4646 was introduced by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JIM TURNER), who is here today and will be also speaking to this topic. This bill will allow pharmacists the opportunity to receive the same big discounts that HMOs get for drugs that they dispense to seniors.

This legislation is long overdue and will ensure that seniors pay reasonable prices for the life-saving medications that they so desperately need, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a document providing information on cost differentials on prescription drugs.

APPENDIX A.—INFORMATION ON PRESCRIPTION DRUGS ANALYZED IN THIS STUDY

Brand name drug	Dosage and form	Indication	Prices (Dollars)				Price differential (percent)
			FSS	Major wholesaler	AWP	Average retail price	
Ticlid	250 mg, 60 tablets	Stroke	\$33.57	\$99.44	\$108.90	\$131.24	291
Zocor	5 mg, 60 tablets	Cholesterol reducer	42.95	85.47	106.84	112.55	161
Prilosec	20 mg, 30 cap	Ulcer	58.38	99.20	108.90	131.47	125
Norvasc	5 mg, 90 tablets	Blood Pressure	58.83	97.92	125.66	128.78	119
Fosamax	10 mg, 30 tablets	Osteoporosis	31.86	50.91	51.88	69.22	117
Procardia XL	30 mg, 100 tab	Heart	67.35	105.05	131.31	143.75	113
Relafen	500 mg, 100 tab	Arthritis	62.58	88.88	111.10	132.78	112
Vasotec	10 mg, 100 tab	Blood Pressure	56.08	85.56	102.94	116.28	107
Cardizem CD	240 mg, 90 tablets	Angina	99.36	154.10	165.42	199.04	100
Zoloft	50 mg, 100 tab	Depression	123.88	172.44	215.55	232.50	88
Average price differential							133

H.R. 4646, THE PRESCRIPTION FAIRNESS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for her remarks regarding the legislation that she and 61 other Members of the House have joined in to try to address this very serious problem that faces many of our senior citizens: The high cost of prescription drugs.

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight did a study at my request, in my district, in response to the many senior citizens who have contacted me telling me that they have noticed that it is becoming an increasing problem for them to pay for the high cost of prescription medication. One of these ladies is a constituent of mine in Orange, Texas. Her name is Frances Daley. I had the opportunity to visit with her in my district, when I was going around talking about H.R. 4646, the Prescription Fairness Act, that 62 of us in the House have introduced.

Ms. Daley is blind. She takes nine prescription medications. She spends an average of \$450 a month on those nine medications. She lives on a meager Social Security check, \$650 a month. With only \$110 left after trying to pay for these prescription drugs, I asked Ms. Daley, "How do you do it?" And she leaned over to me, in a proud

sort of way, and said, "I just take half my medication."

No senior citizen should be faced with the choice of taking only half of their medications. I even talked to senior citizens who quietly told me that they sometimes have to choose between buying food and buying medication.

While we have been very proud of the fact that Medicare has provided some protection for our senior citizens' health care, all the while we have failed to note that slowly prescription drug prices have been rising and rising, to the point where many of our seniors can no longer pay for their prescription medications.

At my request and the request of several other members of our Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the staff put together a study. We went out and we surveyed pharmacies in our own districts, just to find out what the price differential was between what our senior citizens are paying for drugs and what the big drug manufacturers' most favored customers are paying for those same drugs.

The results of that study are shown on this chart to my right. What we determined was that there are 10 drugs that are commonly prescribed for senior citizens. The 10 most commonly prescribed drugs are shown in the left-hand column. The name of the manufacturer is shown in the next column. The use of that drug is shown in the next column.

And in this column we see the prices that are paid by the big drug manufac-

turers' most favored customers. By "favored customers" we are talking about the big HMOs, the big hospital chains, and even the Federal Government. Those are the favored customers of the big drug manufacturers.

For Ticlid, the first example on the chart, which is used as a stroke medication, the most favored customers pay \$33.57 to the big drug manufacturers for a typical prescription; about a month's supply of Ticlid. The retail price paid in the Second Congressional District of Texas, the average retail price, is \$117.95. That is what the senior citizens pays when they walk into their local pharmacy.

The price differential is shown in the last column. For Ticlid, senior citizens in the Second Congressional District, and in most districts in this country, are paying over twice, 251 percent more for Ticlid than the most favored customers of the big drug manufacturers.

We took all 10, we averaged them, and as we can see in the bottom right-hand corner, there is over twice a difference between what senior citizens are paying in their local retail pharmacies and what the big drug companies are charging their most favored customers.

This is not right. This kind of price discrimination is placing the burden of paying the highest prices for prescription drugs in this country on the segment of our population that is least able to pay: our senior citizens who walk into their local pharmacy without insurance.

Our study showed many other examples of price discrimination. One drug, Synthroid, a hormone treatment, had a price difference of 1350 percent. The most favored customers were paying \$1.78 for the prescription, while our senior citizens in their local pharmacies are paying \$25.86.

Some would say, well, maybe the local pharmacies are getting rich. The truth is the markup on drugs at a local pharmacy is very small. Our study indicated that it ranged anywhere from a 1 percent markup to a high of 19 percent. So it is not our local pharmacies that are responsible for this problem. It goes back to the big drug manufacturers and their discriminatory pricing practices. It is wrong, and we need to do something about it.

H.R. 4646 addresses this problem by allowing our local pharmacies to buy directly from the Federal Government at these lower prices and then resale, resale to our senior citizens at much lower prices. We think this is a common sense solution, will cost the government nothing, but it should be done for folks like Ms. Daley in Orange, Texas. The big drug companies will not like it, but for Ms. Daley it is worth the fight.

RESPECT WILL OF HOUSE AND SENATE AND ALLOW WOMEN EQUAL BENEFITS UNDER FEDERAL HEALTH PLANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, last night the Treasury-Postal conference settled virtually everything except the controversy over contraceptives in this body.

Normally, such controversies concern differences between the House and the Senate. There are no differences between the House and the Senate on the matter of allowing Federal employees options for contraception. This matter was won in the House; it was won in the Senate. There is an attempt to undemocratically overturn the will of this House and the will of the Senate in conference. Both the House and the Senate understood that this no-cost health necessity for women is elementary. Yet a group of men, largely of men, in this body is trying to reverse what the majority of two houses have done.

What have we done? We simply require that health plans cover contraception as they do other prescriptions. Most of what men need in prescriptions are covered, yet many health plans do not cover contraception. This is essential for the health of American women, in this case Federal employees, because of vast differences in contraceptives.

We all know, for example, of the pill. And there are some people who cannot take the pill. Some kinds of contraception do not work for some people. Some

have serious side effects. Some are uncomfortable. Some have long-term effects and people do not wish to take the risk.

Federal employees do not have the options necessary for their health today. Eighty percent, that is the vast majority of Federal plans, do not cover the range of available contraceptives and, thereby, are putting the health of women in the Federal service at risk. Ten percent do not cover contraception at all. Imagine that. Often plans cover abortion but not contraception. Really turns on its head the way we should be going at this issue.

One reason why women of reproductive age spend 68 percent more in out-of-pocket costs for health care is this failure to cover contraception which most American women use and need. Most Americans, including the majority of pro-life voters, support the requirement that health insurance cover contraception. So why is it, then, that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. CHRIS SMITH), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), and all the Republicans on the conference committee on the House side, and even the gentleman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP), who is on that committee, are trying to defeat the will of the majority in conference?

The bipartisan Women's Caucus of this House supports this measure. This measure was won fair and square in committee, and then there was an attempt to overturn it here in the House. Now it has been won fair and square in both Houses, and democracy does not yet rule.

This gets to be very personal, Mr. Speaker, because we are here not only talking about women's health, we are talking about the most personal side of their health: reproductive health. We have no right to limit what contraception a woman may use. The five leading methods, oral contraception, diaphragm, IUD, Norplant, and Depo-Provera, are none of them associated with abortion. That, of course, is already taken care of in the bill. Federal employees are put at considerable disadvantage by having their options limited in so basic a way.

Allow women equal benefits under Federal health plans. Let the will of the majority of the House and Senate prevail. Do not give in to an energetic minority not committed either to women or to democracy in this body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BERRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1030

A CHALLENGE TO AMERICA, RECOGNIZE THE FREEDOM IN WHICH WE LIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). Under a pre-

vious order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in less than a week the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, on October 5 will convene for what I believe will be an important hearing.

I thought it was important this morning, in light of the press conference yesterday of the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), to try to not only clarify for myself but to articulate some of the views of those of us who are Democrats juxtaposed against the chairman's remarks yesterday.

This committee now has a task that for many is not a pleasant task. It is not a pleasant time for America or Americans. It is a somber time and a highly serious commitment on all of our parts, for the concept of impeachment goes to the very infrastructure of this Nation.

As I reflected on the will of the Founding Fathers in their design of article 2, section 4, the impeachment provision, I now more than ever understood their thoughts. This fledgling nation they wanted to survive. How well they do, that in 1998, we live in a free nation, a sovereign nation, that respects the First Amendment and certain rights under the Bill of Rights, such as the Fifth Amendment of due process.

The Founding Fathers were immediate immigrants from desperate nations, or nations with monarchies. I believe what they said, that we will have a nation that elects, where the head of government is not a monarchy and we will have a right as a people to elect that person but as well we will have a right to remove that person.

At the same time, I would simply say that they did not want this process to be frivolous and without meaning. Nor did they give us any fine definition.

High crimes and misdemeanors, many may think of the word high as very important. If one reads further one might find that it is high, meaning against the crown. So, in fact, they did leave the definition of high crimes and misdemeanors to the ongoing time frame of when we might find it.

So in 1974, as the Nixon proceedings moved forward, we found that the Republicans, who were then in the minority, decided that high crimes had to be a commitment of a crime and as well it had to be against the government, for obviously Mr. Nixon was of the Republican Party.

We now have had 6 days of hearings in the Committee on the Judiciary. None of them have been on the issue of defining what high crimes and misdemeanors might portend to be in 1998. We have spent a lot of time playing to the public opinion, the media blitz. We have spent a lot of time releasing documents that most Americans thought were sacred because they were part of a grand jury system.

The Office of Independent Counsel uses the grand jury system. It is a system that any one of us could be using by way of the process in local communities, where by some unfortunate circumstances one is arrested and there is a grand jury proceeding and then possibly a trial, that grand jury documentation is never released to the public. In fact, Mr. Timothy McVeigh, well-known for the allegations and charges and then conviction of bombing the Oklahoma building, 168 people dead, none of the grand jury testimony in that proceeding was ever released.

So when this is played out in the public arena, it looks as if we have strident Democrats, some say political hacks, and the white-hat-wearing Republicans who want the people to know everything.

I do not want to be either, and this process by the Founding Fathers was not made to be any of that. It was given to us in trust because we are the representatives of the people. The President is elected by the people. Yet in this Committee on the Judiciary we cannot get a unanimous vote on accepting the Fifth Amendment as a guiding principle of what we would be doing; the rights of the accused to protect them in their life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), says that the President in his guiding principles is not above the law, and I say he is absolutely right, but he is not below the law as well. He said he would be guided by the letter and the spirit of the constitution and yet in this hybrid process he has released willy-nilly the proceedings of the grand jury testimony.

We have a very important responsibility. It is frivolous, Mr. Speaker, that we would think in 2 days we can make a decision on an impeachment inquiry.

My challenge to America is to recognize the freedom in which we live and that democracy will only be preserved if we preserve it in the Committee on the Judiciary and treat everyone fairly.

U.S-INDIA RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to talk about several important issues affecting the relationship between the two largest democracies in the world, that is the United States and India.

Yesterday, Congress took an important step towards getting those relations back in a positive direction. The House-Senate Conference on Agricultural Appropriations approved a provision that would give the President authority to waive sanctions that were imposed on both India and Pakistan as a result of the nuclear tests that those countries conducted earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, it is important and necessary to provide the President with proper sanction waiver authority so that he may have more flexibility in negotiating with India and Pakistan.

Pursuant to the Glenn amendment to the Arms Export Control Act, the President was required to invoke severe economic sanctions after the nuclear tests in May. These unilateral sanctions prohibit a variety of commercial and technical transactions between the United States and India. U.S.-India economic relations were growing in a positive direction at the time of the tests. In fact, the U.S. was India's largest trading partner.

The sanctions that were imposed after the nuclear tests have disrupted a variety of bilateral assistance programs, including technical support for the development of financial institutions and other market reforms. These reforms offer short- and long-term opportunities for U.S. companies, large and small, to gain greater entry into India's vast consumer market and to help meet India's significant infrastructure improvement needs.

Under the unilateral sanctions, we stand to lose many of these opportunities. In addition, the sanctions require the U.S. to block international financial institutions from making loans to India.

The sanctions have not achieved the desired result, namely gaining India's support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. However, several rounds of negotiations between our deputy Secretary of State, Strobe Talbott, and the special envoy of India's Prime Minister Vajpayee, Mr. Jaswant Singh, have shown significant progress.

Giving President Clinton the authority to waive sanctions in exchange for significant agreements for India, as well as Pakistan, will help to move forward the process and ultimately enhance our nuclear non-proliferation efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I was joined by 21 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in this body in sending a letter to the conferees, to the ag conferees, urging them to support this important sanctions waiver provision, and I congratulate the conferees for approving this provision last night.

Yesterday evening, India's Prime Minister Vajpayee left the United States after a brief visit to New York that included a significant speech before the United Nations, as well as a meeting with his Pakistani counterpart Prime Minister Sharif. Prime Minister Vajpayee's speech to the U.N. General Assembly provided a positive foundation for improving U.S.-India relations.

I was also heartened by the new chapter in India-Pakistan ties signalled by Thursday's meeting between the two prime ministers of India and Pakistan.

By expressing India's readiness to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Prime Minister Vajpayee has helped

to vastly improve the climate and relations between the United States and India.

I hope our administration will redouble its efforts to work with the Indian government to achieve results on nuclear proliferation of other issues.

I was also very encouraged by the outcome of the Indian and Pakistani prime ministers' meeting, particularly with regard to peacefully settling the Kashmir issue establishing better communications between the two governments and increasing economic and trade cooperation.

I agree that these issues, particularly the Kashmir issue, should be addressed on a bilateral basis between the two countries.

The prime minister of India's appeal for a concerted international plan to combat terrorism and safeguard human rights is consistent with American views on these issues and deserves the support of the United States and the international community. In fact, the leadership that the prime minister expressed on all of these issues points to the importance of finally granting India a permanent seat on the U.N. Security Council.

Besides the obvious justification for this step, the fact that India has one-sixth of the world's population and has contributed significantly to U.N. peacekeeping efforts, India offers a model for developing countries based on democracy and tolerance and as the prime minister's speech showed yesterday, India has important ideas on global stability issues that the rest of the world should listen to.

I have sponsored legislation expressing support for India's bid to become a permanent member of the Security Council and I hope that the prime minister's visit will add momentum to that effort. I also hope that the progress we have seen in the last few days creates the conditions to allow President Clinton's trip to South Asia to go forward in the near future.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to remind my colleagues here and the American people of an important milestone. October 2, this Friday, is the birthday of Mahatma Gandhi, who led India's independence effort. I mention Gandhi's birthday because this House recently approved legislation, that I cosponsored with my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), that would authorize the government of India to establish a memorial to honor Mahatma Gandhi in Washington, D.C. There is similar legislation pending in the Senate, and I hope our colleagues in the other body will approve that legislation, ideally in time for the commemoration of Gandhi's birthday on Friday, and as another expression of friendship between our two countries.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIXON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TURNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes, on October 2.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. NORTON) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. KIND.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

Mrs. LOWEY.

Mr. LUTHER.

Mr. GEJDENSON.

Mr. VISCLOSKY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUTKNECHT) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

Mr. LAZIO.

Mr. HORN.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) and to include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, October 1, 1998, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

[Omitted from Record of September 28, 1998]

11337. A letter from the Committee on the Judiciary, transmitting the preliminary memorandum of the President of the United States concerning the Referral of the Office

of the Independent Counsel and the initial response of the President of the United States to the Referral of the Office of the Independent Counsel; (H. Doc. No. 105—317); and ordered to be printed.

11340. A letter from the Office of the Independent Counsel, Kenneth W. Starr, transmitting supplemental materials to the Referral to the United States House of Representatives pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 595(c) submitted by the Office of the Independent Counsel, September 9, 1998; (H. Doc. No. 105-316); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

11338. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Limiting the Volume of Small Red Seedless Grapefruit [Docket No. FV98-905-4 IFR] received September 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

11339. A letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Continuous Chilling of Split Poultry Portions [Docket No. 95-011F] (RIN: 0583-AB95) received September 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

[Submitted September 29, 1998]

11341. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Employment History, Verification and Criminal History Records Check [Docket No. 28859; Amendment No. 107-12, 108-17] (RIN: 2120-AG32) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11342. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-246-AD; Amendment 39-10750; AD 98-19-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11343. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hazardous Materials Regulations; Editorial Corrections and Clarifications [Docket No. RSPA-98-4404 (HM-189 0)] (RIN: 2137-AD27) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11344. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Lafourche Bayou, LA [CGD08-98-062—and—CGD08-98-052] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11345. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-102, -103, -106, -201, -202, -301, -311, and -315 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-172-AD; Amendment 39-10781; AD 98-20-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11346. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Technical Amendments; Organizational Changes; Miscellaneous Editorial Changes and Conforming Amendments [USCG-1998-4442] (RIN: 2115-ZZ02) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11347. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; CFM International CFM56-7B and -7B/2 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-55-AD; Amendment 39-10761; AD 98-19-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11348. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB 340B Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-176-AD; Amendment 39-10782; AD 98-20-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11349. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-206-AD; Amendment 39-10783; AD 98-20-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11350. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-257-AD; Amendment 39-10788; AD 98-20-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11351. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328-100 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-162-AD; Amendment 39-10779; AD 98-20-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11352. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-61-AD; Amendment 39-10777; AD 98-20-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11353. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace (Jetstream) Model 4101 Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-339-AD; Amendment 39-10776; AD 98-20-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11354. 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. 96-NM-244-AD; Amendment 39-10775; AD 98-20-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11355. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-169-AD; Amendment 39-10780; AD 98-20-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11356. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airspace Designations; Incorporation By Reference

[Docket No. 29334; Amendment No. 71-30] received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11357. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce, plc RB211 Trent 800 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-33-AD; Amendment 39-10762; AD 98-18-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11358. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Transportation And Community And System Preservation Pilot Program—Implementation Of The Transportation Equity Act For The 21st Century [FHWA Docket No. FHWA-98-4370] received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11359. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations: 2nd Annual Hobbs Island Regatta, Tennessee River mile 333.5 to 336.5, Huntsville, Alabama [CGD08-98-060] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11360. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: World Yacht Cruises Fireworks, New York Harbor, Upper Bay [CGD01-98-144] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11361. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Around Alone Sailboat Race, Charleston, SC [CGD07-98-008] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11362. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Portage Bayou, Tchoutacabouffa and Wolf Rivers, MS [CGD08-98-055] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11363. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Aerospatiale Model ATR72-12A Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-159-AD; Amendment 39-10756; AD 98-19-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11364. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-215-6B11 (CL-415 Variant) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-03-AD; Amendment 39-10487] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11365. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Willits, CA [Airspace Docket No. 96-AWP-26] received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11366. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment

of Class E Airspace; Crosby, ND [Airspace Docket No. 98-AGL-42] received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11367. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Realignment of VOR Federal Airway V-485; San Jose, CA [Airspace Docket No. 95-AWP-6] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11368. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727 and Model 737 Series Airplanes Equipped with J.C. Carter Company Fuel Valve Actuators [Docket No. 96-NM-31-AD; Amendment 39-10736; AD 98-18-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11369. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce, plc RB211 Trent 700 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-10-AD; Amendment 39-10754; AD 98-19-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11370. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Limited, Aero Division-Bristol/S.N.E.C.M.A. Olympus 593 Series Turbojet Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-07-AD; Amendment 39-10753; AD 98-19-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11371. 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. 98-NM-42-AD; Amendment 39-10760; AD 98-19-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11372. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airspace and Flight Operations Requirements for the Kodak Albuquerque International Balloon Fiesta; Albuquerque, NM [Docket No. 2979; SFAR No. 83] (RIN: 2120-AG61) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11373. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification to the Gulf of Mexico Low Offshore Airspace Area [Airspace Docket No. 97-ASW-23] received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11374. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class D Airspace; San Diego-Gillespie Field, CA [Airspace Docket No. 98-AWP-21] received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11375. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace (Jetstream) Model 4101 Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-152-AD; Amendment 39-10774; AD 98-20-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11376. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 and A300-600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-310-AD; Amendment 39-10771; AD 98-20-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11377. 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. 98-NM-63-AD; Amendment 39-10768; AD 98-20-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11378. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Aerospatiale Model ATR42 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-44-AD; Amendment 39-10772; AD 98-20-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11379. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 1000, 2000, 3000, and 4000 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-28-AD; Amendment 39-10769; AD 98-20-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11380. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-15-AD; Amendment 39-10770; AD 98-20-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11381. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-80 Series Airplanes Equipped with Heath Tecna Aerospace Extended Spacial Concept Interior III Installed in Accordance with Supplemental Type Certificate SA4744NM [Docket No. 96-NM-270-AD; Amendment 39-10787; AD 98-20-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11382. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-100, -200, and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-14-AD; Amendment 39-10789; AD 98-20-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11383. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300, A310, and A300-600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-307-AD; Amendment 39-10788; AD 98-20-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11384. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-256-AD; Amendment 39-10791; AD 98-20-25] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11385. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320-111, -211, and -231 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-20-AD; Amendment 39-10792; AD 98-20-26] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11386. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328-100 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-96-AD; Amendment 39-10790; AD 98-20-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1998, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. COX of California) introduced a bill (H.R. 4655) to establish a program to support a transition to democracy in Iraq; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 864: Ms. DANNER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 4374: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. REYES, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. NEY.

H.R. 4449: Mr. REGULA, Mr. ADERHOLD, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H. Con. Res. 279: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.