Section 28:
NE¼ SW¼, 40 acres,
Section 32:
SE¼ SE¼, 40 acres,
Section 34:
SE¼ NW¼, 40 acres,

Township 44 North, Range 14 East,

Section 31:
S½ SW¼, 80 acres.

(2) FORT INDEPENDENCE COMMUNITY OF PAIUTE INDIANS.—Lands to be held in trust for the Fort Independence Community of Paiute Indians are comprised of approximately 200.06 acres described as follows:

Mount Diablo Base and Meridian

Township 13 South, Range 34 East

Section 1:
W½ of Lot 5 in the NE¼, Lot 3, E½ of Lot 4, and E½ of Lot 5 in the NW¼.

(3) BARONA GROUP OF CAPITAN GRANDE BAND OF MISSION INDIANS.—Lands to be held in trust for the Barona Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians are comprised of approximately 5.03 acres described as follows:

San Bernardino Base and Meridian

Township 14 South, Range 2 East

Section 7, Lot 15.

(4) CUYAPAIPE BAND OF MISSION INDIANS.—Lands to be held in trust for the Cuyapaipe Band of Mission Indians are comprised of approximately 1,360 acres described as follows:

San Bernardino Base and Meridian

Township 15 South, Range 6 East

Section 21:
All of this section.
Section 31:
NE¼, N½SE¼, SE¼SE¼.
Section 32:
W½SW¼, NE¼SW¼, NW¼SE¼.
Section 33:
SE¼, SW¼SW¼, E½SW¼.

(5) MANZANITA BAND OF MISSION INDIANS.—Lands to be held in trust for the Manzanita Band of Mission Indians are comprised of approximately 1,000.78 acres described as follows:

San Bernardino Base and Meridian

Township 16 South, Range 6 East

Section 21:
Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, S½.
Section 25:
Lots 2 and 5.
Section 28:
Lots, 1, 2, 3, and 4, N½SE¼.

(6) MORONGO BAND OF MISSION INDIANS.—Lands to be held in trust for the Morongo Band of Mission Indians are comprised of approximately 40 acres described as follows:

San Bernardino Base and Meridian

Township 3 South, Range 2 East

Section 20:
NW¼ of NE¼.

(7) PALA BAND OF MISSION INDIANS.—Lands to be held in trust for the Pala Band of Mission Indians are comprised of approximately 59.20 acres described as follows:

San Bernardino Base and Meridian

Township 9 South, Range 2 West

Section 13, Lot 1, and Section 14, Lots 1, 2, 3.

(8) FORT BIDWELL COMMUNITY OF PAIUTE INDIANS.—Lands to be held in trust for the Fort Bidwell Community of Paiute Indians are comprised of approximately 299.04 described as follows:

Mount Diablo Base and Meridian

Township 46 North, Range 16 East

Section 8:
SW¼SW¼.
Section 19:
Lots 5, 6, 7.
S½NE¼, SE¼NW¼, NE¼SE¼.
Section 20:
Lot 1.

SEC. 3. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) PROCEEDS FROM RENTS AND ROYALTIES TRANSFERRED TO INDIANS.—Amounts which accrue to the United States after the date of the enactment of this Act from sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals relating to any land described in section 2 shall be available for use or obligation, in such manner and for such purposes as the Secretary may approve, by the tribe, band, or group of Indians for whose benefit such land is taken into trust.

(b) NOTICE OF CANCELLATION OF GRAZING PREFERENCES.—Grazing preferences on lands described in section 2 shall terminate 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) LAWS GOVERNING LANDS TO BE HELD IN TRUST.—Any lands which are to be held in trust for the benefit of any tribe, band, or group of Indians pursuant to this Act shall be added to the existing reservation of the tribe, band, or group, and the official boundaries of the reservation shall be modified accordingly. These lands shall be subject to the laws of the United States relating to Indian land in the same manner and to the same extent as other lands held in trust for such tribe, band, or group on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2742, the proposed California Indian Land Transfer Act, would transfer eight parcels of excess Bureau of Land Management land to eight Indian tribes in the State of California. I recommend the adoption of H.R. 2742.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support passage of H.R. 2742, which will transfer some 3,500 acres of excess Bureau of Land Management lands located throughout California to eight Indian tribes in the State.

The bill was introduced pursuant to administration requests and as a result of negotiations between the Interior Department, the local municipalities, and the eight Indian tribes that began in 1994. All affected land is adjacent to existing Indian reservations.

The bill was amended in committee pursuant to the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) to remove lands that would have been transferred to the Bridgeport and the Benton Paiute tribes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the reason that we are enacting this legislation is to allow Indian tribes to develop their own economies. For too long we have neglected the tribes' economic needs, and certainly the creation of a strong land base is part of that equation.

Keep in mind that the history of California Indian dealings is one of the most shameful in this country's past. Approximately 250,000 Native American Indians currently reside in the State of California, Mr. Speaker, more Indians in the State of California than anywhere else in this country, yet they are the most neglected.

The United States broke 18 treaties that promised the tribes 18.5 million acres. California tribes lost more than 70 million acres of land overall and now live on a collective 400,000 acres of land. Thus, I am glad that we are doing what is right in returning a small portion of what we once took from the first Americans.

Again, I commend the gentleman from Alaska for his management of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2742, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1154, H.R. 2370, H.R. 1833, and H.R. 2742, the bills just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHING TOLL-FREE NUMBER IN DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO ASSIST CONSUMERS IN DETERMINING IF PRODUCTS ARE AMERICAN-MADE

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 563) to establish a toll free number in the Department of Commerce to assist consumers in determining if products are American-made, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 563

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

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF TOLL FREE NUMBER PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—If the Secretary of Commerce determines, on the basis of comments submitted in rulemaking under section 2, that—

(1) interest among manufacturers is sufficient to warrant the establishment of a 3-year toll free number pilot program, and

(2) manufacturers will provide fees under section 2(c) so that the program will operate without cost to the Federal Government,

the Secretary shall establish such program solely to help inform consumers whether a product is ''Made in America''. The Secretary shall publish the toll-free number by notice in the Federal Register.

(b) CONTRACT.—The Secretary of Commerce shall enter into a contract for—

(1) the establishment and operation of the toll free number pilot program provided for in subsection (a), and

(2) the registration of products pursuant to regulations issued under section 2,

which shall be funded entirely from fees collected under section 2(c).

(c) USE.—The toll free number shall be used solely to inform consumers as to whether products are registered under section 2 as ''Made in America''. Consumers shall also be informed that registration of a product does not mean—

(1) that the product is endorsed or approved by the Government,

(2) that the Secretary has conducted any investigation to confirm that the product is a product which meets the definition of ''Made in America'' in section 4 of this Act, or

(3) that the product contains 100 percent United States content.

SEC. 2. REGISTRATION.

(a) PROPOSED REGULATION.—The Secretary of Commerce shall propose a regulation—

(1) to establish a procedure under which the manufacturer of a product may voluntarily register such product as complying with the definition of ''Made in America'' in section 4 of this Act and have such product included in the information available through the toll free number established under section 1(a);

(2) to establish, assess, and collect a fee to cover all the costs (including start-up costs) of registering products and including registered products in information provided under the toll-free number;

(3) for the establishment under section 1(a) of the toll-free number pilot program; and

(4) to solicit views from the private sector concerning the level of interest of manufacturers in registering products under the terms and conditions of paragraph (1).

(b) PROMULGATION.—If the Secretary determines based on the comments on the regulation proposed under subsection (a) that the toll-free number pilot program and the registration of products is warranted, the Secretary shall promulgate such regulation.

(c) REGISTRATION FEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Manufacturers of products included in information provided under section 1 shall be subject to a fee imposed by the Secretary of Commerce to pay the cost of registering products and including them in information provided under subsection (a).

(2) AMOUNT.—The amount of fees imposed under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) in the case of a manufacturer, not be greater than the cost of registering the manufacturer's product and providing product information directly attributable to such manufacturer, and

(B) in the case of the total amount of fees, not be greater than the total amount appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for salaries and expenses directly attributable to registration of manufacturers and having products included in the information provided under section 1(a).

(3) CREDITING AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Fees collected for a fiscal year pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be credited to the appropriation account for salaries and expenses of the Secretary of Commerce and shall be available in accordance with appropriation Acts until expended without fiscal year limitation.

(B) COLLECTIONS AND APPROPRIATION ACTS.—The fees imposed under paragraph (1)—

(i) shall be collected in each fiscal year in an amount equal to the amount specified in appropriation Acts for such fiscal year, and

(ii) shall only be collected and available for the costs described in paragraph (2).

SEC. 3. PENALTY.

Any manufacturer of a product who knowingly registers a product under section 2 which is not ''Made in America''—

(1) shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $7500 which the Secretary of Commerce may assess and collect, and

(2) shall not offer such product for purchase by the Federal Government.

SEC. 4. DEFINITION.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term ''Made in America'' has the meaning given unqualified ''Made in U.S.A.'' or ''Made in America'' claims for purposes of laws administered by the Federal Trade Commission.

(2) The term ''product'' means a product with a retail value of at least $250.

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or in any regulation promulgated under section 2 shall be construed to alter, amend, modify, or otherwise affect in any way, the Federal Trade Commission Act or the opinions, decisions, rules, or any guidance issued by the Federal Trade Commission regarding the use of unqualified ''Made in U.S.A.'' or ''Made in America'' claims in labels on products introduced, delivered for introduction, sold, advertised, or offered for sale in commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1730

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to be able to rise in support of H.R. 563, a bill which would create a toll-free number in the Department of Commerce to assist consumers in determining if products are American made. The bill's sponsor, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), should be commended for his commitment to American products and the American worker, and this bill is a fitting tribute to that commitment.

The legislation is designed to assist consumers when they are thinking about purchasing a major appliance or other product. For instance, a family looking for a new refrigerator could call the number to find out which brands and models of refrigerators are manufactured in the United States. Consumers have consistently demonstrated their desire to purchase products made in America. And I believe that if this information is provided, they will use this as another major factor in their purchasing decisions.

An important feature of the legislation is that the creation of the service is conditional both on market demand and the presence of private sector funding. This toll-free number will only be implemented if there is sufficient interest on the part of manufacturers in listing their products and funding the cost of the program through annual fees. Thus, there is no cost to the taxpayer for implementing this program to promote American-made products.

This legislation, as reported by the Committee on Commerce, creates a much-needed consumer service. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to say how pleased I am, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation gives the House an opportunity once again to confirm its support for the Federal Trade Commission's standard for making a claim that a product is made in the USA. Under this legislation, only those products that meet the FTC's standard are eligible for inclusion on the toll-free registry of products that are made in America.

The FTC's standard for making an unqualified ''Made in USA'' claim requires that ''all'' or ''virtually all'' of a product's components be made in the United States and that ''all'' or ''virtually all'' of the labor be American labor. This has been the FTC's standard for more than 50 years. And after a 2-year review, the FTC concluded last year that its standards should not be changed.

For the past several decades, consumers in the United States have relied on the ''Made in USA'' label to mean exactly what it says. American consumers want to buy genuine American products made by American workers. The ''Made in USA'' standard educates consumers, ensures truth-in-labeling, promotes U.S. companies, and preserves and creates American jobs.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, the FTC proposed weakening the standard to allow products to be labeled ''Made in USA'' when as little as 75 percent of their content and labor originated in the United States. If these proposed regulations had been adopted, the FTC's mandate to fight deceptive practices would instead be used to sanction deception.

People all over the country petitioned this Congress and the FTC opposing this new standard. In my district, 9,000 people, by mail, by phone, by petition, said ''no'' to this proposed change. I commend the FTC for its wisdom, ultimately, in returning to the

time honored ''Made in USA'' standard. Any weakening of the Commission's standard would only mislead consumers and expose them to the kind of deceptive practices the FTC is supposed to prohibit.

The Commission has recognized what many American consumers have known for a long time: Where a product is made is an important factor in making purchasing decisions. And consumers want the ability to support American workers and to invest in the Nation's economic growth through those purchasing decisions. I am happy to support legislation that will help consumers buy products that are ''all'' or ''virtually all'' made in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that except for certain technical and conforming changes, this legislation is the same as legislation that has passed the House in each of the last 2 Congresses. Unfortunately, the other body has never taken action on it and the bill has not been enacted. I sincerely hope that will not be the situation this year and that this bill can be enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) for his good work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to start out by thanking the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), one of the strong Members of this House, for taking into consideration this legislation. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOM MANTON), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PHIL ENGLISH), a friend of mine, who worked very hard to bring this to the floor.

I have worked hard to pass this legislation. The Congress might look at a few facts: We have a $60 billion trade deficit with Japan, and an approaching $50 billion trade deficit with China. Everybody talks about buy American. But the truth of the matter is, what is an American made product today? Where is that car really made? Is it made in Detroit? Is it made in Ohio? Is it made in Mexico? Is it made in Canada? Is it made in China? Is it made in Korea?

My legislation simply says if it costs more than $250, and all or virtually all of its components are made in America, a company could register it by paying a small fee to put it on this toll-free hot line. So if a family out in Chicago is going to buy a washer and dryer, they can call this number and say, I want to buy a washer and dryer, what washers and dryers are made in America? It does not cost the taxpayers anything. And I believe the consuming public of America will buy American if their level of conscious understanding of where these products are made are made available to them.

But I wanted to bring something up to the attention of the Congress today, especially to the chairman. I am holding up here a little ad that was sent to me by George Booth of Big Sandy, Texas. It is an ad, I believe in Consumer Reports, for Tisonic quality car radio cassette players. And down in the right-hand corner of this ad there is a very small American flag. But we have to look close, because the colors are reversed. It is, in fact, blue stars on a white map. And if we look at it, we would swear it says made in the USA, until we get the magnifying glass. And listen to what it says. It says, made for the USA. And then in even smaller print below it, it says made in China. Now we have a new label, if we are quick enough, I guess, to investigate these labels: Made ''for'' USA; Made ''in'' China.

Look, I think this is straightforward legislation. It makes sense. And the American people who, I believe, will want to buy American-made products will use the service. More importantly, I think the industries and the companies that produce these products will begin to take pride in being able to say that, ''We pay taxes in America. We hire Americans who pay taxes to keep our government afloat. This product is the one that we make, and, by God, it is good and we take pride in advertising it on our toll-free number.''

So I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY). I know the mindset of many in the other body. They think ''Made in China'' perhaps is good for consumption patterns around the world. I do not know what their thinking is. I think we have to work hard, and I appreciate the gentleman giving it a chance here, and I am hoping we get some help in the other body.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 563, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MONEY LAUNDERING DETERRENCE ACT OF 1998

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4005) to amend title 31 of the United States Code to improve methods for preventing financial crimes, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4005

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Money Laundering Deterrence Act of 1998''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings and purposes.
Sec. 3. Amendments relating to reporting of suspicious activities.
Sec. 4. Expansion of scope of summons power.
Sec. 5. Penalties for violations of geographic targeting orders and certain recordkeeping requirements.
Sec. 6. Repeal of certain reporting requirements.
Sec. 7. Limited exemption from Paperwork Reduction Act.
Sec. 8. Promulgation of ''know your customer'' regulations.
Sec. 9. Report on private banking activities.
Sec. 10. Availability of certain account information.
Sec. 11. Sense of the Congress.
Sec. 12. Designation of foreign high intensity money laundering areas.
Sec. 13. Doubling of criminal penalties for violations of laws aimed at preventing money laundering in foreign high intensity money laundering areas.
Sec. 14. Laundering money through a foreign bank.
Sec. 15. Criminal forfeiture for money laundering conspiracies.
Sec. 16. Charging money laundering as a course of conduct.
Sec. 17. Venue in money laundering cases.
Sec. 18. Technical amendment to restore wiretap authority for certain money laundering offenses.
Sec. 19. Knowledge that the property is the proceeds of a felony.
Sec. 20. Coverage of foreign bank branches in the territories.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds as follows:

(1) The dollar amount involved in international money laundering likely exceeds $500,000,000,000 annually.

(2) Organized crime groups are continually devising new methods to launder the proceeds of illegal activities in an effort to subvert the transaction reporting requirements of subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, and chapter 2 of Public Law 91–508.

(3) A number of methods to launder the proceeds of criminal activity were identified and described in congressional hearings, including the use of financial service providers which are not depository institutions, such as money transmitters and check cashing services, the purchase and resale of durable goods, and the exchange of foreign currency in the so-called ''black market''.

(4) Recent successes in combating domestic money laundering have involved the application of the heretofore seldom-used authority granted to the Secretary of the Treasury and the cooperative efforts of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies.

(5) Such successes have been exemplified by the implementation of the geographic targeting order in New York City and through the work of the El Dorado task force, a group comprised of agents of Department of the Treasury law enforcement agencies, New York State troopers, and New York City police officers.

(6) Money laundering by international criminal enterprises challenges the legitimate authority of national governments, corrupts government institutions, endangers the financial and economic stability of nations, and routinely violates legal norms,