courageous individuals whom we must thank for their assistance in the aftermath of the bombing are too numerous to mention at this time.

First of all, the governments and the people of Kenya and Tanzania were instrumental in saving lives and property. The street demonstrations held in support of the United States by the peoples of Kenya and Tanzania were noted, and they are to be recognized as being deeply appreciated in this country.

The quick thinking of the United States Embassy guards, many of them locals, was instrumental in preventing even more death and destruction. The people of the governments of Israel, France, the United Kingdom, Germany, Japan, Australia and others provided vital assistance for which all Americans are extremely grateful.

Numerous United States Federal and local agencies gathered quickly on the sites, and their outstanding work in securing the scenes paved the way for superlative investigative work which has already led to some arrests in these cases.

This resolution expresses the intention of the House to examine whether the security needs of United States facilities overseas are being met. This issue is particularly relevant to the work that we do under the guidance and leadership of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) in this committee.

We must examine all of our facilities overseas and where weaknesses exist, reinforce those facilities. We must support this administration and the next administration in building alliances with like-minded friends to ensure that terrorists who wish to harm the United States are eliminated.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for the resolution, for his eloquent remarks in support of it.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), our distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for introducing this legislation and for giving us this opportunity as a body, Democrats and Republicans, to express our condolences not just to the American families but also to those in Kenya and Tanzania who lost loved ones or had loved ones hurt very severely, and also to thank the countries of Kenya and Tanzania for the cooperation they have given in trying to apprehend these cowardly terrorists.

Let me also remind the body that within hours of that horrific act, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the ranking member on the Helsinki Commission, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and I convened a press conference on the grassy triangle. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and others were all very supportive of that.

We made it clear that no terrorist should take any solace in any bickering that they may see going on in the Capitol of Washington; that whatever the President's problems may be, we are united in our fight against terrorism; that we will stand shoulder-to-shoulder in trying to apprehend terrorists; and that when you pick on Americans, when you go after Americans, we are absolutely united.

I think that message is coming across. This resolution will help. I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for bringing us this important resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would like to echo and associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Madam Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I yield back the rest of our time.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for his very forceful remarks in support of the resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness, that we all recall the day early this past August when several American officials were killed and injured when terrorist planted bombs exploded at the U.S. embassies in Nairobi and in Tanzania.

These bombs sent powerful explosions throughout U.S. embassy buildings in Nairobi and Dar-es-Salaam, causing significant damage to both buildings, and resulting in the death and wounding of numerous individuals.

These bombings were violent and cowardly acts that preyed on innocent people. As a member of this Congress, we must not tolerate this violence! These bombings were a sobering reminder that violence can occur even in parts of the world where you would least expect it. We must continue to deliberate over what actions to take, both to step up security at other US installations and embassies around the world and to see what help we can give to the Kenyan and Tanzanian authorities in their investigation of the two blasts. These bombings were devastating to all of us here in Congress.

The last major attack against a U.S. facility abroad was in June 1996, when a car bomb devastated a military housing complex near Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, killing 19 Americans. The culprits are not known to have been found. In this last attack, the U.S. worked with local officials in both countries to rapidly move medical, engineering, security and other support personnel and equipment from U.S. facilities inside and outside the region to both locations.

In addition, the U.S. has taken appropriate security measures at our embassies and military facilities throughout the region and around the world. Along with the President we must pledge to use all the means at our disposal to bring those responsible to justice, no matter what or how long it takes. As a member of Congress, I believe the United States should do everything it can to assure that American citizens serve in safety. The families and the loved ones of the American and African victims of these cowardly attacks will of course remain in our thoughts and prayers, and we must continue to express our outrage at the devastation caused by these terrorist acts.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 523, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION ACT OF 1998

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3528) to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the use of alternative dispute resolution processes in United States district courts, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 2, after line 3, insert:

"SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY.

''Congress finds that—

''(1) alternative dispute resolution, when supported by the bench and bar, and utilizing properly trained neutrals in a program adequately administered by the court, has the potential to provide a variety of benefits, including greater satisfaction of the parties, innovative methods of resolving disputes, and greater efficiency in achieving settlements;

''(2) certain forms of alternative dispute resolution, including mediation, early neutral evaluation, minitrials, and voluntary arbitration, may have potential to reduce the large backlog of cases now pending in some federal courts throughout the United States, thereby allowing the courts to process their remaining cases more efficiently; and

''(3) the continued growth of Federal appellate court-annexed mediation programs suggests that this form of alternative dispute resolution can be equally effective in resolving disputes in the federal trial courts; therefore, the district courts should consider including mediation in their local alternative dispute resolution programs.''

Page 2, line 4, strike out ''**SEC, 2**'' and insert: ''**SEC. 3**''

Page 2, line 21, strike out ''2071(b)'' and insert: ''2071(a)''

Page 3, line 1, strike out ''2071(b)'' and insert: ''2071(a)''

Page 4, line 5, strike out ''**SEC. 3**'' and insert: ''**SEC. 4**''

Page 4, line 13, strike out ''2071(b)'' and insert: ''2071(a)''

Page 5, line 18, strike out ''2071(b)'' and insert: ''2071(a)''

Page 5, line 22, strike out ''**SEC. 4**'' and insert: ''**SEC. 5**''

Page 6, line 21, strike out ''2071(b)'' and insert: ''2071(a)''

Page 7, line 1, strike out ''**SEC. 5**'' and insert: ''**SEC. 6**''

Page 7, line 7, strike out ''subsections (b) and (c)'' and insert: ''subsections (a), (b), and (c)''

Page 7, line 11, after ''it'' insert: ''when the parties consent''

Page 7, line 24, strike out ''2071(b)'' and insert: ''2071(a)''

Page 8, line 9, strike out ''section'' and insert: ''chapter''

Page 8, line 10, strike out ''action'' and insert: ''program''

Page 8, line 11, strike out ''section 906'' and insert: ''title IX''

Page 8, line 12, strike out ''100–102'' and insert: ''100–702''

Page 8, line 13, strike out ''as in effect prior to the date of its repeal'' and insert: ''as amended by section 1 of Public Law 105–53''

Page 8, line 14, strike out ''**SEC. 6**'' and insert: ''**SEC. 7**''

Page 9, line 16, strike out ''**SEC. 7**'' and insert: ''**SEC. 8**''

Page 10, line 1, strike out ''**SEC. 8**'' and insert: ''**SEC. 9**''

Page 10, line 21, strike out ''2071(b)'' and insert: ''2071(a)''

Page 11, line 22, strike out ''**SEC. 9**'' and insert: ''**SEC. 10**''

Page 12, line 10, after ''arbitrators'' insert: ''and other neutrals''

Page 12, line 13, strike out ''**SEC. 10**'' and insert: ''**SEC. 11**''

Page 12, line 18, strike out ''**SEC. 11**'' and insert: ''**SEC 12**''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 3528.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3528 is designed to address the problem of high caseloads burdening the Federal courts. This legislation will provide a quicker, more efficient method by which to resolve some Federal cases when the parties or the courts so choose.

H.R. 3528 directs each Federal trial court to establish some form of alternative dispute resolution, popularly known as ADR, which could include arbitration, mediation, mini trials, or early neutral evaluation or some combination of those for certain civil cases.

The bill also provides for the confidentiality of the alternative dispute resolution process and prohibits the disclosure of such confidential communications.

The version considered today is substantially the same as the one we passed under suspension in April, with minor Senate clarifications. The bill has no known opposition and is supported by the American Bar Association, the Judicial Conference and the Department of Justice.

This legislation will provide the Federal courts with the tools necessary to present quality alternatives to intensive Federal litigation. In sum, this is a good bill that will offer our citizens a reasonable and cost-effective alternative to expensive Federal litigation, while at the same time still guaranteeing their right to have their day in court.

I urge my colleagues, Madam Speaker, to pass H.R. 3528.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3528, the Alternative Dispute Resolution Act of 1998. As litigation increases, so do litigation costs. It is clear that we all agree Congress should do all it can to encourage opposing parties to try alternative dispute resolution.

While I am concerned about the bill's provision making this process mandatory, since the overwhelming majority of Federal courts already have some form of alternative dispute resolution, the mandatory provision is a de jure insult but not so much de facto.

As one who served in the Federal courts and in the State courts, I am mindful of the tremendous need for alternative dispute resolution.

The Federal courts have been willing to implement alternative dispute resolution. This bill now says they must. I would prefer that the decision whether to adopt a particular court-annexed ADR program be left to the courts, but I think this bill has it both ways. It requires mandatory alternative dispute resolution but retains some flexibility for the courts to determine for themselves exactly what kind.

The legislation has improved dramatically from what it reflected upon introduction. There is more flexibility for the courts to determine how to proceed once they set up an alternative dispute resolution program. I appreciate the positive changes that have been made and urge my colleagues to support this bill, and thank the sponsor and cosponsors, my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), for bringing this action for our consideration.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3528, the Alternative Dispute Resolution Act of 1998.

This Bill passed the House in April, by a vote of 405 to 2, and it is here again, with Senate Amendments.

Alternative Dispute Resolution is commonly referred to as ''ADR.''

ADR includes a range of procedures, such as mediation, arbitration, peer panels and ombudsmen.

Traditional dispute resolution in America almost always involves a Plaintiff and a Defendant, battling each other in a court, before a judge or jury, to prove that one is wrong and one is right.

It is time consuming, and it is expensive, too expensive for most wage earners to afford, and often too time-consuming to be of much practical use.

In addition, as one writer has observed, a process that has to pronounce ''winners and losers necessarily destroys almost any preexisting relationship between the people involved . . . [and] . . . it is virtually impossible to maintain a civil relationship once people have confronted one another across a courtroom.''

The Bill before us requires all U.S. District Courts to establish a voluntary alternative dispute resolution program within the courts.

The purpose of the Bill is to guarantee that all litigants have another way to resolve their differences, short of a full trial.

Mediation is a voluntary process in which a neutral third party—a mediator—assists two or more disputants, to reach a negotiated settlement of their differences.

The process allows the principal parties to vent and diffuse feelings, clear up misunderstandings, find areas of agreement, and incorporate these areas of agreement into solutions that the parties themselves construct.

The process is quick, efficient and economical.

It also facilitates lasting relationships between disputants.

A recent survey by the Government Accounting Office showed that mediation is the ADR technique of choice among the five federal agencies and five private corporations that were surveyed.

The Report stated, ''Most of the organizations we studied had data to show that their ADR processes, especially mediation, resolved a high proportion of disputes, thereby helping them avoid formal redress processes and litigation.''

In a taped message on Law Day, May 1st, Attorney General Janet Reno said, ''Our lawyers are using mediation . . . to resolve . . . employment . . . cases. I have directed that all of our attorneys in civil practice receive training in mediation advocacy.''

On that same day, President Clinton issued a memorandum, creating a federal interagency committee to promote the use of alternative dispute resolution methods within the federal government, pursuant to the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act of 1996.

In addition, the Civil Rights Act of 1991 encourages the use of mediation and other alternative means of resolving disputes that arise under the Act or provisions of federal laws amended by the title.

And, in 1995, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission promulgated its policy on ADR which encourages the use of ADR in appropriate circumstances.

ADR can provide faster, less expensive, less contentious and more productive results in eliminating disputes.

In sum, ADR is effective and is legislatively and administratively encouraged.

Mediation is the ADR method of choice.

It is the wave of the future, an effective tool.

In the next Congress, I intend to introduce legislation to further encourage the use of ADR.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 3528, this important legislation relating to the Alternative Dispute

Resolution Act of 1998. Alternative Dispute Resolution, whether medication, neutral evaluation, arbitration, mini-trial or any other fair procedure that the courts can oversee, and which makes litigation less burdensome, is in my view welcome and something that we should all support.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I support reporting out this bill which provides the appropriate standards for federal courts throughout the nation to continue to develop workable alternative dispute resolution methods, and I am pleased that we worked with the judicial conference and the department of justice to craft legislation which is not objected to by those important institutions.

I support the legislation before us. According to the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, the vast majority of the 94 federal district courts have established dispute resolution programs, in effect, simply because it works. It is efficient, less expensive and, it works for all parties involved. I hope my colleagues throughout Congress support this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 3528.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POLICE, FIRE, AND EMERGENCY OFFICERS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1998

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3046) to provide financial assistance for higher education to the dependents of Federal, State, and local public safety officers who are killed or permanently and totally disabled as the result of a traumatic injury sustained in the line of duty, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3046

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Police, Fire, and Emergency Officers Educational Assistance Act of 1998''.

SEC. 2. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION TO DEPENDENTS OF PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS KILLED OR PERMANENTLY AND TOTALLY DISABLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY.

Part L of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the heading for subpart 2, by striking ''**Civilian Federal Law Enforcement**'' and inserting ''**Public Safety**'';

(2) in section 1211(1), by striking ''civilian Federal law enforcement'' and inserting ''public safety'';

(3) in section 1212(a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''Federal law enforcement'' and inserting ''public safety'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''Financial'' and inserting the following: ''Except as provided in paragraph (3), financial''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) The financial assistance referred to in paragraph (2) shall be reduced by the sum of—

''(A) the amount of educational assistance benefits from other Federal, State, or local governmental sources to which the eligible dependent would otherwise be entitled to receive; and

''(B) the amount, if any, determined under section 1214(b).'';

(4) in section 1214—

(A) by inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''The''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) SLIDING SCALE.—Notwithstanding section 1213(b), the Attorney General shall issue regulations regarding the use of a sliding scale based on financial need to ensure that an eligible dependent who is in financial need receives priority in receiving funds under this subpart.'';

(5) in section 1216(a), by inserting ''and each dependent of a public safety officer killed in the line of duty on or after October 1, 1997,'' after ''1992,''; and

(6) in section 1217—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, as we were all so painfully reminded this past July, law enforcement officers are at risk for serious injury or loss of life every time they don their uniform.

The United States Capitol serves as an international symbol for peace and justice, and yet on July 24 this year a violent and angry gunman shattered that image and took the lives of two heroic and dedicated police officers. It is a national tragedy, but the sacrifices made by Officers Gibson and Chestnut were not the first and will not be the last.

Even as we work to further secure the lives of our law enforcement officers, we can and must seek out new ways in which to express our gratitude. This legislation provides such an opportunity. Nationwide, police departments offer emotional, spiritual and financial support to spouses and children of deceased officers.

The Federal Government, too, offers several benefits and assistance programs. For example, the program we are amending today as a result of a bill we passed in the last Congress provides educational assistance to dependents of Federal officers who are permanently disabled or killed in the line of duty.

H.R. 3046, the Police, Fire and Emergency Officers Act of 1998, extends the Federal educational assistance benefits to dependents of State and local law enforcement officers killed or permanently injured in the line of duty. Thankfully, there is a small number of persons who are eligible under the program at the Federal law enforcement level.

The Bureau of Justice Assistance, within the Department of Justice, anticipates that additional funding for other public safety officers' dependents should not pose any new financial changes.

Specifically, the costs to Federal law enforcement dependents assistance program are estimated to be $515,000 in 1998, including the estimated number of new survivors. That number includes, Madam Speaker, $182,000 for 30 Federal survivors, plus $333,000 for an estimated 55 new survivors under the extension this legislation proposes.

Madam Speaker, this legislation can have an enormous impact on the quality of life for a child whose mother or father may have died while in service to the public. The Congress should pass this legislation as an expression of thanks to those public safety officers who have given their lives for the good of our citizenry.

□ 1700

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3046, the Federal Law Enforcement Dependents Assistance program, an important change in Federal law that we should all be focused on today and proud to see enacted into law.

I know that the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX), the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and other Members who are cosponsors originally of this matter stand proud for its coming forward today.

This legislation, spearheaded by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), my colleague, of the Subcommittee on Crime, would amend the law to extend Federal educational assistance benefits to dependents of State and local law enforcement officials killed in the line of duty.

We can all hope that the number of eligible beneficiaries of this change will, one day, be zero. But sadly, that will probably not be the case. It is the least that we can do to say to law enforcement officers, Federal and State who give their lives in the line of duty, that we will help take care of their children.