



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1999

No. 30

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

Help us, gracious God, to take the good words we say with our lips and translate those words into deeds of justice and mercy. Encourage us to take ideas of compassion and peace, of respect and goodwill, and allow those thoughts to be made whole and complete by making them part of our daily lives. We pray, O God, that the gift of faith will find fulfillment in good deeds and that the blessings of this day will be shared by us and all people. In Your name we pray. Amen

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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.

Mr. EHRlich. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. EHRlich. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 362, nays 28, answered "present" 2, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—362

Abercrombie  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Andrews  
Army  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Blagojevich  
Bliley  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cannon  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Collins

Combest  
Condit  
Cook  
Cooksey  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (VA)  
Deal  
DeGette  
DeLahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fossella  
Fowler  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte

Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hill (IN)  
Hilleary  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kelly  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kleczka  
Klink  
Knollenberg  
Kuykendall  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Lantos

Largent  
Larson  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Menendez  
Metcalf  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Minge  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Borski  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (CA)

Nussle  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Ose  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Paul  
Pease  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Regula  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schakowsky  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shows  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sisisky  
NAYS—28  
Clay  
Costello  
Crane

Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Pease  
Stabenow  
Stark  
Stearns  
Strickland  
Stump  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Talent  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Traficant  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Walden  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Wexler  
Weygand  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (FL)  
DeFazio  
English  
Filner

□ 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.

Ford	Moran (KS)	Stupak
Gutknecht	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
Hill (MT)	Peterson (MN)	Thompson (MS)
Hilliard	Pickett	Visclosky
Kucinich	Ramstad	Waters
LoBiondo	Sabo	
McDermott	Schaffer	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gutierrez Stenholm

## NOT VOTING—41

Ackerman	Goodling	Reyes
Archer	Hastings (FL)	Rogan
Becerra	Heger	Rogers
Bishop	Kasich	Royal-Allard
Brown (FL)	Kolbe	Royce
Canady	Lee	Rush
Capps	Martinez	Salmon
Coburn	McIntosh	Taylor (NC)
Conyers	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Cox	Moakley	Watkins
Davis (IL)	Pastor	Waxman
Doyle	Payne	Weller
Etheridge	Pelosi	Young (AK)
Fattah	Rangel	

□ 1022

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent. As a result, I missed rollcall votes 22–27. Had I been present, I would have voted "Aye" on rollcall 22; "Aye" on rollcall 23; "Aye" on rollcall 24; "Aye" on rollcall 25; "Aye" on rollcall 26, and "Aye" on rollcall 27.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SANDLIN 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 a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4. An act to improve pay and retirement equity for members of the Armed Forces; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 99-93, as amended by Public Law 99-151, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators as members of the United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control—

the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), Chairman;  
the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE);  
the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM); and  
the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS).

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 25, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Linda W. Beazley, Director, Elections Division, Office of the Georgia Secretary of State, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns for the election held February 23, 1999, the Honorable Johnny Isakson was elected Representative in Congress for the Sixth Congressional District, State of Georgia.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,  
Clerk.

## SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE JOHNNY ISAKSON OF GEORGIA AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. JOHNNY ISAKSON, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His Certificate of Election has not yet arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect and the Members of the Georgia delegation present themselves in the well.

Mr. ISAKSON appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 106th Congress.

## WELCOMING THE HONORABLE JOHNNY ISAKSON TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning, as the dean of the Georgia delegation, to welcome our newest Member to the House of Representatives. JOHNNY ISAKSON won an impressive victory in Tuesday's special

election in Georgia's 6th Congressional District. He received 65 percent of the vote in a crowded field of contenders.

Mr. ISAKSON brings with him a wealth of experience, having served in both the Georgia House and Senate. Back home, JOHNNY has developed a reputation as a bridge builder, a man who has strong beliefs but is also willing to work with others to get things done. I believe that trait will serve him very well here in Congress.

JOHNNY, on behalf of all the members of the Georgia delegation, Democrats and Republicans, we welcome you to this great institution, the people's House. We look forward to working with you to improve the lives of the people of the 6th Congressional District, of Georgia, and the people of the Nation.

Welcome. Welcome here. Work hard and enjoy yourself and have some fun as you work.

## OPENING REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JOHNNY ISAKSON

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

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, distinguished Congressman JOHN LEWIS and all of my friends in the Georgia delegation, I am very honored and privileged to be here today.

I am particularly honored that 150 of my closest family members are in the gallery. I have the most wonderful family a man could have and the most wonderful friends in the world. And anytime you get 65 percent of the vote, there are a lot more than 150 folks back home that helped you. But I could not be prouder than to be associated with and to represent these people.

□ 1030

I am sure there are probably a lot of wise words I ought to say today, but I can only really think of two things that seem appropriate. One is an admonition I got from a great friend of mine by the name of Carl Harrison who on the first day of my swearing in to the Georgia House of Representatives said, "JOHNNY, the best way to learn is to keep your mouth shut." And so I intend to be a very good listener and learn.

And then from my father and mother who always admonished me to do what was right and always talked about Mark Twain's great quote: "Just do what's right. You'll gratify few but you'll astonish the rest."

I will do the very best I can to do what is right in the service of my State and in cooperation with you. I am well aware that to all of you I am nothing more today than the fellow that replaced Newt. I hope in the years to come I will be a respected friend and one who joined with you to make a difference for the United States of America.

FAREWELL REMARKS OF  
HONORABLE BOB LIVINGSTON

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my most sincere and hearty congratulations to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) as he embarks on this wonderful opportunity to serve the people of his State and the people of this country in the United States Congress.

I take this opportunity for a slightly different purpose to address the House because this marks my last official day before the House of Representatives after 21½ years. In that time I have had many successes and a few failures, many good times and a few moments of heartache. I have watched with just admiration the many statesmen and I have just watched those who are less so.

I have learned some lessons along the way. Public service is a virtue. Term limits in my opinion is a stupid idea that deprives government of experience and small States of participation in leadership. Tolerance is a necessity. Politician is not a dirty word. And compromise is the glue that renders democracy possible.

To my friends on the left, government left unwatched can lead to injustice. To my friends on the right, government is not inherently evil. Compassion is desired, but in its extreme it will deprive us of our freedom.

My friends, America in the new millennium is like the great forests of the West some 200 years ago. Our ideologues on the left and the right are scouting the terrain and lighting the path to the future. Our trendsetters in both parties survey, decipher and construct the roads and bridges. And the American people follow in waves taking the routes most appropriate for their ultimate destination.

Where are they headed? I cannot say for certain. Ronald Reagan said it was for the shining city on the hill and I certainly will not argue with that. But with commitment to public service, with tolerance and with compromise, I know that the roads to the future of America will be straight and true and headed toward justice and freedom not just for all Americans but for all the people of the world.

I thank the people of southeast Louisiana for allowing me to serve here in the greatest of all institutions, the United States Congress. I thank my colleagues for their great friendship, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I thank my wife Bonnie and my children, Shep and his lovely wife Sissy, Rich, Dave and Susie, and my very new beautiful grandchild Caroline and my parents and all my family for their love and their support through these 21½ wonderful years.

Thank you all and God bless America.

FAREWELL TO THE HONORABLE  
BOB LIVINGSTON

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is ironic that on a day when we are swearing in a new colleague, the House is losing one of its best Members.

I have known the gentleman from Louisiana a long time. He came here a little over 20 years ago. He served as my ranking member on the Foreign Operations appropriations subcommittee. We had many differences. But I have to say that never for one moment did I doubt that he felt that he was putting the national interest above every other consideration in dealing with American foreign policy.

I have to say that I think the chances of the peace process moving forward in the Middle East would have been much less without his steadfast commitment to sometimes taking the tough actions on this floor that were necessary to help promote that process. I also have to say that I think that we would not see countries such as Poland and some of the other former East European captives of the Soviet Union, we would not see those countries in nearly the good shape they are in today if it were not for the very active efforts made on a bipartisan basis by the gentleman from Louisiana and his predecessor in that same committee slot, Mickey Edwards.

He served honorably and fairly when he served as my ranking member on the committee. He then succeeded me as chairman of the full committee and again we had very large differences, but we never surprised each other and we learned to trust each other implicitly.

We all have conflicting responsibilities and conflicting loyalties in this place. We have responsibilities to our party, to our country and to our institution. The gentleman from Louisiana in every case that I know of always put those priorities in the right order. He put country first, he put this institution second and he put his party third, and sometimes his own self-interest fourth.

He and his wife Bonnie Livingston have graced this institution with their presence. They are both wonderful people. I will miss them both.

I respect BOB. Sometimes I think he has been off the wall. I am sure he feels the same about me. And sometimes we probably both were. But I also love him. And I especially want to honor him because I think he has demonstrated that the word politician is not a bad name. As John Hume, that great leader for peace in Northern Ireland, said, politics is the alternative that democracies have to war in sorting out and settling our major differences. I think the gentleman from Louisiana has always recognized that. The House has been better for his being here. The House will certainly be lesser for his leaving. I know that BOB and I

are living examples of what Will Rogers meant when he said that if two people agree on everything, one of them is unnecessary, but nonetheless we have been good friends. I think we can all agree that as BOB leaves this place, we can say that he has indeed been a good and faithful servant.

FAREWELL TO HONORABLE BOB  
LIVINGSTON

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for those most kind and warm and generous remarks about the gentleman from Louisiana. I know that there are many others who would like to similarly make comments for the record. There is leave to do so. The day before yesterday we held an hour special order to honor and extend our respect and admiration and best wishes to the gentleman from Louisiana on behalf of the people of Louisiana and this grateful Nation. If Members would like to submit words for the record, there is 5-day leave and I would encourage them to do so.

In that special order, we wanted the Nation to know a few very important things about this man. One of them is that he comes from an extraordinary lineage. It was his ancestor of many great degrees back, Robert Livingston, who as Minister to France signed the Louisiana Purchase on behalf of President Jefferson and purchased the territory from which 13 States or parts of States have been carved. Yet with that amazing lineage behind him, BOB LIVINGSTON rose from very humble beginnings. Losing his father at a very early age, his mother nevertheless went to work in a shipyard in Louisiana to raise BOB and his sister and to give them a chance at an education. BOB himself returned to that shipyard to work as he got his own education in his later years.

But BOB's life has been spent in public service. BOB did a stint in the U.S. Navy, the U.S. Navy Reserve. He worked most of his career as a U.S. Justice Department prosecutor in New Orleans as a prosecutor for the criminal court system in New Orleans and for the Attorney General of the State of Louisiana before coming to this body and serving for those 21½ years. He has given his life to public service.

And our State and our Nation are deeply grateful, BOB, for all you have done in your whole life for this country and for the people of our great State of Louisiana. More importantly, BOB LIVINGSTON has been a remarkable legislator in this House of colleagues who all rise to different levels of greatness. BOB LIVINGSTON, acknowledged by many Members of the Committee on Appropriations the other night, is probably the single individual most responsible for finding the consensus in the last 4 years as chairman of the

Committee on Appropriations that has delivered for this country a surplus for us to talk about this year, has taken us out of deficit, not in 5 or 7 years as predicted but in a short 2-year period.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, for all the things he will be remembered for and for all the good things he has done in this body and throughout his public career, I think this Nation owes him a debt of gratitude for that most important thing of taking us out of deficit and giving us a surplus to debate this year.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOB LIVINGSTON) may not ever get the credit he deserves, Mr. Speaker, but I will tell my colleagues that I know it in my heart and the people of Louisiana know it in their heart: We have rarely seen a man of that kind of dedication and spirit and deep respect and love and compassion and, as was said, tolerance for different opinions represent our State than has BOB LIVINGSTON. Louisiana will miss him sorely, and on behalf of all the people of his great district, and by the way BOB leaves with not a 60 or 70 or 80 percent approval rate, Mr. Speaker. He leaves Congress with an over 90 percent approval rate. On behalf of those people in his district and the entire State of Louisiana and, I know, this great Nation, I thank my friend for all the years he gave us. God bless him and Bonnie and his family.

Mr. Speaker, I want to wish the gentleman from Louisiana the great Cajun wish of *joie de vie*. I hope his life is full of joy, that his life is rich and that the retirement he justly deserves is one that he and his family will fully enjoy.

Again, BOB, thank you. God bless you.

#### CONGRATULATIONS ON A JOB WELL DONE

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by this day because we are saying an official farewell to a very dear friend and a very distinguished Member of this House, and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) and I have served together on the Committee on Appropriations for many years. We served on the same subcommittee and sat side-by-side. And I can tell my colleagues that here is a man who is totally honest. What you see is what he is. When he says something, we can depend on it. He is not afraid to buck the tide of public opinion, if that need be the case on a given occasion, in order to stand for what his conscience tells him is right, for what his convictions tell him is right.

Mr. Speaker, he is an example for people in public life to follow through his dedication to the constituents that he represented, his dedication to the country, the entire United States of America and his willingness to stand

up and take whatever heat was necessary to do what he felt was right for America.

Personally, I will miss BOB LIVINGSTON, and I hope that he will feel free to stay in touch with this Member and, I think, with all of us, because he has been a good friend, and he has been an outstanding Member. And he became Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations when many of us had never ever served in the majority before, and we were wondering:

What do we do next?

Mr. Speaker, of all the things that have to be done in a Congress, appropriations bills have to pass. Those are the things that have to be done. And BOB LIVINGSTON, as the new chairman and the first Republican chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in 40 years, had a major, major task and a major responsibility, and he had problems not only in the House within his own party on occasion. But he stood tall, and he stood strong, and he guided this appropriations process for those 4 years in such a way that most of us thought never would work.

To the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) I say:

Congratulations on a job well done. Your friends will miss you dearly, and that comes from our heart.

#### WIRELESS PRIVACY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 77 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 77

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 514) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen and clarify prohibitions on electronic eavesdropping, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Each section of the bill shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose and in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote

without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 77 is an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 514, the Wireless Privacy Enhancement Act, a bill that will improve wireless communication privacy and make it more difficult for scanners to be altered for unlawful purposes. H. Res. 77 is a wide-open rule providing 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce.

The rule waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of Rule 13 which requires a 3-day layover for committee reports, and the rule provides that each section of the bill shall be considered as read.

H. Res. 77 further allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority in recognition to those Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration. The rule also allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone recorded votes and to reduce to 5 minutes the voting time on any postponed question provided voting time on the first in any series of questions is not less than 15 minutes. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, when an American citizen picks up his telephone, we want to believe that the right to privacy is protecting us. Unfortunately, the rapid advance of technology permits the interception of phone calls rather easily, and relatively simple modifications to devices can provide anyone with an electronic stocking device. The bill before us today is designed to ensure that the current penalties for intercepting and divulging communications are strengthened.

It is important to note that many consumers are not even aware that current penalties even exist, and current law unfortunately encourages a relaxed attitude among those who casually intercept communications. As a result, this bill will improve the enforcement of privacy laws by increasing penalties

for violators and encouraging the use of warning labels by the manufacturers of scanners and parts.

The bill also addresses the concern that current prohibitions on the manufacture of scanners capable of receiving cellular frequencies do not extend to other wireless technology such as personal communications and paging services. In addition, current statutes require both interception and divulgence of communications to trigger a violation, which again engenders a relaxed attitude among those that intercept communications. To fix the weakness in the current statute, H.R. 514 will protect privacy and provide effective enforcement mechanisms.

A point of concern has been made about police, fire and other emergency service communications, and I do believe that the assistance of the emergency service personnel should not be interrupted. It is my understanding that language in the committee report will explain that nothing in the bill is intended to interfere with the lawful reception of these emergency communications.

Finally, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) for her hard work in drafting this legislation. She has played an instrumental role in guiding this bill through the committee process and deserves special recognition for leadership on this issue. I certainly expect that her management of this bill on the House floor today will ensure its passage with the support of an overwhelming majority of Members.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 514 will directly improve wireless communications privacy, and this legislation was approved by the Committee on Commerce without amendment by voice vote. We will have ample time to discuss the merits of the bill during the general debate later today.

This is a fair rule, and I urge my colleagues to support it so that we may proceed with general debate and consideration of this bipartisan bill.

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

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

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, today will be the last day of service of my aide on the Committee on Rules Thomas Bantle who came with me from our hometown in 1986, and during those years Tom has served with great distinction in my office and for the people of the 28th congressional district. But also during the time that I was the Chair of the Organization, Study and Review Committee, he had a great impact on the rules of the House, and I want to thank him for the great service that he is given me with integrity and faithfulness and wish him the very best in his new post.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia

(Mr. LINDER), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I rise in support of this open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 514, the Wireless Privacy Enhancement Act.

Similar legislation passed the House in the 105th Congress by a vote of 414 to 1. While the Senate took no action on the bill, the need for this kind of privacy protection requires us to move ahead this year in the hopes that the legislation can soon become law.

Mr. Speaker, current legislation provides protection for some older technology wireless communications, but this bill extends that protection to newer technology including digital wireless communication. In addition, the bill requires the Federal Communications Commission to step up its enforcement actions against the violations of the newly-expanded privacy laws. H.R. 514 also prohibits the manufacture or modification of off-the-shelf radio scanners that could intercept digital cellular telephone communications, and this updates federal law to deal with the changes in technology since the 1986 Electronic Communications Protection Act became law.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this legislation might stop some of the predatory practices that threaten the privacy of millions of cellular conversations placed each and every day. I urge support of this open rule, and I support the underlying bill.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 77 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 514.

□ 1057

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 514) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen and clarify prohibitions on electronic eavesdropping, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN).

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today we are here to protect the privacy of the near 68 million Americans who use wireless telecommunications services and the countless millions who will use those services in the future.

Privacy is important to all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) for introducing H.R. 514 and for shepherding this important bill through the Subcommittee on Telecommunications of the Committee on Commerce. I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and his staff, again for the excellent cooperation and again the bipartisan spirit that our committee so often shows in these telecommunication issues and other matters before our committee.

We begin our review of this issue in the 105th Congress. Two years ago the Subcommittee on Telecommunications held a hearing on wireless privacy. What our Members learned at that hearing was astonishing. Off-the-shelf scanners can be easily modified to turn them into electronic stalking devices.

□ 1100

With the clip of a wire, a scanner can pick up a cellular conversation in a nearby vicinity. In fact, we actually did that. I demonstrated the soldering of a small wire and within 3 minutes converted a scanner, a legal scanner, into an illegal listening device; and my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), helped with the demonstration by making a private telephone conversation.

We picked it up in the committee room, with his consent in advance, and we listened to him as he plotted an overthrow of the committee, a coup d'etat, and we demonstrated in fact how easy it was to listen in on somebody's private conversation.

I want everyone to know that we thwarted that coup d'etat, and we have been good friends ever since.

What our Members indeed learned was that privacy was deeply at risk in America, and although current law and FCC rules prohibit such eavesdropping, the technology was readily available to intercept cellular phone calls.

We also learned at the hearing that some people believed that the present law did not prohibit them from modifying legal scanners to turn them into eavesdropping devices. In fact, a whole modification industry had developed. It was openly advertising in print media and over the Internet, complete with easy-to-follow instructions on how to listen in on neighbors.

H.R. 514 was introduced to crack down on those modification scanners and to prevent a new scanning market from developing for new digital wireless services. The bill prohibits the modification of legal scanners for that purpose. It requires the FCC to adopt regulations that extend current protections, this is very important, to the new digital service, such as the personal communication services; protecting the paging and specialized mobile

services, the new digital so-called secure communications, to make sure they remain secure.

What our Members discovered was a residual belief out there, harkening to the early days of radio, that because the airwaves are a public good, all communications traversing over them are public as well. We discovered an almost right-to-listen mentality, and that mentality is directly inconsistent with cellular users' expectations and, of course, would hamper the growth of wireless communication services that promise so much good for our personal and our professional lives.

Our Members were disturbed by such a callousness for privacy of communications, an intent on establishing the policy that, regardless of the media, private communications deserved to remain private. H.R. 514, therefore, provides that interception alone of wireless communications is illegal. Current provisions in the Communications Act provide that an interception without divulgence is legal. In other words, eavesdropping alone is not illegal under the Communications Act today.

Divulgence alone is also prohibited. Existing Communications Act provisions prohibit a person from divulging an intercepted communications, wireless communication. While we abhor electronic stalking and the violation of privacy rights divulgence brings, we did not intend to punish unintentional behavior. We therefore prohibit in H.R. 514 only intentional interception.

The gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), who has done such a great job on this bill, will offer an amendment today that will clarify that our intent is only to punish divulgence that is in fact intentional. The unintentional divulgence will not be punished. I thank her in advance for her efforts to safeguard the consumers' privacy, while ensuring that first amendment freedoms of the press and of free speech are not in fact hampered by our bill.

When we first began our examination 2 years ago, we were dismayed that the FCC, the most likely enforcer of violations against scanning abuses, was deferring to the FBI and the Justice Department for enforcement. These law enforcement agencies obviously have serious crimes to investigate, so often eavesdropping and divulgence of private communications violations was simply not pursued. We were surprised to hear this, despite the fact that one of our witnesses at our hearings 2 years ago, the FBI official in charge of the TWA crash investigation on Long Island, told us that FBI agents were unable to use their cellular phones during that investigation because the press was scanning and then divulging their intercepted calls when writing articles about the investigation, in fact hampering their ability to find what happened in that awful plane crash.

This illegal interception and divulgence of communications over com-

mercial cellular services was hampering a major FBI investigation. Because of the current lack of aggressive enforcement, the bill now requires that the FCC, regardless of what other enforcement agencies are doing, that they must investigate alleged violations and in fact take action to prevent them.

H.R. 514 leaves undisturbed legitimate uses of scanners. Let me say it again for all Members. This bill does not affect the legitimate scanner, the legal scanner such as those that are used for public safety channels or listening to NASCAR communications for automobile races. Legal scanners, not modified to listen to your cellular phone, are legal today, will remain legal tomorrow. The bill only seeks to prohibit the interception of communications for services that are exclusively allocated for commercial service, for which consumers have the expectation of privacy. We believe we have successfully balanced a number of competing concerns, and I ask all Members to vote for this very good bill.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first, I want to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), for bringing this bill to the floor today and to thank him and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) for the way in which the minority have been treated on this excellent bipartisan legislation.

We have crafted this bill over a couple-of-year period, and it reflects that very close consultation between majority and minority that has always characterized the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade and Consumer Protection. And I want to particularly single out the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) for her work on this legislation. She has helped us to fine-tune it in her brief time here on the committee, and she is the lead sponsor here today, and I want to thank her for her work on this legislation.

The bill that we have before us today offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) is essentially the same wireless scanner legislation that the House of Representatives overwhelmingly approved last session. No action was taken on that legislation in the Senate, and so we return early this session, under the leadership of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), and the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) to approve it again in the hopes that the other body will do likewise.

There is a very important amendment that the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) has crafted, which I think should be included. This legislation modifies the wireless scanner prohibitions contained in the Communications Act and updates them to address digital wireless technologies.

The legislation clarifies our intention that legally protected conversations should not be readily available to scanner enthusiasts who buy scanners for entertainment or for other interests, but they should not be able to eavesdrop on their neighbors. It leaves available those public frequencies utilized often by police and fire and emergency service personnel for scanner hobbyists to continue listening in on.

It ensures that everyday wireless conversations, legally protected conversations, are not easily picked up and listened to.

The bill on the floor this morning has four main parts.

First, the bill extends current scanner receiver manufacturing restrictions to prevent the manufacture of scanners that are capable of intercepting communications in frequencies allocated to new wireless communications, namely personal communications services and protected paging and specialized mobile radio services.

Second, the bill prohibits the modification of scanners and requires the Federal Communications Commission to strengthen its rules to prevent the modification of scanning receivers. This is very important, because committee records from this year and last year make clear that some entities are restoring scanners that comply with the Federal Communications rules so that these scanners can obtain protected frequencies.

Third, the bill makes it illegal to intentionally intercept or divulge the content of radio communications.

Finally, penalties are increased for violations; and the legislation requires the Commission to move expeditiously on investigations of alleged violations.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we point out that digital cellular, the next generation of cellular services, and digital personal communications services are less susceptible to unauthorized eavesdropping than analogue cellular that most people in our country have been using over the last decade. Yet, digital cellular and PCS are not completely immune from eavesdropping because, in a never-ending saga of technical one-upmanship, the equipment for intercepting digital calls and converting digital conversations is becoming more available and more affordable.

Currently, such digital scanners remain vastly more expensive and complex than existing off-the-shelf scanners that intercept analogue communications. However, one of the purposes of the bill is to prevent a market from developing for less expensive digital scanners by clearly prohibiting the authorization of such scanners by the Federal Communications Commission.

In the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, consumers will best be protected through a combination of the scanner provisions we are poised to approve today and the implementation of encryption technology so that consumers can encode their own conversations

and their own private data. For this reason, we must make sure that the United States encryption policy avails consumers of the opportunity to utilize the best, most sophisticated technology, so that they can help to protect themselves, and I urge the wireless industry to help make these encryption technologies available to consumers in an affordable way.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, and I want to again commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), because the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and I and the other Members on our side feel that we were very fairly treated. We feel it is a good piece of legislation. We compliment the chairman, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) and all involved in it.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), a new, extremely bright new voice, on our committee and the author of the legislation.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, almost 70 million Americans have cellular or digital phones or those new PCS phones that have everything on them from caller IDs to voice messaging and paging all in one little phone that can fit in someone's pocket.

In America, 1997 was a milestone year. That was the first year in American history that more cordless and cell phones were sold than hard wire phones to hang on our walls or set on our telephone tables at home.

People expect the calls that we make on those little phones in our pockets to be private, because we are used to it. We are used to it on the hard line phones in our homes and in our offices, and we have a right to expect the same thing on the ones that more and more people are carrying with them, are using in their car, sometimes dangerously, or in restaurants or outside office buildings or walking down the street or on the subway. They expect privacy, and we need to give it to them.

While the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) were here in Washington busy with their soldering irons and plotting coup d'etats in the Subcommittee on Telecommunications Trade and Consumer Protection, I was back in New Mexico in my home State.

I am not really a technology person, but shortly after my baby was born, I heard voices coming from her room and went in there and found that the baby monitor was picking up the conversations of my neighbor, and while that is not exactly on point it proved to me how easy it is for technology to inadvertently pick up the private conversations of someone that thought that conversation and had a right to believe that conversation should be private.

The law in privacy has loopholes, and technology has outstripped our privacy protection laws. I would note that it was the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) in 1992 who wrote the original law here that covers cell phones, but it needs to be expanded today, and that is what this bill is all about.

We should not have companies in America advertising scanners that can be easily modified to pick up private conversations. There should not be a business for that in America, and this bill would eliminate that kind of business. The bill updates scanner manufacturing bans so that new frequencies, including digital and PCS phones are covered, in addition to cell phones. It prohibits the modification of scanners to intercept calls.

□ 1115

So there is no more messing around in the hearing room.

Mr. Chairman, it makes it illegal to intentionally intercept calls or to intentionally divulge the content of private calls, and it increases the penalties for violators and requires the FCC to investigate violations, instead of just referring them over to somebody else who is overburdened as it is.

I think it is also important to make clear what this bill does not do, because I think it can be confusing, especially for those of us who are not really used to dealing with some of these telecommunications widgets. There are a lot of people who listen to the police and fire departments on the scanners because they are volunteer firefighters or just because they like to. They like to know what is going on in their town and where they can help. There are also ham operators that enjoy their hobby, and they provide a public service, and that is okay.

It is okay now, and it will continue to be okay with this bill. Those are public service and amateur radio frequencies, and people should be able to listen to them and to use them. Just to make it perfectly clear, we have added report language to the bill that makes this intent very clear to the FCC. There will be no interference with those rights and public frequencies and the ability to have scanners for public service and fire and police.

Mr. Chairman, I will also have an amendment that clarifies that those who unintentionally divulge information that they do not know comes from an illegally intercepted conversation are not penalized. One should not be held accountable for something if they had no intention or no knowledge, and we will clarify that with an amendment in a few minutes here.

Of course, we also have to be sensitive to the needs of law enforcement agencies and national security; and the bill also, by cross-reference to Title 18 in the Criminal Code, makes clear that the procedures that exist now for fighting terrorism and drug traffickers and other criminal acts remain as they always have been.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman BLILEY) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman TAUZIN), as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) for working on this bill for so long and tolerating some of the tweaking that we have been doing to it. Their staffs have been very cooperative, and I think we have a good, solid piece of legislation that is supported by both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate particularly the prompt action of the gentleman from Louisiana in bringing this to the floor today. This bill will give Americans privacy they expect and they deserve, and I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) on behalf of all of us on the committee for the excellent job on this bill, and I look forward to working with her on many other high-tech issues as we learn them together.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Richmond, Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), who is not only the chairman of our Committee on Commerce but the chairman of what we consider to be the most important committee in the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, the House considered and passed the first of a couple of wireless bills and, like its brother of yesterday, the bill before us today both increases the usefulness of wireless services for our constituents and promotes an important public interest.

H.R. 514 will increase the privacy of the 70-odd million subscribers of wireless services in this country. The bill outlaws modifications of off-the-shelf scanners to intercept personal wireless communications, not communications over shared frequencies where the parties expect to be heard, like in NASCAR racing, boating or police or fire channels, but of private communications enabled by commercial services where users have an expectation of privacy.

Mr. Chairman, I remember a hearing in the last Congress when the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member put on a demonstration of just how easy it is to take an off-the-shelf scanner and modify it. Nobody has the right to listen to private communication merely because one has the technical expertise to intercept. This bill will outlaw such interception and force the FCC to deal with electronic stalking as a serious breach of our privacy rights enforceable under this new law.

The bill will also prevent the development of a market for next generation digital scanners, so that from the get-go digital wireless service will remain private.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico

(Mrs. WILSON) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman TAUZIN), as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), ranking member of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to also single out again the work of the staff who have always, as I said, toiled long hours to help us bring bills like this, complex in nature, technical in nature, to the floor.

I want to again acknowledge and thank Andy Levin and Colin Crowell, and from the majority, Tricia Paoletta, Mike O'Rielly, Cliff Riccio and Luke Rose for their excellent work on this bill and for our entire committee and subcommittee.

Again, I say thanks for the work of the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman BLILEY) in helping us to move this legislation to the floor, as well as to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) for their excellent cooperation.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me this opportunity to address this important bill, H.R. 514, that will extend our federal privacy protections to protect the users of wireless technologies.

Many historians would agree, that it is our country's long tradition of innovation and ingenuity that made us, and keeps us, a superpower. However, the rewards of innovation do not always come without a price.

First, there is the cost of developing the innovation. Our government often participates in that innovation through agencies and programs like NASA, the Science Foundation (NSF), and the Advanced Technology Program (ATP).

Second, new technologies often have hidden costs. One example is the Y2K problem, which manifested itself in part because technology developers did not believe that their products would still be in use in the 21st century.

Third and unfortunately, because the law is sometimes unable to adjust quickly enough to these rapidly-changing technologies, there are other costs that come about because of fraudulent or criminal activity. This bill addresses one such problem that has developed because of the rise in the use of wireless technologies, such as cellular phones.

With the demand for wireless technologies growing at a near-exponential rate, we have seen the development of technologies that are capable of intercepting wireless transmissions, and in some instances, decoding those transmissions. That means that with a simply modified scanner, an individual with criminal intentions could readily listen into cellular phone conversations undetectably.

Furthermore, there are some scanners that even have the ability to decode the digital transmissions that up until now were a strong

selling point for high-end cellular phones. Many of the purchasers of digital phones, in fact, purchased them in part because they felt that their conversations and cellular phone profiles are more secure than with the use of analog technology.

This bill works to better protect those consumers, and in fact, all consumers of wireless technologies, by making it illegal to intentionally intercept or disclose any wireless communication. By criminalizing both behaviors, we will be protecting all consumers from the fraudulent misuse of their conversations and transmissions.

It is our responsibility as a Congress to preserve the principles put forth in our Constitution. I feel that this bill is a logical extension of the Right of Privacy recognized by the Supreme Court in *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965), and I support this bill as a result.

I urge all of you to vote in favor of this bill, and to further protect our citizens from high-tech fraud.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 514, and in support of the Wilson amendment. The passage of this legislation will, as does so much of the legislation we pass, move our nation yet another step close to a national police state by further expanding a federal crime and empowering more federal police—this time at the Federal Communications Commission. Despite recent and stern warnings by both former U.S. attorney general Edwin Meese III and current U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist, the Congress seems compelled to ride the current wave of federally criminalizing every human misdeed in the name of saving the world from some evil rather than to uphold a Constitutional oath which prescribes a procedural structure by which the nation is protected from totalitarianism.

Our federal government is, constitutionally, a government of limited powers. Article one, Section eight, enumerates the legislative areas for which the U.S. Congress is allowed to act or enact legislation. For every issue, the federal government lacks any authority or consent of the governed and only the state governments, their designees, or the people in their private market actions enjoy such rights to governance. The tenth amendment is brutally clear in stating "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Our nation's history makes clear that the U.S. Constitution is a document intended to limit the power of central government. No serious reading of historical events surrounding the creation of the Constitution could reasonably portray it differently. Of course, there will be those who will hand their constitutional "hats" on the interstate commerce or general welfare clauses, both of which have been popular "headgear" since the plunge into New Deal Socialism.

Perhaps, more dangerous is the loss of another Constitutional protection which comes with the passage of more and more federal criminal legislation. Constitutionally, there are only three federal crimes. These are treason against the United States, piracy on the high seas, and counterfeiting (and, as mentioned above, for a short period of history, the manufacture, sale, or transport of alcohol was concurrently a federal and state crime). "Concur-

rent" jurisdiction crimes, such as alcohol prohibition in the past and eavesdropping today, erode the right of citizens to be free of double jeopardy. The fifth amendment to the U.S. Constitution specifies that no "person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb . . ." In other words, no person shall be tried twice for the same offense. However, in *United States v. Lanza*, the high court in 1922 sustained a ruling that being tried by both the federal government and a state government for the same offense did not offend the doctrine of double jeopardy. One danger of unconstitutionally expanding the federal justice code is that it seriously increases the danger that one will be subject to being tried twice for the same crime. Despite the various pleas for federal correction of societal wrongs, a national police force is neither prudent nor constitutional.

The argument which springs from the criticism of a federalized criminal code and a federal police force is that states may be less effective than a centralized federal government in dealing with those who leave one state jurisdiction for another. Fortunately, the Constitution provides for the procedural means for preserving the integrity of state sovereignty over those issues delegated to it via the tenth amendment. Article IV, Section 2, Clause 2 makes provision for the rendition of fugitives from one state to another. While not self-enacting, in 1783 Congress passed an act which did exactly this. There is, of course, a cost imposed upon states in working with one another rather than relying on a national, unified police force. At the same time, there is a greater cost to centralization of police power.

It is important to be reminded of the benefits of federalism as well as the costs. There are sound reasons to maintain a system of smaller, independent jurisdictions—it is called competition and governments must, for the sake of the citizenry, be allowed to compete. We have obsessed so much over the notion of "competition" in this country we harangue someone like Bill Gates when, by offering superior products to every other similarly-situated entity, he becomes the dominant provider of certain computer products. Rather than allow someone who serves to provide values as made obvious by their voluntary exchanges in the free market, we lambaste efficiency and economies of scale in the private marketplace. Yet, at the same time, we further centralize government, the ultimate monopoly and one empowered by force rather than voluntary exchange.

As government becomes more centralized, it becomes much more difficult to vote with one's feet to escape the relatively more oppressive governments. Governmental units must remain small with ample opportunity for citizen mobility both to efficient governments and away from those which tend to be oppressive. Centralization of criminal law makes such mobility less and less practical.

For each of these reasons, among others, I must oppose the further and unconstitutional centralization of police power in the national government and, accordingly, H.R. 514.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered under the 5-minute rule by section, and each section shall be considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that has been printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

*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 "Wireless Privacy Enhancement Act of 1999".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

The Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

**SEC. 2. COMMERCE IN ELECTRONIC EAVES-DROPPING DEVICES.**

(a) PROHIBITION ON MODIFICATION.—Section 302(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 302a(b)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", or modify any such device, equipment, or system in any manner that causes such device, equipment, or system to fail to comply with such regulations".

(b) PROHIBITION ON COMMERCE IN SCANNING RECEIVERS.—Section 302(d) of such Act (47 U.S.C. 302a(d)) is amended to read as follows: "(d) EQUIPMENT AUTHORIZATION REGULATIONS.—

"(1) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS REQUIRED.—The Commission shall prescribe regulations, and review and revise such regulations as necessary in response to subsequent changes in technology or behavior, denying equipment authorization (under part 15 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any other part of that title) for any scanning receiver that is capable of—

"(A) receiving transmissions in the frequencies that are allocated to the domestic cellular radio telecommunications service or the personal communications service;

"(B) readily being altered to receive transmissions in such frequencies;

"(C) being equipped with decoders that—

"(i) convert digital domestic cellular radio telecommunications service, personal communications service, or protected specialized mobile radio service transmissions to analog voice audio; or

"(ii) convert protected paging service transmissions to alphanumeric text; or

"(D) being equipped with devices that otherwise decode encrypted radio transmissions for the purposes of unauthorized interception.

"(2) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS FOR SHARED FREQUENCIES.—The Commission shall, with respect to scanning receivers capable of receiving transmissions in frequencies that are used by commercial mobile services and that are shared by public safety users, examine methods, and may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary, to enhance the privacy of users of such frequencies.

"(3) TAMPERING PREVENTION.—In prescribing regulations pursuant to paragraph (1), the Commission shall consider defining 'capable of readily being altered' to require scanning receivers to be manufactured in a

manner that effectively precludes alteration of equipment features and functions as necessary to prevent commerce in devices that may be used unlawfully to intercept or divulge radio communication.

"(4) WARNING LABELS.—In prescribing regulations under paragraph (1), the Commission shall consider requiring labels on scanning receivers warning of the prohibitions in Federal law on intentionally intercepting or divulging radio communications.

"(5) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subsection, the term 'protected' means secured by an electronic method that is not published or disclosed except to authorized users, as further defined by Commission regulation."

(c) IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS.—Within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall prescribe amendments to its regulations for the purposes of implementing the amendments made by this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

The Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

**SEC. 3. UNAUTHORIZED INTERCEPTION OR PUBLICATION OF COMMUNICATIONS.**

Section 705 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 605) is amended—

(1) in the heading of such section, by inserting "INTERCEPTION or" after "UNAUTHORIZED";

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (a), by striking "Except as authorized by chapter 119, title 18, United States Code, no person" and inserting "No person";

(3) in the second sentence of subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting "intentionally" before "intercept"; and

(B) by striking "and divulge" and inserting "or divulge";

(4) by striking the last sentence of subsection (a) and inserting the following: "Nothing in this subsection prohibits an interception or disclosure of a communication as authorized by chapter 119 of title 18, United States Code.;"

(5) in subsection (e)(1)—

(A) by striking "fined not more than \$2,000 or"; and

(B) by inserting "or fined under title 18, United States Code," after "6 months,;" and

(6) in subsection (e)(3), by striking "any violation" and inserting "any receipt, interception, divulgence, publication, or utilization of any communication in violation";

(7) in subsection (e)(4), by striking "any other activity prohibited by subsection (a)" and inserting "any receipt, interception, divulgence, publication, or utilization of any communication in violation of subsection (a)"; and

(8) by adding at the end of subsection (e) the following new paragraph:

"(7) Notwithstanding any other investigative or enforcement activities of any other Federal agency, the Commission shall investigate alleged violations of this section and may proceed to initiate action under section 503 of this Act to impose forfeiture penalties with respect to such violation upon conclusion of the Commission's investigation."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 3?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. WILSON

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. WILSON:

Page 5, strike lines 14 and 15 and insert the following:

(B) by striking "communication and divulge" and inserting "communication, and no person having intercepted such a communication shall intentionally divulge";

(4) in the fourth sentence of subsection

(a)—

(A) by inserting "(A)" after "intercepted, shall"; and

(B) by striking "thereof or" and inserting "thereof; or (B)";

Page 5, line 16, strike "(4)" and insert "(5)";

Page 5, line 21, strike "(5)" and insert "(6)";

Page 6, line 1, strike "(6)" and insert "(7)";

Page 6, line 5, strike "(7)" and insert "(8)";

Page 6, line 10, strike "(8)" and insert "(9)";

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, concern was raised during the consideration of this bill by several folks who were concerned about first amendment rights. It was a drafting point, but it needed to be fixed in order to make it perfectly clear. We do not want to make it a crime to divulge or publish information that someone does not know came from an intercepted cell call. That would criminalize unintentional acts.

Mr. Chairman, say a reporter gets a scoop from a source, not knowing that it came from an intercepted call, for example. We do not want that to be a crime, even if the interception is a crime. But we do wish to prohibit people divulging information that they know was illegally intercepted, even if they were not the ones that actually intercepted the call. If we did not do that, that would be a loophole to drive a truck through.

How could that happen? Let us say I am illegally monitoring cell calls, whether for pleasure or just systematically, and I intercept a cell call of a builder who is talking over his phone who talks about information on a bid that he is going to give on a job. I give it to my buddy, and my buddy divulges it to another builder or divulges it publicly. It should be a crime to divulge that information if one knows that it came from an intercepted call. It should be a crime for me to do it or for my buddy to do it, if he knows that I have been scanning those calls.

This amendment makes that clarification, that it is a crime to intentionally intercept. It is a crime to intentionally divulge. It is not a crime to divulge it if one does not know where the information came from. It sounds a little bit confusing, but this amendment will protect first amendment rights while criminalizing eavesdropping and those who are a part of eavesdropping schemes.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important clarifying amendment which will protect innocent people from being swept up in a statute which is clearly aimed at wrongdoers. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from New

Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) for this important refinement, which I think at the point of enforcement is going to be very helpful to law enforcement officials because it will make it quite clear what it was that Congress intended. I would urge all Members to support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to the bill?

If there are no further amendments, under the rule the committee now rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 514) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen and clarify prohibitions on electronic eavesdropping, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 77, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 3, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—403

Abercrombie	Bateman	Borski
Aderholt	Becerra	Boswell
Allen	Bentsen	Boucher
Andrews	Bereuter	Boyd
Archer	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Armey	Berman	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Berry	Brown (CA)
Baird	Biggart	Brown (FL)
Baker	Bilbray	Brown (OH)
Baldacci	Bilirakis	Bryant
Baldwin	Bishop	Burr
Ballenger	Blagojevich	Burton
Barcia	Bliley	Buyer
Barr	Blumenthal	Callahan
Barrett (NE)	Blunt	Calvert
Barrett (WI)	Boehler	Camp
Bartlett	Boehner	Campbell
Barton	Bonilla	Canady
Bass	Bono	Cannon

Capuano	Hefley	Mink
Cardin	Herger	Mollohan
Carson	Hill (IN)	Moore
Castle	Hill (MT)	Moran (KS)
Chabot	Hillery	Moran (VA)
Chambliss	Hilliard	Morrell
Chenoweth	Hinojosa	Murtha
Clay	Hobson	Myrick
Clayton	Hoeffel	Nadler
Clement	Hoekstra	Napolitano
Clyburn	Holden	Neal
Coble	Holt	Nethercutt
Coburn	Hooley	Ney
Collins	Horn	Northrup
Combest	Hostettler	Norwood
Condit	Houghton	Nussle
Conyers	Hoyer	Oberstar
Cook	Hulshof	Obey
Cooksey	Hunter	Olver
Costello	Hutchinson	Ortiz
Cox	Hyde	Ose
Coyne	Inslie	Owens
Cramer	Isakson	Oxley
Crane	Istook	Packard
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Cubin	Jackson-Lee	Pascrell
Cummings	(TX)	Pease
Cunningham	Jefferson	Peterson (MN)
Danner	Jenkins	Peterson (PA)
Davis (FL)	John	Petri
Davis (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Phelps
Deal	Johnson, E. B.	Pickering
DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Pickett
DeGette	Jones (NC)	Pitts
Delahunt	Jones (OH)	Pombo
DeLauro	Kanjorski	Pomeroy
DeLay	Kaptur	Porter
DeMint	Kelly	Portman
Deutsch	Kildee	Price (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Kilpatrick	Pryce (OH)
Dicks	Kind (WI)	Quinn
Dingell	King (NY)	Radanovich
Dixon	Kingston	Rahall
Doggett	Kleczka	Ramstad
Dooley	Klink	Rangel
Doolittle	Knollenberg	Reynolds
Doyle	Kucinich	Riley
Dreier	Kuykendall	Rivers
Duncan	LaFalce	Rodriguez
Dunn	LaHood	Roemer
Edwards	Lampson	Rogers
Ehlers	Lantos	Rohrabacher
Ehrlich	Largent	Ros-Lehtinen
Emerson	Larson	Rothman
Engel	Latham	Roukema
English	LaTourette	Roybal-Allard
Etheridge	Lazio	Ryan (WI)
Evans	Leach	Ryun (KS)
Everett	Levin	Sabo
Ewing	Lewis (CA)	Salmon
Farr	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez
Fattah	Lewis (KY)	Sanders
Filner	Linder	Sandlin
Fletcher	Lipinski	Sanford
Foley	LoBiondo	Sawyer
Forbes	Lofgren	Saxton
Ford	Lowe	Scarborough
Fossella	Lucas (KY)	Schaffer
Fowler	Lucas (OK)	Schakowsky
Franks (NJ)	Luther	Scott
Frelinghuysen	Maloney (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Frost	Maloney (NY)	Serrano
Gallegly	Manzullo	Sessions
Ganske	Markey	Shadegg
Gejdenson	Martinez	Shaw
Gekas	Mascara	Shays
Gibbons	Matsui	Sherman
Gilchrest	McCarthy (MO)	Sherwood
Gillmor	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus
Gilman	McCollum	Shoos
Gonzalez	McCrery	Shuster
Goode	McGovern	Simpson
Goodlatte	McHugh	Sisisky
Gordon	McInnis	Skeen
Goss	McIntosh	Skelton
Graham	McIntyre	Slaughter
Granger	McKeon	Smith (MI)
Green (TX)	McKinney	Smith (NJ)
Green (WI)	McNulty	Smith (TX)
Greenwood	Meehan	Smith (WA)
Gutierrez	Meek (FL)	Snyder
Gutknecht	Menendez	Souder
Hall (OH)	Metcalfe	Spence
Hall (TX)	Mica	Spratt
Hansen	Millender-	Stabenow
Hastings (FL)	McDonald	Stark
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Hayes	Miller, Gary	Stenholm
Hayworth	Minge	Strickland

Stump	Thurman	Watts (OK)
Stupak	Tiahrt	Waxman
Sununu	Tierney	Weiner
Sweeney	Toomey	Weldon (FL)
Talent	Trafficant	Weldon (PA)
Tancredo	Turner	Weller
Tanner	Udall (CO)	Wexler
Tauscher	Udall (NM)	Weygand
Tauzin	Upton	Whitfield
Taylor (MS)	Velazquez	Wicker
Taylor (NC)	Vento	Wilson
Terry	Visclosky	Wise
Thomas	Walden	Wolf
Thompson (CA)	Walsh	Wu
Thompson (MS)	Wamp	Wynn
Thornberry	Watkins	Young (AK)
Thune	Watt (NC)	Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Hinchey	McDermott	Paul
---------	-----------	------

NOT VOTING—28

Ackerman	Kennedy	Regula
Bonior	Kolbe	Reyes
Capps	Lee	Rogan
Davis (VA)	Livingston	Royce
Dickey	Meeks (NY)	Rush
Eshoo	Miller, George	Towns
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Waters
Gephardt	Pastor	Woolsey
Goodling	Payne	
Kasich	Pelosi	

□ 1147

Mr. HINCHEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 28, I was traveling with the Chairman, Subcommittee on Africa and was unavoidably absent for the vote on H.R. 514. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, regrettably I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote 28. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 25, 1999, I was unavoidably detained and unable to record a vote by electronic device on roll No. 27. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on roll No. 27.

On Thursday, February 25, 1999, I was unavoidably detained and unable to record a vote by electronic device on roll No. 28. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on roll No. 28.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, due to a family illness I was unable to attend votes this week. Had I been here I would have made the following votes: Rollcall No. 22—"aye"; rollcall No. 23—"aye"; rollcall No. 24—"aye"; rollcall No. 25—"aye"; rollcall No. 26—"aye"; rollcall No. 27—"aye"; rollcall No. 28—"aye".

#### SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER  
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 434

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as an original cosponsor of H.R. 434. My name was inadvertently included as a cosponsor of that bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAUZIN. 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 on the bill just passed, H.R. 514.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 669, AMENDING PEACE  
CORPS ACT TO AUTHORIZE AP-  
PROPRIATIONS FOR FY 2000  
THROUGH 2003 TO CARRY OUT  
THAT ACT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 83 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 83

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 669) to amend the Peace Corps Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 to carry out that Act. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion

except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

House Resolution 83, Mr. Speaker, is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 669, the Peace Corps Reauthorization Act. The purpose of the bill is to authorize funds for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2000 through 2003, expanding the Peace Corps from the current number of volunteers to the goal of 10,000 by the year 2003.

The rule provides for the customary 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. In addition, the rule provides the bill shall be considered as read. The rule permits the Chair to grant priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments and consider them as read.

Further, as has become standard practice for open rules, the Chair is allowed to postpone votes and to reduce the time for electronic voting on postponed votes.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with our without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, to keep our record of fair rules for the 106th Congress, I am pleased to report to the House that House Resolution 83 is another open rule that affords any Member the opportunity to offer any germane amendments.

H.R. 669, the Peace Corps Reauthorization Act, is in line with an effort started by President Reagan in 1985 to expand the Peace Corps to 10,000 volunteers. Since the Peace Corps was established, first by President Kennedy and affirmed by the 87th Congress, over 150,000 Americans have served in 134 countries and have learned 180 languages and dialects.

We are fortunate to have five former Peace Corps volunteers working with us in the U.S. House of Representatives: The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

I commend these gentlemen as well as the thousands of other volunteers for their tireless efforts in providing basic health and agriculture education, working so communities have access to clean water, as well as teaching English and other skills to extraordinarily needy populations.

I am honored to serve on the Committee on Rules with my esteemed and distinguished colleague from Ohio (Mr.

HALL), whose Peace Corps experience, no doubt, had much to do with his clear and long-time commitment to fighting hunger throughout the world.

H.R. 669 fulfills the effort which President Reagan proposed in 1985 to expand the number of volunteers, and this expansion has been requested by President Clinton. I urge my colleagues to support this open rule, this fair rule, and hope that they will give careful consideration to supporting the underlying positive legislation as well.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me the time and certainly his many kind words about me.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. It will allow for full and fair debate on H.R. 669. As my colleague from Florida has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member on the Committee on International Relations.

The rule permits amendments under the 5-minute rule. This is the normal amending process in the House. All Members on both sides of the aisle will have the opportunity to offer germane amendments.

In 1985, President Reagan set a goal for the Peace Corps of 10,000 volunteers and, unfortunately, low levels of funding have prevented us from getting there. The bill before us would finally accomplish that goal. The bill would also expand the work of the Crisis Corps, a group of experienced Peace Corps volunteers who assist in emergencies.

Since it was founded by President Kennedy in 1961, the Peace Corps has been one of our most important tools of international diplomacy. The people-to-people style of the Peace Corps has won friends for America all over the world, and I know this because I was a Peace Corps volunteer in Thailand in 1966 and 1967.

In the rural villages and urban communities where they serve, Peace Corps volunteers are educating the children, they are caring for the sick, and they are teaching the poorest of the poor how to help themselves. They are on the front lines every day fighting the major health threats to young children.

□ 1200

But, most importantly, these volunteers are the face of America for people all across the globe.

The Peace Corps' exciting new Crisis Corps initiative is well under way, in which experienced volunteers and return volunteers provide short-term assistance during humanitarian crises and natural disasters. Crisis Corps volunteers were recently dispatched to Central America to aid in recovery from the Hurricane Mitch disaster.

They have also worked with refugees from Liberia and Sierra Leone in Guinea and the Ivory Coast.

The Peace Corps represents the best that our country has to offer, I think. It brings together bright, dedicated, energetic people and arms them with the tools to work in foreign countries as ambassadors of peace.

The Peace Corps is one of the best known and loved of our foreign aid programs. Its budget represents only a tiny fraction, about 1 percent, of our international affairs accounts. It is a remarkable return from a very modest investment.

Last month, I had the opportunity to visit the town in Thailand where I served as a Peace Corps volunteer. It is no longer this sleepy rural village I remembered but a very large urban center of a million people. The old school where I taught English was not only still standing but was thriving, and so were the lasting bonds of friendship that I established with so many wonderful people in that community.

I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation. I urge adoption of the rule and the bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the open rule that will govern the debate for the Peace Corps Act (H.R. 669). This bill authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 2000 through 2003. This organization has a legacy of service that has become an important part of American history.

President John F. Kennedy first proposed the idea of the Peace Corps during a campaign stop at the University of Michigan in 1960. He challenged the students to give two years of their lives to help people in the developing world.

Since its inception, the Peace Corps has trained 150,000 volunteers to work in 134 countries. Some of these volunteers include members who have served here in the House: Representative SAM FARR of California, Representative TONY HALL of Ohio, Representative THOMAS PETRI of Wisconsin, Representative CHRISTOPHER SHAYS of Connecticut and Representative JAMES WALSH of New York.

Currently there are 6,700 volunteers serving in 80 countries. The increased funding would allow the Peace Corps to expand to its goal of 10,000 volunteers. It would also allow the Peace Corps programs to expand to South Africa, Jordan, China, Bangladesh, Mozambique and other countries in Central Asia, the Middle East, South America, Eastern Europe and Africa.

The Peace Corps is an important part of our foreign assistance program. It helps communities gain access to clean water, grow food, prevent the spread of AIDS and work with to protect the environment.

I look forward to the improvements on this bill via the amendment process on the floor of the House. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule on this bill.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was traveling with the Chairman, Subcommittee on Africa and was unavoidably absent from debate on the rule on H.R. 669. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of agreeing to the rule.

#### APPOINTMENT TO TRADE DEFICIT REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(3) of the Trade Deficit Review Commission Act (Division A of Public Law 105-277) the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following person on the part of the House to the Trade Deficit Review Commission:

Mrs. Carla Anderson Hills, Washington D.C.

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 6(B) of the National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 as amended by section 346(e) of Public Law 105-83, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the National Council on the Arts:

Mr. BALLENGER of North Carolina.

There was no objection.

#### CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CUBA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H.DOC. 106-30)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

#### *To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the FEDERAL REGISTER and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared with respect to the Government of Cuba's destruction of two unarmed U.S.-registered civilian aircraft in international airspace north of Cuba on February 24, 1996, is to continue in effect beyond March 1, 1999, to the *Federal Register* for publication.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 24, 1999.

#### BIENNIAL REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Resources:

#### *To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit the Biennial Report to Congress on the Administration of the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) of the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) for fiscal years 1996 and 1997. This report is submitted as required by section 316 of the CZMA of 1972 as amended, (16 U.S.C. 1451, *et seq.*).

The report discusses progress made at the national and State level in administering the Coastal Zone Management and Estuarine Research Reserve Programs during these years, and spotlights the accomplishments of NOAA's State coastal management and estuarine research reserve program partners under the CZMA.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 24, 1999.

#### RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Washington, DC, January 27, 1999.

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find a copy of a letter to the Louisiana Secretary of State announcing my intention to resign from the U.S. House of Representatives on February 28, 1999. Upon receipt of this letter, I expect the Governor to notice and call an election to fill my vacancy. My hope is that it will occur as quickly as possible so as to result in as little inconvenience as possible to the Republican Conference.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. LIVINGSTON,  
Member of Congress.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1999

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY,  
MARCH 2, 1999

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 1, 1999, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, March 2, 1999, for morning hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR  
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON  
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

TASK FORCE AGUILA

(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, General George Patton once said, "There is no limit to what you can accomplish, if you don't care who gets the credit."

This quote is very fitting for the 5,000 men and women of Task Force Aguila, who left their homes and loved ones during the holidays last year to provide humanitarian relief to the victims of Hurricane Mitch.

As members of the Task Force prepare to end their mission, I feel it is important to take note of the following. Mr. Speaker, there are many accomplishments of our U.S. military in Central America that are not known by my colleagues here or, for that matter, most Americans; like the over 15,000 sick and injured people that were treated and cared for, the delivery of almost 2,000 tons of food and other humanitarian aid, millions of gallons of water purified, and the miles and miles of roads repaired and washed out bridges rebuilt.

All of these will be lasting reminders of the goodwill and ambassadorship provided by every airman, soldier and Marine as part of our U.S. diplomacy there.

I rise today to express my thanks and give national recognition to our Armed Forces for a job well done.

COMPARABLE TREATMENT OF  
FEDERAL WORKERS, MEMBERS  
OF CONGRESS, AND THE PRESI-  
DENT DURING FEDERAL GOV-  
ERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in the past when we shut the Federal Government down, the government employees were not paid but Members of Congress and the President and the Senate of course were. So today I am introducing legislation to provide for comparable treatment of Federal employees, Members of Congress, and the President if there is a Federal Government shutdown.

I think, in good conscience, if we are asking our Federal employees to suffer the consequences, then we in this House should, too. Maybe we would think more carefully about shutting this place down. If my colleagues believe, as I do, that it is only right and just that we also forgo our paychecks, then I hope they will join with me in asking Congress and the President to put our paychecks where our values are and not expect special treatment in the event we shut the Federal Government down. Show their support for Federal workers by cosponsoring my bill, which I intend to drop this morning. I look forward to the support of my colleagues.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE  
CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE  
ON THE BUDGET REGARDING IN-  
TERIM BUDGET ALLOCATIONS  
AND AGGREGATES FOR FISCAL  
YEARS 1999-2003

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KASICH, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Section 2 of House Resolution 5, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD interim budget aggregates and allocations for fiscal year 1999 and for the period of fiscal years 1999 through fiscal year 2003.

These interim levels will be used to enforce sections 302(f), 303(a) and 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Section 303(a) prohibits the consideration of legislation that provides new budget authority or changes in revenues until Congress has agreed to a budget resolution for the appropriate fiscal year. Sections 302(f) and 311(a) prohibit the consideration of legislation that exceeds the appropriate budgetary levels set forth in budget resolution and the accompanying report.

Without these interim levels, the House would be prohibited under section 303(a) of the Budget Act from considering legislation with even negligible budgetary effects in certain fiscal years because a budget resolution is not in effect for the current fiscal year. There would be no levels to make determinations under sections 302(f) and 311(a) for fiscal year 1999 and such determinations for the five year period would be based on the now-obsolete levels set forth under H. Con. Res. 84 (H. Rept. 105-116) in 1997.

The interim allocations and aggregates are essentially based on current status levels. They reflect enacted and House-passed legislation as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). In the case of the Committee on Appropriations, the allocations are identical to the levels set forth in H. Res. 477 (H. Rept. 105-585) except that they reflect adjustments for emergencies, arrearages and other items under section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act.

These levels are effective until they are superseded by a conference report on the current budget resolution.

If there are any questions on these interim allocations and aggregates, please contact Jim Bates, Chief Counsel of the Budget Committee, at ext. 6-7270.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES  
[Committees other than Appropriations]

Committee		Budget year					Total 1999-2003
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	
Agriculture Committee:							
	Current Law .....	BA 17,337	9,727	8,499	6,967	2,738	45,268
		OT 14,885	5,927	5,729	4,374	51	30,966
	Reauthorizations .....	BA 0	0	0	0	28,328	28,328
		OT 0	0	0	0	27,801	27,801
	Total .....	BA 17,337	9,727	8,499	6,967	31,066	73,596
		OT 15,885	5,927	5,729	4,374	27,852	58,767
Armed Services Committee:							
	Current Law .....	BA 47,809	49,218	50,895	52,579	54,366	254,867
		OT 47,672	49,108	50,792	52,476	54,273	254,321
Banking and Financial Services Committee:							
	Current Law .....	BA 3,442	4,586	5,431	5,297	5,027	23,783
		OT 874	-2,016	-473	-24	186	-1,453
Committee on Education and the Workforce:							
	Current Law .....	BA 3,303	4,503	5,061	5,495	5,424	23,786
		OT 2,744	3,829	4,366	4,835	4,995	20,729
	Discretionary Action .....	BA 0	0	0	305	305	610
		OT 0	0	0	92	275	367
	Total .....	BA 3,303	4,503	5,061	5,800	5,729	24,396
		OT 2,744	3,829	4,366	4,927	5,270	21,096

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES—Continued  
 [Committees other than Appropriations]

Committee		Budget year					Total 1999–2003
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	
Commerce Committee:	OT	2,744	3,829	4,366	4,927	5,230	21,096
Current Law	BA	8,663	10,247	12,263	15,747	16,015	62,935
	OT	5,421	8,351	10,963	16,458	16,942	58,135
International Relations Committee:	BA	10,924	9,888	9,982	9,557	8,711	49,062
Current Law	OT	12,162	11,516	10,860	10,415	9,698	54,651
Government Reform Committee:	BA	57,886	59,661	61,516	63,577	65,822	308,462
Current Law	OT	56,644	48,365	60,164	62,174	64,396	301,743
Discretionary Action	BA	0	2	4	4	4	14
	OT	0	2	4	4	4	14
Total	BA	57,886	59,663	61,520	63,581	65,826	308,476
	OT	56,644	58,367	60,168	62,178	64,400	301,757
Committee on House Administration:	BA	93	90	90	90	93	456
Current Law	OT	56	262	49	13	57	437
Resources Committee:	BA	2,296	2,391	2,370	2,319	2,351	11,727
Current Law	OT	2,253	2,254	2,332	2,205	2,326	11,370
Judiciary Committee:	BA	4,759	4,548	4,550	4,539	4,631	23,027
Current Law	OT	4,578	4,371	4,461	4,617	4,622	22,649
Transportation and Infrastructure Committee:	BA	49,121	48,697	49,721	50,714	51,714	249,967
Current Law	OT	16,114	16,021	16,026	15,834	15,722	79,717
Discretionary Action	BA	1,205	2,410	2,410	2,410	2,410	10,845
	OT	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	BA	50,326	51,107	52,131	53,124	54,124	260,812
	OT	16,114	16,021	16,026	15,834	15,722	79,717
Science Committee:	BA	38	38	35	32	32	175
Current Law	OT	33	36	36	36	34	175
Small Business Committee:	BA	-414	0	0	0	0	-414
Current Law	OT	-585	-156	-140	-125	-110	-1,116
Veterans' Affairs Committee:	BA	1,182	1,144	1,077	990	931	5,324
Current Law	OT	1,296	1,358	1,331	1,316	1,355	6,656
Discretionary Action	BA	0	394	874	1,367	1,868	4,503
	OT	0	360	833	1,325	1,824	4,342
Total	BA	1,182	1,538	1,951	2,357	2,799	9,827
	OT	1,296	1,718	1,664	2,641	3,179	10,998
Ways and Means Committee:	BA	671,063	676,265	692,412	705,685	728,575	3,474,000
Current Law	OT	659,770	666,279	684,407	696,184	721,486	3,428,126
Reauthorizations	BA	0	0	0	0	19,553	19,553
	OT	0	0	0	0	17,312	17,312
Discretionary Action	BA	0	-2	0	0	0	-2
	OT	0	-2	0	0	0	-2
Total	BA	671,063	676,263	692,412	705,685	728,575	3,473,998
	OT	659,770	666,277	684,407	696,184	721,486	3,428,124

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

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

UNITED STATES NEEDS TO FOCUS ON INDONESIA

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, one aspect of livable communities is the global connections that we are facing today as trade interrelates our economies, world peace is affected as one destabilized area can have serious consequences for others, how environmental exploitation has global consequences for us all as we have increasingly destructive capacity in an increasingly smaller world.

There is need for people who care about livable communities to focus on Indonesia, focus across four time zones, over 15,000 islands, and a population of over 210 million people. It is a spectacular, diverse, and extremely vulnerable region. It is one in political transition, moving from three political parties and really no Democratic election in the last 40 years, to approaching over 150 and its first election in two generations this June.

We have seen in East Timor, home of tragic violence, as it was invaded by the Indonesian military 25 years ago, we have seen the death of over 200,000 people in an island that still has only perhaps a population of 800,000 and a situation that cries for a peaceful resolution.

Indonesia is a nation of great financial turmoil today. Less than 2 years ago, it was one of those successful Asian financial tigers, so successful that we were on the verge of withdrawing our aid programs. Today, it is now an economic basket case, with half its population at or below the Indonesian poverty level and virtually not a single solvent financial institution in the entire country.

We have seen long simmering racial, ethnic and religious tensions bubble to the surface, aggravated by the serious economic difficulties that have led to the death of hundreds of its citizens.

Indonesia was the backdrop for the movie "The Year Of Living Dangerously" a third of a century ago when Sukarno lost power to Suharto.

Today, in the post-Suharto era, Indonesia is still living dangerously. We have serious potential for violence even as the ray of hope dawns on East Timor and the government is talking about a potential for independence. Yet at the same time there is pervasive evidence that the military has provided weapons to paramilitary agents on the island, and there could be the potential for bloodshed upon their withdrawal.

There continues to be the potential for violence in Indonesia's urban centers, and there is definitely violence that is being visited upon its ecology as the nation struggles to get economic gain at the expense of its forests, fishing stock, coral reefs and endangered species.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues will put Indonesia on the radar screen. It will be on the radar screen for the administration and for the American public. It is time for the United States to take a strong and aggressive action to help resolve the situation in East Timor so that the potential news of the military withdrawal is not an open invitation for greater bloodshed against the Timorees.

It is important that our Secretary of State, who is due to visit Indonesia

after a China visit later this month, is prepared to put the full force of American attention into this area. It is important that we be thoughtful in terms of our economic assistance so the world environment does not suffer as a result of this economic collapse.

We need to press for as much support, monitoring, and observation as possible for these critical elections taking place in June spread across over 100,000 polling places in a country that has no election infrastructure.

□ 1215

It may be a little effort, a little time, it may be a little trouble for the United States to be involved in Indonesia during these troubled times, but I can think of no place in the world where our investment would have more impact on the global economy and on the lives of ordinary men and women.

#### TAX REFORM

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

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak briefly this afternoon, in this raspy, cold-driven voice, about the need for tax reform in America today.

I would like to begin my remarks by reading part of a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. Gerald Racine, of Green Bay, Wisconsin. This letter is one that I believe speaks for a majority of people in northeastern Wisconsin and I trust and hope for a majority of Americans. He writes:

Representative Green: We just finished doing our 1998 Federal income tax returns and we agree with you that it must be simplified. Doing those calculations seems impossible and when we get done, we don't know if it makes sense. We just keep our fingers crossed that we did it right. Being a retired banker and accountant, we don't feel that we should have to go to a tax expert to file what should be a simple income tax return.

Mr. Racine, I agree. We have a frightful tax problem in America today, Mr. Speaker. Not only do our families pay nearly 40 percent, almost half, of their income in taxes, they are also forced to endure a difficult, frustrating and confusing maze of paperwork and bureaucracy that can challenge even a retired financial expert like Gerald Racine.

According to the IRS's own numbers, it will take an American who has a few investments and itemizes his deductions some 22 hours to file his Federal income taxes this year. That is more than a half a week of work, and it is 3 hours longer than it took just last year.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we get this session under way in earnest, let us remember that while tax relief is a key priority for us in Congress, tax reform is also an issue that must be addressed.

I am proud to be a supporter of the Date Certain Tax Code Replacement

Act. This bill would scrap the current Tax Code and enable us to replace it with a simpler, more reasonable tax system. It would ensure that we have a serious debate in this Nation, a long-overdue debate, about what our Tax Code should look like. I believe that new Tax Code will be simpler, more fair and less burdensome.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this proposal and in a larger effort to reduce and reform taxes for our working families.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his excellent statement and remind him that last year the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) and I toured this country and debated in 30 of our great cities in America the issue of replacing the current Income Tax Code with a simple, fair code, either a flat income tax or no income tax and a national sales tax which is a plan that I have espoused. The crowds were enormous. Americans are ready for this Congress to act.

I just had a great conversation with the chairman of our Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), who is also a strong supporter of repealing the IRS and the Income Tax Code and replacing it with a consumption tax like a sales tax. He has assured me that before he leaves Congress this session he intends to give us a chance to not only debate this issue but perhaps even resolve it.

I want to congratulate the gentleman for being a soldier in this quest and wish him the best of luck because not only the people of Green Bay but the people of America are depending on us.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### DECENNIAL CENSUS

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Census Bureau announced a new plan to conduct the decennial census in the year 2000. It was disappointing. The Census Bureau has flip-flopped and now wants to have a two-number census.

What they want is that, after the Supreme Court ruled last month that you have to do a full enumeration as the Constitution clearly states, a full enumeration will be conducted and that is the good thing, they announced yesterday that they will go out and make every effort they can to count everybody in this country on April 1, 2000.

But what they want to do is, once they get that number and so we will have a Supreme Court-accepted number that every city, county, census tract, census block in the country will have, they then want to do a manipulation of that number. They want to take that actual count and manipulate it and get a second number. That second number they want to say, that is going to be the official number. It kind of baffles my mind.

I thought when the Supreme Court ruled, I thought when six Federal judges last year ruled that sampling was illegal that we would just move on and get the job done. But, no, this administration is playing politics with the census, and it is very clear now that they have flip-flopped to go to a second number. Because for the past 7 years they have been focused on one number and have said, "We can't do two numbers. We can't do two numbers." Now, yesterday, they say, "Oh, yeah, we want to do two numbers."

They argued against two numbers, because it will not be trusted by the American people, it will add tremendous confusion and it is the lawyers' dream. When every city, county and each census tract in this country sees two numbers, they are going to want the number that is best for them. If they do not get the best number, they are going to file suit. This is going to be tied up in the courts for years to come.

Every State's efforts to do redistricting, and this involves whether it is a city council, a county commission, a State legislature or the House of Representatives, if they use these manipulated numbers, that second census set of numbers, it is going to be thrown out, I feel quite confidently, by the court, but it is going to be tied up in the courts.

Why in the world are we wasting the time, the money and the effort to do that? Unless we really like to support trial lawyers to give them this area. In fact, at the Supreme Court hearing last November, Justice Scalia even raised the question, "Are we going to be creating a whole new area of law called census law?" I guarantee you we called we go with the two-number census.

What they are going to do is take that original set of numbers, the real count, and then they are going to take another sample, a sample of 300,000. This was attempted in 1990. It failed in 1990. Now, they want to take the failure of 1990 and say we are going to do that in the year 2000.

In 1990, when they tried to do it, what they did is did regions of the country. That is what they are proposing now again. Instead of using 750,000, where they are going to have a sample in each State as originally conceived, now they are going to have to group States together. So my home State of Florida, it is very likely, and we do not know yet, lumped in with Georgia, Mississippi Alabama and South Carolina.

They will get all these States together, and then they will use that

sample to go back and adjust Sarasota, Florida, to adjust Bradenton, Florida, my home area, or to adjust Miami. As if Atlanta has a lot in common statistically with Miami.

That is what they are going to be doing. That is one reason it is going to get thrown out in the courts, but it is just not going to be trusted.

I have proposed, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Census in Congress, ideas to improve the census. We are fully supportive of all the resources that the Census Bureau needs to do the best job possible next year. In fact, this Republican Congress is giving the Census Bureau \$200 million more than requested by the administration during the past 2 years to get prepared for this census.

For example, one area that we have already passed out of subcommittee and that is something called post-census local review. I think that is very important to build trust in our census. It was used in 1990. What it basically consists of is, after the Census Bureau conducts the census, they will send the numbers to the local cities and counties to give them a brief time to review the numbers and check for errors. It is kind of an audit. And then if they have questions or problems with it, they can let the Census Bureau know and the Census Bureau will go back and check those numbers.

Now, in 1990, Detroit added 45,000 people. Cleveland added people. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) talked about a whole ward that was mistakenly left out of one of his areas in his congressional district in Wisconsin. Mistakes are made. The Bureau is not perfect. But they are refusing to allow cities and counties the opportunity to check the numbers before they become official.

Every elected official in the country should be supportive of this. It is only the Census Bureau that says, "Oh, it's a pain. It's too much trouble. We don't want to deal with trouble."

We have got to build trust in this census. What you are doing by not allowing post-census local review as was allowed in 1990 is you are building up distrust already because you are trying to hide something. That is wrong. We need to build up that confidence that we are doing the right thing. Why not let the local cities and counties have the opportunity to review the numbers? But, no, they are so fixated on this second number census that they will not do anything to improve and build on the full enumeration.

Mr. Speaker, we need to go to a full enumeration for all Americans to be counted in the year 2000.

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 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 Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO PROTECT SATELLITE HOME VIEWERS

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield half of that time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, but let me first inform the House and the American public that, as many now know, consumers across America have been notified that they will soon lose access to network programming signals that are currently delivered via satellite.

Satellite television distributors are under now a Federal court order to terminate delivery of these network signals because of a finding that distributors have violated the Satellite Home Viewers Act. What we learned in the subcommittee yesterday was that, with new FCC findings, some 220,000 American citizens who are scheduled to be terminated from network signal delivery are, in fact, qualified to receive those signals legally under the act.

What we are announcing today is the filing of a moratorium bill, with the support of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a lot of other members of our committee and Members of this Congress, a moratorium bill to give us 90 days to work this problem out without unnecessarily cutting off Americans from network programming delivered by satellite. It is intolerable that over 200,000 citizens would be terminated in that service without giving them a chance to qualify under the act according to the FCC's new findings.

Let me point out we are not suggesting in our legislation that any violations of law be tolerated. Those folks who can receive local signals are going to have to do so. But the hundreds of thousands who are going to get cut off this weekend unnecessarily should not be cut off, and we are hopeful that this moratorium bill can become law quickly next week in order to protect their rights.

We had hoped that the parties could settle this. We still encourage them to do so this weekend. We had hoped that the broadcast and satellite industries would walk into court this weekend together and ask the court to modify its injunction to incorporate the new FCC findings so that these hundreds of thousands of Americans would not lose their network signals.

But unless the parties go to court this weekend and modify the injunc-

tion, our only way to protect those consumers while we work with the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Commerce on a new Satellite Home Viewers Act to provide those local signals to consumers, our only hope will be this moratorium bill which we are filing today and which we intend to move expeditiously next week absent an agreement by the parties to do so.

I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman points out, there are thousands of people across the country who are affected by this court ordered cut-off of distant TV signals, meaning that people with satellite dishes cannot pick up the national NBC or CBS or ABC or Fox feed. Specifically here I think CBS and Fox are in question.

The legislation that we are introducing today will help give consumers limited relief to reapply for permission to obtain these signals or to apply for waivers from their local broadcasters, that is, write or visit their local TV station and say, "Please, I can't get your signal here locally. Let me take this national feed so I can gain advantage to the programming, news and entertainment that are so valuable for my family."

Equally important, it will give Congress additional time to develop a long-term plan to update the Satellite Home Viewer Act and to include permission for satellite local-to-local broadcasts. Meaning that we have to now develop as a strategy a way in which an individual with an 18-inch dish now, to pick up their local TV stations.

Today, they cannot do that. Today, it is impossible. If you want to have a satellite dish, you have to give up access to your local TV stations. You have got to put up your own antenna. You have got to subscribe to the cable service as a supplement.

□ 1230

But you cannot get it all from a satellite dish.

What we are going to try to do this year is craft legislation that will make it possible for you to buy an 18-inch satellite dish, pick up all of that great cable and satellite programming and have access to your local TV stations at the same time. Then people will have real consumer choice.

So, the legislation, which has been drafted by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) working with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and I and other members of our committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) and a long list of Members is something which we think makes lot of sense. But again, we have this moment arriving where on March 31 all regulation of the cable industry goes off the books, and we, as the committee, are going to have to respond. We are going to have to find ways of insuring that the consumers

have access to more competition and that there is a real protection.

#### PROVIDING FOR COMPETITION IN THE CABLE INDUSTRY

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for doing so because I would be remiss if I did not second what the gentleman has just said, that we are about to see the complete deregulation of cable in America at the end of March. If American citizens cannot receive network programming over their satellites when they are entitled to receive it, they are going to be forced to either climb up on the roof and try to put up antennas that may or may not get good signals or go back to the monopoly cable company which will be deregulated.

We in this Chamber, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) has been a valiant soldier in this effort along with me and others, have tried to desperately make sure that cable has a competitor out there before they are deregulated. This court decision means for thousands of Americans, hundreds of thousands of Americans, they are forced back into a cable monopoly instead of a competitive choice.

It is critical that we find a solution this year to get local signals into the satellite feed so that Americans have a real choice when cable is deregulated. You and I know when there is only one store in town, you get bad prices, bad service and bad quality of products. But when you got a choice, when there are two stores in town, prices get better, service gets better, quality gets better.

Americans deserve a choice in television. This moratorium is just a stop-gap measure to help us find that solution, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MARKEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, for a consumer, if they subscribe to cable today, they can get all of their local TV stations on that cable system. If they subscribe to satellite, they cannot get the local channels. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and I, and the other members of our committee, we are going to try to rectify this.

If Tip O'Neill was here today and looking at these issues, he would say that all politics of satellites are local, into local. How do we provide local people with their local TV stations? We are going to try to do that this year, and, I think, provide real competition through wireless, through satellite and other technologies to the cable industry and give the consumer a real break.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CAPPS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today through March 10, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. PASTOR (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business, traveling to the district with the President of the United States.

Mr. KOLBE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of traveling with the President to Arizona for meetings on Social Security.

Mr. ROYCE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of observing the elections in Nigeria.

#### 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 Mr. TURNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAUZIN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MARKEY, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 433. An act to restore the management and personnel authority of the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for this approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 433. To restore the management and personnel authority of the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 1, 1999, at 2 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

749. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Sweet Onions Grown in the Walla Walla Valley of Southeast Washington and Northeast Oregon: Order Amending Marketing Agreement and Order No. 956 [Docket Nos. 98AMA-FV-956-1; FV98-956-1] received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

750. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Milk in the Nebraska-Western Iowa Marketing Area: Suspension of Certain Provisions of the Order [DA-98-10] received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

751. A letter from the Administrator, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fees for Rice Inspection (RIN: 0580-AA67) received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

752. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Small Hog Operation Payment Program (RIN: 0560-AF70) received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

753. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—List of Communities Eligible for the Sale of Flood Insurance [Docket No. FEMA-7706] received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

754. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Impact Aid—received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

755. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits—received February 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

756. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management and Policy Staff, FDA, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Standards for Animal Food and Food Additives in Standardized Animal Food [Docket No. 95N-0313] received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

757. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Laxative Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use [Docket No. 78N-036L] (RIN: 0910-AA01)

received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

758. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Russian Federation extending the Agreement on Mutual Fisheries Relations of May 31, 1988, with annex, as amended and extended, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1823(a); (H. Doc. No. 106-31); to the Committee on Resources and ordered to be printed.

759. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Summer Flounder Commercial Quota Transfer from North Carolina to Virginia [I.D. 010699B] received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

760. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Models B300 and B300C Airplanes [Docket No. 97-CE-16-AD; Amendment 39-11008; AD 99-02-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

761. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Model 205A-1 and 205B Helicopters [Docket No. 98-SW-21-AD; Amendment 39-11011; AD 98-11-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

762. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Establishment of Port of Entry in Fort Myers, Florida [T.D. 99-9] received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

763. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Foreign-Based Commercial Motor Vehicles in International Traffic (T.D. 99-10) (RIN: 1515-AB88) received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

764. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting [Revenue Procedure 99-17] received February 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

765. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Low-Income Housing Tax Credit—1999 Calendar Year Resident Population Estimates [Notice 99-10] received February 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

766. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—ROTH IRAs [TD 8816] (RIN: 1545-AW62) received February 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. DUNN (for herself and Mr. TANNER):

H.R. 8. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phase out the estate and gift taxes over a 10-year period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 849. A bill to provide for adjustment of status for certain nationals of Bangladesh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. COX, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FROST, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. PEASE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. ROGAN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mrs. CHRISTIAN-CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. COOK, Mr. COOKSEY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EWING, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATHAM, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. LUTHER, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MICA, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. POMBO, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUINN,

Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SALMON, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STARK, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. TANNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WICKER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 850. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to affirm the rights of United States persons to use and sell encryption and to relax export controls on encryption; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GILLMOR, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. JOHN, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 851. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish improved predictive models for determining the availability of television broadcast signals; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 852. A bill to require the Department of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable the public to file all required paperwork electronically with the Department and to have access to public information on farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports, and other similar information; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NUSSLE (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KASICH, Mr. DREIER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. MINGE, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. STENHOLM):

H.R. 853. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for joint resolutions on the budget, reserve funds for emergency spending, strengthened enforcement of budgetary decisions, increased accountability for Federal spending, accrual budgeting for Federal insurance programs, mitigation of the bias in the budget process toward higher spending, modifications in paygo requirements when there is an on-budget surplus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H.R. 854. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for the presumptive eligibility of Medicare beneficiaries for the qualified Medicare beneficiary and special low-income Medicare beneficiary programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 855. A bill to amend the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 relating to the dumping of dredged material in Long Island Sound, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 856. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction allowed for interest on education loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 857. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a 200 percent deduction for amounts paid or incurred for training employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 858. A bill to amend title 11, District of Columbia Code, to extend coverage under the whistleblower protection provisions of the District of Columbia Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 to personnel of the courts of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. DUNN (for herself, Mr. DICKS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 859. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-exempt private activity bonds to be issued for highway infrastructure construction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. NEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FROST, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 860. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restrict the application of the windfall elimination provision to individuals whose combined monthly income from benefits under such title and other monthly periodic payments exceeds \$2,000 and to provide for a graduated implementation of such provision on amounts above such \$2,000 amount; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODE (for himself, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. CONDIT):

H.R. 861. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 1993 Federal income tax rate increases on trusts established for the benefit of individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 862. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to implement the provisions of the Agreement conveying title to a Distribution System from the United States to the Clear Creek Community Services District; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. MINGE, Mr. BASS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. CAMPBELL):

H.R. 863. A bill to require appropriate off-budget treatment of Social Security in official budget pronouncements; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the

Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. COOK, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BASS, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. SHAW, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. COYNE, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. LAZIO, and Mr. MCNULTY):

H.R. 864. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the State ceiling on private activity bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUGHTON:

H.R. 865. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special rule for members of the uniformed services and the Foreign Service in determining the exclusion of gain from the sale of a principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. HORN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 866. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to protect critical infrastructure radio systems from interference and to promote efficient spectrum management of the private land mobile radio bands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 867. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require, in the evaluation of bids and proposals for a contract for the procurement by the Department of Defense of property or services, the consideration of the percentage of work under the contract planned to be performed in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 868. A bill to establish the Fallen Timbers Battlefield and Fort Miamis National Historical Site in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 869. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from issuing oil and gas leases on certain portions of the Outer Continental Shelf; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MCCRERY (for himself, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. JOHN, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. COBURN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. PICKERING):

H.R. 870. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to change the determination of the 50,000-barrel refinery limitation on oil depletion deduction from a daily basis to an annual average daily basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. POMEROY):

H.R. 871. A bill to provide for investment in private sector securities markets of amounts held in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund for payment

of benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 872. A bill to amend certain Federal civil rights statutes to prevent the involuntary application of arbitration to claims that arise from unlawful employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. OLVER, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 873. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that employees of a political subdivision of a State shall not lose their exemption from the hospital insurance tax by reason of the consolidation of the subdivision with the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan):

H.R. 874. A bill to reform Social Security by creating individual Social Security retirement accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FORD, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CHRISTIAN-CHRISTENSEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FROST, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 875. A bill to provide for programs to develop and implement integrated cockroach management programs in urban communities that are effective in reducing health risks to inner city residents, especially children, suffering from asthma and asthma-related illnesses; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 876. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the maximum amount of contributions to individual retirement accounts and the amounts of adjusted gross income at which the IRA deduction phases out for active participants in pension plans, and to allow penalty-free distributions from individual retirement accounts and 401(k) plans for certain purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 877. A bill to provide for the comparable treatment of Federal employees and Members of Congress and the President during a period in which there is a Federal Government shutdown; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SALMON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SHADEGG, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BUYER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. EHRlich, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas):

H.R. 878. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to repeal the National Service Trust Program under which certain persons who perform national or community service receive stipends and educational awards for such services; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 879. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to exempt licenses in the instructional television fixed service from competitive bidding; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SPENCE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BUYER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. QUINN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. REYES, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.J. Res. 34. A joint resolution congratulating and commending the Veterans of Foreign Wars; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FORD, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. STARK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. BONIOR):

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued honoring Paul Leroy Robeson, and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General in 1999, that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Government Reform.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, Mr. MCINTYRE introduced a bill (H.R. 880) for the relief of Rabon Lowry; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. GANSKE.

H.R. 17: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 38: Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 40: Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. CHRISTIAN-CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 49: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 50: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 70: Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. LAZIO, and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 72: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 104: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 105: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 106: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 107: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 108: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 133: Mr. HOEFFEL and Mr. BASS.

H.R. 148: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. HORN, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 216: Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 220: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 315: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 323: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 352: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 355: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JOHN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 373: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 380: Mr. WYNN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 408: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. MINGE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 415: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 464: Mrs. BONO, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. DELAY, Mr. MICA, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 488: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin and Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 492: Mr. MICA, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. COLLINS.

H.R. 506: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. REYES, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PICKETT, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 537: Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 543: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 544: Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 586: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 620: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 623: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 647: Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 681: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 685: Mr. PHELPS and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 707: Mr. TERRY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 719: Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. FORD, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 725: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. STARK, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 730: Mr. FORD and Mr. BONIOR,

H.R. 756: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 763: Mr. SMITH of Michigan and Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 774: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. MCNULTY and Mr. PICKETT.

H. Con. Res. 14: Ms. DANNER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PEASE, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. RILEY, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HILL of Montana, and Mr. GRAHAM.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FROST, Mr. FORD, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H. Res. 34: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MOORE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. INSLEE.

H. Res. 41: Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. MOORE.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 434: Mr. STRICKLAND.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Estate of Jurgen Wanderlich, relative to a demand for damages for the estate of Jurgen Wanderlich, resulting from the Cavalese, Italy tragedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3. Also, a petition of the Estate of Egon Uwe Renkewitz, relative to a demand for damages for the estate of Egon Uwe Renkewitz, resulting from the Cavalese, Italy tragedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4. Also, a petition of the Estate of Michael Potschke, relative to a demand for damages for the estate of Michael Potschke, resulting from the Cavalese, Italy tragedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5. Also, a petition of the Estate of Irene Annelie Urban, relative to a demand for damages for the estate of Irene Annelie Urban, resulting from the Cavalese, Italy tragedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6. Also, a petition of the Estate of Dieter Frank Blumenfeld, relative to a demand for damages for the estate of Dieter Frank Blumenfeld, resulting from the Cavalese, Italy tragedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7. Also, a petition of the Estate of Harald Urban, relative to a demand for damages for the estate of Harald Urban, resulting from the Cavalese, Italy tragedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8. Also, a petition of the Estate of Marina Mandy Renkewitz, relative to a demand for damages for the estate of Marina Mandy Renkewitz, resulting from the Cavalese, Italy tragedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.