



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 1999

No. 33

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Michael E. Robinson, Head of Upper School, St. Patrick's Episcopal Day School, offered the following prayer:

O God, You have so revealed Yourself in the glory of the heavens and in the many faces of the nations, in the still small voice and in the might of the forces of nature. Make us aware of Your presence as You come in judgment through the events of our time. Help us to discern through the many competing claims, the right and the just by using the tools of reason, compassion and wisdom. Help us to be good citizens, to work for the common good, to be willing to sacrifice whatever it takes to work with You, and to remake this world into Your kingdom, the place where Your will is done, where Your children may know no other way but the way of righteousness, justice, and peace. This we ask, anxious yet calm in You; unsure, yet certain in You; weak, yet strong in You; through Him who is the saviour of us all, Jesus Christ our Lord. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland 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 bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 314. An act to provide for a loan guarantee program to address the Year 2000 computer problems of small business concerns, and for other purposes.

S. 447. An act to deem as timely filed, and process for payment, the applications submitted by the Dodson School Districts for certain Impact Aid payments for fiscal year 1999.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 4355(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the United States Military Academy—

the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), from the Committee on Armed Services; and

the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), from the Committee on Appropriations.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 6968(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the United States Naval Academy—

the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), from the Committee on Armed Services; and

the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), from the Committee on Appropriations.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 9355(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the United States Air Force Academy—

the Senator from Colorado (Mr. AL-LARD), from the Committee on Armed Services; and

the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), from the Committee on Appropriations.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki)—

the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON);

the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM); and

the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK).

WELCOME TO REV. MICHAEL E. ROBINSON

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) and I take great pleasure in introducing to the House today the Reverend Michael Robinson.

The gentleman from Texas and I are proud parents of children at St. Patrick's Day School here in the District of Columbia. The Reverend Robinson is the Upper School director for St. Patrick's and has just done an incredible job. He and his wife Frances and their two children are members of the St. Patrick's community in every way, whether it be the church or through the school. I saw him this morning directing traffic, shepherding students and parents in. He will be doing the same thing this evening, as well as guiding them spiritually and educationally throughout the day. I think it is a tribute to Reverend Robinson that he is always the teacher. He is accompanied today by the St. Patrick's Student Council as well.

Reverend Robinson will leave St. Patrick's and join the St. Nicholas

□ 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.

H893

School in Chattanooga, Tennessee, this next semester as Headmaster. He will leave behind many parents and students who have been touched forever by his work, as I say, both spiritually, educationally, in so many ways. We wish him well and take great pleasure and celebrate all that he has done for St. Patrick's and the many students and parishioners that attend therein.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The Chair will entertain 15 one-minutes on each side.

NEW DOCUMENTARY FEATURES MEMBER AS HOLOCAUST SUR- VIVOR

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, a new documentary by renowned filmmaker Steven Spielberg, entitled "The Last Days," tells the tragic tale of the Nazi Holocaust through the eyes of five Hungarian Jews who personally experienced and survived this horrific period of history.

One of the survivors featured in the documentary is one of the most articulate Members of Congress, our colleague from California, TOM LANTOS. TOM is one of the five Hungarian Jews who describes their experiences in a Nazi war camp. Fortunately, unlike an estimated 438,000 other Hungarian Jews and millions of other Jews in Europe, our colleague was able to escape his death sentence.

It is to TOM's credit that, decades after his experience with totalitarianism, he has not forgotten those around the world who live under repressive regimes. From China to Cuba, TOM gives voice to those who are forced to remain silent by repressive regimes. I urge all of our colleagues to view "The Last Days" to remind ourselves that we must always fight against tyranny.

UNVEILING 1999 DEMOCRATIC AGENDA

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to say that in just a short period of time over at the Library of Congress, President Clinton, Vice President GORE and Democrats in the House and the Senate will unveil our 1999 Democratic agenda which, once again, is a families first agenda. The centerpiece of our congressional agenda is to invest the surplus, to save Social Security and Medicare and pay down the debt.

What Democrats are doing with this agenda is continuing on the path of fiscal responsibility by investing the sur-

plus to save Social Security and Medicare and pay down the debt to keep our economy growing. With regard to Social Security, we reserve 62 percent of the projected budget surplus to preserve Social Security until 2055. With regard to Medicare, we reserve 15 percent of the projected surplus for Medicare, ensuring that the Medicare trust fund is secure for 20 years.

We are paying down the debt, Mr. Speaker. We are investing a total of 77 percent of the surplus in Social Security and Medicare to reduce the national debt to its lowest level since 1917. This is what the Democrats are all about.

MAKING TAX RELIEF A REALITY

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the American people are overtaxed. Americans work almost 3 hours every 8-hour workday just to pay their taxes. Federal taxes, State taxes, income taxes, sales taxes, utility taxes, death taxes and on and on.

But what many folks do not realize is that they are paying way too much. The government is charging the American people more than it needs to pay its bills, an estimated \$2.6 trillion over the next 10 years of tax overcharge. That is a whopping \$27,000 per family, money those families could put forward to buy a home or pay for their children's college.

Mr. Speaker, no one would tolerate a phone company or cable company that overcharged them and then refused to return the money. Indeed, we would all call upon the government for relief. Yet the government is overcharging the American taxpayer. It is time they knew about it.

Mr. and Mrs. America, help is on the way. Today I will announce a national initiative designed to make tax relief a reality. I will be joined by many colleagues who, like myself, are committed to showing that Americans are overtaxed. We are united in the belief that we can both save Social Security and return a portion of the overcharge to Americans in the form of a tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, that money does not belong to the government. It belongs to the American taxpayers. Americans earned it, Americans paid it, Americans deserve a refund. Return the tax overcharge, and the American people will be treated properly and fairly by this government.

1999 DEMOCRATIC AGENDA

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today Democrats from both Chambers will unveil our agenda for the 106th Congress. At the top of that agenda are the two pillars of retirement security, So-

cial Security and Medicare. So that there can be no doubt about our priorities, I will state it loud and clear. Democrats are committed to using the lion's share of the Federal surplus to protect Social Security and Medicare well into the future.

For the first time in three decades, the Federal Government has a surplus. This is a historic opportunity to protect Social Security and Medicare so that our seniors can live independently and with dignity. Protecting Social Security and Medicare is sound fiscal planning. Two-thirds of our seniors rely on Social Security for over one-half of their income. Medicare ensures that 99 percent of our seniors have health insurance. These two programs are paramount to a strong and a vibrant America and should come before a 10 percent tax cut that benefits mostly the wealthy. The surplus must be used carefully, not spent irresponsibly on a one-time, feel-good tax break.

On behalf of our peers and our parents and our children, let us not squander this historic opportunity.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET DOES NOT ADD UP

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office, or the CBO, has issued a report confirming what everyone in Washington has known for 1 month now. The President's budget does not add up.

The nonpartisan CBO has carefully documented exactly why the President's budget does not do what it says it does. The numbers in his budget are not even close. The spending caps are busted. Social Security is endangered. The surpluses are not what they appear to be.

The administration has no response to this nonpartisan report. Through slick accounting and deception, the budget looks wonderful on paper. The problem is that there is not an economist to be found who can defend it. The double counting of imaginary money and the shifting of funds make a mockery of the budget promises signed into law just 2 years ago in the bipartisan balanced budget agreement. That agreement was supposed to prevent exactly the kind of budgetary chicanery that is contained in the President's budget.

The American people deserve better, Mr. Speaker.

THE ONLY SURPLUS IN WASHINGTON

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, who is kidding whom? The only surplus in Washington, D.C., is in the Social Security trust fund. The truth is, Social

Security money coming in one door today is going out the other door tomorrow, because the facts are very clear. The Social Security trust fund is a big basket full of IOUs. The reason is very simple: Politicians from both parties have reached in and borrowed money from the Social Security trust fund and have not repaid it. Billions and billions of dollars. Beam me up. Now we are saying Social Security is going to run out of money. I say not one dime of Social Security should be used for anything but Social Security.

I yield back any economic common sense that may be left down here.

THE SURPLUS BELONGS TO THE TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I have a simple question to ask. To whom does the surplus belong? Anyone listening to the other side would conclude that the surplus belongs to the government. In speech after speech, I have heard implied that politicians in Washington have the first claim to the money as if it is their money.

The surplus belongs to the taxpayers. It is their money. The surplus is in fact nothing more than tax overpayment made by taxpayers.

Anyone who has ever looked at Washington for any length of time knows that one of only two things will happen to the surplus. We can give it back to the people who earned it or Washington will find a way to spend it.

I think Jesse "The Body" Ventura was right. The government should apologize and then refund the money back to the people to whom it belongs in the first place, the taxpayers of America.

ANOTHER VIEW ON SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, let me set the record straight. The money that comes in here belongs to the American people. But what we fail to deal with is the history.

All during the Reagan administration, Democrats and Republicans in this House spent Social Security money and used it like a credit card. We built up a \$5 trillion debt for the Cold War. Now, after almost 10 years of work, since I have been in the Congress, since 1988 and under Mr. Clinton for the last few years, we have got a surplus. What does the majority leader offer us? Let us take the surplus and give it away and leave that credit card debt there.

No American family, when they receive money in a Christmas bonus or whatever, says, "Well, we got all this

credit card debt; let's go get deeper in debt." That would not be a financially prudent family. The United States Congress, acting on behalf of the American people, ought to pay off the credit card debt in Medicare and in Social Security.

CONGRATULATING COACH JIM PHELAN AND MOUNT ST. MARY'S MOUNTAINEERS ON EARNING BID TO NCAA BASKETBALL TOURNAMENT

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate coach Jim Phelan and the Mount St. Mary's Mountaineers on earning a bid to the NCAA basketball championship for only the second time in their school's history.

The Mounties won the right to go to the Big Dance by defeating the Blue Devils of Central Connecticut State on Monday night by a 72-56 margin. Monday night's victory was the third straight upset for the Mountaineers who were seeded sixth entering the Northeast Conference Tournament. The Mount was led by the smooth shooting of Gregory Harris and the tenacious defense of Melvin Whitaker.

In addition to earning a right to play in the NCAA championships, Monday's victory was also an historic event for their longtime coach. Jim Phelan became only the fourth coach in NCAA history to win 800 games. He joins the ranks of Adolph Rupp, Dean Smith and Clarence Gaines and is the winningest active coach in the NCAA. Coach Phelan's 800 wins demonstrate his commitment to the school, his players and his community. I am convinced the Hall of Fame is just around the corner.

Congratulations Mount Saint Mary's, and congratulations Coach Jim Phelan.

□ 1015

GUNS OVER PEOPLE

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, during the past year did we not hear the Republicans say something about the rule of law? I think I recall some Republicans saying everyone deserves his or her day in court, even if it means tying up Congress, the White House and the judiciary, costs the taxpayers \$40 million, huge legal bills for everyone. But when it comes to their good friends in the gun lobby and their precious time and money, well, the Republicans simply will not allow them to be threatened with a lawsuit or held accountable through civil action.

Mr. Speaker, once again the GOP does the bidding of the National Rifle Association, preempting cities like Chicago who dare to sue the gun indus-

try, the modern-day merchants of vengeance. A Republican bill will be introduced limiting lawsuits against the gun makers, ironically sponsored by the same gentleman who once told the Committee on the Judiciary a plaintiff deserved her day in court. In the eyes of the GOP, a sitting President can be dragged into a civil suit, but not the gun industry.

Clearly, the Republicans care more about guns than people. I guess that is what GOP stands for: "Guns Over People."

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET DOES NOT ADD UP

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

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the truth is now out about the President's budget. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, has now documented the obvious. The President's budget just does not add up.

It is not simply a case of the usual Washington accounting tricks. The accounting is so outrageous that no serious analyst can defend it. In fact, the nonpartisan CBO, Congressional Budget Office, shows exactly where and why it does not add up. The budget busts the spending caps that were signed into law by the President in 1997, in the summer of 1997. And even more disturbing, Mr. Speaker, this budget, not only does it not save Social Security, it even dangers Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better.

They deserve an honest budget.

They deserve a budget that will continue American prosperity.

They deserve a budget that protects Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, the President's budget does not do that.

PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS

(Ms. STABENOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support a Democratic administration that has brought us from very large deficits to large surpluses and to say that the next step is to protect Social Security and Medicare and pay back the Social Security Trust Fund. We are not really out of debt until we do that.

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot pay off the national debt when we have a surplus, when will we do it?

Never.

Mr. Speaker, this is a test of the current Congress. Are we going to continue fiscal responsibility or go back to the spending and the deficits of the 1980s?

I stand to support Social Security, Medicare and paying off the debt. If we

do that, we put real dollars back into people's pockets by lowering interest rates, which means our mortgages, our credit cards, our car payments go down.

Mr. Chairman, we need to bring down the debt and protect Social Security and Medicare for future generations, and I call on my colleagues to join us in doing that.

THE REPUBLICAN PLAN IS BETTER THAN A PAY RAISE

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, tax relief is as good as a pay raise, maybe even better. A pay raise could mean higher taxes. It could result in sending more money to Washington, D.C., and have very little extra money jingling around in our pockets. But tax relief is more money in the household budget.

Mr. Speaker, Americans do one of two things when they get a little extra money in their pocket. It is saved or it is spent. Either is good for the economy. Saving the money from a tax cut would provide more resources, more capital for creating new jobs and new businesses. Spending the tax relief not only provides for the needs of hard-working Americans, but the demands for products will create new jobs and sustain the jobs we have.

Mr. Speaker, tax relief can be as good, if not better, than a pay raise, and the Republican plan will not only restore the integrity of Social Security, rebuild our national defense, strengthen education, but it will also provide much-needed tax relief for hard-working Americans.

SAVE OUR AMERICAN TREASURES: MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is a good day. I am glad the debate is on tax cuts versus Social Security and Medicare and paying down our national debt. Medicare and Social Security are two of the greatest, most effective programs our country has ever created. They provide the two fundamental keys to retirement security: medical and financial security.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has the responsibility to every American, past, present and future, to save these national treasures.

The good news is that we have the opportunity to ensure the long-term stability of these programs. The bad news will only come if people try to politicize the programs or, worse yet, dismantle them. We can strengthen Social Security, Medicare and pay down the debt. They are popular with the American people for the simple reason that they work.

Mr. Speaker, let us work together to strengthen Medicare and Social Security. Social Security and Medicare are needed for the current seniors, the baby boomers, and our children and our grandchildren.

NO EXIT STRATEGY

(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, today I rise to talk about our administration's foreign policy and the men and women in our Nation's military service. I have three words to describe the administration's strategy for deployment of U.S. troops to police Kosovo, and they are: No exit strategy.

Can we honestly ask the men and women of our Armed Services to stand up and once again become the world's police of foreign policy decisions? Should we not justify to the American people the need for intervention based on some realistic, identified and threatened vital national interest? I should think so.

However, when a defective strategy results in a multi-year deployment, billions of dollars in cost to the American taxpayer and the risk in lives of every American soldier over there, it is time for us to say no. It is time that our foreign policy marches to a new cadence, one that protects our vital national interests and the lives of our hard-working, dedicated men and women in our nation's military.

On behalf of our Nation's interests and the lives of our service men and women, I yield back this dangerous foreign policy and the balance of my time.

EDUCATION MUST BE OUR NUMBER 1 PRIORITY

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ran for Congress, and I am here today because I believe that our children's education must be the number one priority in our country. Education is another of President Clinton's major budget priorities because he also agrees that we must prepare all of our children for the high-skill, high-wage jobs that will insure America's leadership in the world marketplace and at the same time prevent dependency on welfare here at home.

Public education is the backbone of our country. It is why we are a great Nation. Public education is available to all.

This Congress we have an opportunity that comes along once every 5 years, and that opportunity is to review and update the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. ESEA is best known for Title I, the program that educates the disadvantaged. Title I is important because it helps dis-

advantaged children achieve along with their more fortunate peers.

Title I must be supported. Tax relief for the well off must wait.

UNITED STATES VULNERABLE TO BALLISTIC MISSILE ATTACKS

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, it is the official policy of the United States to remain vulnerable to a ballistic missile attack. That might be surprising to many, but it is true, even though it flies in the face of common sense. Iraq, North Korea, Iran are all embarked on nuclear weapons programs that would enable them to reach the United States with a ballistic missile, and China already has that ability.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing we have to protect us is a relic of the Cold War, an ABM treaty with a country that no longer even exists.

Do my colleagues think the leaders of Iraq and North Korea and Iran and Communist China are impressed with our ABM treaty? I do not think so.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's timid, weak and uncertain steps to begin building a national defense system are not enough. They are too little, and I am afraid they are going to be too late.

I urge the Congress to take the lead on this vital issue, Mr. Speaker, and as my liberal colleagues so often love to say:

Let us do it for the children.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE LEON HIGGINBOTHAM

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to invite my colleagues of the House of Representatives to join me this evening for a special order to pay tribute to a wonderful and outstanding American, a jurist of great renown, the late Judge Leon Higginbotham. He was awarded the Presidential Medal of Honor in 1995 and the Raoul Wallenberg Humanitarian Award, and in 1994 South African President Nelson Mandela asked Higginbotham to be an international mediator. I would hope that we would spend our evening, this evening, paying tribute to this great American.

I STAND HERE FOR THE CHILDREN

Mr. Speaker, let me also say that I stand here for the children. Be it liberal or conservative or moderate, I do not know who could not stand for the children.

I believe we should, if my colleagues will, pay off the debt and as well save Social Security and Medicare. At the same time, we can give targeted child tax credits to businesses that provide child care services, and we can

also provide targeted tax credits to stay-at-home parents. We can do all of this at once by doing the right thing and standing for our children.

AIR FORCE JUNIOR ROTC PROGRAM AT ROME HIGH

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

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it seems as if every day we are reading or hearing a new story about the difficulty our military forces are having recruiting and retaining top-notch personnel. Our military is being stretched thinner and thinner by missions of some dubious value around the world, and we are paying the price with the loss of key personnel and lower retention.

I am pleased today to announce that at least one program in Georgia's 7th District is taking steps to reverse this trend. That program is the Air Force Junior ROTC Program at Rome High School. The Air Force Junior ROTC Program at Rome High School official is only 4 years old, yet it is already having a major positive impact. It offers students a variety of challenges and learning experiences in airplanes and on flight simulators as well as in classrooms that help prepare them for a career in military aviation. Additionally, it helps teach students the kind of work ethic and values that will enable them to succeed as leaders no matter where their future takes them.

This program and programs like it deserve our support. I am proud to honor today the Rome High School Junior ROTC Program.

HONORING MARK BROWN, ONE OF OUR NATION'S FALLEN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge adoption of House Resolution 31 in honor of fallen police officers and, more personally and specifically, in honor of a great Shoreline City police officer and King County sheriff's deputy, Mark Brown, who died in the line of duty Saturday, February 27, leaving his wife, Laurie, and Hannah and Alex, his children; and it is a personal matter because he was my cousin.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Members that I am proud that my cousin responded to an alarm last Thursday on his motorcycle and was pursuing his duties and was involved in a collision and died early Saturday morning, and I want to tell them that it brings home that we have many public servants who get up and risk their lives every day, and their families do not know whether they are coming home.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell my colleagues that in 1993 I voted for a bill

that established community police officers, and I want to tell them Mark Brown was the epitome of a community police officer.

On the TV stations in Seattle I listened to tribute after tribute after tribute to a man in his grocery stores and in his restaurants who was a pillar of his community. Mark Brown, as a community police officer, I want his children, Hannah and Alex, to know they lost a father and we lost an American hero, Mark Brown.

□ 1030

ED-FLEX AND ENDING SOCIAL PROMOTION

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I also extend my prayers to the Brown family, as we all do.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 800, as my friend just did, the Ed-Flex Partnership Act of 1999. I support this bill because it gives States and local school districts the flexibility to tailor Federal programs to meet their local needs.

But with flexibility also comes accountability. Ed-Flex works to require States to identify specific and measurable goals they have for those students and groups affected by the waivers. In other words, Ed-Flex requires States to have accountability systems in place prior to granting them the authority to waive specific requirements.

But Ed-Flex alone will not solve all of our problems. Our public schools still have pressing needs: Unmet school construction and modernization, a shrinking pool of qualified teachers, and a lack of technology in the classroom.

At a time when children are being promoted to successive grades based on age and not achievement, social promotion is an issue that should concern us all. It must stop. That is why I urge my colleagues, cosponsors of Ed-Flex, to not only cosponsor Ed-Flex, but to support the Democrats' plan to reward those school districts who end social promotion and close underperforming schools by providing them with additional funds to build new schools and hire new teachers. Ed-Flex is good, but alone it will not solve all our problems.

FRESHMAN REPUBLICANS ARE WORKING TO RETURN DOLLARS, DECISIONS, AND FREEDOM BACK HOME

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

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my fellow freshman Republicans to thank the leadership for recognizing our ideas and allowing us to quickly turn our campaign promises into action.

Yesterday the House passed a resolution that directs this body towards real social security reform. That bill was sponsored by a freshman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PAUL RYAN). The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. LEE TERRY) has already introduced a bill to eliminate a tax on international home pages, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. MARK GREEN) is heading up a project for the freshman class that will reduce Federal mandates on our State governments.

We believe local people can best secure our Nation's future: parents, teachers, pastors, small business owners, and civic leaders. These are not only the heroes of our home towns, they are the heroes of our country. The answers to our problems are seldom found here in Washington. They are found on Main Street, in board rooms and community centers, in church sanctuaries and classrooms, and in family rooms all across our Nation.

Freshmen Republicans are working to return dollars, decisions, and freedom back home.

COMMEMORATING THE NAVAL RESERVE ASSOCIATION

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

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the men and women of the Naval Reserve Association, and to congratulate them on the 84th anniversary of the founding of the Naval Reserve, celebrated on March 3, 1999. At the same time, I wish the Association's Spring National Conference to be held on the same day in San Diego, California, the best of success.

The American people owe the 94,000-strong Naval Reserve a debt of gratitude for the sacrifices they have made, both past and present. America's strength and position as the sole superpower in the world is the result of our dedication to our country's defense. Without the Naval Reserve's contribution, America would not have become the beacon of democracy it is today in the world. For that, I, along with the residents of the 41st Congressional District in California, thank them.

I look forward to working with them and other members of the Naval Reserve Association on issues which affect all the men and women of our military.

WELCOME TO WHITNEY ELIZABETH GERRO

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, having a Member of Congress in your family is kind of like a white elephant gift. You are kind of glad you have it, you just do not quite know what to do

with it. But every now and then it pays off to have a congressman in your family.

Today is one of those days. On December 7, 1998, Mike Gerro and Jan Barton Gerro had a beautiful baby daughter, Whitney Elizabeth Gerro. They have written this poem to announce her arrival to the world, and I want to read it for my colleagues here in the House. It is entitled, "A Special Arrival."

She's an angel of sweetness
A treasure of love
A beautiful blessing
From heaven above.
A daughter adored.
Who with nurture will grow.
What a pleasure to welcome
Whitney Elizabeth Gerro.

She really is a blessing. She had her baptism this past Sunday in Arlington, Texas. I am very, very proud to be one of her uncles.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY WORKS DILIGENTLY TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party is working very diligently and very intensely with the Senate to try to protect social security. We have a lot of concerns about the President's proposal, which only protects or earmarks 62 percent of the social security trust fund dollars for social security.

Many of us believe that we should put 100 percent of social security dollars into social security and not spend it on any other program; not for roads, not for bridges, not for congressional salaries, not for anything else. We hope that we can get the President to come around to our way of thinking.

We also feel that we need to pay down the debt. We have a debt of \$5.4 trillion. Which costs the American families, on an average for a family of four, about \$2,000 dollars a year. That is \$2,000 for a college tuition, for house payments, for a nice vacation, for a car, whatever the need of the family is. Now it just goes to interest on the debt. It does not even pay down the principal.

These are things we think the President's budget ignores. We want to put it on the table. We are working in that direction. I hope that the President will decide to join us.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 603, CLARIFYING THE APPLICATION OF THE "DEATH ON THE HIGH SEAS ACT" TO AVIATION INCIDENTS

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 85 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 85

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. 603) to amend title 49, United States code, to clarify the application of the Act popularly known as the "Death on the High Seas Act" to aviation incidents. 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 Transportation and Infrastructure. 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 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. FOLEY). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished 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 purposes of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 85 is an open rule providing 1 hour of general debate. It would be equally divided and controlled between the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The rule provides that each section of the bill shall be considered as read. Furthermore, the rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The rule also permits the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the

bill, and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote. Finally, the rule provides for 1 motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 603, reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, would clarify that the Death on the High Seas Act shall not be the controlling law in lawsuits arising from aviation crashes into the high seas.

The purpose of this legislation is to ensure that families of passengers killed in airline disasters are not treated differently under law depending on whether the aircraft crashed over land or water.

This discrepancy arises from a Supreme Court ruling in *Zicherman versus Korean Airlines* that applied the Death on the High Seas Act to lawsuits related to crashes over the ocean. Under the Death on the High Seas Act, Mr. Speaker, families are denied the ability to seek compensation in a court of law for such noneconomic factors as a loss of companionship of a loved one, relatives' pain and suffering, or for punitive damages. Under existing law, for example, parents receive virtually no compensation in the death of a child. On the other hand, if a plane crashes over land, State tort laws usually apply, offering a broader range of legal remedies to surviving family members.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and his colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure have made this legislation an early priority this session, and have requested an open rule, which was granted by the Committee on Rules without dissent.

Accordingly, I encourage my colleagues to support House Resolution 85, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. It will allow for full and fair debates on H.R. 603. As my colleague has described, it will allow for 1 hour of general debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule permits amendments under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amending process in the House. All Members on both sides of the aisle will have the opportunity to offer germane amendments.

H.R. 603 would allow the families of ocean plane crash victims the same rights to file lawsuits as when the crash takes place on land. It was introduced in response to TWA Flight 800, which crashed off the coast of New York in 1996. In 1997, the House passed a similar bill by a voice vote under suspension of the rules, but the Senate failed to take action on the bill.

This is an open rule. It was adopted by a voice vote of the Committee on Rules. I urge adoption of the rule and of the bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 661, COMMERCIAL OPERATION OF SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT CATEGORY AIRCRAFT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 86 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 86

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. 661) to direct the Secretary of Transportation to prohibit the commercial operation of supersonic transport category aircraft that do not comply with stage 3 noise levels if the European Union adopts certain aircraft noise regulations. 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 Transportation and Infrastructure. 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.

□ 1045

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may con-

sume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 86 is an open rule waiving clause 4(a) of rule XIII, that requires a 3-day layover of the committee report, against consideration of the bill. I would advise my colleagues that the committee's report was, however, filed yesterday on March 2.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule provides that the bill shall be open for amendment at any point.

Furthermore, the rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The rule also allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce votes to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 661 will prohibit the operation of supersonic aircraft, such as the Concorde, in the United States if the European Union adopts a rule prohibiting the operation of U.S. aircraft that have been modified to reduce noise emissions or fitted with new engines.

The Europeans claim the EU rule is an environmental issue, but in fact it is a trade issue, because the rule would effectively prevent U.S. airlines from selling their aircraft to European airlines if those aircraft have been modified.

Ironically, however, the proposed EU regulation would not prevent European airlines from selling their own modified aircraft to other European airlines. This legislation, then, is intended to send a signal that the U.S. will not sit for such blatant discrimination and that U.S.-modified aircraft should be treated no differently than similarly modified European airplanes.

Mr. Speaker, CBO estimates that H.R. 661 would have no immediate impact on the Federal budget and that the bill contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. The bill would, however, provide a new private-sector mandate on British Airways and Air France, the operators of the Concorde, although such mandates are not expected to exceed the \$100 million threshold.

Mr. Speaker, none of us relishes retaliatory measures of this type. Indeed, we wish they were, in fact, unnecessary. But fair is fair and, accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 86 and the underlying bill, H.R. 661.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 661, Conditionally Prohibiting the Operation of Supersonic Aircraft.

This bipartisan bill is brought to the House by the Democratic leader on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure chairman. They are joined by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Since this has been described as the "year of aviation" in Congress, this may then be the first in a series of appearances by these thoughtful and capable leaders on aviation issues. I thank them for their efforts on this legislation and look forward to their good work as the session proceeds.

The rule will allow our highly skilled aviation leaders on both sides of the aisle to make the case for the bill, which I will address just briefly in discussing the rule.

In short, the bill would respond to action being considered by the European Union which would severely restrict the use of some 1,600 U.S.-registered aircraft used by cargo, package services and passenger airlines.

The straw man in this case is airline noise, as the EU proposes to take action against these U.S.-registered aircraft which have been engineered to meet or exceed all applicable noise standards. And I repeat, the United States aircraft are in compliance.

If taken, this action will make it more difficult to sell the United States-owned aircraft because they would be barred from operating internationally.

H.R. 661 says that if the EU persists in taking such action, our Secretary of Transportation must respond by prohibiting the arrival of the supersonic transport, the Concorde, an aircraft which by comparison to our ever-more-quiet United States aircraft is a regular roof-rattler.

H.R. 661 sends a simple message to our friends "across the pond" in the European Union that we will respond in kind should they choose to take action that prohibits the use of U.S. aircraft which are completely in compliance with international standards.

That being said, I commend my friends from the committee of jurisdiction, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and urge support of the rule and the bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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.

CLAIRFYING THE APPLICATION OF THE "DEATH ON THE HIGH SEAS ACT" TO AVIATION INCIDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Pursuant to House Resolution 85 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. 603.

□ 1052

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. 603) to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the application of the Act popularly known as the "Death on the High Seas Act" to aviation incidents, with Mr. FOLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) each will control 30 minutes. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) will control the time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

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

Mr. Chairman, in 1996, the Supreme Court decided that the Death on the High Seas Act applied to aviation accidents. This took everybody by surprise because the Death on the High Seas Act is a shipping law and the Federal Aviation Act states that shipping laws do not apply to aviation.

Nevertheless, the Supreme Court said it did apply when the plane crashed into the ocean outside of U.S. territorial waters. The effect of this decision is to treat families differently depending on whether their relative dies in an aircraft that crashes into the ocean or one that crashes into the land.

If the plane crashes into the ocean, the Death on the High Seas Act applies. This act prevents a family from collecting damages for their relatives' pain and suffering or from the loss of the companionship of their loved one. However, if the plane crashes into land, there is no legal bar to collecting these damages.

So, there really is no reason why the monetary recovery from a lawsuit should depend upon where the plane happens to come down, whether it is into the water or into the land.

Mr. McDade, who was the predecessor of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), introduced this bill last year, and it was passed overwhelmingly in this House, but it died in the Senate. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) is to be congratulated for moving this legislation so expeditiously through our committee so that we can be here on the floor today to correct this obvious, nearly bizarre inequity. It is something that we certainly should do.

Now, this bill, sponsored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and supported by many of us on both sides of the aisle, will be very helpful to the families of the victims of TWA 800, some of whom reside in the gentleman's district, and the families of aircraft crash victims throughout the United States. It will ensure that all families are treated equally, regardless of whether a loved one died, be it in the water or on land.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 603, a bill to clarify the application of the Death on the High Seas Act. An identical bill overwhelmingly passed the House of Representatives last Congress. Unfortunately, the full Senate did not consider the bill before the end of Congress.

H.R. 603 addresses a gross inequity which was brought to our attention by the family members of the victims of TWA flight 800, which is created when the Death on the High Seas Act is applied to aviation accidents.

If a plane crashes into the ocean more than 3 miles from land, as did TWA flight 800, the Death on the High Seas Act applies. This act denies families the ability to win noneconomic damages in a lawsuit. This means that a family member could not be compensated, for example, for the loss of companionship of a loved one; parents could not be compensated for the loss of their teenaged sons and daughters; sons and daughters could not be compensated for the loss of their elderly parents. However, if a plane crashed on land, State tort law or the Warsaw Convention would apply. Both permit the award of noneconomic damages.

The effect of applying the Death on the High Seas Act to aviation accidents is to treat families differently depending on whether the loved ones die in an aircraft that crashed into the ocean or one that crashed on land. This is obviously unfair. The value of an individual's life does not change depending on where the plane happens to come down.

H.R. 603 would correct this critical flaw of the Death on the High Seas Act. First, the bill simply adds the bill to the list of shipping laws that do not apply to aviation. Secondly, the bill makes this change applicable to all cases still pending in the lower courts, which includes the family members of the victims of TWA flight 800.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is a simple piece of legislation that will fix the harmful inequity that results when the Death on the High Seas Act is applied to aviation disasters.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation which was introduced by the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD). Let me just say that this legislation, I think, shows that the gentleman from Pennsylvania really cares about his constituents and is willing to try to help them in any way he can. This legislation is an example of that, because many young people from the gentleman's district in Montoursville, Pennsylvania, died tragically in the TWA 800 crash. But this legislation will help people all over the Nation and it could help families years from now if, God forbid, we have another similar crash in the ocean.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is designed simply to clarify the application of the Death on the High Seas Act to aviation accidents. This issue arises because, in 1996, the Supreme Court really surprised everyone in deciding the case of Zickerman versus Korean Airlines in holding that the Death on the High Seas Act applies to lawsuits that arise out of an aircraft crash in the ocean that occurs more than 3 miles from land.

□ 1100

The effect of this decision is to treat families differently depending on whether their relative died in an aircraft that crashed into the ocean or one that crashed on land.

I think it is fair to say that almost no one in the aviation or legal communities believe that this Death on the High Seas Act would apply to the TWA crash until the recent decision in the Zickerman case.

Moreover, as a matter of simple fairness and equity, a 1920 maritime shipping law should not apply to the victims of the TWA crash, and this is the injustice that this legislation will correct if we pass this bill.

As of now, if we do not enact the bill of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), if a plane crashes into the ocean, the Death on the High Seas Act applies. This Act denies families the ability to seek compensation in a court of law for the loss of companionship of a loved one, their relatives' pain and suffering, or punitive damages. Basically, these people are limited to recovering only lost wages.

Because of the Zickerman decision and this law, it means that parents will

receive almost no compensation in the death of a child.

On the other hand, if a plane crashes on land, State tort laws apply. These would permit the award of nonpecuniary damages such as loss of companionship and pain and suffering.

Simply put, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 603 amends the Federal Aviation Act so that the Death on the High Seas Act does not apply to airline crashes. It would accomplish this by specifically stating that the Death on the High Seas Act is one of the navigation and shipping laws that do not apply to aircraft.

With this legislation, we will ensure that all families will be treated the same, regardless of whether a plane crashes into the ocean or on land.

Again, Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) for introducing this legislation, which will help a number of constituents in his district and others across the Nation who were devastated by the loss of their loved ones in the TWA Flight 800 tragedy.

As the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) noted, this bill passed the House last year overwhelmingly. Unfortunately, we did not get it worked out in the Senate and in conference, and we need to do that this year. I think we can very quickly.

Let me also thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the very distinguished chairman of the full committee, for his support on this legislation, as well as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, and especially my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Aviation.

This is a good bill, and I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), for yield me this time. I compliment him on the splendid job of leadership he has done in working to craft this legislation and to bring it to the floor. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), chairman of the full committee, for moving so quickly and decisively last year and again this year to correct the clear gap in the law that amounts to an abuse of the rights of the families of victims. I thank, of course, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), our splendid chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation, the ever judicious and thoughtful advocate for aviation.

This legislation arises out of a tragedy that occurred in Long Island Sound, but it arises also out of the genuine, deep, profound humanitarian concern of our former colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. McDade.

I have known Joe McDade all the years I served in this body, at first as a staff member and then as a colleague. There is one quality that shines through this thoughtful and sparkly, ever-with-a-twinkle-in-his-eye gentleman who chaired the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and that was his concern for his fellow human beings, his splendid representation of the people of his District, the remarkable locomotive museum that I visited when I took my daughter up to look at a college in his District, the everlasting memorial that he has created in one after another community project to serve the needs of his people.

But none of those accomplishments will be a greater memorial than the enactment of this legislation, which has been introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), his successor in the Congress and our committee.

It is really unfortunate the other body did not act on this legislation in the last Congress. We hope that moving the bill early this year will give them motivation to proceed with dispatch and to take action on the mark of delayed justice overdue.

Those of us who have served on the PanAm 103 Commission, my good friend, John Paul Hammerschmidt, former ranking member of the Subcommittee on Public Works and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and I served on the PanAm 103 Commissions. We learned that families of the victims realize nothing that we could do will bring back their loved ones.

What they ask is that the injustice in that case, that the tragedy not be repeated through terrorist actions against aviation, and in this case that justice be done for families in the future that may have, God forbid that it should happen again, but who may have such a tragedy occur.

PanAm 103 did not raise this issue because it crashed on land. Had PanAm 103 not been delayed a half hour on the ground in London and taken off on time, it would have been blown up over the North Atlantic.

It would have raised the same issues that TWA 800 raises for us in this legislation of Death on the High Seas, that ancient piece of legislation that prohibits recovery for those who are lost beyond the territorial limits of the United States.

I will not repeat all of the points that have been made about the details of the legislation. I do not think it is necessary to do so. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) have already made that case.

What we do hear, though, is a lasting memorial to the families of the victims, to the victims themselves, that justice in the future will be done should ever a tragedy of this magnitude occur on the high seas.

It is a great tribute to our committee that, as we build memorials of con-

crete, steel, and we create great transportation systems, move America, that we also have the compassion to act in matters of this kind that do justice for those of our fellow citizens and those whom we represent in this great body.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), the principal author of this legislation.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 603, the Airline Disaster Relief Act. I want to thank my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for his hard work and leadership in shepherding H.R. 603 to the floor.

Additionally, I am grateful for the guidance and support of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), ranking members.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's swift consideration of this measure is greatly appreciated by me and by the families of the victims of TWA Flight 800 and the Swiss Air tragedies.

This bill, above all, is about fairness. It is about providing equitable treatment for the families who lost loved ones in airline disasters over international waters. Right now, we apply a 79-year-old maritime law written to help the widows of sailors lost at sea in cases of modern airline disasters. This maritime law is known as the 1920 Death on the High Seas Act.

On July 17, 1996, 230 people lost their lives in the tragic crash of TWA Flight 800. Among the victims were 21 people from Montoursville, Pennsylvania, a small town in my district. The people of Montoursville were brutally impacted by the sudden loss of 16 high school seniors and five chaperones on a trip to France for educational purposes. For the families of the victims aboard Flight 800, this tragedy has been made worse by the Supreme Court's application of this dated maritime law.

If a plane crashed on land, family members can seek redress for losses in State courts for various different types of compensation. However, if a loved one crashed at sea, one can only seek compensation for loss of income in a U.S. District Court.

In the case of a child or a retired person lost at sea, the Supreme Court's application of this archaic maritime law makes that child valueless in the face of the law.

Clearly, the application of this law is patently unfair and cruel. Why are we standing here in 1999 and applying a 1920's maritime law to modern aviation disaster claims? The time has come to create one level playing field and one process for all airline crash claims.

The current treatment of land and sea crashes as separate and unequal must come to an end. This bill clarifies

that the 1920s Death on the High Seas Act does not apply to aviation.

I urge my colleagues to overwhelmingly approve this bill for it is the right thing to do. It is the fair thing to do. It is the compassionate thing to do.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that I have any other speakers, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to say in conclusion that this is a very important piece of legislation. I agree that it should be passed overwhelmingly.

I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), ranking member, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), and the Democratic and Republican staff for their outstanding cooperation and work on behalf of this bill.

Everyone has worked very diligently to bring this bill to the floor as early as possible in this session of Congress so that we could give the other body ample and sufficient time to pass it. Because, as it has been stated here, it is definitely the right thing to do, the fair thing to do, the equitable thing to do. So, please, everyone vote on behalf of this bill.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 603, the Death on the High Seas Act.

As many know, I have been an outspoken proponent of the ideas contained within this bill because of a tragedy that struck my district on July 17, 1996, the crash of TWA 800, and the loss of all of its passengers and crew.

This important act would allow full compensation for the families of victims of aviation disasters like TWA 800. Current law makes certain distinctions between different types of aviation disaster victims. These distinctions prohibit the families of some disaster victims from receiving the type of compensation that they truly deserve. As a result, many aviation disaster victims suffered both the loss of a loved one and the economic assistance that such persons provided.

H.R. 603 would replace outdated provisions of a law adopted 79 years ago that was designed to allow the surviving family members of sailors lost at sea to sue for lost wages. Subsequent court rulings determined that the act applies to all maritime and aviation disasters that occur more than one marine league, or three miles, from America's shoreline.

TWA 800 crashed nine miles off of Long Island's South Shore. Therefore, the Supreme Court ultimately determined that the incident was covered by existing law that limits compensation to the families of victims of aviation disasters. I am sorry to say that victims of TWA 800 and their surviving families have suffered greatly as a result.

As a matter of justice and human decency, I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 603. We cannot fully restore the lives of those affected by the crash of TWA 800 and similar disasters, but can, and should, do what we can to ease their pain.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, on July 17th, 1997, 230 people died when TWA Flight 800 exploded 9 miles off the coast of Long Island.

To this day the crash continues to be a national tragedy. For almost 2 years, the families of those who perished have had to deal with more than the unbearable pain of losing a loved one in such a sudden, violent and public manner. To this day they have to live with not having many answers for their loss, as they continue to wait for an explanation about why the disaster occurred.

As if this disaster alone is not enough, the tragedy is made all the worse by an outdated law that prevents survivors from suing in state court, in front of a jury, for damages like pain and suffering and loss of companionship that are traditionally available under the tort law system. Had the plane crashed seconds earlier—when the plane was only two miles off of New York's coast—this would not be an issue. However, at nine miles out, the 1920 "Death on the High Seas Act" governs. This out-dated law dictates that lawsuits arising from aviation accidents that occur more than 3 miles off of the United States shoreline be brought in Admiralty Court, and limits recovery of damages for survivors to lose income only. While this may have been an appropriate law 79 years ago, in 1999 it is nothing short of outrageous.

A constituent of mine, Carol Ziemkiewicz (ZEM-ka-witz), lost her daughter on that flight. Jill Ziemkiewicz had been working as a flight attendant for only a month and a half when she was assigned to her first international flight on TWA Flight 800. She would be going to Paris, where she was eager to visit the Garden of Versailles. An hour before TWA Flight 800 left to take Jill to Paris, she called her mother and summed up her anticipation—her last words to her were "I'm psyched."

Jill was only twenty-three years old at the time she was killed and it is accurate to say that her life, along with every other on the plane, ended too early. But the 230 people who died in that crash were not the only victims on that fateful night. Those victims left behind families, friends, and loved ones, people who continue to live but whose lives will never be the same because of this tragedy.

I am proud to support H.R. 603. H.R. 603 will help to ensure that Carol Ziemkiewicz and the hundreds of other surviving family members like her know that the lives of their loved ones had value—that what happened to them was a tragedy and we all must do what we can to ease their pain and suffering. They have been through enough. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 603.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 603 The Death on the High Seas & Airline Disaster Act of 1999. I would like to commend Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member Mr. OBERSTAR for quickly moving this bill through the Transportation Committee. I would also like to call commend Representative DON SHERWOOD for all of his hard work on bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman. H.R. 603 will correct an inequity in the law which currently treats families differently depending on whether their relative died in an aircraft that crashed into the ocean or one that crashed into land. This is especially harsh for families which lose a child in a crash. This creates cruel inequality depending on where a plane happens to come down.

Mr. Chairman, the need for this bill became clear after TWA 800 crashed 8 miles off Long Island, New York on July 16, 1996. Two of my constituents, Kyle and Amy Miller of Tamaqua, PA, were aboard this flight en route from New

York to Paris. They were on their way to Paris to celebrate their fifth wedding anniversary. Their loss, and the loss of all of the passengers and crew on the plane, was a horrible tragedy.

Kyle and Amy symbolized the American spirit and were outstanding members of their community. Kyle was a small businessman and owned part of his family hardware and plumbing businesses. Amy worked at the hardware store and was a member of the Tamaqua Area School Board. Her work in local education programs was outstanding and she was the top vote-getter in both the primary and general election.

Both Amy and Kyle were well liked and well respected in the community. The effect of this change in the law would allow families such as Kyle and Amy's to receive the same monetary awards families receive when planes crash over land.

I strongly encourage all members to support H.R. 603 The Death on the High Seas & Airline Disaster Act of 1999. To help all families who lose loved ones in aircraft accidents regardless of where the plane crashes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 603.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). 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 he has 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 a 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. CLARIFICATION AMENDMENT.

Section 40120(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(including the Act entitled 'An Act relating to the maintenance of actions for death on the high seas and other navigable waters', approved March 30, 1920, commonly known as the Death on the High Seas Act (46 U.S.C. App. 761-767; 41 Stat. 537-538))" after "United States".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 1?

Hearing none, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. APPLICABILITY.

The amendment made by section 1 applies to civil actions commenced after the date of the enactment of this Act and to civil actions that are not adjudicated by a court of original jurisdiction or settled on or before such date of enactment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 2?

There being no amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

□ 1115

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WICKER) having assumed the chair, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Chairman pro tempore 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. 603) to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the application of the Act popularly known as the "Death on the High Seas Act" to aviation incidents, pursuant to House Resolution 85, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed until later today.

COMMERCIAL OPERATION OF SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT CATEGORY AIRCRAFT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 86 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. 661.

□ 1116

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. 661) to direct the Secretary of Transportation to prohibit the commercial operation of supersonic transport category aircraft that do not comply with stage 3 noise levels if the European Union adopts certain aircraft noise regulations, with Mr. BURR of North Carolina 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

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

Recently, the European Union took the first step in adopting a very discriminatory regulation that would effectively ban most U.S.-based stage 3 hushkitted and certain U.S. re-engined aircraft from operation in the European Union, even though they meet all international noise standards.

Hushkitted aircraft are older aircraft that have what is essentially a muffler added so that they can meet the current stage 3 noise requirements. Re-engined aircraft are stage 2 aircraft that have stage 3 engines added to meet current noise requirements.

Now, the proposed European Union regulation, on which they have already taken the first step, limits the number of possible buyers of U.S.-owned hushkitted and re-engined aircraft. Under the regulation, the European Union operators can only buy these hushkitted and re-engined aircraft from other European operators. They cannot buy them from American operators.

In addition, the regulation significantly increases U.S. costs of operation in European Union countries. New U.S. operations will have to be flown by aircraft originally manufactured to meet stage 3 requirements even though the retrofitted engines meet all the requirements. U.S. hushkitted aircraft will not be allowed to fly in Europe.

This is blatant, outrageous discrimination. This regulation implements a regional standard that is substantially different from that agreed upon through international standards and unfairly targets U.S. operations.

The bill before us takes the first step to respond to these discriminatory practices by effectively banning flights of the Concorde in the U.S. if a final regulation is adopted by the European Union. The Concorde does not meet the stage 3 noise requirements that the U.S.-owned hushkitted aircraft currently meet. It does not even meet the less restricted stage 2 requirements.

So it is important that we, today, take our first step in response to the Europeans, having already taken their first step, so that we demand a level playing field. I strongly urge support of this bill.

It is our hope that we do not need to proceed further with the Senate and having this signed into law, because our hope is that the Europeans will not proceed beyond the step they have already taken. But if they do, we are certainly prepared to respond in a similar fashion, and I urge strong support for this pro-American legislation.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may con-

sume. I want to thank the chairman of our full committee for that very strong, forceful, well-phrased statement but, more importantly, for his prompt action on this legislation, moving it through subcommittee and full committee to the floor quickly, because the situation demanded quick action. The gentleman is a strong advocate for American interests, whether in steel or in other modes of transportation, but especially here in this case in aviation.

I did my graduate studies at the College of Europe in Brugge, Belgium, at the time of the formation of the European Common Market. I have continued to follow events in Europe very closely, from the coal and steel community, through the European Common Market, to the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers developments, all of which have united Europe, have brought a higher standard of living to Europe in the post-World War II era, all of which developments have been strongly supported by a succession of U.S. presidents and Congresses.

We want a strong, economically strong, united Europe. It is in our best economic interest. It is in our national security interest. But it is to be a Europe that will trade fairly with the United States, that their markets must be open to ours on the same terms and conditions that ours are open to theirs. And we have the world's largest open, free market for any commodity, and especially in aviation.

We have negotiated one after another liberal aviation trade agreement with European countries, beginning with the Netherlands. Free open-skies agreements. We have with Germany. We have with Italy. We are negotiating one now with France. Why, then, in the face of this openness to trade, why in the face of U.S. cooperation with Europe in aviation matters, joint ventures with Airbus industry, the joint venture between GE and Snecma, the French engine manufacturer, why in the face of some 60 percent of the materials and parts produced for Airbus aircraft coming from the United States, why is the European Community taking anti-competitive action as they have done with their proposal to eliminate some 1,600 U.S. aircraft from the European air system?

The European Commission made a recommendation to the European Parliament, which debated this issue, and then adopted a proposed regulation, submitted to the European Council of Ministers, that would restrict the use in Europe of some, but not all, aircraft that have either a new engine or a hushkit installed on existing engines to meet their highest current noise standards, Chapter 3 of ICAO, or stage 3 as we call it in the United States.

On the face of it, it looks fair, but in practice it applies only to U.S. aircraft and U.S. engines. Conveniently, it excludes the engines produced by the GE alliance with the French manufacturer

Snekma, the CFM series engines. U.S. aircraft engines are quieter than their European Chapter 3 counterparts, and if this regulation is finalized, the effect would be to cost American businesses over a billion dollars in spare parts and engine sales and reduce the resale value of some 1,600 U.S. aircraft as well as reduce the market for U.S. hushkitted manufacturers.

Now, I have been to the Nordham facilities in the United States where they manufacture hushkits, and I have seen the splendid job they do. And their hushkits have been installed, starting with Federal Express and then with other U.S. airline operators, to meet our Stage 3 standards. They do a superb job. They quiet those engines down. We are down now from the 1990 noise law in the United States, from 2,340 aircraft in 1990 that were Stage 2, we are down to just under 900 aircraft. By the end of this year we will be down to under 600, and by the end of next year we will be down to zero.

We have done a far superior job of noise control in the United States than the European Community has done. Our aircraft are seen worldwide as the standard. Our technology is seen worldwide as the standard. So why has Europe chosen to take this policy initiative? Hushkits have been used for over 15 years to quiet aircraft. The regulation says that engines with a higher bypass ratio would be allowed in the European airspace, but those high bypass engines are mostly European manufactured.

An engine's bypass ratio is only one of several factors in determining the actual noise produced by that equipment. Compare a 727-200 re-engined with a Pratt & Whitney JT8D-217C/15 engine and a Airbus A300B4-200 equipped with a CF6-50C2 engine. The 727, and I want to be very precise about this, because the Europeans have made a big stink about this issue, the 727 I have described is quieter than the Airbus 300. The 727 re-engined has a performance standard of 288.8 decibels; the Airbus A300, 293.3 decibels. Yet, under the European Union proposed regulation, the Boeing aircraft would be banned, the Airbus aircraft will fly.

Well, I got news for the Europeans, that does not fly here in the United States. Furthermore, I think this would be destructive in the long run for the Europeans to enact this and permanently put into place this regulation because it will create havoc in the international community in negotiations on future noise regulation and air emissions standards from aircraft.

Probably there is no one today who can remember what the skies over Washington looked like 25 years ago. Huge clouds of smoke, 12,000 tons of pollutants deposited on the Nation's capital from aircraft taking off from National Airport. We have cleaned that all up. We do not see those black smoke trails any longer. Well, Europe caught on, too. They followed our path, but now they want to be discriminatory.

If the proposed recommendation is adopted, then our bill banning the Concorde is an appropriate response to Europe's anti-competitive practice.

□ 1130

The Concorde is European aviation's flagship aircraft. The Concorde is Europe's signature technological mark on world aviation. It is a mark of pride for Europe. We have been allowing their market pride to fly in our airspace, even though it does not meet our noise standards. We have been tolerant of and cooperated with airlines flying the Concorde. British Airways and Air France operate four daily flights, eight operations, that is, eight arrivals and departures each day into U.S. airspace. Yesterday, March 2, was the 30th anniversary of the first Concorde flight to the United States.

It is rather appropriate we bring this legislation to the floor today. I am willing, and I know the chairman of our committee is willing, to cooperate and to support continuation of the waiver that has been in place for these three decades. But we are not going to do it unless the Europeans play fair and unless they drop their regulation that would prohibit certain U.S. aircraft from operating in European airspace. Fair is fair.

There will be positive environmental benefits from prohibiting the Concorde in our airspace. Preliminary analysis from the FAA says that eliminating the Concorde and its noise from New York airspace will reduce the noise footprint around John F. Kennedy International Airport by at least 20 percent. I think that is a very strong argument. The Europeans I hope will see the wisdom of changing their ways. The Clinton administration, I am very pleased, has responded vigorously to this thinly veiled attempt to give a competitive advantage to European aircraft and engine manufacturers. Transportation Secretary Slater, Commerce Secretary Daley and U.S. Trade Representative Ambassador Barshefsky have already appealed to the European Commission to defer action and to let this go to the proper forum, the ICAO, the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Last week, Commerce Under Secretary for International Trade Aaron testified before the Finance Committee of the other body:

The acceleration of consideration at the Council level appears aimed at precluding consultations between the United States and the European Union before implementation on April 1, 1999. Because of its potential impact on our bilateral commerce, Secretaries Daley and Slater, and Ambassador Barshefsky have written not only the European Commission but also to Ministers of the Member States asking that the Council not proceed with adoption of the regulation until consultations could be held. We are deeply concerned that this regulation remains on track for approval without meaningful consultations having taken place. I have informed the EU that the United States is prepared to respond appropriately to the harm our industry will suffer.

Mr. Chairman, we are responding today. Our action moving this bill through committee and to the floor so quickly has already had a positive effect. Deputy Transportation Secretary Mort Downey informed me yesterday that he was advised at an ICAO meeting on Friday that the President of the EU has postponed action for at least 3 weeks on the pending proposal, which means that the Council of Ministers will not be able to consider the banning of U.S. engines and hushkitted engines at least until the end of this month. The reason: They took very careful note of this bill moving through committee and to the House floor. The Secretary of Transportation and the State Department have asked for consultation with the EU. We understand that those consultations are likely to take place within the next week or so, certainly before the end of this month.

I share the administration's hope that the Europeans will come to their senses and realize that they have a lot at stake in working with us rather than against us. We have already been through the banana wars. We have had steel trade issues between the United States and the European community. Countervailing duties have been imposed on unfair trade practices by the European community and by Russia. I think Europe should get the message that in aviation, cooperation, competition on a fair and equitable playing field is right, but protective practices are not. We take a strong stand today and I think we have got their attention. We have just got to keep the heat on.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Aviation.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of this bill by one of the great aviation experts, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR). I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill.

H.R. 661, Mr. Chairman, would prohibit the commercial operation of supersonic transport aircraft if the European Union adopts a rule that would prohibit operation of U.S. aircraft that have been modified with hushkits or fitted with new engines. The Europeans contend that their regulation is merely intended to improve the environment by reducing aircraft noise, but this is really ridiculous. The European Union, if they adopt this rule, would be asking us to allow one of the noisiest airplanes in the world into the U.S., the Concorde, which does not even meet Stage 2 noise standards, while banning some of the quietest airplanes in the world, planes that meet the more advanced Stage 3 noise requirements. These would be banned only because they come from the United States.

This is not an environmental issue. This is a trade issue. What the EU is

proposing goes against every principle of free trade and open skies and in fact would be very unfair trade. In fact what the Europeans are trying to do is to keep U.S. aircraft out of their market. The regulation in question would prevent U.S. airlines from selling their aircraft to European airlines if those aircraft have been modified with these more advanced hushkits or new engines. But the regulation would not prevent European airlines from selling their hushkit modified aircraft to other European airlines.

This is blatant discrimination, Mr. Chairman. There is no reason that U.S. hushkitted aircraft should be treated differently from European ones. Moreover, aircraft with a hushkit or a new engine are environmentally friendly. As I have noted, they meet the Stage 3 standards established by our own FAA and the Chapter 3 standards established by the International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO. In many cases, these aircraft are quieter than aircraft that the Europeans would continue to allow.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has acted quickly in addressing this issue and he and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) are both to be commended for moving this bill so quickly. I know that there is some concern regarding the speed with which we are moving. Some people really wanted us to go much further. But this bill is an appropriate and I think measured response to the European action. It would target the commercial flights of the Concorde which meet neither the Stage 3 nor Chapter 3 standards for noise. In fact, as I noted earlier, they do not even meet Stage 2 noise standards. They make much more noise than the hushkitted aircraft that the Europeans want to ban. The EU refused to enter into consultations regarding its measure until this bill was introduced. It is important that we move ahead with this bill to keep up the pressure on the EU. This approach will give our State Department added leverage in its consultations and negotiations on this matter.

This is a very good bill, Mr. Chairman. I urge my fellow Members to support it.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), ranking member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, and thank him for his splendid support for this issue.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me the time. I want to compliment him on this piece of legislation. My only regret in regards to it is that I did not think of it first. I salute him. I also want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for moving this bill so quickly through the subcommittee and the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in very, very strong support of H.R. 661, a bill

that will prohibit the operation of the Concorde in the United States. This bill is in direct response to a proposed European regulation which would effectively ban most U.S.-based Stage 3 hushkitted and reengined aircraft from operation in the European Union.

The European resolution banning hushkits is supposedly based on noise-related environmental concerns. However, there is no environmental analysis that supports the hushkit ban. In fact, some of the aircraft that will be banned under the regulation are quieter than some of those that will still be flying into European airports.

The European regulation banning hushkitted and reengined aircraft is not an environmental regulation. Instead, it is an unfair trade action disguised as an environmental regulation. The regulation proposed by the European Parliament is specifically targeted against U.S. products, such as Boeing aircraft, Pratt & Whitney engines, and hushkits, which are only manufactured in the United States of America. There is no doubt that this regulation is designed to discriminate against U.S. aircraft and aircraft manufacturers.

The economic effect of this proposed regulation will be immediate and severe. The U.S. aviation industry is already suffering at the hands of the Europeans. Within the past 2 years, Boeing's market share has fallen from 70 percent to 50 percent. Boeing is losing out to Airbus, which is still subsidized by four European countries that own it, because Boeing does not receive the same protectionist treatment that is given to Airbus.

We cannot allow the Europeans to use the environment as a false excuse to attack U.S. aviation and aviation companies. Therefore, if this proposed regulation banning hushkitted and reengined aircraft is implemented, we must reciprocate by banning the operation of the Concorde, which is the pride of European aviation.

H.R. 661 sends a strong message to our counterparts in Europe that we are serious about this issue. We cannot afford to let Europe use unfair trade methods to protect and promote their own aviation industry at the expense of U.S. companies. Boeing cannot afford to lose any more market share. In fact, no U.S. company can afford to lose business because of unfair trade regulations.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 661. This bill will ban the operation of the Concorde in the United States if and only if the European Union implements the regulation banning hushkitted and reengined aircraft. We must act quickly to let the Europeans know we are serious about protecting U.S. environmental interests from unfair trade actions, even if they are disguised as environmental protections.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN)

the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I am pleased to rise in support of this bill requiring retaliation against the European Union banning flights of the Concorde if the EU adopts legislation restricting the use of so-called hushkits.

I commend the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for bringing the issue to the floor and our attention and to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for moving this measure quickly through the House.

We had the opportunity to raise this issue with members of the European Parliament in Strasbourg during this past January. I was joined in that regard by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), a member of the U.S. delegation and a member of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. We informed our European colleagues that we were very much concerned that the proposed legislation was a design standard and not a performance standard and that it was unilateral action not in keeping with the rules of the International Civil Aviation Organization. We told them it would cause great harm to American interests.

Upon our return to the States, the gentleman from California and I decided to proceed in expressing our views in greater detail. Meanwhile, the legislative tempo in Europe sped up almost as if to try to cut off the flow of information from this side of the Atlantic.

□ 1145

The legislation was approved in early February even though it did not appear on the advanced agenda for that day of the week, and the final step in the adoption of the European legislation is approval by the Council of Ministers of the European Union. However, in reaction to strong representations by several members of our own Cabinet and, I believe, in the expectation that this legislation we are now considering will be coming to the floor, the European Union's Executive Commission has asked the final approval by the council administrators be held off until late March. During that time and during which negotiations will be under way we are hoping that some kind of agreement can be reached that will uphold our American interests.

Mr. Chairman, we have often heard the view that sanctions do not work. Well, this is a case where the justified frustration and concern of the American people has brought us to the point of adopting a unilateral sanction to retaliate, and we will do so by a wide margin. I hope that the sponsors of this

bill will bear in mind how important it was to take quick action and will not agree to legislation to place speed bumps in the way of enactment of future sanctions bills. I hope that the bill's managers will be sensitive to the need to modify this bill as the process moves along and will bear in mind the importance of the overall U.S.-EU relationship and balance them along with the very important American interests involved in the hushkit issue.

Let me indicate my dismay that the hushkit issue was allowed to get to this point where it may precipitate a series of measures and countermeasures. We need to prevent this from happening and not just reacting to events. The U.S. and European parliamentary delegations agreed in Strasbourg to step up the level of our cooperation for this purpose among others. Indeed, we have formed a transatlantic legislative dialogue. We hope to have, for example, video conferences to allow in-depth discussions on the issues that concern us. Aviation issues such as Airbus/Boeing and hushkits might well be a good place to start.

We will also be setting up links between the relevant committees to try to give early warning and advice in both directions across the Atlantic, again to try to prevent crises in our relationships and find ways to cooperate. Our Nation and the EU's democracies, which have the world's largest trading and investing relationships, need, of course, to head off conflict wherever possible.

In conclusion, not only is conflict disruptive to our economies, but it can make it difficult for us to cooperate on important matters on the transatlantic agenda and in third countries. It has aptly been said that if our Nation and Europe do not act together, little will get done on the world scene.

So, let me conclude again by saying that we simply must do a better job of managing the U.S.-EU relationships, but I regret to say that at this point we need to keep the pressure on, and the best course of action is to pass this measure before us. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 661.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill requiring retaliation against the European Union banning flights of the Concorde if the EU adopts legislation to restrict the use of so-called "hush kits."

I became aware of the so-called "hush kit" issue late last year, when the impending European legislation to ban the entry of additional "hushkitted" planes from Europe was brought to my attention by industry.

After consultation with industry and the Executive branch, we had the opportunity to raise it with members of the European Parliament in Strasbourg this past January. I was joined in this regard by our colleague, Congressman STEVE HORN, a member of our United States delegation and a member of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Transportation Committee.

We informed our European friends that we were concerned that the proposed legislation was a design standard, not a performance

standard, and that it was a unilateral action not in keeping with the rules of the International Civil Aviation Organization. We told them it would cause great harm to American interests.

We were pleasantly surprised to learn that the new Chairman of the European Parliament delegation, Barry Seal, M.E.P., was the spokesman of the Socialist group on aviation. He told us that he had been unaware of the problem the United States had with the legislation and that he would look into it. Mr. Seal serves on the EP's Transportation Committee.

Subsequently, a meeting of the Parliament's Environment Committee was held and this bill was discussed. Another member of the EP's delegation for relations with the United States, Mary Banotti, M.E.P., raised our concerns along with her own. However, she did not amend the legislation, but expressed her hope that an amendment could be worked out that would provide for a performance standard in lieu of a design standard.

Upon our return, Congressman HORN and I wrote to the EU Members we had met with expressing our views in greater detail. In addition, Mr. HORN and I rounded up several colleagues on a letter to Secretary Slater and Ambassador Barshefsky to express our concerns.

Meanwhile, the legislative tempo in Europe sped up, almost as if to try to cut off the flow of information from this side of the Atlantic. The legislation was approved on February 10th, even though it did not appear on the advance agenda for that day or week.

The final step in the adoption of the European legislation is approval by the Council of Ministers of the European Union. However, in reaction to strong representations by several members of the United States cabinet, and, I believe, in the expectation that this legislation we are now considering would be coming to the floor, the European Union's Executive Commission has asked that final approval by the Council of Ministers be held off until late March. During this period of time, during which negotiations will be under way, I hope some kind of agreement can be reached that will uphold American interests.

Even so, it appears that the legislation itself will be adopted, and whatever agreement comes will be by way of a side agreement of some sort relating to the implementation of the legislation. If no appropriate agreement is reached, legislation like this may be just the beginning of our reaction to the EU's position.

Mr. Chairman, we have often heard in this chamber the view that "sanctions don't work." Well, here is a case where the justified frustration and concern of the American people have brought us to the point of adopting—dare I say it?—a "unilateral sanction" to retaliate. And we will do so by a wide margin. I hope that the sponsors of this bill will remember how important it was to take quick action and will not agree to legislation to place "speed bumps" in the way of the enactment of future "sanctions" bills.

The mere threat of the passage of this sanctions bill becoming law should make its final enactment unnecessary. It may well be necessary to modify this bill in the Senate or in Conference to reflect an agreement between the United States and EU. I hope that this bill's managers will be sensitive to the need to do so, and will bear in mind the importance of the overall U.S.-EU relationship,

and balance them along with the very important American interests involved in the hush kit issue per se.

Let me indicate my dismay that the "hush kit" issue was allowed to get to the point where it may precipitate a series of measures and countermeasures. We need to prevent that from happening and not just reacting to events.

The U.S. and European Parliament delegations agreed in Strasbourg to step up the level of our cooperation for this purpose (among others). Indeed, we have formed a "Transatlantic Legislative Dialogue." We hope to have, for example, videoconferences to allow in depth discussions on the issues that concern us. Aviation issues such as Airbus/Boeing and "hushkits" might well be a good place to start. We will also be setting up links between relevant Committees to try to give early warning and advice in both directions across the Atlantic—again, to try to prevent crises in our relationship and to find ways to cooperate.

There is no question that there have been significant bumps on the road in U.S.-EU relations in the recent past. With tensions high on the banana and beef hormone disputes, not to mention issues such as data protection, Iran, and Cuba, we need to keep all lines of communication open.

The private sector also needs to be on the lookout for legislation or regulations that will cause the U.S. and the EU to come into conflict. Organizations such as the Transatlantic Business Dialogue and the Transatlantic Policy Network have an important role to play in this regard. Our Administration could also do a better job in keeping on the lookout for such problems on the horizon. But they need to be helped by the private sector—and there is no question that the rather non-transparent policy process in Brussels contributes to our being taken by surprise from time to time. Policymakers need to have issues on which conflict might arise brought to their attention well in advance, so that they can be addressed with ample time to make effective, thoughtful decisions.

Our Nation and the EU's democracies, which have the world's largest trading and investing relationship, need, of course, to head off conflict wherever possible. Not only is conflict disruptive to our economies, but it can make it difficult for us to cooperate on important matters on the transatlantic agenda and in third countries. It has aptly been said that if the United States and Europe do not act together, little will get done on the world scene.

Let me conclude by saying that we simply must do a better job of managing the U.S.-EU relationship but, I regret to say, at this point we need to keep the pressure on and the best course of action is to pass this bill.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 661.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), I yield myself 30 seconds to say that I am delighted to hear from the Chairman of the Committee on International Relations that this mechanism is being set up for consultations through the committee process between the U.S. Congress and the European Parliament. I think that will go a long way to improve understandings and prevent, hopefully, debacles of this kind or near debacles of this kind.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman and ranking member for moving quickly. This is a critical time in our relationship with the European community, because the ground rules are just being established, and if the United States sits back as the Europeans close up this very important market for us, protecting and nurturing their own markets, we will find it will not just be in aerospace, it will be in every other sector. Any time the Europeans have a problem, whether it is exports of grain or beef or technology, they will come up with some new standard that their companies have already reached or have been advance notified, and American companies will be locked out.

This administration and this Congress have to be tough and hard on this issue because, as we begin the relationship with a unified Europe, if they get the sense that they can shut out American products without paying a price, every worker and every company in America is under threat.

Mr. Chairman, again I commend the ranking member and the chairman for taking this swift action.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I totally concur in the splendid statement of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON). After all, Europe is where they invented the Hanseatic League, cartels, and they know how to control markets. This is a message to Europe: "You're not going to do it in aviation."

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

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

I would emphasize indeed it is the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) who provided the leadership in moving this bill forward, and so I am very happy to be supportive of his initiative, but he is the one that really deserves the credit for this.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this legislation, and I would like to thank the distinguished Chairman and the ranking member for giving members the opportunity to express their concern about this situation.

At a time when the United States has advanced measures to reduce trade barriers and open doors to the global marketplace—and while the European Union has done much of the same—we're facing the passage of a new European Union regulation to limit the fair trade of aircraft.

The regulation will have the effect of targeting the resale of U.S. aircraft that already meet International noise standards. And one of the most frustrating aspects of this initiative, common position 66/99, is that some of the aircraft banned under that regulation are quieter than some that are permitted to be sold.

The regulation would prohibit the purchase of aircraft, from non-EU nations, that have been re-engined with a "hushkit" to meet

internationally-established noise standards agreed upon by the International Civil Aviation Organization.

And the regulation, which is presumably designed to reduce environmental noise, will allow purchases of aircraft with the same level of noise emissions that are already owned by EU operators.

This type of gerrymandered regulation is a step backward in our efforts to promote international cooperation and a freer flow of trade, and may actually be a violation of some bilateral air service agreements between EU member states and the U.S.

If the rule is adopted, U.S. manufacturers, airlines, and leasing companies stand to lose billions of dollars—and the impact on U.S. aviation workers will be substantial.

I've heard estimates that the EU rule could result in job reductions as high as 16 thousand at impacted airlines and engine manufacturers.

The U.S. can't stand by and watch as the EU unilaterally takes steps with this wide of an impact on U.S. airline, machinist, and aerospace workers.

H.R. 661 is an appropriate response to an unfair barrier, and I strongly support its passage.

Again, I thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for their efforts and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express apprehension regarding the passage of H.R. 661. This bill, which bans the Concorde from operating in the United States, was introduced to deter the European Union (EU) from adopting a proposed regulation that would limit the use of hushkitted aircraft in Europe. American companies are worldwide suppliers of hushkits, which are fitted on older aircraft to reduce their noise level to meet worldwide noise pollution standards. The EU regulation discriminates against U.S. companies, and will cost American industry millions of dollars in losses. I strongly oppose the EU's regulation to restrict hushkitted aircraft, and support efforts to propel the EU to reassess their hushkit regulation.

Last week, the EU did just that. The EU decided to postpone its decision on banning hushkitted aircraft until the end of March 1999. Originally, the EU was scheduled to pass the regulation on March 9, 1999. This delay gives U.S. negotiators a chance to make our case to the EU, and us a chance to carefully consider a reasoned and appropriate U.S. response if one proves necessary. I have some concerns that this particular proposal is neither effective nor risk free for U.S. interests.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 661 is as follows:

H.R. 661

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

SECTION 1. COMMERCIAL OPERATION OF SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT CATEGORY AIRCRAFT.

If the European Union adopts Common Position (EC) No. 66/98 as a final regulation or adopts any similar final regulation, the Secretary of Transportation shall prohibit, after

such date of adoption, the commercial operation of a civil supersonic transport category aircraft to or from an airport in the United States unless the Secretary finds that the aircraft complies with stage 3 noise levels.

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has 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 a 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.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FORBES) having assumed the chair, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, 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. 661) to direct the Secretary of Transportation to prohibit the commercial operation of supersonic transport category aircraft that do not comply with stage 3 noise levels if the European Union adopts certain aircraft noise regulations, pursuant to House Resolution 86, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on H.R. 661, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PEACE CORPS ACT
AUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 83 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. 669.

□ 1155

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. 669) to amend the Peace Corps Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 to carry out that Act, and for other purposes, with Mr. PEASE 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 New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the main purpose of H.R. 6689 is to reauthorize appropriations to expand the Peace Corps to President Ronald Reagan's goal of 10,000 volunteers. This legislation was introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), and I am proud to be a cosponsor along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON). I understand that all three Republican and all three Democratic Members who served in the Peace Corps cosponsored this bill. Senator COVERDELL and Senator DODD will introduce companion legislation in the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, 14 years ago Ronald Reagan's late beloved Peace Corps director, Loret Ruppe, gave us a vision of a Peace Corps that could grow to 10,000 volunteers, and today we renew that goal on a bipartisan basis, working with the administration and with the minority in Congress to realize that vision.

This bill was carefully drafted in cooperation with the administration and with OMB, and while we initially planned to get the Peace Corps to 10,000 by the year 2000, budget realities and our concern for the planned and orderly expansion of the Corps means that we will reach our goal by the year 2003. This is a slower pace than we like and with which the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has indicated he would be more comfortable.

We choose the Peace Corps as one of our first orders of business because it represents the best part of our foreign assistance programs. The Peace Corps remains foremost in the imagination of America's young people. From President Kennedy to President Reagan and now to President Clinton, the Peace Corps serves as a symbol of what is best in our own Nation and its humanitarian missions around the world.

Today, there are millions of people around the world whose first impression of our Nation is through a Peace Corps volunteer. To date, over 150,000

Americans have served in the Peace Corps, including seven U.S. ambassadors, five current Members of Congress and Senator DODD, and they represent an invaluable corps of veterans who speak over 80 languages in some of the countries most important in advancing our Nation's nationality security, economic and humanitarian interests.

Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps is changing. It is not the same young people going overseas just to teach English. More people are volunteering after retiring, providing a wealth of knowledge and experience to their projects.

Peace Corps Director Mark Gearan formed the Crisis Corps to bring former volunteers back to the most difficult projects of importance to our Nation. For example, Crisis Corps volunteers are serving today in Central America, helping those nations recover from the 200-year devastation of Hurricane Mitch.

□ 1200

House passage of this bill will demonstrate that the Congress is back at work, passing important legislation and doing it on a bipartisan basis.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I urge support for this measure, and I insert the following for the RECORD:

THE DIRECTOR OF THE PEACE CORPS,
Washington, DC, March 3, 1998.

Hon. BENJAMIN GILMAN,
*Committee on International Relations,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to convey my sincere appreciation to you and the other Members of the Committee for your decision to authorize an increase of \$29 million for the Peace Corps FY 2000 budget. The Peace Corps has been fortunate to enjoy bipartisan support in the Congress for many years. On behalf of the Peace Corps, I wish to thank you for the strong leadership that you have brought to bear in making it possible for more Americans to serve our country as Peace Corps Volunteers. If Congress appropriates the Committee's authorized funding level, there will be 8,000 Volunteers serving overseas by the end of FY 2000. This proposed budget will keep the Peace Corps on the path to achieving the goal that Congress established for us in 1985—to field a Volunteer Corps of 10,000—in the early part of the next century.

This is a particularly appropriate moment in the Peace Corps history to undertake a careful effort to expand the number of Volunteers. Today, there are nearly 6,700 Volunteers serving in 79 countries. In recent years, however, the requests for Peace Corps Volunteers that we have received from developing countries has generally far exceeded the capacity of our budget. There is a reason for this: Our Volunteers are making important and lasting contributions to the development of some of the world's poorest communities. Their work at the grass-roots level in education, small business development, the environment, health, and agriculture has become a model of success for other international development agencies. Given the pressing need for this kind of people-to-people assistance, I am confident that the additional Volunteers we recruit will have effective and successful jobs in their overseas communities.

As the need for the service of Peace Corps Volunteers continues to rise overseas, I am

pleased to report to you that we have seen an equally significant increase in interest in Peace Corps service among Americans here at home. Each year, tens of thousands of our fellow citizens contact the Peace Corps seeking information about serving as a Volunteer, and thousands of more of our citizens apply for Peace Corps service than our budget can fund. This growth in interest in the Peace Corps reflects our country's great tradition of service and our willingness to work with people in some of the world's poorest countries who want to build a better future for their communities. I believe that now is the time to enable more of our citizens to offer their skills in the cause of peace and progress in the developing world.

I also wish to assure you and the Committee that the Peace Corps is prepared to manage this growth in the Volunteers corps in a responsible manner. In recent years, the Peace Corps has implemented a series of operational policies that have reduced the agency's overhead costs and improved the way we conduct our business. We have reduced the size of our headquarters staff, closed five regional recruitment offices, and closed 18 overseas programs. These cost savings have allowed us to open new and exciting Volunteer programs in South Africa, Jordan, Mozambique, and Bangladesh. Moreover, these management streamlining efforts will also ensure that the Peace Corps can recruit, train, and support additional Volunteers under the Committee's authorized funding level.

Finally, Peace Corps Volunteers are fulfilling an even larger purpose through their service in the developing world: By living and working overseas for two years, they are strengthening the ties of friendship and cross-cultural understanding between our citizens and the people of other countries. In the process, they build enormous goodwill for our country and make an intangible contribution to our country's long-term interests abroad. As we look to maintain America's leadership in the next century, our understanding of other people and cultures will assume an even greater importance in maintaining our international leadership. I believe that there are few organizations that can contribute as much to America's understanding of the world beyond our borders as the Peace Corps.

Mr. Chairman, as part of our efforts to mark the 38th anniversary of the founding of the Peace Corps, yesterday thousands of former Volunteers visited classrooms in every state to talk with students about the cross-cultural experience they gained while serving in the Peace Corps. This is but one example of how Peace Corps Volunteers continue their service, even after returning home, and our country can take great pride in what our Volunteers are accomplishing overseas every day. I thank you and the other Members of the Committee for providing the support that is so vital to the thousands of other Americans who want to take part in the Peace Corps experience, and I look forward to working with you to make our goal of 10,000 Volunteers a reality.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

MARK D. GEARAN,
Director.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, oftentimes the debate on the floor is whether the investment of the taxpayers' resources is commensurate with the benefit we get as a

country from the expenditure. The entire foreign assistance program is less than 1 percent of the Federal budget, and the Peace Corps is less than 1 percent of that budget.

When we take a look at the impact it has on the world community from President Kennedy's initiation of this program, there is no American program that has been a better ambassador for America and its values than the Peace Corps.

I think a sense of what the broad-based support in this Congress is for this program is not because of a Washington decision, it is a decision in the countryside. The American people like what the Peace Corps does. It takes people with normal skills in survival, building dams, houses, finding ways to train people better, and puts them in countries where they are desperately needed.

Unlike other programs that are often hard to calculate in their impact, that have fungible effects on their economy, this is one where we can see one individual helping a family, helping a village, and representing the very best of our American society.

So I am proud to be here today to support this budget, to support the Administration's request to make sure there is adequate funding so these ambassadors for America's best interest can continue to do their job. I would hope that my colleagues would all join together in supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), a sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for giving me the honor to present this bill on the floor. I would not be here were it not for the graciousness of the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, who asked me to carry this very important legislation.

At the start, I also want to recognize the very fine leadership of Mark Gearan and the Administration's strong support for this Peace Corps reauthorization bill. We truly have a bipartisan consensus that this is a way to show to the rest of the world the very best that America has to offer; that funds for the Peace Corps are, in my judgment, the best dollars that we spend in the foreign assistance categories.

This reauthorization bill permits the increase in numbers of volunteers from today's level of 6,700 to eventually 10,000 by the year 2003. I note that this is, as a benchmark, still not the maximum that we have ever had in the Peace Corps. That was reached in 1966, when we had 15,000. But it is a goal towards which we have been directing our efforts for some time.

Presently, we have more people in America applying to be Peace Corps

volunteers, qualified to be ambassadors of our country overseas, and to do good at the most basic levels overseas, we have more volunteers for that task than we have budget authority to employ.

For example, over the last 4 years, the numbers of Americans requesting applications for the Peace Corps has gone up by 40 percent. Financially, though, over the last 4 years, we have only been able to adopt and make part of the Peace Corps an increase of 2 percent.

Since its inception, over 150,000 Americans have served in the Peace Corps. I am proud to relate that every returning Peace Corps volunteer member of this House of Representatives is a cosponsor of the bill. I draw particular attention to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. CHRIS SHAYS), the gentleman from California (Mr. SAM FARR), the gentleman from New York (Mr. JIM WALSH), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TOM PETRI); and over in the other body, Senators DODD and COVERDELL. Senator COVERDELL is not technically a returned volunteer, but he was director of the Peace Corps under President George Bush.

Mr. Chairman, I have a personal interest in Africa that I have attempted to bring to the attention of my colleagues on many occasions. Whenever I travel to Africa, I try to focus on the poorest countries, the countries of greatest need. My wife travels with me. Susanne and I have visited, just in the last few months, the Ivory Coast, Ghana, Mali, and in previous trips, as well, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi, Congo.

Every time we visit we make a point to see the Peace Corps volunteers, to find out what they are doing, to talk with them. Then I will frequently write a note to the individuals' parents to let them know how proud we are of the job they are doing. Recently, Mr. Chairman, I have been writing notes to their children, because the Peace Corps now is taking more and more Americans who have finished a career and have decided to give to their country and give to their world at that stage in their lives, a little departure from what we might have originally identified with the Peace Corps.

This bill allows adequate funding to allow this increase in volunteers and to make other changes in the authorizing legislation, so that Peace Corps volunteers and employees will have many of the same benefits accorded to members of the Foreign Service.

Affirmatively, it is good for our country, good for the world. But in addition, I wish to anticipate those who have criticized the Peace Corps, who have been very few over the years, but there have been some, and to the extent that those criticisms were valid, it is my judgment that this director of the Peace Corps, Mr. Mark Gearan, has superbly addressed them.

I note, for example, that under his leadership the Peace Corps has now ac-

complished an actual reduction of 13 percent in the United States-based staff, putting more of the Peace Corps resources overseas where they make such a difference.

The Peace Corps has also achieved a 14 percent decrease in the annual cost of a volunteer. Under Mark Gearan's directorship we have closed unnecessary regional recruiting offices, and consolidated our activities overseas.

The administration, in other words, has improved the Peace Corps until it is, in my judgment, to be compared favorably with any of our foreign assistance programs.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I want to add a personal note, that when my wife and I were in Senegal we witnessed the opening of the Karen Robinson Center just outside Dakar, a center that was created to assist albino children who, in that society, had theretofore been social outcasts and who also had physical disabilities particularly associated with the bright sun, the danger of exposure to sun, due to their lack of pigmentation, as well as the nearsightedness that is oftentimes associated with albinism.

The point is that this center, opened for this remarkably compassionate purpose, was named for a Peace Corps volunteer whose idea it was, who arranged the local funding, who arranged the assistance with the local authorities, so that it happened.

Mr. Chairman, there are stories like the Karen Robinson Center in every country throughout Africa that I have been privileged to visit over the last 3 years. I conclude by saying that of all of the honors that the chairman of the Committee on International Relations could have given me, his designation of me to be the author of this bill is certainly the highest. I am most grateful.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I thank our very distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

I am very proud to rise today in support of H.R. 669, a bill which is designed to expand the Peace Corps so it can meet the demands and challenges as it heads into the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, the extraordinary vision of President Kennedy really lives on today through the Peace Corps. In the Congress of the United States, we have our own honor roll of former Peace Corps members: in the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SAM FARR), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. CHRIS SHAYS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. JIM WALSH); certainly in the Senate, CHRIS DODD, the late Paul Tsongas.

Mr. Chairman, when we send Peace Corps volunteers overseas, we do not just export our volunteers. We really are exporting American values. Our Peace Corps volunteers demonstrate

firsthand what it means to build community and to build democracy. We export our great intellectual genius with each one of our volunteers.

The Peace Corps has always enjoyed a bipartisan support in the Congress. The proposed increases in this bill really represent, I think, a very small investment for a large return. By sending our best and our brightest ambassadors, the Peace Corps itself is one of the most effective and long-lasting foreign policy tools that the United States of America has.

At a time when so many of our young people, Mr. Chairman, are turning away from public service, are not interested in it, the Peace Corps is actually inundated with applications and is having to turn people away from that service. We know that we need to match their idealism and their attraction to the Peace Corps.

The number of Americans requesting applications and information about the Peace Corps has increased by more than 40 percent over the last 4 years. Yet, the Peace Corps is only able to increase its volunteers by 2 percent during this same period.

I am exceedingly proud to be a political descendant of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and I am an unabashed idealist. President Kennedy's aspirations live on today, and the torch, as he said, has been passed to a new generation. That new generation includes my son, Paul Eshoo, who is a volunteer in the Peace Corps today in Nepal, in the Himalayas.

I cannot wait to send him an e-mail to say that this legislation has passed, and that with it, the Congress of the United States really not only thanks and acknowledges what the volunteers in the Peace Corps are doing all around the world, but that we match our idealism and our pragmatism in the investment of America's tax dollars in the hopes and aspirations of people around the world.

So I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It is very well put together. If in fact the amendment that would flatten out this budget is offered, I urge my colleagues to vote against it. It is an amendment to diminish aspirations. It would be an amendment to diminish the hopes and aspirations of generations and generations that have seen fit to go around the world and be America's best ambassadors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) will control the time allotted to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, before introducing the next speaker, I am proud to say that my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), has added her strong support for this legislation. I

have the highest regard for my neighbor and colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 669, the Peace Corps Reauthorization Act, which will strengthen the impact of the Peace Corps. This legislation was introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), and cosponsored by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, and many other members, including this Member.

We passed this bill from the committee unanimously on February 11th. I would congratulate the distinguished gentleman from California for introducing this act which, if passed and signed into law, would authorize the expansion of the Peace Corps to 10,000 volunteers by the year 2003. It will be fulfilling the goal set by former President Ronald Reagan in 1985, who built on the legacy of President John F. Kennedy.

Mr. Chairman, in the 38 years since the Peace Corps was established, its volunteers have compiled a distinguished record of service to people in countries around the world. Volunteers provide badly needed, at times critical, assistance, while at the same time embodying not just the technical know-how but also the ideals and the can-do spirit of the American people.

The annals of the Peace Corps are replete with examples of communities strengthened and lives changed, both among those who have received the assistance and among the volunteers themselves, who come back to this country and continue to provide service to our Nation's communities.

Former volunteers have gone on to distinguished careers in many fields, including five Peace Corps alumni who are members of this body. There can be little doubt that the type of—the need for the type of assistance the Peace Corps provides remains great. At the same time, this Member is pleased to note that there is no shortage of Americans, both young people and those with years or even decades of experience, willing to dedicate a significant period of their lives to volunteering to assist others.

In its 38-year-history, more than 1,200 volunteers have come from this Member's low population State of Nebraska, including 63 Nebraskans currently providing this important form of volunteer service.

As a personal note, a former intern of this Member's staff in whom we take great pride was Tammy Ortega, who performed in an exemplary fashion as a Peace Corps volunteer in ecuadorial Guinea. This Nation should be proud that we have individuals like Tammy who are willing to devote 2 or more years of their lives to helping those less fortunate.

Mr. Chairman, for many reasons, this Member is pleased both to cosponsor this important bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 669, introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

□ 1215

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations, a subcommittee chairman, and himself a returned Peace Corps volunteer.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), my good friend, colleague, and classmate for his hard work on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps not only benefits the world, it benefits our country, it benefits the individual. Everyone wins in this program. It is a remarkably ingenious idea. Take America's idealistic youth, send them around the world. They learn, the people in the other countries learn, there is a benefit to all.

Then these young people come back to the United States and, throughout our society, they are engaged and active in making this a better country, just as they were when they visited Nepal or Ghana or any of the other Peace Corps locations around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I have a bias, obviously, as a returned Peace Corps volunteer. But the fact is, the world is changing. We have seen great progress here in our country. But in some places in the world, the countries are actually poorer. People are in more difficult conditions than they were when I was a volunteer 25 or 30 years ago, so the need is still there. And, as the world changes, other countries open up to this idea, and we need to fulfill that need.

I just recently returned to India and to Nepal to my village. It was a remarkable homecoming for me. I saw people who were there when I was there. I renewed relationships. Visually, it was very much the same as when I left, although there were improvements in permanent housing. They have electricity in the village now. They have municipal water in the village.

We used to have to boil the water and put iodine in it to make sure it was drinkable. Today, they have municipal water throughout the village. Two weeks after I returned home, I received an e-mail from my village. Talk about

amazing. When I was there, the only machine that I saw on a regular basis was the Thailand International jet that flew over on Tuesday.

The world is changing dramatically and rapidly as it gets smaller, as the world gets smaller. And with this Internet now that is reaching out and touching every village, literally, in the world, the personal relationships that Peace Corps volunteers make and the associations they make with people from all these different countries can only benefit our country.

We will be more and more a global citizen, more and more involved in all of these countries, and the more knowledge we have of the rest of the world through these individuals can only make us stronger.

Mr. Speaker, those are the emotional, the idealistic views. Let me tell a few things about the Peace Corps. They are changing, too, with the improvements that Director Gearan has made. They have reduced headquarters staff by 13 percent. They have reduced the number of domestic recruiting offices. They have reduced the cost to support volunteers in the field. All of this with the thought in mind that we need to be better and smarter and work faster, reduce the cost of government.

But, at the same time, the investment that we are making in these individuals in those countries and ultimately in our own country is a sound investment that we need to support today.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I have always supported the Peace Corps and the invaluable work their volunteers provide because I have seen it first hand. These volunteers are informal ambassadors for the United States. They spread our culture and values while learning and absorbing from people in some of the most remote areas of the world. More importantly, they bring these cultures back with them to the United States and educate friends and neighbors on the communities that most only read about in magazines.

I have traveled to some of these areas where Peace Corps volunteers are working. Time and again, I am always impressed with the volunteers I meet. Their acceptance into the community and the hard work they provide is truly remarkable. Just when you think you have reached the most remote area on earth, there is a Peace Corps volunteer helping to build a house or sow a field.

Since the Peace Corps' inception thirty-eight years ago, its popularity has only grown. In 1998, more than 150,000 individuals contacted the Peace Corps to inquire about becoming a volunteer, this is an increase of over forty percent since 1994. We must make sure that the Peace Corps is able to meet this demand. Further, I believe that success and effectiveness should be rewarded. Therefore, I strongly support this reauthorization and the goal of reaching 10,000 volunteers by fiscal year 2003.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, on the 38th anniversary of the founding by President Kennedy of the Peace Corps, one of our nation's most successful international relief and development programs, I rise in support of Peace

Corps reauthorization funding to meet President Clinton's goal of expanding the number of volunteers to 10,000 early in the new millennium.

Thanks to the 150,000 peace corps volunteers who have served overseas, communities around the world have benefited from the continue to reap the benefits of the contributions of the Peace Corps. 6,700 volunteers are serving in 80 countries, working to bring clean water to communities, teaching children, helping to develop small businesses, and preventing the spread of AIDS.

Today, volunteers are making contributions by working along side local people throughout the world as AIDS and environmental educators, business advisors and teachers. Through their work, they are helping people of developing countries to help themselves for only 1 percent of our foreign aid budget.

There is no greater testament to the success of this program than the Peace Corps Director's recent visit with Kenya's minister of public works who had been taught by a Peace Corps volunteer and Tanzania's minister of education who could still recall all of his Peace Corps teachers. Communities around the world, including our own, are better off today as a result of Peace Corps volunteers, their mission, their contributions and their commitment to service.

The Peace Corps is a successful international diplomacy program that is improving the lives of people in the developing world and enriching the lives of Peace Corps volunteers who return from the field to contribute to their own communities across this nation. We can be proud of this program and its legacies and salute the members of this body who have served.

Volunteers are returning home to be leaders in every field. Young and old of all backgrounds are not only sharing their commitment to altruism and volunteerism throughout the world, but are coming home to continue their commitment to service in an ever increasing multi-cultural society. As the Ranking Member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 669.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 669, which will expand our sensible investment in the Peace Corps.

As an original cosponsor of this important legislation, I am proud to join my colleagues today in support of the Peace Corps, one of our most effective foreign assistance tools.

This bill, which has broad bipartisan support, will increase the number of Peace Corps volunteers to 10,000 over the next four years. It is especially fitting that we make this commitment today, just a day after the Peace Corps celebrated its 38th birthday.

Under the outstanding leadership of Mark Gearan, the Peace Corps has become a lean and effective advocate for the United States' foreign assistance goals around the world. With almost 7,000 volunteers in about 80 countries, the Peace Corps has brought assistance in education, microcredit, health care, and a range of other fields to millions of people in Latin America, Africa, Eastern Europe, the Pacific, and the Middle East.

This bill responds to the increasing demand for the Peace Corps, both in the United States and around the world. Here in the United States, interest in volunteering in the Peace Corps has increased by 40 percent over the last four years. And Peace Corps volunteers

continue to be welcomed into communities around the world for their unique ability to work closely with the indigenous populations to implement successful development projects.

Mr. Chairman, this bill makes good sense. The Administration supports it. Congress has been on the record since 1985 in support of the goal of 10,000 Peace Corps volunteers. And even this increase would still leave Peace Corps funding at only one percent of our foreign aid budget, which itself is less than one percent of our overall federal budget.

I urge my colleagues to support the Peace Corps by voting for H.R. 669.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Peace Corps Act (H.R. 669). This bill authorizes appropriations for fiscal years 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.

Later in his inaugural address, President Kennedy stated the philosophy of the organization: "To those peoples in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves." The Peace Corps was officially established on March 1, 1961 by an Executive Order. Sargent Shriver was appointed as its first director.

Since its inception, the Peace Corps has trained 150,000 volunteers to work in 134 countries. Currently there are 6,700 volunteers serving in 80 countries. The increased funding proposed in this bill 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.

For the past 38 years, the Peace Corps has been 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 to protect the environment.

Some Peace Corps volunteers include current members of this 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. Donna Shalala, Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services also served in the Peace Corps.

Let me tell you a little about the Peace Corps participation from my state of Texas. There are 197 Texans currently serving in the Peace Corps. Since 1961, Texas has supplied 2,784 volunteers. Of the colleges and universities that send Peace Corps volunteers this year, the University of Texas at Austin has 52 volunteers.

An intern from Houston now serving in my office, LaQuinta Wadsworth, was a participant in the Peace Corps internship during the summer of 1998. She traveled to Ghana as a part of a Peace Corps program through her school, Texas Southern University. Her internship was designed to increase awareness among the

Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).

LaQuinta shared these thoughts, "The Peace Corps motto is 'The Toughest Job You Will Ever Love', and this statement is definitely true. The service opens the minds of the volunteers to new and amazing people and adventures. The Peace Corps is an asset to the communities of the countries in which volunteers serve."

Another citizen from my district, Roosevelt Harris worked as Associate Director of Field Operations for the Peace Corps in Liberia from 1972–1975. He had this to say about his experience, "It has been one of the best experiences I've ever had in my life. It surpasses any foreign aid in terms of the direct impact it has on the local populace and the exchange between people contributes greatly to world peace. The Peace Corps enhances the image of America abroad. If I had the opportunity, I . . . [would] not hesitate to return to the Peace Corps."

These testimonials are just an example of the positive impact the Peace Corps has had on the lives of former volunteers. I urge my colleagues today to vote in support of this appropriation for this worthwhile organization.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my very strongest support for H.R. 669 to authorize \$270 million in fiscal year 2000 for the Peace Corps. This bill will provide an increase of \$29 million over current funding levels. Surely a very modest increase, Mr. Speaker, for a program that has such a positive impact around the world and such a proven track record of success.

Over the last 38 years 6,921 Peace Corps Volunteers from Massachusetts have built a legacy of service and made contributions to the health, education, and development of countless people around the world. Currently, 232 Massachusetts citizens are serving in the Peace Corps.

I can go into any school in my district and find young people who dream of working in the Peace Corps. These students already know that the Peace Corps embodies our most enduring values of service, compassion, and peace-making. They dream about going to some of the poorest communities on the face of this earth and helping people help themselves, while learning about other people and other cultures.

But their dreams will only come true if we provide now the necessary funding to allow the Peace Corps to expand its volunteer program. Under the leadership of Peace Corps Director Mark Gearan—a Massachusetts native, I might add—more and more of our fellow citizens, of all ages and backgrounds, are applying to serve as volunteers. Under his leadership, the Peace Corps has also become a model government agency—streamlining procedures, cutting costs and reducing the number of U.S.-based staff, while at the same time increasing the support and training for new volunteers.

I am especially grateful that the new program established in 1996, the Crisis Corps, will be sending more than 60 experienced former Peace Corps Volunteers to Central America to help those communities rebuild after the devastation of Hurricane Mitch.

I urge my colleagues to support this authorization and to reject any amendments to freeze or cut funding for the Peace Corps.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 669, a bill that will allow more

Americans to serve our country as Peace Corps Volunteers. Peace Corps volunteers play a vital role in the development of some of the worlds' poorest communities. Through the contributions of these volunteers, great strides have been made to improve education, economic development and healthcare. In recent years, our foreign neighbors have come to depend on Peace Corps volunteers for the grass root assistance, and the demand for volunteers increases every year. Furthermore, American interest in the Peace Corps has risen by 40%. Increased funding for this program over the next three years is essential to insure that more Americans can make a difference around the world. With great pride I recognize the individuals in the Peace Corps and this organization for its commitment to helping our international neighbors. Organizations such as the Peace Corps have not only established proud traditions of goodwill and service around the world, but also have contributed to improved relationships with people of other countries. Support for the Peace Corps requires little more than one percent of the resource allocated for foreign assistance. The benefit gained from this investment will be felt by both the foreign countries we help and the volunteers who return from their service with a better understanding of the world. Let us continue to support the Peace Corps Organization as a display of the strong American commitment to international development and partnerships.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 669 is as follows:

H.R. 669

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2000 THROUGH 2003 TO CARRY OUT THE PEACE CORPS ACT.

Section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2502(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act \$270,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, \$298,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, \$327,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and \$365,000,000 for fiscal year 2003.

"(2) Amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year are authorized to remain available for that fiscal year and the subsequent fiscal year."

SEC. 2. MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS TO THE PEACE CORPS ACT.

(a) INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL.—Section 15(d) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2514(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (11), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (12), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(13) the transportation of Peace Corps employees, Peace Corps volunteers, dependents of such employees and volunteers, and accompanying baggage, by a foreign air carrier when the transportation is between two places outside the United States without regard to section 40118 of title 49, United States Code."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 5(f)(1)(B) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2504(f)(1)(B))

is amended by striking "Civil Service Commission" and inserting "Office of Personnel Management".

(2) Section 5(h) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2504(h)) is amended by striking "the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (5 U.S.C. 2171 et seq.)" and all that follows through "(31 U.S.C. 492a)," and inserting "section 3342 of title 31, United States Code, section 5732 and".

(3) Section 5(j) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2504(j)) is amended by striking "section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" and all that follows and inserting "section 3331 of title 5, United States Code."

(4) Section 10(a)(4) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2509(a)(4)) is amended by striking "31 U.S.C. 665(b)" and inserting "section 1342 of title 31, United States Code".

(5) Section 15(c) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2514(c)) is amended by striking "Public Law 84–918 (7 U.S.C. 1881 et seq.)" and inserting "subchapter VI of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code".

(6) Section 15(d)(2) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2514(d)(2)) is amended by striking "section 9 of Public Law 60–328 (31 U.S.C. 673)" and inserting "section 1346 of title 31, United States Code".

(7) Section 15(d)(6) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2514(d)(6)) is amended by striking "without regard to section 3561 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 543)".

(8) Section 15(d)(11) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2514(d)(11)), as amended by this section, is further amended by striking "Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801 et seq.)" and inserting "Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.)".

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has 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 a 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.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALSH) having assumed the chair, Mr. PEASE, 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. 669) to amend the Peace Corps Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 to carry out that Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 83, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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. CAMPBELL. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8(c) of rule XX, this 15-minute vote will be followed by a 5-minute vote on H.R. 603.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 326, nays 90, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—326

Abercrombie	Doggett	Kaptur
Aderholt	Dooley	Kasich
Allen	Doyle	Kelly
Andrews	Dreier	Kennedy
Bachus	Dunn	Kildee
Baird	Edwards	Kilpatrick
Baker	Ehlers	Kind (WI)
Baldacci	Ehrlich	King (NY)
Baldwin	Emerson	Kleczka
Barcia	Engel	Klink
Barrett (WI)	English	Knollenberg
Barton	Eshoo	Kucinich
Bass	Etheridge	Kuykendall
Bateman	Ewing	LaFalce
Becerra	Farr	LaHood
Bentsen	Fattah	Lampson
Bereuter	Filner	Lantos
Berkley	Fletcher	Larson
Berman	Foley	LaTourette
Berry	Forbes	Lazio
Biggert	Ford	Leach
Bilirakis	Fossella	Lee
Bishop	Frank (MA)	Levin
Blagojevich	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Bliley	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (GA)
Blumenauer	Frost	Linder
Boehler	Gallegly	Lipinski
Bonior	Ganske	LoBiondo
Bono	Gejdenson	Loftgren
Borski	Gekas	Lowe
Boswell	Gephardt	Lucas (KY)
Boyd	Gibbons	Luther
Brady (PA)	Gilchrest	Maloney (CT)
Brady (TX)	Gillmor	Maloney (NY)
Brown (CA)	Gilman	Markey
Brown (FL)	Gonzalez	Martinez
Brown (OH)	Gordon	Mascara
Bryant	Goss	Matsui
Burr	Green (TX)	McCarthy (MO)
Buyer	Greenwood	McCarthy (NY)
Calvert	Gutierrez	McCreery
Camp	Hall (OH)	McDermott
Campbell	Hansen	McGovern
Canady	Hastings (FL)	McHugh
Capuano	Herger	McInnis
Cardin	Hill (IN)	McIntyre
Castle	Hilliard	McKeon
Chambliss	Hinches	McKinney
Clay	Hinojosa	McNulty
Clayton	Hobson	Meehan
Clement	Hoefel	Meeks (NY)
Clyburn	Hoekstra	Menendez
Condit	Holden	Millender
Conyers	Holt	McDonald
Cook	Hooley	Miller (FL)
Cooksey	Horn	Miller, Gary
Costello	Houghton	Miller, George
Coyne	Hoyer	Minge
Crowley	Hulshof	Mink
Cummings	Hunter	Moakley
Danner	Hutchinson	Mollohan
Davis (FL)	Hyde	Moore
Davis (IL)	Insee	Moran (VA)
Davis (VA)	Isakson	Morella
Deal	Jackson (IL)	Murtha
DeFazio	Jackson-Lee	Myrick
DeGette	(TX)	Nadler
DeLauro	Jefferson	Napolitano
DeMint	Jenkins	Neal
Deutsch	John	Nethercutt
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (CT)	Ney
Dicks	Johnson, E. B.	Northup
Dingell	Jones (OH)	Norwood
Dixon	Kanjorski	Nussle

Obey	Roukema	Taylor (MS)
Olver	Roybal-Allard	Thomas
Ortiz	Rush	Thompson (CA)
Ose	Sabo	Thompson (MS)
Owens	Salmon	Thornberry
Oxley	Sanders	Thune
Packard	Sandlin	Thurman
Pallone	Sawyer	Tierney
Pastor	Saxton	Towns
Payne	Schakowsky	Traficant
Pease	Scott	Turner
Pelosi	Serrano	Udall (CO)
Peterson (MN)	Shaw	Udall (NM)
Peterson (PA)	Shays	Upton
Petri	Sherman	Velazquez
Phelps	Sherwood	Vento
Pickett	Shimkus	Visclosky
Pitts	Shows	Walsh
Pomeroy	Sisisky	Waters
Porter	Skeen	Watt (NC)
Portman	Skelton	Waxman
Price (NC)	Slaughter	Weiner
Pryce (OH)	Smith (NJ)	Weldon (FL)
Quinn	Smith (TX)	Weller
Rahall	Smith (WA)	Wexler
Rangel	Snyder	Weygand
Regula	Souder	Whitfield
Reyes	Spratt	Wise
Reynolds	Stabenow	Wolf
Rivers	Stark	Woolsey
Rodriguez	Strickland	Wu
Roemer	Stupak	Wynn
Rogan	Talent	Young (AK)
Rogers	Tanner	Young (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Tauscher	
Rothman	Tauzin	

NAYS—90

Archer	Graham	Riley
Armey	Green (WI)	Rohrabacher
Balenger	Gutknecht	Royce
Barr	Hall (TX)	Ryan (WI)
Barrett (NE)	Hastings (WA)	Ryun (KS)
Bartlett	Hayes	Sanford
Bilbray	Hayworth	Scarborough
Blunt	Hefley	Schaffer
Boehner	Hill (MT)	Sensenbrenner
Bonilla	Hilleary	Sessions
Burton	Hostettler	Shadegg
Cannon	Istook	Shuster
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Simpson
Chenoweth	Jones (NC)	Smith (MI)
Coble	Kingston	Spence
Coburn	Kolbe	Stearns
Collins	Largent	Stenholm
Combest	Latham	Stump
Cox	Lewis (KY)	Sununu
Cramer	Lucas (OK)	Sweeney
Crane	Manzulso	Tancredo
Cubin	McIntosh	Taylor (NC)
Cunningham	Metcalf	Tiahrt
DeLay	Mica	Toomey
DoLittle	Moran (KS)	Walden
Duncan	Paul	Wamp
Fowler	Pickering	Watkins
Goode	Pombo	Watts (OK)
Goodlatte	Radanovich	Wicker
Goodling	Ramstad	Wilson

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman	Dickey	Oberstar
Boucher	Evans	Pascal
Callahan	Everett	Sanchez
Capps	Granger	Terry
Carson	McCollum	Weldon (PA)
Delahunt	Meek (FL)	

□ 1241

Messrs. LATHAM, SIMPSON, KINGSTON, TANCREDO, GRAHAM, SEN-SEN-BRENNER, HILL of Montana, HALL of Texas, BOEHNER, SCHAF-FER, BILBRAY, WATKINS, MORAN of Kansas, HAYWORTH, SUNUNU, BAR-RETT of Nebraska, Mrs. FOWLER, and Mrs. CHENOWETH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

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. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 31 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

CLARIFYING THE APPLICATION OF THE "DEATH ON THE HIGH SEAS ACT" TO AVIATION INCIDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The pending business is the question of the passage of the bill, H.R. 603, on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 2, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie	Condit	Gordon
Aderholt	Conyers	Goss
Allen	Cook	Graham
Andrews	Costello	Green (TX)
Archer	Cox	Green (WI)
Armey	Coyne	Greenwood
Bachus	Cramer	Gutierrez
Baird	Crane	Gutknecht
Baker	Crowley	Hall (OH)
Baldacci	Cubin	Hall (TX)
Baldwin	Cummings	Hansen
Balenger	Cunningham	Hastings (FL)
Barcia	Danner	Hastings (WA)
Barr	Davis (IL)	Hayes
Barrett (NE)	Davis (VA)	Hayworth
Barrett (WI)	Deal	Hefley
Bartlett	DeFazio	Herger
Barton	DeGette	Hill (IN)
Bass	Delahunt	Hill (MT)
Bateman	DeLauro	Hilleary
Becerra	DeLay	Hilliard
Bentsen	DeMint	Hinches
Bereuter	Deutsch	Hinojosa
Berkley	Diaz-Balart	Hobson
Berman	Dicks	Hoefel
Berry	Dingell	Hoekstra
Biggert	Dixon	Holden
Bilbray	Doggett	Holt
Bilirakis	Dooley	Hooley
Bishop	Doolittle	Horn
Blagojevich	Doyle	Houghton
Bliley	Dreier	Hoyer
Blumenauer	Duncan	Hulshof
Boehler	Dunn	Hunter
Boehner	Edwards	Hutchinson
Bonilla	Ehlers	Hyde
Bonior	Ehrlich	Insee
Bono	Emerson	Isakson
Borski	Engel	Istook
Boswell	English	Jackson (IL)
Boyd	Eshoo	Jackson-Lee
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	(TX)
Brady (TX)	Ewing	Jefferson
Brown (CA)	Farr	Jenkins
Brown (FL)	Fattah	John
Brown (OH)	Filner	Johnson (CT)
Bryant	Fletcher	Johnson, E. B.
Burr	Foley	Johnson, Sam
Burton	Forbes	Jones (NC)
Buyer	Ford	Jones (OH)
Calvert	Fossella	Kanjorski
Camp	Fowler	Kaptur
Campbell	Frank (MA)	Kelly
Canady	Franks (NJ)	Kennedy
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Kildee
Capuano	Frost	Kilpatrick
Cardin	Gallegly	Kind (WI)
Castle	Ganske	King (NY)
Chabot	Gejdenson	Kingston
Chambliss	Gekas	Kleczka
Chenoweth	Gephardt	Klink
Clay	Gibbons	Knollenberg
Clayton	Gilchrest	Kolbe
Clement	Gillmor	Kucinich
Clyburn	Gilman	Kuykendall
Coble	Gonzalez	LaFalce
Coburn	Goode	LaHood
Collins	Goodlatte	Lampson
Combest	Goodling	Lantos

Largent	Ose	Skene
Larson	Owens	Skelton
Latham	Oxley	Slaughter
LaTourette	Packard	Smith (MI)
Lazio	Pallone	Smith (NJ)
Leach	Pastor	Smith (TX)
Lee	Paul	Smith (WA)
Levin	Payne	Snyder
Lewis (CA)	Pease	Souder
Lewis (GA)	Pelosi	Spence
Lewis (KY)	Peterson (MN)	Spratt
Linder	Peterson (PA)	Stabenow
Lipinski	Petri	Stark
LoBiondo	Phelps	Stearns
Lofgren	Pickering	Stenholm
Lowey	Pickett	Strickland
Lucas (KY)	Pitts	Stump
Lucas (OK)	Pombo	Stupak
Luther	Pomeroy	Sununu
Maloney (CT)	Porter	Sweeney
Maloney (NY)	Portman	Talent
Manzullo	Price (NC)	Tancredo
Markey	Pryce (OH)	Tanner
Martinez	Quinn	Tauscher
Mascara	Radanovich	Tauzin
Matsui	Rahall	Taylor (MS)
McCarthy (MO)	Ramstad	Taylor (NC)
McCarthy (NY)	Regula	Terry
McCrery	Reyes	Thomas
McDermott	Reynolds	Thompson (CA)
McGovern	Riley	Thompson (MS)
McHugh	Rivers	Thornberry
McInnis	Rodriguez	Thune
McIntosh	Roemer	Thurman
McIntyre	Rogan	Tiahrt
McKeon	Rogers	Tierney
McKinney	Rohrabacher	Toomey
McNulty	Ros-Lehtinen	Towns
Meehan	Rothman	Trafficant
Meeks (NY)	Roukema	Turner
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Udall (CO)
Metcalf	Royce	Udall (NM)
Mica	Rush	Upton
Millender-	Ryan (WI)	Velazquez
McDonald	Ryun (KS)	Vento
Miller (FL)	Sabo	Visclosky
Miller, Gary	Salmon	Walden
Miller, George	Sanders	Walsh
Minge	Sandlin	Wamp
Mink	Sanford	Waters
Moakley	Sawyer	Watkins
Mollohan	Saxton	Watt (NC)
Moore	Scarborough	Watts (OK)
Moran (KS)	Schaffer	Waxman
Moran (VA)	Schakowsky	Weiner
Morella	Scott	Weldon (FL)
Murtha	Sensenbrenner	Weller
Myrick	Serrano	Wexler
Nadler	Sessions	Weygand
Napolitano	Shadegg	Whitfield
Neal	Shaw	Wicker
Nethercutt	Shays	Wilson
Ney	Sherman	Wise
Northup	Sherwood	Wolf
Norwood	Shimkus	Woolsey
Nussle	Shows	Wu
Obey	Shuster	Wynn
Olver	Simpson	Young (AK)
Ortiz	Sisisky	Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Blunt Hostettler

NOT VOTING—19

Ackerman	Dickey	Oberstar
Boucher	Evans	Pascrell
Callahan	Everett	Rangel
Capps	Granger	Sanchez
Carson	Kasich	Weldon (PA)
Cooksey	McCollum	
Davis (FL)	Meek (FL)	

□ 1249

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:

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and unable to record a vote by electronic device on Roll No. 32, to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the application of the act popularly known as the "Death on the High Seas Act" to aviation inci-

dents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on Roll No. 32.

Mr. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 32, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 669, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 41

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 41, the Mass Immigration Reduction Act.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 103 of Public Law 99-371 (20 U.S.C. 4303), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University:

Mr. LAHOOD of Illinois.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 1505 of Public Law 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 4412), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76h(a)), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts:

Mr. PORTER of Illinois.
There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 94-304 as amended by section 1 of Public Law 99-7, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Chairman.
There was no objection.

THE REPUBLICANS TAKE ACTION ON IMPROVING SCHOOLS

(Mr. SOUDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot today and we will hear a lot more in the future about who is saving social security, but there is a key fact we should keep in mind. That is, for 40 years the Democrats held control of this House. The number of times they worked to save social security was somewhere around zero.

The important thing here is not whether we talk, but whether we do. Today in the Committee on Education and the Workforce we are considering a bill called Ed-Flex, to give local and State governments more flexibility, and allowing school boards more flexibility in education. Similar bills are being considered on the Senate floor. We are actually doing something about what other people talk about. It is a bipartisan effort. The gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and others from both sides of the aisle are reaching forth.

Will the Democratic Party join with us in trying to give flexibility? I will refer to two articles, which I will insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD along with these remarks. One is from Steve Gordon, president of the East Allen County School Board, saying, States should fight Federal meddling in the schools. We don't need a national school board in Washington. We need to give more flexibility to local school boards and States.

Another is a letter to the editor praising Concordia High School in my district, which is the largest Lutheran high school in the country, for their drug testing programs. At the local level people are doing things, not just talking.

The letters referred to are as follows:
[From the Ft. Wayne News Sentinel, Feb. 22, 1999]

STATE SHOULD FIGHT FEDERAL MEDDLING IN SCHOOLS

With the start of the new legislative year, one issue that always comes up is education. Of course, the president, governor and every

legislator have this issue near the top of their agendas.

The president used his State of the Union speech to address aspects of education, and I would like to respond. He recommends bringing public education more under the authority of the federal government. He also makes some points that should be common-sense to most Americans, but to him are more of a revelation that only the federal government should implement.

His first point was to end social promotion. Children should not graduate with a diploma they can't read. Who could possibly oppose this? Already schools—at the local level—are endeavoring to ensure reading skills are mastered at the earliest grade levels.

His second point was to close low-performing schools. Will the federal government decide this issue? By what standard? Indiana already examines each public school's performance and intervenes when necessary to help those schools to meet their specific needs. We don't need the federal government to transcend the state authority already in place.

His third point suggested that teachers only teach subjects they are trained in. This is another local issue—one manipulated by contracts, state licensing rules and course offerings requested by students. What we at the local level need is greater flexibility in putting qualified teachers into the classroom. Indiana should modify the licensing procedure to allow people to teach who are qualified in the material but do not necessarily have a major in education.

An example is: Schools are in great need of vocational program teachers. People who have vocational skills but may not meet licensing requirements could pass their experience on to students. For example, people just out of the military or retirees could fill this need.

His fourth point was to allow parents to choose which public school to send their child to based on school "report cards." Indiana already requires each district to publish information about schools' performance. Charter schools have been a state issue and should remain so. One aspect of charters that makes them unique is the avoidance of many current state Department of Education regulations. I suggest that if some schools can do this, all public schools should be allowed to avoid these rules.

His fifth point was to "implement sensible discipline policies." Not long ago, the president pushed through the mandatory one-year expulsion for any student who comes to school with a handgun. Every state had to make this into law. Indiana already had a law forbidding handguns to be within 1,000 feet of a school. Why was it necessary to federalize this issue?

I would like to make some suggestions in contrast to the president's agenda.

First, give real tax relief to families. When families have both parents working out of necessity, they have less time for their children. A parent waiting for the child to arrive at home is better than after-school programs. Families are paying approximately 40 percent of their income to taxes. One parent is effectively working just to pay the government. Children need their parents—not another government program!

Second, do not generalize when talking about education. Every school has unique problems—and many have unique successes. Create opportunities for all schools to succeed in the areas that they want and need. Rather than add more bureaucracy, remove what currently exists. Free the public schools up so that they can compete equally with private schools. It is tempting—and easy—for legislators to get their hands into the means of education. Be more concerned

about the results and leave the means implementation to the local school districts. They can better assess their specific needs and respond to them directly.

Third, let the local districts decide how to spend money. The recent "100,000 teachers" legislation is a perfect example. Considering the amount of money appropriated, it will never meet the need to hire that amount of teachers. It creates an obligation to the school districts to make up a difference that they may not have.

Finally, I would ask that education remain a local issue and that the state resist any further federal intervention. There are problems in public education, but they can be much better resolved at the local and state level. Washington doesn't need to involve itself any further.

I realize I do not have the influence on lawmakers that the president or governor may have. But I am only a school board member. I want to do what is in the best interests of students in this district. I ask parents who support these ideas to contact their representatives and tell them how they feel.

[From the Ft. Wayne Journal-Gazette, Mar. 2, 1999]

PRaise SCHOOL THAT FIGHTS DRUGS

It has long been said that one picture is worth a thousand words. Unfortunately those words do not have to be the truth or accurate. Such is the case with the Feb. 26 editorial cartoon. It infers several incorrect concepts. The first is that education will take a secondary role to drug testing at Concordia High School. One only has to look at ISTEP scores, graduation rates, percent of graduates going to college and SAT scores to refute that idea.

The second is that the testing will occupy the entire school day. Testing can be completed in a very short period of time, being minimally disruptive to the school day. For a non-drug user an inconvenience—to a drug user, surely no more disruptive than days missed because of over indulgence.

His third incorrect concept is the most damaging. His attempt to ridicule the recently announced plan for random drug testing at Concordia, by overstating his case, will give those who have a misguided belief that drug testing is evil and an invasion of privacy the belief that taking action to help prevent good kids from making bad decisions is an unworthy undertaking.

Rather than swelling up with righteous indignation over the alleged loss of privacy, I would suggest the editorial staff consider looking at the educational success gained at a high school where standards are set, expectations delineated and students and faculty are held accountable for their actions. This action to take care of a problem that occurs in every high school in this area is the act of responsible administrators and parents who are taking action rather than burying their heads in the sand.

EARNIE WILLIAMSON,
Fort Wayne.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

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

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART 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 Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

ST. JOSEPH'S DAY BREAKFAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform my colleagues about an important event, the St. Joseph's Day Breakfast, that will be held on March 18th, and I strongly urge anyone who can be present to attend. The St. Joseph's Day Breakfast is sponsored by a truly exceptional organization called the Faith and Politics Institute.

The St. Joseph's Day Breakfast celebrates the day of St. Joseph, who is the patron saint of the worker. This event brings Members of Congress together with leaders of our Nation's labor unions. As they break bread together, they will remember the religious values and the moral imperative that underlie the struggle for economic justice.

This is a bipartisan event sponsored by our colleagues the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHN LEWIS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. AMO HOUGHTON) to honor those who have acted courageously on behalf of the working men and women of our country. The St. Joseph's Day Breakfast is also the primary event of the Faith and Politics Institute, and the motto of this wonderful organization best sums up their goals and their accomplishments: spirit, community and conscience in public life.

The Faith and Politics Institute was established in 1991 as an interfaith, nonpartisan approach to reach consensus across party lines and break down the polarization that often engulfs our body. The mission of Faith and Politics seeks to provide occasions for moral reflection and spiritual community to political leaders, and draws upon the moral lessons and religious traditions to encourage civility and respect for one another and differing opinions.

These values, civility and respect, are essential to our strong democracy, and toward this end Faith and Politics have brought Mark Gerzon to Washington for private meetings a year before he led our Members into the historic bipartisan Hershey retreat.

Since its inception, the Institute has brought to Capitol Hill a combination of theological perspective, spiritual sensitivity, and political know-how as it has undertaken projects on behalf of labor, race, economic exploitation, the environment, and kindness to all. Last June this marvelous organization kicked off, with the help of General

Colin Powell, the "Congressional Conversations on Race", which is spearheaded by a bipartisan steering committee made up of equal numbers of Republican and Democrat Members.

The goal is to "evoke the potential among Members of Congress, seeking spiritual insights to provide creative moral leadership on racial issues." They have already sponsored many events to bring about a dialogue on race, and will continue to do so, understanding that the "serious of experiences to deepen Members' understandings and to strengthen their leadership in the realm of race relations" is a worthy goal.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get involved with this wonderful Institute, to go to the breakfast, if they can, because it is good for us individually and good for the country as a whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). 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 Florida (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MILLER of Florida 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 Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER 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 Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

A NATIONAL HOLIDAY FOR CESAR CHAVEZ

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember a great American leader and hero, Cesar Chavez. He was a husband, father, grandfather, labor organizer, community leader and symbol of the ongoing struggle for equal rights and equal opportunity. March 31, the birthday of Cesar Chavez, has already been declared a State holiday in my State of

California. Today I ask my colleagues to join me in making March 31 a Federal holiday so that our entire Nation can honor Cesar Chavez for his many contributions.

Cesar was the son of migrant farm workers who dedicated his life to fighting for the human rights and dignity of farm laborers. He was born on March 31, 1927, on a small farm near Yuma, Arizona, and died nearly 6 years ago in April of 1993. Over the course of his 66-year life, Cesar Chavez' work inspired millions and made him a major force in American history.

In 1962, Cesar Chavez and his family founded the National Farm Workers Association which organized thousands of farm workers to confront one of the most powerful industries in our Nation. He inspired them to join together and nonviolently demand safe and fair working conditions.

Through the use of a grape boycott, he was able to secure the first union contracts for farm workers in this country. These contracts provided farm workers with the basic services that most workers take for granted, services such as clean drinking water and sanitary facilities. Because of his fight to enforce child labor laws, farm workers could also be certain that their children would not be working side by side with them and would instead attend the migrant schools he helped to establish. In addition, Cesar Chavez made the world aware of the exposure to dangerous chemicals that farm workers and every consumer faces every day.

As a labor leader, he earned great support from unions and elected officials across the country. The movement he began continues today as the United Farm Workers of America.

Cesar Chavez' influence extends far beyond agriculture. He was instrumental in forming the Community Service Organization, one of the first civic action groups in the Mexican-American communities of California and Arizona.

He worked in urban areas, organized voter registration drives, brought complaints against mistreatment by government agencies. He taught community members how to deal with governmental, school and financial institutions and empowered many thousands to seek further advancement in education and politics. There are countless stories of judges, engineers, lawyers, teachers, church leaders, organizers and other hardworking professionals who credit Cesar Chavez as the inspiring force in their lives.

During a time of great social upheaval, he was sought out by groups from all walks of life and all religions to help bring calm with his nonviolent practices. In his fight for peace, justice, respect and self-determination, he gained the admiration and respect of millions of Americans and most Members of this House of Representatives.

Cesar Chavez will be remembered for his tireless commitment to improve the plight of farm workers, children

and the poor throughout the United States and for the inspiration his heroic efforts gave to so many Americans.

We in Congress must make certain that the movement Cesar Chavez began and the timeless lessons of justice and fairness he taught be preserved and honored in our national conscience. To make sure that these fundamental principles are never forgotten, I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 22 which would declare March 31 as a Federal holiday in honor of Cesar Chavez. In the words of Cesar and the United Farm Workers, *si se puede, yes, we can.*

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

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

FISCAL DISCIPLINE AND REDUCING THE DEBT

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

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we stand on a threshold of a truly remarkable time, a time when we will be able to do wonderful things for this country and for our children.

In fiscal year 2001, we will have for the first time in decades a surplus in our budget, in the general fund budget. What we do with this surplus will tell a great deal about us, about our resolve, about how serious we are in providing a strong, fiscally sound country for those who come after us.

Some would have us spend this surplus on a multitude of well-intentioned programs and initiatives. But this is a time for restraint, not largesse. Others would have us return the surplus to the American people in the form of broad, across-the-board tax cuts. But for the average taxpayer, that would provide a small short-term gain when we have the ability to provide a much longer term and larger benefit.

That benefit can be provided if we use this projected surplus over the next 15 years to keep the budget balanced and pay down the national debt.

Under the administration's debt reduction program, our debt payments will be reduced from today's level of 14 percent of the national budget to only 2 percent by the year 2015.

The numbers are huge. We owe in public debt \$3.7 trillion. Under the President's debt reduction plan, that would be reduced to \$1.3 trillion by 2015. This would be an immense gift to the American people, and it would benefit all Americans, families, farmers and businesses. It would provide a real long-term benefit to almost every economic level of American society, unlike a broad, across-the-board tax cut

as proposed that would mean little more to the average American than \$100 a year in a tax cut.

The biggest effect of paying down our debt would be a further reduction in interest rates that would save homeowners thousands of dollars in mortgage payments. The burden of loans shouldered by our college students would be greatly alleviated. Our farmers would be able to save thousands of dollars on their equipment purchases which in turn would allow them to be more efficient and increase their yields.

With lower interest rates, industry would have more to invest in new technologies and there would be more money to invest in education, in transportation and other infrastructure improvements that would make the America of the 21st century even stronger than the last.

The importance of reducing the debt, however, can be measured in more ways than just dollars and cents. If we show courage and restraint, if we demonstrate that we too can finally live within budgetary guidelines, if we only do in Washington what American families have to do every day at home, we will restore much of the trust that has been lost in government by the American people.

We talk about bipartisanship. Now is the time to begin practicing it. I urge all Democrats and my friends on the Republican side of the aisle as well to do what is prudent, to do what is right, to do something for their children and grandchildren that will be a lasting legacy. Keep the budget balanced and use the surplus to pay down the debt.

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

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

FISCAL DISCIPLINE AND REDUCING THE DEBT

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge fiscal discipline and fiscal responsibility as we work on the budget for the next fiscal year.

Back in the 1980s when we were running up our yearly deficits and consequently our overall Federal debt, there was a phrase that politicians used to utter in dealing with the problem which was, "The balanced budget has no constituency," which is to say that when you spend money or cut taxes, there is somebody or some group of somebodies who are going to be happy about it. It has a constituency that you can please.

Who benefits from the balanced budget? Who specifically? Well, obviously

the entire public, both present and future, of our Nation benefits from it, but in purely political terms, those folks in the 1980s and 1990s had a point. The constituencies were definitely more well defined for all of the programs and tax cuts that were being proposed and passed. I just stand up today to say that fiscal discipline and fiscal responsibility should still be a priority.

Since I have been elected to Congress, a lot of folks have been talking to me about what it means to be a Congressman, how can in essence you prove that you have done a good job. I talk a lot about my emphasis on fiscal responsibility and balancing the budget and there tends to be this look like, "Well, that's just not good enough." As they like to say, you have to have something to bring home, something to put your name on, whether it is a new bridge, a new bus stop in your district, a new swimming pool, you name it, something that you went back there and fought for Federal money to bring home. I understand that. In fact, I will say that many if not most of all of these programs are indeed worthwhile. Spending money on all of those things will help the district, help the State, help the future of the country.

But we also have to remember that we need to be fiscally responsible because, a couple of reasons: First of all, in the future, folks are going to need all of those things as well and if we spend all their money now, they are not going to have them. And second of all, when you run debt up too high, you drag down the economy, drive up interest rates and create job loss, which makes it even more necessary to spend Federal money and it becomes a downward spiral.

What I want people to recognize is that being fiscally responsible and paying down the debt does have a constituency. That is the legacy that I want to leave in my district. I think that is something to bring home, to go back to the people of the Ninth District of the State of Washington or any other district in the country and say, "Yes, maybe I didn't fight for every last Federal dollar but I fought to balance the budget for your benefit, your children's benefit and their children's benefit." I think all politicians on both sides of the aisle should have the courage and stand up for that.

As we head towards this year's budget, there is going to be a major battle. There is incredible pressure to spend money or cut taxes in thousands of different places. The thing about it is, these programs do have some value. As I have often said, I wish just once in my time as a public official somebody would walk into my office and say, "We've got this plan to spend \$5 million on fill-in-the-blank," and I could honestly look at that person and say, "That's just a complete waste of money. That doesn't do any good for anybody and there's no way we're going to do it."

Of course when you spend money, there is always an argument that it is helping people, and it does. But you have to look at the long term as well. If we spend all the money now, we will be forfeiting and mortgaging our children's future, and that is not fair. At this particular time it is particularly frustrating, because we have a strong economy. We have unemployment of just over 4 percent, we have inflation of below 2 percent. We have a strong economy so that we do not have to spend as much money. The economy is taking care of people. The government does not have to do as much. Now is the time to be fiscally responsible, because if we do not do it now, a few years from now when the business cycle turns on us, it is going to be a thousand times more difficult, because people are going to need those programs and that help or that tax cut even more. Now is the time to be fiscally responsible, balance the budget and give something back to our future.

I think all politicians in this body should be proud to go back to their district and say, "Don't judge me by whether or not I brought you back a highway or a bridge or some other Federal program. Judge me by the fact that I had the foresight and the discipline to balance the budget and take care of our economy for today and tomorrow." That is what I think we should be doing back here in Congress, despite the overwhelming pressure to spend money. Spend it, fine. The Federal Government spends a lot of money, \$1.7 trillion. No reason we cannot spend it within our means. No reason we cannot be fiscally responsible and balance the budget. I urge that we do that as soon as possible and remember that discipline when we go into the budget battles that lie ahead this year.

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 California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

LEGISLATION TO PREVENT GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I want the last two speakers to know that I am grateful for their emphasis on fiscal responsibility and to let them know how refreshing it is to hear Members of the

other side of the aisle concentrate on reduction of debt, budget responsibility, fiscal responsibility. It gives impetus to my remarks about to be made on something that has been bothering me for 10 years and on which I have spoken at least 100 times on the floor and on which I will ask for their support when the time comes. This mainly is budget restraint through prevent government shutdown legislation.

If there ever was a clamp on our ability to balance the budget and to exude fiscal responsibility, it is the lack of a mechanism to prevent government shutdown. What have I proposed over the last 10 years which now seems to be gathering more momentum?

Everyone should recognize that on September 30, the end of the fiscal year for the Congress of the United States, for the U.S. Government, if no new budget is in place the next day, October 1, we enter into an automatic shutdown of government until a budget can be put into place. What we have resorted to in the past, as a Congress, has been temporary appropriations for 10 days, 2 months, sometimes more than that, but always with another crisis to face us at the end of that deadline on whether or not we will have a full budget.

My proposal is so simple that it cannot penetrate the consciousness of Members of Congress, and that is this: That at the end of the fiscal year, September 30, if no new budget is in place the next day, if no new budget has been passed, then the next day automatically, by instant replay, like in professional football, instant replay, there will be enacted last year's budget.

□ 1315

What will that do?

That means that forever we will avoid the possibility ever after of shutting down government because there will always be a budget in place. I ask for support of my instant replay legislation which is making the rounds now of the Members of the Congress because it makes common sense.

In the past, I have been saying that the reason my proposal has not passed is because it makes so much sense. Now I want to turn that around and say: Because it makes so much sense, and because it is vital to fiscal responsibility, and because it is vital to the reduction of the debt, and because it is vital to keep the stream of American society moving past any impasse that we might have because of budget breakdowns, I urge that we now see the light of day and pass my instant replay legislation.

No more government shutdowns, no more leaving our troops as we did in Desert Storm ready to fight that battle while the government back in Washington shut down. Can my colleagues imagine anything more disgraceful, more embarrassing, more revolting than that? My legislation would prevent that for all time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge full and constant and instant support of my instant replay legislation.

MEXICO IS NOT AGGRESSIVE IN DRUG ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. SOUDER. First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say "amen" to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) and would like to remind people who sometimes do not remember historical points and therefore are prone to repeat them is, as one of the so-called firebrands of the Class of 1994, I supported Mr. GEKAS and other similar legislation from the beginning, as we did before the government shutdown.

The fact is that it was not the House that shut down the government, it will not be the House that shuts down the government, and it should not be, which is why we need to pass this legislation. We have been for this all the way along.

Others would like to make it look like unless they get their way in the appropriation bills that we are the bad guys, but that is different from the truth, and it is put up or shut up time. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) has had this bill for year after year. Where are the cosponsors who like to whine about the threat of a government shutdown? Why are they not backing his bill?

But I came down here today to talk about the drug issue. In the last few days, the President has certified Mexico as a cooperating partner in the war against drugs, and I would like to comment particularly on that subject. Although in the Committee on Education and the Workforce we are continuing to work with the Drug-free Schools Act, Safe and Drug-free Schools Act, we are continuing to work with treatment programs and many other areas, right now the focus is and should be on interdiction, because there is only so much schools can do in Indiana and around the country if they are flooded with this huge supply of high-grade cocaine, heroin, marijuana that has been coming in mostly through the Mexican border and increasingly through the Mexican border and is produced predominantly in three countries in the world: Peru, Bolivia and Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, we need to understand that we, while we can argue whether this is a cancer or a war, it is, in fact, both because there is a war going on in South America. Two countries have made tremendous progress: Peru and Bolivia. It shows that we can actually reduce the coca bean grown, reduce the cocaine being processed and reduce the cocaine being shipped.

In Columbia, there is a battle on the ground; and, in Mexico, it is a little bit bigger question because it is clear that some of the people, or most, as far as we can tell, of the people in their government are attempting to cooperate with us. It is not clear that we have had such cooperation in the past, and many of the proposals are relatively new on the table.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) of the Subcommittee on Drug Policy on the Committee on Government Reform took a CODEL to Central and South America that just arrived back a little over a week ago, and we spent 3 days in Mexico, and I would like to put into the RECORD a list of different things that Mexico has actually been doing in the past year:

PGR—PROCURADURIA GENERAL DE LA REPUBLICA, FEBRUARY 19, 1999

Overall Reform of Mexico's Law Enforcement Legal System—Key Points—Legal, Institutional Reorganization, and Human Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL REFORMS

Articles 16 and 19: Increased balance in order to present proof of the "probable cause" of the crime and obtain arrest warrants, and orders of formal incarceration (submission to criminal proceeding).

Article 22: Forfeiture of organized crime proceeds in not concluded criminal proceedings (e.g., death of the offender). The intention is to avoid the simulation in the transfer of the assets to third parties.

Article 123 paragraph B fraction XIII: Police bodies depuration, dismissed police officers will not be able to demand reinstatement, and they would only be compensated.

FEDERAL ACT FOR THE CONTROL OF PRECURSOR CHEMICALS—DEC. 26, 1997, OFFICIAL GAZETTE

To prevent and locate the diversion of chemical precursors, and it regulates the chemical substances related to in the 1988 Vienna Convention against Illicit Drug Trafficking.

Fast mechanism in order to add the regulated chemical substances list.

Data Base: Increased coordination between agencies and PGR. Imports and exports exchange of information with other nations.

PROPOSED FEDERAL ACT FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF SEIZED, FORFEITED AND ABANDONED ASSETS

Objective basis for the proper administration of the proceeds of crime.

Strengthening of the legal basis for the use of the proceeds seized by the Federal Public Prosecutor in the fight against crime.

Sharing of proceeds with State, Local and Foreign governments.

Final destiny of the seized proceeds in favor of the Federal Judicial Branch and the Attorney General's Office.

Establishment of Deputy Attorney General Offices for Criminal Procedures A, B y C (Territorial distribution of the cases), Special Prosecutor's Office for the Attention of Health Related Crimes (Drug trafficking), Special Unit on Organized Crime, Special Unit against Money Laundering, and Reliability Control Center.

DISMISSAL OF BAD ELEMENTS

Imposition of 1,973 sanctions (Dec. 2, 1996 to Feb. 17, 1999), 438 dismissed, 294 disqualified, and 157 dismissed/disqualified.

Criminal charges against 317 former public servants.

TRAINING

Participation of DEA, and FBI. National Police of Spain, National Police of France, Canadian Royal Mounted Police, and Police of Israel.

NEW FRINGE BENEFITS FOR THE PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN THE FIGHT AGAINST DRUG TRAFFICKING

Civil Service regulations, major medical expenses insurance ("Premier"), Life insurance (major risk—100 thousand to 400 thousand dollars), additional salary to compensate risks, and bonuses for relevant actions.

BINATIONAL SEMINAR ON MEXICO-US LEGAL TRAINING

It is focused on the knowledge of legal provisions and investigation techniques in both countries.

Its objective is to provide participants with a wider and clearer comprehension of the legal systems, the structures and means of law enforcement in Mexico and the US.

RELIABILITY CONTROL CENTER

It was established on May 2, 1997, performs evaluations (vetting) for the detection of the reliability of the personnel. Applies the following evaluations: Medical, toxicological, psychological, family background and financial situation, and polygraph or lie detector.

RELIABILITY CONTROL CENTER

The evaluations are applied to newly recruited public servants, and All individuals working in FEADS, UEDO, and UCLD.

Periodical evaluations are applied to all the employees of the Attorney General's Office (PGR). 60% of the people tested have been rejected or dismissed.

SEALING OPERATION

The following agencies of the Mexican Government participate in the sealing operations—Attorney General's Office (PGR), Ministry of the Interior (SG), Ministry of National Defense (SDN), Ministry of the Navy (SM-AM), Ministry of Communications and Transport (SCT)—Federal Highway Police, and Ministry of the Treasury (SHCP)—Fiscal Police.

The operation sealing includes—Early warning operations, identification and interdiction of suspicious targets, air, land and sea interdiction, patrolling, control of land, sea and air collateral elements that support drug trafficking, creation of a comprehensive communications system, coordination with the authorities of Guatemala and Belize, and organization of an intelligence scheme.

The sealing operation covers the following geographical areas—Gulf of California—States: Baja California, Baja California Sur, Sonora, Sinaloa, and Nayarit. Land: 419,049 km². Litorals: 3,525 km.

Peninsula of Yucatán—States: Campeche, Yucatán, and Quintana Roo. Land: 132,426 km². Litorals: 1,740 km.

Southern Border—States: Chiapas and Tabasco. Land: 30,783 km². Litorals: 300 km.

In the near future the efforts of the Sealing Operation will also cover the State of Tamaulipas.

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF THE NEW STRATEGY

1. Intensify the fight against production and traffic of drugs by doing the following: A higher control in the access, transit and exit of drugs. The sealing of borders, coasts, maritime ports and airports, and the eradication of illicit drug crops.

2. Procure new systems of detection, destruction, tracing, register and response. Helicopters with advanced equipment of—Navigation, overnight operation, and coded communications. 40 speedboats (there is a current inventory of 20 and the rest will be purchased next year). 8 gunboats "Holzinger 2000" equipped with high speed interdiction boats (more than 50 knots) and a helicopter.

3 "Centenario" corvettes equipment with—1 high speed intercepting boat. 2 "Caribe" patrols for low waters. 144 speedboats (already existing) for coast and riverside patrolling.

Counternarcotics equipment at ports, airports, roads and border crossings, equipped with X-rays—"Mobile Search" (current inventory of 5 and 8 will be purchased next year), "Cargo Search" for the inspection of containers at ports, "Body Search" and "Buster" in ports, airports and border crossings, and dog units for drug detection.

The following will be used for the eradication of illicit drug crops—35 fast surveillance aircraft. 64 helicopters (24 will be purchased during this year and the next), and autonomous access to satellite images and precise aerial photographs to detect illicit drug crops and verify its effective eradication.

3. Strengthening the coordination between the PGR, SEDENA and SEMAR.

4. Create a control center within the PGR to coordinate the counter-narcotics operations, joint, interinstitutional, and multidisciplinary.

5. Utilize Air Platforms in the combat to drug trafficking, 7 air platforms with cruising range of 9 to 12 hours. Equipped with—long range, high resolution air radars, long range electronic-optical sensors, and high technology cruising systems.

6. Renew the distribution of the air, sea and land reaction forces.

7. Apply Trust Control procedures to counternarcotics personnel, in addition to those applied by the PGR.

8. Increase the budget for the purchase of tracing and interdiction infrastructure.

Mexico has been the world's leader in the eradication of crops since 1994. It is an effort coordinated by the Attorney General's Office, the Ministry of National Defense and the Ministry of the Navy, among other. There is a continuous growth of efforts, and the methods used are air spraying and manual eradication.

Juárez Cartel—The dismantling of this organization began with the drug-trafficking protection activities performed by General Jesús Gutiérrez Rebollo. More than 100 arrest warrants were issued, and millions of dollars were seized corresponding to various real properties and documents that allow the identification of money laundering activities.

Tijuana Cartel—16 members of the criminal organization of the Arellano Félix have been arrested.

Colima Cartel—5 members of this Cartel have been arrested, among which are the Amezcua Contreras brothers.

Gulf Cartel—Juan García Abrego and Oscar Malherbe were arrested, and four of its members have been apprehended.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE SPECIALIZED UNIT AGAINST MONEY LAUNDERING

The Specialized Unit against Money Laundering (UECLD) was established on January 1st, 1998. UECLD has been working in close collaboration with FEADS and UEDO, in order to coordinate the various matters related to money laundering crimes. Money laundering matters (From January 1st through December 31st 1998). Pre trial investigations, 58; Criminal proceedings, 31; and Convictions, 3.

OFFICE OF THE FISCAL ATTORNEY OF THE FEDERATION

Contributes with the PGR in the fight against money laundering by presenting accusations and criminal complaints on the probable commission of such crimes.

Accusations and complaints presented, (December 1994 to February 1999). Article 115 Bis of the Federal Fiscal Code (repealed), 47; and Article 400 Bis of the Federal Penal Code, 19.

International Cooperation Principles, full respect to—The sovereignty of both countries, the territorial jurisdiction, and the domestic law.

TIJUANA—SAN DIEGO GROUP

Personnel, 21 elements vetted and trained. Functions, intelligence investigations in all the national territory in order to locate the Arellano Félix brothers.

Information exchange, this group will be supported by the Border Task Forces,

FEADS, CENDRO and all PGR structure. Meetings to coordinate and exchange information with a similar group in San Diego, California are also taking place.

EXTRADITIONS IN PROCESS—FIGURES UPDATED TO FEBRUARY 13, 1999

Active (Mexico requests to other countries), Total 383; with the U.S.—355, 92.6%.

Passive (Requests made to Mexico by other countries), Total 235; from the U.S.—210, 89.3%.

Application of the provisions to prevent and detect transactions carried out with resources from illicit origin.

Suspicious transaction reports, 715; concerning transaction reports, 31; and large value transaction reports, 5,623,665.

Mexican citizens surrendered in extradition to the U.S.

Mexicans by naturalization: John Amos Devries (Robbery/fraud 07/27/95), Leslie Worttemberg Kenneth (Drug Trafficking 01/19/96), and Dominick Espósito Joseph (Drug trafficking 06/12/96).

Native Mexicans: Francisco Gómez García (Sexual Abuse 04/17/96), Aaron Morel Lebaron (Criminal Association 04/25/96), Delia Cantú de Sánchez (Sexual Assault 03/04/98), Rosendo Gutiérrez Rojero (Sexual Abuse 10/15/98), and Bernardo Velárdes López (Drug trafficking/Homicide of a BP agent 11/06/98).

Mexican citizens subject to extradition proceeding at the 1st step (Not Compulsory Opinion of the District Judge).

Gerardo Álvarez Vázquez (Drug trafficking 12/03/97), Miguel Ángel Martínez Mtz. (Drug trafficking 06/08/98), and Luis Amezcua Contreras (Drug trafficking 10/08/98). (All provisional arrest.)

Extraditions of Mexicans already granted pending an amparo (all of them in drug trafficking related crimes).

Date on which the extradition was granted by the Secretary of State of Mexico. Tirzo Ángel Robles, 02/28/97; Jaime Arturo Ladino, 09/04/97; Juan Ángel Salinas, 12/16/97; Everardo Arturo Páez, 05/04/98; Florentino Blanco, 05/08/98; and José de Jesús Amezcua, 12/10/98.

Mexican citizens tried under Article 4 of the Federal Penal Code (important cases).

Oscar Malherbe de León, Drug trafficking/criminal association; David Alex Alvarez, "Spooky", Homicide/illegal deprivation of freedom; José Eustaquio Chávez Laines*, Homicide/drug trafficking; Jaime González Castro, Drug trafficking; Gildardo Martínez López**, Money laundering; Carlos Escoto Alcalá**, Money laundering; Miguel Ángel Barba Martín**, Money laundering; Jorge Milton Díaz**, Money laundering; José Sergio Calderón Fdz.**, Money laundering; and Lionel Barajas, Homicide.

* Convicted.

** Operation Casablanca. At present in process.

BROWNSVILLE LETTER

Signed on July 2, 1998 between Attorney Generals Reno and Madrazo establishing commitments in order to improve cooperation and to regain confidence between both countries.

Based on the Letter, both countries signed a Memorandum of Understanding on procedures for cooperation regarding law enforcement activities.

Likewise, authorities of Mexico and the U.S. have been working on effectiveness measures for a bilateral, objective, transparent, and balanced evaluation of the efforts of both countries in the fight against drug trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to acknowledge, as frustrated as I and other Members are with Mexico, the fact is is they are attempting to make progress. Now that is different from

saying that they have made progress. Yes, they have continued to eradicate marijuana, they have fallen behind some in some of their efforts for interdiction on cocaine, and we need those efforts back up. They have not extradited people that we have asked to be extradited, but they have started the process to extradite.

But there are a couple of facts that make this a very difficult vote should it come to that here in Congress. One is, for all the current plans and efforts that they have done in this past year, there are a couple of irrevocable facts. One is, their drug czar was living in an apartment owned by one under the name of one cartel member. Through that compromised drug czar, who was actually on the take from the cartel, potentially every single source we have in Mexico was compromised.

It is going to be very difficult to rebuild a relationship of trust when you have potentially blown every single source you have worked to develop over decades when they have the brother of the President being involved in the assassination of a presidential candidate, when they have people high up in their military, we learn that they are on the take from the drug cartel.

These are not little low-level occasional problems. When we have the DEA unable to go into regional parts of their country, we have substantive problems we have to address with Mexico.

The North American Free Trade Agreement, often referred to along the border and in other parts of the country as the North American Free Drug Trading Act, is something that has opened up the borders, and we have to get control of those borders. But we must not forget much of what we know about the corruption in the Mexican government is because leaders of Mexico have in fact identified those leaders for us and acknowledged that they have to clean it up. The fact is is they have started and have proposals on the table to work through extradition, to work through rebuilding their navy. We need a maritime agreement, but one of their comebacks to us is, as my colleagues know: Your government never asked us to sign the maritime agreement.

Part of our argument in Congress is with our own administration, and it is tough to put all the blame on Mexico. I say that as somebody who, for my 4 years here in Congress, has been steadily pounding on Mexico because I believe they have not been aggressive enough in drug enforcement. I have had several amendments related to Mexico, and I am not certain how I am going to vote. But it is not a clear-cut case, and we need to continue to encourage the current government.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the

5-minute special order of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

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

There was no objection.

LIBERALS THINK WASHINGTON KNOWS HOW TO SPEND AMERICANS' MONEY BETTER THAN THEY DO

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) on his plan. It is something that we have supported since 1995 and had the President and also Members of this Chamber on the left supported the same thing. Then when the President vetoed the nine appropriation bills in 1995 that shut down the government, that could have been avoided. I hope that we will be willing to do that in the future.

I was very, very interested to hear our Democratic friends talk about fiscal responsibility and talking about how the saying went that the balanced budget has no constituency. Mr. Speaker, I can tell my colleagues one person that cared about it in 1993 while he was sitting on the couch watching C-Span in the summer in Pensacola, Florida, was myself.

I remember in 1993 watching the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and a band of young Republican conservatives come to this floor and fight the President and the liberal left's plans to pass the largest tax increase in the history of this Republic. See, their vision of America then and now has been that if we want to balance the budget, the only way we can do it is by raiding the pockets of taxpayers.

In fact, we had some insight on this about a month ago when the President went up to Buffalo, New York, and he told the people in the audience that we really have to avoid this idea that the Republicans have that we are going to cut taxes. The President said to that Buffalo audience:

We could give you money back and hope that you spend it on the right things, but we cannot trust you, basically.

As my colleagues know, what a vision for America. What a sad, tired, worn-out vision for America. It is a vision that is radically different from what the Republican party believes.

GOP, as far as I believe, stands for government of the people. We believe people know how to spend their money better than bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. That is why I ran for office in 1994. I saw the President's budget and the Democrats' budget that passed without a single Republican vote, and I saw that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and the rest of the Republicans laid out a blueprint, and we said:

Let us balance the budget in 7 years, and if we balance the budget in 7 years, then the economy will explode.

Now the President said that we could not do this because this would destroy the economy, and how many liberals did I hear come to the floor and speak into this microphone and tell the American people if we tried to balance the budget in 7 years, the economy would be wrecked? Boy, talk about a rewriting of history. Now they talk about the Clinton recovery?

I remember Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Fed, testifying before the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH's) committee, and he said:

If you guys and ladies will only pass this balanced budget plan, you will see interest rates go down, you will see unemployment go down, and you will see one of the largest peace-time economic expansions in the history of our country.

That is what Alan Greenspan said. And do my colleagues know what? It is a good thing we listened to the economic intelligence of Alan Greenspan instead of the demagoguery that came from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, because we stayed the course, we fought the good fight, and we took a deficit from \$300 billion when we got here in 1995 down to a point where it is almost balanced.

Mr. Speaker, the news only gets better. We find out this past week that the CBO is now saying:

If Congress and the President do nothing, then the \$5.4 trillion debt that threatens my children's economic future and all of America's economic future will virtually be eradicated in 15 years.

But the question is:

Can the President and those on the left leave well enough alone?

See, we have got these horrible little things called budget caps, a road map for fiscal responsibility, and they think this is a bad thing. In fact, the President sees his only way out is by doing what he did in 1993 and what Democrats have done for 40 years. He says, let us take it from the American people; they do not know how to spend their money. Let us raise taxes by billions and billions of dollars. That is in the President's budget. That is the President's plan.

My gosh, if we talk about cutting taxes, how about cutting taxes for Americans that make from 45 to \$60,000? Raising the threshold? What if we talk about cutting capital gains taxes that actually helps so many Americans, helps grow the economy? They say that is a bad thing. I disagree.

Unlike the liberals, I still believe Americans know how to spend their money better than Washington, D.C.

KEY OBJECTIVES OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for

60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be joined in this special order with a number of Republican colleagues, two from my home State of Colorado and one from the great State of Michigan, and I would invite other members of our conference to come join us as well as we spend a little bit of time sharing with each other and with our colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle and indeed the American people the values and beliefs that we stand for and that we, as a Republican party, hope to move forward on the floor of the House.

Among those are key objectives of this session: tax relief for the American people, a strong national defense, a world-class education system, and Social Security reform in a way that guarantees and safeguards the Social Security system.

Mr. Speaker, part of that discussion also entails some international issues that I know at least one Member is prepared to talk about, and with that I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) who had a unique experience with one of his elementary schools in his district that I think all of us would benefit learning more about.

□ 1330

Mr. TANCREDO. I thank the gentleman. It truly was. Of the 25 or more years that I have spent in public life, this was perhaps the most significant and most moving experience I think I have had.

I visited a class, a fourth and fifth grade class at Highline Community School in my district. It is a public school in the Cherry Creek School District. Why this school is unique, and it certainly is unique, and that is a word that gets thrown around a lot, oftentimes misused, because it really means nothing else like it. But I can use it appropriately and correctly in describing this particular school.

Actually, this particular class and their teacher, Mrs. Vogel, about a year ago this class studied or actually had to just read a little tract that was discussing the situation in the Sudan, particularly the situation of slavery in the Sudan.

The Sudan, as we know, is a troubled country with a history of civil war now that has gone on for about 8 or 10 years that has cost almost 2 million lives. More people have died in this struggle than in any war since World War II. This is absolutely amazing that we pay so little attention to it. That was really the concern raised by the students and the teacher.

They said, how can this be happening? How can slavery be happening in this day and age, medieval slavery be occurring in the world someplace today, and nobody knows or no one cares? So they set about to do something about it. They started an organization that they now call STOP.

It has now become an international organization, and, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that this fourth and fifth grade classroom of Mrs. Vogel's has now raised over \$100,000 worldwide, and has redeemed, has purchased freedom, for over 1,000 people in the Sudan. It is an absolutely incredible story. This classroom has done more for human rights in the Sudan than this administration, I assure the Members, than this government, has done.

They are not finished yet. When I was there on Monday, they had just received a fax copy of a front page article that appeared in a Tokyo newspaper about this class. It is truly an extraordinary situation. I brought them a flag, and each one of the students in the class had written me a note. I have introduced them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But I want to keep talking about this, Mr. Speaker, because few other people are. This is a land that needs our attention.

I am on the Committee on International Relations. We had the Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, in a week ago to discuss foreign policy issues. As it turns out, in a half-hour presentation, in a 30-page written document about foreign policy, every foreign policy issue we have, every country was named where we have an interest, where there is a concern, except for one. I scanned it thoroughly to watch for it, to look for it. Not one time was there a mention of the Sudan. There are horrendous things happening there that need to be brought to the attention of the American public. The attention is being brought by classrooms like this one; no, in fact, just this classroom. I wish there were more, and there will be before we get done with this.

Mr. SCHAFFER. It is a remarkable example of what a classroom can be, given the liberty and freedom to teach under the direction of a professional educator. For those students in particular, they are getting quite an education in international affairs, about how government works, about human rights, and so on.

Those young kids also ought to be concerned about their retirement and their savings, another topic that Republicans care deeply about.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) to talk about why those kids should care about the Social Security Administration.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) for organizing this one-hour session. When I yield to the gentleman from Colorado, I want you all to feel free to respond.

Mr. Speaker, let me just give my impression of what has happened, how it happened, and maybe what we have to look forward to.

In 1995, Republicans took the majority in this House, the U.S. House of Representatives. After being a minority for 40 years, we came in quite aggressively trying to promote the phi-

losophy on what we thought was going to be good for our future and for our kids and our grandkids.

We decided, with a great deal of determination, that we were going to balance the budget. We cut out \$70 billion of projected spending that first year, in 1995. We pledged among ourselves that we were going to be very frugal in cutting down the size of this government in order to balance our budget, in order to not pass on the debt of this country to our kids and our grandkids.

I am a farmer. Where we grew up in Addison, Michigan, our goal was to pay off the farm so we could leave the farm to our kids, so they had a better chance of making it and surviving. We should do the same thing as a country.

We were successful. The only reason that we went from a \$300 billion deficit projected for as far as we could see, \$200 billion on out, was that we became very frugal in slowing down the increase in spending. Now we have succeeded. We have an overall unified budget surplus. Most all of that is coming from the social security surplus.

The question is, what do we do now? If part of the goal is to have a smaller, less intrusive government, should we reduce taxes? Should we pay down this \$5.5 trillion debt? Should we somehow make the adjustments into capital investments, hopefully in individuals' names for social security, to start solving the social security problem?

Let me tell the Members what I think the fear is as Republicans try to make these tough decisions. The fear is that if we do not get this money, if you will, extra money out of town, the spenders, the tax and spenders, are going to use it for expanded government spending.

Just a comment on the President's budget. He is suggesting over \$100 billion of increased spending, almost \$100 billion over the caps that we passed in 1997 for increased spending. We could say that is coming out of the social security surplus, because that is where it is coming from.

What do we do? If we could be guaranteed that the spenders that want a bigger government, that want to tell the people of this country how they should act and where they should go and how they should do it by increasing the taxes and taking the money out of their pockets, if I could be convinced that we could hold the line on spending and the growth of this intrusive government, then I say the first choice is to pay down the public debt.

Not only does that increase the economy by reducing interest rates, but I think there is a danger of the spenders saying, look, we need this money for all of these good things, and therefore we are going to reach into that pot, if you will, of social security trust fund money and start spending it like they have for the last 40 years.

So let us look at a balance. Let us say that everything coming in from social security should be saved for social security. One way to do that is to pay

down the debt. Hopefully we will have the guts, the intestinal fortitude, to move ahead on social security. But let us also look at the other general fund surpluses to put that money back where it came from, in the pockets of this country's taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, that is sort of my speech. I think the challenge is really ahead of us. I just encourage, Mr. Speaker, everybody that is listening to contact their Congressman, contact their United States Senator, to give them your ideas and thoughts as we move ahead. The danger is that this government is going to continue to grow, it is going to continue to be more intrusive, it is going to continue to be a weight or a burden on economic expansion and development.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Back home in Colorado, there is no question that the majority of constituents that we hear from in my State are very strongly behind the belief that the era of big government is over. When we look at the President's proposed budget plan, it does entail escalated rates of spending here in Washington, additional tax increases in that budget, and just tremendous growth of the bureaucracy and the regulatory structure in Washington.

My district is on the eastern half of Colorado. My colleague from the other half of Colorado is here representing the western slope. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to change the subject for a moment, although I do recognize and appreciate the gentleman from Michigan's comments on social security.

The good news about our country is that people are living to a longer age. That is as a result of our good health in this country and the medicine and so on. But they have never adjusted anything in social security to account for that. The average couple on social security right now draws out \$118,000 more than they have put into the system. On an actuarial basis, the system is broke.

The Republicans have said for years that we have to fix it. I note that the President, in the State of the Union Address, said that he wanted to reserve a certain percentage. We have agreed to reserve that percentage. I am glad that the President has joined our long-term efforts in saying we can do it in a balanced budget way. But as the gentleman has said, I think very accurately, we have to make sure we keep the big spenders, keep their fingers out of the cookie jar.

I would like to shift for a moment, because I know my colleagues would like to talk about it, and invite the gentleman from Michigan to join us as well. That is topic of the national defense.

In Colorado, all three of us border an area called the NORAD Command Center. What they actually did in Colorado, they went into a mountain full of granite, they hollowed it out, our coun-

try did, and we put a command center inside that mountain in Colorado Springs, actually in the district of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. JOEL HEFLEY), who is considered around here as an expert in defense.

This center, among other responsibilities, detects missile launches from around the country. As many of us know, and we have been very active in complaining about this, unfortunately, the need for a strong military has been somewhat diluted because we have been in fairly peaceful times. I can assure the Members, as my colleagues would agree, that that is a very dangerous attitude to get into.

We are respected throughout the world and we are the superpower throughout the world in part because of the strong military that we have. There are a lot of people in this world who would like to take things that we have, and they will take it by force, if they ever have that opportunity. We can never afford to be second in the strength of our military.

In order to maintain or actually regain, at this point in time, the strength in our military, we have to do several things. One, the quarters that these military people sleep in and the pay that they have is very low. I last week toured a number of military barracks, and I will tell the Members, it looks like poverty housing in a large city. It is disgraceful.

We owe these young men and women that are serving in our military more than that. We need to make a commitment to put money in to bring those barracks up to at least decent living standards.

The second thing, of course, and the Republicans have taken the initiative on this, that is a pay increase for our people who serve in the military. So we have to worry about personnel. We have to get our personnel built back up again. We have got to give them benefits that will encourage our personnel to stay in the military for a career. We have to get the excitement back in the personnel that we put in there about the defense of this country.

We have very dedicated, very hard-working people that serve us today in the military, but we are testing their patience when we ask them to live in the kind of facilities they are in, and when we pay them the kind of pay we are giving to them.

The second issue that I touched on at the beginning of my remarks is the NORAD Command Center, and frankly, what we call missile defense.

For years the Democrats, and I will make this very clear, for years the Democratic administration and the Democrats in most part have opposed the Republicans' urging that we install a missile defense system in this country.

President Ronald Reagan was ridiculed, ridiculed, by the liberal media and by the liberals in the United States Congress and around parts of this country when he said, this country needs a

missile defense system. The most logical way to have a missile defense system is a space-oriented system.

All of a sudden, in the last year, the Democratic Party and the administration has turned a new leaf. They have now stepped forward and said, we are willing to have a missile defense system. It is amazing in this country how few of us out there know that this country has no missile defense system.

When I speak with my average constituent, I say, tell me, do you think the United States, if we detect a missile launch, which we detect in the NORAD facility in Colorado Springs, and by the way, our detection can tell us the size of the missile, the speed of the missile, the destination of the missile, time of firing, et cetera, et cetera.

When I tell my constituents that then the only other thing we can do is call up on the phone to the destination and say, you have an incoming missile, say a prayer, that is all we can do for you, they are stunned. Because a lot of my constituents know that we provide missile defense for the country of Israel. We provide missile defense for some of our allies' ships, because under the antiballistic missile treaty we can do that, but we do not provide it for ourselves.

Is that the finest example of ludicrous behavior we have ever seen? It is important that we put in place in this country, not just talk about it, although talking about it is an important first step. I am glad that the Democrats have joined us to talk about it. They have come over to the Republican position that the defense of this country is necessary, that we need to put missile defense in.

But we have to get beyond talking. What about a land-based system? In my opinion, the only realistic missile defense that we can put in in this country is going to have to be space-oriented. Why? A land-based system, with the technology that we have today, cannot pick up a threatening missile at the launchpad of another country. It can only pick it up once that missile is within a certain range. Maybe 100, 200 miles is when the radar picks it up and actually fires a missile against it, probably within 100 miles of the target over the land.

So if our missile here from a land-based system goes up and connects with the enemy missile, and by the way, they told me when I went and looked at our land-based system that the odds of these two missiles coming together at the same time are about the same as throwing a basketball out of Cincinnati, Ohio, and making it through the hoop in Washington, D.C.

You get about one chance on a land-based system, and if you happen to hit the incoming missile, you blow it up over the United States. If, for example, we had an incoming missile into Kansas City, they might connect with the missile somewhere over Colorado and we would have this nuclear explosion.

What makes sense on a defensive missile system is a space-oriented system that can pick up and either destroy the missile before it leaves the launchpad, or has any number of windows as the missile is coming over to our country to hit that missile.

□ 1345

And our odds of being able to come in on the directional altitude of that missile with a laser are a lot higher than the hopeful or lucky shot from a land-based system.

So, I know that I and my colleagues, we have had many discussions on it. Our constituents are concerned about it in Colorado where the detection takes place. But it is a subject that all of us have to put to the forefront so that we can offer the next generation, those young people that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) went and visited, we want to assure not only the ability to free slaves, but assure that the next generation has the best possible defense out there for these rogue nations that are willing to use a missile or a nuclear weapon against the United States of America.

The best way to do it, and finally recognized by that side of the aisle, is for us to sit down, not just talk about it, put money where our mouth is, and build that system as soon as we can. I am sure my colleagues may want to comment on it.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the topic is certainly a relevant one, but not a new one here in Congress. For years, the Republicans have been trying to point out this fact that the North American continent has no defense against a single, incoming intercontinental ballistic missile. We cannot stop it presently.

The strategy that we have suggested over the years involves several different strategies, trying to get at least two shots at a missile launched at the North American continent. I had a tour of NORAD, I have been on a few of them over the years, but just a few months back. And one of the simulations that I had seen, just in terms of the timing, is important to realize. We are talking about a missile launched from the interior of China takes about a half-hour to get to the North American continent. A half-hour is all the time we have.

What NORAD does is approximately within the first few minutes, they can identify the type of missile that is launched, can identify a potential path in the early first few minutes, can identify potential targets, and over about the first 15 minutes gets closer and closer to narrowing and defining the specific targets. It takes about 15 minutes to identify the exact city that is being targeted in such a launch.

But what a space-based laser system would allow us to do is basically shoot down those missiles in the boost phase. The technology, people think this is some technology that does not exist. This is technology that we have today.

We just have not spent the money to deploy this technology. And it is now becoming an expensive proposition. If we would have been on track and moving forward on a missile defense system over the last 6 years that the Clintons have held the White House, the cost of this would be substantially less than what we are confronted with today.

But when it comes to the reality that we are virtually defenseless after an attack has been initiated, it really causes us to put this within the context of priorities. We are spending billions of dollars in Washington on things that really do not affect the day-to-day lives of the American people. But defending our borders is one of those priorities that we need to get more serious about here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a long time coming for the President to stand here, as he did just recently, and say all of the sudden he realizes we need to develop a system to defend our country. It is a realization that I think is a step in the right direction, but it is 6 years too late, frankly, and it puts the American people at some peril.

What the White House has tried to convince the Congress over the years is that we can maintain national security through reliance on our intelligence-gathering community throughout the world. But Pakistan and India showed how reliable that system is, when Pakistan detonated five nuclear devices, frankly, when we were looking right at the site and had not figured out what was occurring.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman pointed out that he just recently toured NORAD, NORAD is probably the most sophisticated intelligence-gathering facility in the world. The other sophisticated ones happen to be under the control of the United States or on American territory also. So we have the intelligence capability.

But the intelligence does not do a lot of good once we figure there is an incoming missile, as the gentleman said. We can have all the intelligence in the world about where that missile is coming, but if we do not have a missile defense, what good is the intelligence?

Mr. SCHAFFER. That is exactly right. With the technology we have today, if it were to be employed, it virtually makes the prospect of nuclear weapons becoming obsolete a very real one. Think about that for a moment. The prospect of having nuclear weapons become obsolete basically by stepping forward and deploying the technology that makes it possible to knock down those missiles at a reliable rate in the offender's airspace before these missiles finish the boost phase or leave the enemy territory and airspace.

Mr. MCINNIS. And where the missile would discharge in the country of the person launching the missile. Then they would think twice about launching it if they knew, for example if China or Russia right now, where our big concern about Russia is an accidental launch, but if Russia decided to

launch against the United States but they knew that we could destroy that missile at some point over Russia, so we may pick a point where it has the maximum impact on Russia. They would be reluctant to launch that missile if they knew on its course it was going over Moscow and we could use a laser beam and destroy it there and have nuclear impact there. There is some serious thought about that.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the other aspect that I think needs to be understood by more Members of Congress and the American people is that the threat of this kind of warfare is really getting broader, not more constrained. Even though the Berlin Wall fell and the old line communists have lost power in Russia, in the old Soviet Union, it is the expansion of rogue nations accumulating and developing nuclear technology that we need to be more concerned about.

In fact, it was Korea that launched the Taepodong missile, the three-stage rocket, and really announced to the world that they had the capacity within a 600-mile radius to reach the North American continent in less than a half-hour. That was a real shock to all of us, but I also think it sends up a signal for all of us that we do need to elevate the level of priority in this Congress, and express that concern to the White House, that defending our borders is a high priority.

It is the reason that we, as a Republican Conference, have made this among our top four objectives in this Congress. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for our colleagues to understand and for the people listening to understand that those rogue nations are indeed becoming much more dangerous and they now pose the greatest threat to the security of the United States that has actually existed since the end of the Cold War.

One of the reasons why that is the case today is because they have technology. They have been able to improve their missile systems, they have been able to improve their guidance systems as a result of a technology that we provided for them and also as a result of the President's Executive orders that were signed that allowed that transfer of technology to go on.

Since I am the newest Member here, I had several great opportunities to discuss issues like this during various retreats and prior to actually coming and taking over or getting sworn in, and I asked every single person that came in, every single person who had a foreign policy or foreign relations or some expertise in this area, I asked them four questions: Is it true that we have transferred technology to the Chinese? Is it true that transfer was illegal? Is it true that it has jeopardized our security? And is it true that that was made as a result of these Executive orders signed by the President?

Mr. Speaker, each case, to a person, liberal, conservative, and this was at

the Kennedy School at Harvard, we had four liberal people in front of us, foreign policy specialists, and to a person they all said yes. We never had one person that disagreed with that.

When we look at the situation that we face, not only is there more nations out there with the capacity to strike the United States; now we are even more unprepared than we were in the past because of what this administration has done to our military. Not just our missile defense system, but the general preparedness of the military which has degraded dramatically over the last several years. And not only has the preparedness degraded, our ability to respond all over the world degraded, but our responses everywhere around the world. Troops continue to be sent all over the place. There a proposal to send 4,000 to Kosovo, along with the United Nations troops, that would not be under American command. Troops that would be under blue berets.

These things are being asked of American troops and boys and girls, citizens who are in the armed forces. To put their life on the line. To go in harm's way. We are not providing the support that we need to both in the housing and also in the actual equipment of war that they need to protect their lives. And we put not just them but the entire Nation at risk by the fact that we do not have the defense system that we need.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the President stood up there at the podium during his State of the Union address and boasted at the time that there were no nuclear weapons pointed at the United States of America. Just a year later, there were no less than 13 targeted at the United States by China, and done so presumably with the targeting technology and satellite communication equipment that they ended up with through the signing of the six waivers, that have been mentioned, by the Clinton administration, the President himself.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, that is exactly the point. We do not need to argue with the administration about whether or not there are missiles pointed at this country. We know. And what we have tried to convince the administration is that we should not go on the assumption that Russia is telling us the truth that they are no longer targeting the United States. We should not go on the assumption that China says, "Don't worry. We are not interested in targeting the United States."

In fact, we should go on the opposite assumption. The fact is that throughout the world, whether it is Russia or China or some terrorist organization, there will be at some point in the future of this country a threat or a missile launched against this country. We can today prepare for that.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the leading critics of the Clinton administration and what they have done to our defense and to our military. But I have deter-

mined that I am going to put my resources not as a critique of the Clinton administration necessarily, but to say to the Clinton administration, all right, the administration is finally acknowledging, as we have all discussed, thank you for finally acknowledging that we need to put money into this military. Real money into a real military. Thank you for acknowledging that we need real missile defense in this country.

We should assume that the proliferation of nuclear weapons will continue. We should assume that we cannot unilaterally disarm. And we should assume that at some point in time somebody might try and take us on. There is a reason that they call our Trident submarines, for example, "peacekeepers." Because if we are strong and we remain number one, we minimize the chances of us getting into an engagement. But we must, nonetheless, be prepared.

Mr. Speaker, I think it was George Washington who said the best way to avoid a war is to always be prepared for war. Well, as we have said here, the best way to avoid an incoming missile is to always be prepared for an incoming missile. That is our best defense. That is all we are asking of the administration. Put money in so that the best way to protect the next generation from an incoming missile is to be prepared for an incoming missile.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the delegation from Colorado. Just an observation: The air in Colorado may be thin, but its representation in Congress is very strong.

Mr. MCINNIS. Our snow is good.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out, as somebody who represents San Diego which actually is one of the largest if not the largest military complex in the world, we always think about the fact that since the sacking and burning of Washington in 1814, Americans have basically perceived themselves as being insulated from attack from across the ocean. The trouble right now is that we sort of make that assumption that our Capitol is safe. In fact I think, more importantly, we would like to make the assumption that our wives and our children and our families back at home are safe from foreign aggression.

The sad fact about it is that is not true. And I will just ask anybody if they want to think that this is not an important issue to do as I was able to do. Talk to the parents who lived in Tel Aviv at the time the scuds were coming into Tel Aviv in Israel, and talk to those parents about the difference of being soldiers in the field as opposed to being parents at home and the fear of their children having missiles rained down on them. That really made an impression on me and really changed my attitude a lot of ways about missile defense capabilities.

Now, I have got to say that when I came here a few years ago to Washington, I was really shocked, in fact dumbfounded, that there were people here in Congress who sat on a certain side of the aisle that would vote for a missile defense system if that missile defense system would defend another country. But at the same time there would be a motion made by somebody on the Republican side, and I hate to do this but it tended to draw along partisan lines, if somebody proposed that the missile defense systems that we were developing would be used to defend our own children or our own families, they voted against that funding.

I just shook my head. I have to say this as somebody who believes in rights and responsibilities, that if the taxpayers of the United States are going to bear the responsibility of developing missile defense systems, how in the world can those who claim to represent those taxpayers not allow that defense system to defend those taxpayers?

□ 1400

It is astonishing how shortsighted people can be. For a long time, people did not think about the fact that our troops could have missiles rain down on them when they were in a tactical situation. All at once, now it is universally accepted by Democrat, Republican, Independent, left and right, that a theater defense system is not only appropriate, it is essential if we are going to defend our troops in the field.

What is sad is, are we going to wait until the missiles land in our neighborhood before the same enlightenment applies for defending our sovereign territory here in North America? What is really scary is, what does it take to learn.

I think that maybe what it takes to learn is that a lot of Americans before 1814 thought the Capitol was safe because of our big Atlantic Ocean. After the sacking and burning of this Capitol and this city, there was a lot different attitude about national defense.

I hope that we are able to learn from other countries' experiences rather than having to wait for those disasters to actually end up in our own neighborhood.

Let me point out, I will say this clearly, and I think any Member of Congress will say this, the only thing worse than seeing our Capitol destroyed would be watching our neighborhoods at home destroyed. We have a responsibility to defend that and to add that. I do not think it is something that is pie in the sky. I do not think it is something that is outside.

I think we saw what American ingenuity did with a glorified P.C. computer and a missile defense system that was never meant to be a missile defense system. It was supposed to go after airplanes. But Americans and American ingenuity can conquer this problem and defend our neighborhoods. I think we have to have the trust and commitment to get the job done.

We spend billions and billions to go all over the world to protect everybody else's neighborhood. Doggone it, we have the responsibility to do the same for our own.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the Patriot System we all watched during the Desert Storm conflict was something that we celebrated, and I think most Americans found to be rather remarkable. But we had the ability in a theater missile defense structure to have a relatively high success rate of shooting down incoming missiles with respect to the attacks on Israel.

But once again, the discussion about a national missile defense system as it relates to an intercontinental scenario is a defense system that we just do not have and does not exist today.

Again, the scientists, those who are involved just from the research and technology side, have developed the technology to defend our country. It is just a matter of making it a priority and putting the pieces in place here politically to make that defense system a reality. That is what we are going to be pushing for this year.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield just very briefly, I am sure that, when we get back to our office, somebody will call up and say, "Are you guys aware of what is called the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty?"

Just very quickly, to run through that again, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, the basis or premise for it was that Russia got together with the United States and said, "All right, the best way for us to provide security that we will not have a conflict between each other is neither one of us will build a missile defense system. That way, we will be hesitant to attack each other because we do not have anything to defend ourselves."

For example, the United States, under the theory of this treaty, would not attack Russia because they would not have any way to defend themselves from Russia's retaliation.

Well, those days of that treaty are over. If one reads the treaty, the treaty can be abrogated by the United States and by Russia. It is foolish for us to continue under the pretense that this treaty is going to preserve us from an incoming missile attack at some point in time by some rogue nation.

At the time this was signed, technology was different, the thoughts were different, the atmosphere was different, and the number of countries that had this kind of weaponry was different.

So I think it is important, as the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) and I have discussed, do not let that ABM Treaty be a diversion from what is a necessary and, frankly, an obligation of this Congress and to the people of this country for this generation and future generations to defend our country.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we, in discussing

what should be higher priorities here in this Congress, not only with respect to our attention, but also with respect to budgeting and the finances, many may wonder how it is that the gentleman and I and others like us believe that we should balance the budget and do it continuously, second, establish the priorities that allow us to rescue the Social Security system, provide for a world class education system and defense system, as well as provide tax relief for the American people.

I want to kind of switch the subject by talking about another issue we are concerned about, but it really is all within the context of priorities. The President, in his latest budget, has proposed \$10 and a quarter billion for what amounts to a land grant, the Federal Government purchasing more land, primarily in our State and out in the West under the Lands Legacy Initiative.

This is one of the things, when the President and others who believe what he does, that the Federal Government should increase the ownership of property, decreasing the amount of private ownership of property in America, that some are inspired by that. There is no question about that.

But, in reality, what proposals like this do is, first of all, it takes valuable land out of private ownership. These lands are taxed by our local school districts, by local communities, provide necessary funds for education, for street, and road improvements, for county budgets, and so on.

But the other thing it does, by removing that land from private ownership and putting it into the government's pocket, it results in restricted liberty and freedom of the American people.

For the gentleman and I who represent a great western State, our heritage is built upon the land and land ownership and sound management of natural resources in a way that has really created a thriving economy among western States.

So I use that as an example, and perhaps the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) and I would talk further just about the effect of the Clinton administration, the Federal Government's perspective on these western land-related issues.

But, once again, I point out that this is an area where the administration's priorities are different than the Congress'. We believe in defending the country, creating great schools. The President obviously believes in having the Federal Government purchase more land that is better managed under private ownership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank gentleman for yielding to me. This issue of course crosses party lines. It is a bipartisan issue. It is the question of how much land should the Federal Government be allowed to continue to buy up, take out of the private market-

place, and to put under government hands and government management.

I have often heard some of the special interest environmental groups try and educate the American public thinking that the government every day sells away land and gives land to mining companies and timber companies, and the land is being destroyed by millions of acres. In fact, just the opposite is true. You see dwindling industries, not just because of this, but in part related to this, you see dwindling industries in timber and so on.

What you see is the government acquiring land. The government is a net acquirer. In other words, the government acquires more land than it gets rid of by many, many, many multiples. The government does not sell very much land. If they sell, it is for a right-of-way or they may do a land swap or something like that.

But if one takes a look across this country, when one looks at the different lottos that are used to buy open space, the different kind of funds that local municipalities and areas have dedicated of taxpayers' money to buy land from the private marketplace and to put it into the government hands, and then you consider proposals when the President of the United States is willing to go out and spend billions and billions of dollars to take more land away from the American people and put it into the government, I mean, I am not sure that is the right answer.

Clearly, all of us with today's technology have to be more concerned about what do we do for the preservation for future generations of the land we have. But I think the best managers of the land most obvious, not always, but most often are the people that live the land, the people that live off the land, the people that work the land, the people that enjoy the beauty of the land.

You must always be suspicious when the government shows up and says we are here to help. We have better ideas than you do. The better ideas come out of Washington, not out of Colorado.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Absolutely.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, as the government buys, for example, wilderness areas, the first thing you do is you take away local control. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) and I have discussed this on a number of issues.

The gentleman has a vast district in eastern Colorado, some of the most beautiful, I think, some of the most beautiful plains in the United States. I adjoin him, and I have the western part of the State of Colorado which we think are the most beautiful set of mountains. We share those beautiful mountains with States like Utah, Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming, but the Rocky Mountain range.

There are certain areas there that are owned by the government, and the government should retain the ownership of that. But we must make sure that the concept of multiple use stays

in place. We have to be careful because, what else happens, is when the government buys land, they drive up the price for everybody else.

It is very hard today to find one's children or my children desire to go out and be a farmer, especially in our areas where the government has driven up the price of land because they are out acquiring the land. We have to encourage good and prudent management of the land, whether it is in the government hands or whether it is in private hands.

But I am not sure the answer is always to take it out of private hands and put it into government hands and one is going to end up with better management. Sometimes that might be the answer, but not always.

The American people need to be aware of how many thousands of acres every day across this country, through one government agency or another, at one level, local, clear up to national, go from private hands into public hands.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Absolutely. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the best stewards of the land, the best environmentalists are the farmers, the ranchers, the private landowners who have a future at stake in the ownership of that land. This is what they want to hand down to their children.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a heritage, like the gentleman said.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, it absolutely is. For us in Colorado, this is what defines our State. This is part of our culture in the western States. We have some of the most beautiful vistas and greatest natural resources, some private, some public, but in all cases, these are resources that, when managed well, the extraction of minerals or the sound timber management actually improves the environmental quality, particularly with respect to timber.

Let me talk about that for a moment, because the timber industry in the west, after, not only the poor policies that are put forward by the Forest Service these days, but also the misapplication of the Endangered Species Act, there are very, very few mills left in States like ours.

But what we are discovering is that active forest management, from a scientific perspective, actually improves overall forest health. What we are seeing out in the West today are devastating forest fires that burn far more intensely than ever before. We are seeing the pine beetle infestation in western States, which is an infestation at escalated levels primarily as a result of the poor condition of government-owned forests in western States.

When these trees begin to grow too closely together, they start competing for nutrients, for water. They prevent the snowpack from getting to the surface of the forest floor, and it respirates much quicker than would be natural.

As a result, these trees begin to undergo a certain amount of stress. Once they become stressed, these beetles

move in, these trees die, they become brittle, they become dry. It really sets up the West for some of these devastating forest fires that get worse and worse year after year after year.

But there is one interesting thing about these forest fires. Sometimes they tend to stop along straight lines. I have flown over some of the old burned areas, and I have never seen anything like it before. It is really remarkable.

These forest fires will burn, and they will stop along pretty much a straight line in some cases. The difference between the side that burned to the ground and the side that is still green and standing and flourishing and providing habitat for wildlife is that the government owns the land that was not well managed and not well taken care of. Private owners are managing the land that is still green today, still providing critical habitat for wildlife and so on.

The bottom line is the Federal Government owns far more land than it is able to effectively take care of, and that is irresponsible. That is an antienvironmental record that our Federal Government is moving itself into by acquiring more land than we have the capacity to care for.

I would also make one other observation. Since the fall of communism and the old Soviet Union, many of the republics have had a difficult time making the full transition to free market capitalism and ensuring democracies in their new countries.

One of the key provisions that comes back to us over and over again in observations is that what these countries need to do to make the last step toward free market capitalism is guarantee private property ownership. These are countries that understand they need to move toward private property ownership, not away from it.

We here in the United States, enjoying the greatest economy on the planet right now, are moving with great speed in the exact opposite direction, having taxpayers' wealth confiscated from the American people, sitting here in Washington, D.C. so the Clinton administration and others who agree with him can then go back and purchase at above-market prices land that should remain in private property ownership, putting it into the hands of the government which, as I mentioned, is incapable of doing an effective job of taking care of it.

So it is quite a problem. It is one that, when we hear the term the "war on the west," the gentleman and I understand that term very well. But for others who have heard the term may not understand what that means. It essentially means the Federal Government coming into a great State like ours, not only purchasing the property rights, but the mineral rights that go with it, and affecting directly the water rights, water being the most precious natural resource that our economy depends on.

□ 1415

Mr. MCINNIS. If I might, the gentleman is correct. And let me make it very clear. There are some areas, and my colleague and I have talked about this, there are some areas where timbering is not appropriate. There are some areas, regrettably, where in our history some people have abused the timber rights. They have gone out and clearcut areas where they should never have clearcut. And part of that, by the way, was the irresponsibility of the Federal Government's supervising that type of thing.

But what has happened is they have taken that section of misbehavior and said, and there are actual groups out there that have said, we never want another piece of timber taken off Federal lands. We have the national Sierra Club, whose number one goal of their president is to take down the dam at Lake Powell, drain Lake Powell, which is one of the most critical resources in the western United States.

What I am trying to say here is that, just as we have an obligation as citizens of this country to build a missile defense system for the next generation and just as we have a like obligation to provide a good solid education system for the next generation and just as we have a similar obligation to provide a retirement system for the next generation, we also have an obligation for this next generation to enhance the environment that we are in. But the answer for the enhancement of the environment is not necessarily, and in most cases not at all, to take away the right and the dream of private property ownership.

Now, I should add, and some night we should just come and discuss that, how when the government decides they do not have the money to go in there, what they will do is go in and regulate. That way they never have to buy the land. They just go in on private property and regulate it so no one can move.

In the State of Colorado we had, I think it was the jumping mouse.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse.

Mr. MCINNIS. The jumping mouse, and on the eastern range, which had never been seen, never been spotted, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, and they were going to regulate that as an over-riding land issue.

My bottom line is, we owe it to the next generation to protect our environment, but we owe it to this next generation to do it in a common-sense way that also preserves, as my colleague has very accurately defined, the fundamental philosophy of this country, and that is, as a citizen of this country we all dream someday of owning our own house or owning our own piece of the pie. And if we take care of that pie, we can all have at that opportunity. Do not let Washington, D.C., dictate and do not let Washington, D.C., try to convince the American people that they know what is best.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Sustaining our heritage and preserving our legacy is really a matter of keeping this land in private ownership. Many of the old farmers and ranchers who are reaching retirement age now and planning their estates realize they are going to have to deal with the inheritance tax.

Mr. MCINNIS. The death tax.

Mr. SCHAFFER. This is another aspect that we are trying to address and trying to eventually get to the point of eliminating the death tax overall. And I think that the Congress ought to view death tax elimination in environmental terms as well. Keeping these properties in the hands of the families that have worked this land for many, many years is something that we want to see more of, rather than moving toward more government ownership.

I know this is an issue in our State of Colorado. It is also an important issue in the State of South Dakota, and I see the gentleman from South Dakota has joined us for the remaining couple of minutes that we have left. The inheritance tax is a big issue for his constituents, and we will finish this special order up with just a brief discussion on inheritance taxes.

Mr. THUNE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank both my friends and colleagues from the great State of Colorado for taking this issue up. This is an issue which is important, obviously, to anybody who makes their living off the land.

And one of the things I find is one of the biggest insults to people who actually are in the actual day-to-day business of farming and ranching and involved in natural resource industries is to suggest that they are not concerned about conservation. When the gentleman was discussing the environmental burdens and the regulations that the government imposes on people who are trying to make a living at that, I could not help but think of a lot of the small independent farmers and ranchers in my State of South Dakota and the cost that is associated with those burdens. We talk right now about prices being in the tank, which they are, and it is very difficult for small independent farmers and ranchers to make a living today. And, obviously, that is something that we are going to have to address as well.

Frankly, one of the reasons we are not doing so well is because we have failed in a couple of important things, and one is opening export markets. We made a commitment, when the last farm policy was put in place, that we would aggressively open export markets. We have not done that. We do not utilize the tools that are in place and, furthermore, I think that this is a basic failure in our farm policy today. And, as a result, we are seeing the depressed prices because we do not have the demand that we need out there.

But the second thing that is really important, as the gentleman mentioned, is regulation and taxes. Again, that was another thing that was prom-

ised under the new farm policy a couple of years ago, which happened before the gentleman and I arrived here, but it was clear one of the things we said we would do is regulatory reform. That has not happened. There are still enormous costs associated with production agriculture.

And, again, as the gentleman, my friend from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), also noted, there is the tax burden. Today, when someone dies, we basically have to deal not only with the undertaker but with the IRS. And that is a real liability in terms of trying to provide a framework for passing on the family farm, the family ranch, the family business to the next generation of Americans. The tax burden continues to strangle folks who are in the business of production agriculture.

So I think this is something that needs to be addressed. I hope we will do it in this Congress as part of our agenda, as we address the needs that are out there and talking about, for the first time in a generation, the politics of surplus, a surplus that has come about as a result of decisions that we made a couple of years ago in the balanced budget agreement. We were able at that time to bring some tax relief, but we need to bring additional tax relief after we have addressed Social Security and coupled that with paying down the national debt, which is an important priority for myself and a lot of Members I think on our side of the aisle, and hopefully a lot of Members in the whole Congress, but also to look at ways that we can continually streamline regulations and lessen the tax burden on America's working families.

I cannot think of any working family today that is having a tougher time making a living and making ends meet than people who are in the day-to-day business of agriculture.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The farm economy is really going to be strained this year. The administration's failure to aggressively and assertively open up foreign export markets is really leaving American producers high and dry in many cases.

Also, the debacle in Brazil, for example, with the devaluing of the currency and the role indirectly that our government played, is going to result in cheap soybeans swamping the U.S. market. Now, we have some soybean growers out in our parts of the country, it is going to be a bigger issue perhaps in the Midwest, but for agriculture in general these kinds of realities over the next months are going to, unfortunately, result in a very troubled agricultural economy in America. And I think we are going to feel the brunt of it around August, September, and October, in those months, and on into the year 2000.

But at a time when we know that competitiveness issues, that regulatory issues are going continue to be hitting hard on American farmers and ranchers we need to seize on that opportunity to focus on the other govern-

ment-imposed fixed costs of doing business, the inheritance tax certainly being one of them. Capital gains tax relief is something else that could make the difference between farmers declaring bankruptcy and selling out versus remaining in production agriculture and hopefully passing these productive agricultural assets on to their children.

The important thing to remember when we talk about eliminating the inheritance tax, or the death tax, we hear many of our critics on the Democratic side of the aisle who will claim this is a tax cut for the rich. We have all heard that. And many farmers and ranchers, when calculating the present value of their land and equipment and so on, it sounds like an awful lot of money. But that wealth is all tied up in the land. It cannot be extracted easily at all.

And what we are talking about is the children, the heirs of the present farm land owners, having to fork over upwards of 50 percent of the value of that asset over to the Federal Government when it changes hands between the parents to the children. Fifty percent of the value of an asset value of a farm means that that farm goes on the auction block, that it is sold. It is over. It is out of business. And that is why the inheritance tax relief that we are trying to push forward is so critical for agriculture today.

Mr. THUNE. It is. And what people do not realize is that agriculture is a very capital-intensive business. It is not uncommon for a small independent producer to have a lot of investment in equipment in order to try and do all the things they have to do to raise a crop and then be able to market it.

So the gentleman is exactly right in that people, when they talk about this being something that favors people in the higher income categories, I can tell my colleague one thing, the farmers and ranchers I know and visit with in South Dakota are not people I consider to be cutting the fat hog. In fact, right now, they are having a very, very difficult time.

And if we want to keep them on the land, if we want to keep that small family farm, independent producer, the thing that I think has helped establish and build the values in this country that we cherish, if we want to keep them on the land, we have to make it easier to transfer that farm or that ranch to the next generation of Americans. And that is why I think, again, as we look at what we can do in terms of trying to assist the agricultural economy today, rolling back the estate tax, the death tax, dealing with capital gains, as the gentleman noted, is important as well, and also trying to figure out a way to make it less costly to be in production agriculture.

Because, again, there are enormous costs to these regulations. I hear ludicrous examples of this all the time. And probably the most recent one I heard was a small business in South Dakota that wanted to sell, and they

were trying to get a buyer. And the buyer, before they could consummate the sale, had to go through an environmental analysis. Well, they discovered in one of the buildings there was an air conditioner hanging out in the back, as there often is in our State of South Dakota, because the summers get to be a little hot, but that air conditioner, as air conditioners are prone to do, was dripping a little bit of water. And the EPA said, well, I am sorry, we cannot have that. That is disrupting the vegetation. Ironically, their solution to that was to come up with a one foot by one foot square slab of concrete to place down there. Not that that would disrupt the vegetation.

There are ludicrous, frivolous examples of these regulations all the time. And I will not say for a minute that there are not needs in terms of safety and health reasons why we have regulations, but there are certainly a lot of frivolous ones. And as they apply to agriculture, we should look at what we can do to make it less costly.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The American public is looking to Congress for somebody here to listen and to resolve many of these issues, and I am proud to be part of the Republican conference that will continue to push forward for a strong economy, for maintaining and protecting Social Security, providing a strong national defense, providing for a world-class education system and, ultimately, trying to provide for some tax relief for the American people.

THE STATE OF THE MILITARY

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I just a left a meeting with Secretary Cohen, Chief of Naval Operations, and General Shelton. I know people are talking about Social Security, they are talking about education, they are talking about Medicare, but I want to read something to my colleagues, and I want to quote.

Quite often our military leaders have been remiss in stating what the actual needs are so that they do not get in trouble, and I would like to read this to my colleagues. This was taken from a hearing in Las Vegas, Nevada. It said, "Displaying unusual candor, the commanders of combat training centers for the Army, the Air Force, the Marines, the Navy and Coast Guard described poor training conditions, outdated equipment held together 'by junkyard parts', and an underpaid, overworked cadre of service workers who cannot wait to get out and find a better job."

What is happening is our overseas deployments are 300 percent above what they were at the height of Vietnam. We are driving our military into the ground but not using the reinvestment into the parts, the manpower, or even the creature comforts for our military folks.

This goes on to say, "We have a great military filled with terrific soldiers who are suffering from an inability to train at every level with battle focus and frequency necessary to develop and sustain its full combat potential."

Mr. Speaker, we are maintaining only 23 percent of our enlisted. If my colleagues go out in any military division today and ask our sailors or our troops of any branch how many of them have been there within the last 8 years, every hand will go up; about 90 percent of them. They have not seen anything else but a de-escalation of military spending and/or support, which is denied.

We only have, today, 14 of 23 up jets at Navy Fighter Weapons School, known as Top Gun. They do not have engines. There are 137 parts missing. The 414th for the Air Force, the same problem. They do not have engines or parts to fly their aircraft back here in CONUS. We had 4 of 45 up jets at Oceania. What does that all equate to?

Why they are down is because we are taking the parts to support Bosnia, to support our off-loads and our carriers and our air force out of Italy, to put those parts in those parts of the world. We are killing our training back home. When we only have 23 percent of our enlisted and 30 percent of our pilots in all services, that means our experience is gone. Captain O'Grady, who was shot down, was not trained in air combat maneuvering.

□ 1430

That lack of training. When you only have four up jets in a training squadron back here in the United States, that means all your new pilots are getting limited training so when they go over, whether it is just handling an emergency or handling a combat situation, they are not trained for it. We lost about 50 airplanes this year, Mr. Speaker. We are going to lose a great number of aircraft and pilots over the next 5 years, even if we invest in those spare parts and so on today.

Now, the service chief will tell you, we have just put money into the spare parts and it takes delay. But that money they took and put into spare parts came out of other military programs. The chiefs have told us we need \$150 billion. That is \$22 billion a year. The President's new money is \$4 billion. Last year when they say they needed 150, the President said, "Well, I'll give you a \$1 billion offset," which means it has to come out of other military programs, which is a zero gain, zero net for the military.

We are in bad shape, we are losing our troops, the economy is high, but the number-one reason why our troops are getting out, yes, pay raise is important. But the number-one reason is because they are away from their families. They are going overseas, they are deploying, they are coming back, then they have to deploy here and they do not have the equipment, the spare parts that they use or take a part off of

your Chevy and put it on another Chevy. That part is not going to last you very long and we are going to lose those numbers of pilots.

It is said that we have more tasks for armed services than we do people. Now, we are asking our people in all services to do this 300 percent increase of deployments. But we have one-half the force to do it with. That means that the ones that are left have to go and do twice the work than we had to do it before. We cannot sustain that kind of downsizing and leave our troops unprepared.

If we look at Haiti, at Somalia and Aided, Aristide is still there, it is still a disaster and we have spent billions of dollars. The already low budget that we have, all of those excursions come out of that low budget which even drives us further.

EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank my Democratic colleagues for joining me here today to talk about one of the most vital issues that faces this Congress, I think, and certainly this country over the next several years, and that is education.

So that you and others will not think that I am just standing talking about education, because I have found in this great deliberative body called the People's House, we talk about a lot of issues, and we can talk endlessly on issues if someone will provide us data. But prior to my being elected to the People's House in 1996, I served 8 years, or two terms, as the elected State Superintendent of Schools in my home State. I have made education a top priority, public education for our children, not only at the State level but I have done that also since I have been here in Congress.

Throughout my service as Superintendent and to this day as a Member of Congress, I have spent a great deal of time in the classrooms of the schools of my State to observe firsthand the exciting educational innovations that are taking place in my home State. I would say that is true all across America. As my colleagues join me this afternoon, I trust they will talk about some of the exciting things that are happening in their State, also. Too many times, all we do is we talk about the problems, and it is important to acknowledge we have shortcomings and that we work on those shortcomings to make them better, because young people only have one chance to get a good education in their first 12 years and so it is throughout the rest of their lives. But sometimes it is important to acknowledge our successes as well as our shortcomings.

Recently, I had the opportunity to visit a school in Wake County, which happens to be the largest county in my district and that also is the capital city county. The school I went in was Conn Elementary and it is really now called Conn Global Communications Magnet Elementary School. That is a mouthful. But what it really means is that these young people are wired through the Internet and through a special innovative program that the leadership in that county has put together in a partnership with the Federal Government to do some creative and exciting things for these young people. They really are on the cutting edge of education reform in America. The buzzword in Washington these days is accountability. I would say to you, as strongly as I possibly can, that an effective accountability or assessment mechanism is absolutely essential to sustain educational achievement, and I will talk about that later on today as I talk because we have done that in North Carolina on a statewide basis.

But now let me continue to talk about Conn Elementary, because they can teach us here in Washington a great deal about this whole issue of accountability and what you do to excite and energize young people and make them really love school all over again and love this thing we call learning.

Let me share with my colleagues and read, if I may, Mr. Speaker, the mission statement of Conn Elementary School. Let me say that Conn is not an exception in my State of a school having a mission statement. Every school has one.

"Conn Global Communications Magnet Elementary School will prepare students for successful citizenship in a global society. The learning environment created at Conn will provide an educational experience that will emphasize heightened communications skills via reading, writing, mathematics, science technology, and the arts as a means of connecting and interfacing with the world."

I would read that again, but let me just paraphrase it very quickly to say they understand that education is broader than what some have said, reading, writing and arithmetic. It has gone long past the three Rs. There are a lot of other things that need to be interfaced and integrated in a good, sound public education these days.

"Conn will ensure success for all students." Underlined "all students." Not just the bright students, not just the students that come from parents who have money, not just from parents who have the time to interface and work with the schools, but all students.

Now, let me share with you why they say that and how they get to that point, because I think it is important to as we emphasize that this innovative public school focuses on achieving for all their students and how they do it.

To achieve these goals, Conn has set out the following expectations for their

students and, yes, for their staff and for the parents:

"Motivational global studies will accomplish a narrowing of the achievement gap between minority and non-minority students." This is true not only in my State, it is not just true in Conn, it is true in every school in this country. How do we narrow that gap between those students who are achieving at a high level and those who are not and how do we make sure they all achieve at a much higher level because we need all of them participating in this new economy of the 21st century.

"Cultural diversity will provide opportunities for children to recognize and appreciate the value of cultural differences in their own communities and beyond." Let me tell you why that statement is so important. We have the most diverse population in our public schools today we have had in the history of this republic. Yet there are those who want us to believe that we can educate the same way we have educated historically. That is absolutely not true. We have to recognize the cultural diversities and backgrounds from which our children come, accept those, and then help them achieve at a high level. That may mean that they need more time on task in some areas than others and it may mean that they need smaller class sizes. This Congress is going to be about that, and I will talk about that more in just a moment.

"Technological resources will enable students to communicate with the world around them." Many times when we talk about technology, some of us talk about technology as if it were just a computer. That is not the whole view of the issue. Computers are just one piece of a total mass communication world that we live in that children must have access to in our public schools. If they do not have access to that total view of technology, how in the world can we expect them to walk out of school one day and engage and interface in a world that is changing so rapidly? We talk on this floor of the House about the changing world and talk is awful cheap. It is easy to talk about changing education and making it better. I have often said, money is not the only issue but the last time I checked, without a certain amount of money very little happens. Even though here at the Federal level we only put in about 7 percent of the resources that our public schools use, we can have a tremendous impact if we will encourage, provide leadership, help and be a partner. Because we are a partner. We are not the senior partner but we are a major partner and we ought to be a partner that is about helping rather than throwing impediments anywhere along the way.

"Communication skills will be the key to meaningful connections between students' education and their understanding of individuals, groups and countries." Now, understand when I use this, this is a special school that has access to the Internet and other

things that a lot of schools do not have. Every school should have this. But it gives them a chance to understand what they are about.

"Integrated, project-based learning will ensure active participation and in-depth understanding of global concepts." When we talk about education sometimes, many of us talk about education in the framework of our own background, of how schools were when we were in school. If we have not been in the classroom in the last 10 years and we go in and visit, we would recognize the school, we would recognize the hallways, we might even recognize the classroom, but I will guarantee you if you look at the curriculum and the things that a lot of teachers are doing in these creative classrooms, it would sure be different.

"Integrated project-based learning will ensure active participation and in-depth understanding of global concepts." I want to repeat that, because I think that is important as we move in this world economy. We stand on this floor and we talk about the issues of trade. We talk about the issues of money moving, et cetera. All this is in the perspective of the world that has changed in the last 10 years with global communication.

"Lower student-teacher ratios will encourage more active involvement in the learning process, more developmentally appropriate teaching, differentiation of instruction, and focused applications to improve student performance." The last bullet I read is so important to this whole concept of what we talk about when we talk about total education for every child, so that it is geared to that student, that that student understands what is expected, that teachers have class sizes small enough that they can deal with. In a diverse population that we have when a teacher has to go in the classroom and have 30 students, it is a very, very difficult task when the range is so great with those students.

I have said many times, my wife and I have three lovely children of whom we care very deeply, and I love them dearly. But I would be less than honest if I did not say today, it would be very difficult if we had 30 of them and we were trying to instruct them around the house and to direct traffic. I think that is true in most households. Too many times we ask our teachers to do the impossible task of doing what we could not do, what we would not do, and yet we talk a lot, and I have often said when it comes to education, we all have lots of answers and very few solutions. In the political arena, we need to become better partners. As those partners, we need to be sort of like the managing partner. We are willing to help where we can and push where we need to and be less critical of the children and teachers who I think are working awful hard.

Let me close on Conn Elementary with one other point, and then I am going to yield to one of my colleagues.

This vision is a prescription for excellence for Conn Elementary and really for education in Wake County. I think that would be somewhat true of all the schools in my State of North Carolina. Conn is a richly diverse, inner city magnet school, and they really are laying a foundation for lifelong learning and citizenship for these students. In a situation where in many cases we would say those students could not do it, they are measuring up and they are achieving at very high levels and they are closing the gap between minority and nonminority students. They are doing it because teachers care, students are focused, parents are engaged, and they are also disaggregating data for both minority and nonminority students.

Let me tell you what I mean when I say disaggregating, because so many times we talk about averages, average students. Very few of us are average. We are special in our own way. If you take that data and break it down in individuals and individual groups, pretty soon you will find out which student really needs the help, where you need to give more time for math, where you need to give more time for reading.

□ 1445

All of us learn differently and at different levels, and Conn Elementary is doing that to make sure that every child reaches their full potential. Mr. Speaker, to meet the needs they are making sure that some of these students have smaller class sizes, and they can only do it, my colleagues, because they have some additional money in a partnership with the Federal Government, and the State is putting some extra in it. That is why I say when you say it does not take extra money we are deceiving ourselves and misleading the public. It takes additional dollars.

Mr. Speaker, with that I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) who really does understand how important it is, how important education is to the future of this country. He is close to it. Not only has he been a fighter here in Congress, but every weekend when he goes home, his wife reminds him.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from North Carolina for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to share in the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE'S) special order because not only am I privileged to have a wife who teaches high school algebra, without her I could not have made it through college algebra, Mr. Speaker. So she tutored me to make sure I can have my gentleman's C, but every weekend when I go home, I try to spend time in our public schools.

Just recently, I was at Stevens Elementary in the Aldine School District. Last Monday, I was actually at Aldine 9th Grade Center, Aldine High School 9th Grade Center, because this week is Texas Public School Week in Texas, and so to recognize the value of public education.

Last Saturday, I was at Burnet Elementary in Houston Independent School District, not necessarily for an education program, although there was students there and their parents, but it was for a Fannie Mae home buyer seminar. So, using the public school facilities also for home buying in an inner-city school in Houston.

Recently, I was at R.P. Harris Elementary and H.I.C. to read to the students and talk about what I do. But this Friday that school will be having their Career Day that I will be there, and also we are hosting a job fair for people in the community.

Public education is working, and all we need to do is go to our districts, to go to those schools and see it happening. You see the success. I like to spend time in my schools because it recharges my batteries for the debates we are having like today on Federal funding for education and things like that, but it also provides a great role model for Members to go in and sit down and read to their students and also to talk about the job we do.

Mr. Speaker, we have quality education in every one of my public schools in my district. And, again, I have lots of different school districts in Houston Harris County, a very urban district, predominantly minority children, both African American and Hispanic, but there is quality education going on, and that is why I want to talk about the Democratic Families First agenda that was just announced today by the President and the Democratic Leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), and Senator DASCHLE where we talk about school modernization and providing Federal tax credit to States and school districts to modernize and renovate 6,000 local public schools. The Houston Independent School District, who recently passed a bond election, a scaled-back bond election, by the way, is providing the local funds.

Now, on the Federal level, we need to try and help because of the deteriorating situation of not just urban schools like I represent, but rural schools, smaller class sizes. Texas now has a law since 1984 that is 20-to-1 for elementary schoolchildren from kindergarten through 4th grade, and that is great. The President announced we would like to see 18-to-1. Of course, that will not help my wife who teaches 30 and 32 children in high school algebra class, but we know that we need to put our resources into elementary schools.

So the Families First agenda, the Democratic agenda, also builds on additional teacher training and recruitment.

My wife told me a story a few weeks ago, and I know the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) can relate to this. She said:

You know how long it took us to get overhead projectors out of the bowling alleys and into the public schools? It took us years. The technology was in

the bowling alleys before we could use them in our public schools. I hope we are not waiting for that long before the computers are really utilized in our public schools.

Teacher training and educational technology, there is so many things that is part of this agenda, and I know we share the same goals. The Federal Government cannot dictate what goes on in our local schools, but we can help. We can provide a little extra help for our school board members, our administrators, our teachers, our parents and the State legislators who provide most of the funding, and we can help to make sure that we pave the way for the 20th century, 21st century, so our children will be prepared to stand here on the floor of the House and want to get their children and their grandchildren prepared for the next century.

I thank the gentleman for asking for this special order and allowing me to participate today.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman from Texas, because he is absolutely correct, and the Families First agenda at this time with the educational package in it is just a tremendous piece with the President's initiative for more teachers, for modernizing our school facilities.

Every State has needs, and every State is doing some things to make a difference, and yet at the end of World War II, when our men and women came home from fighting the war that many in history said would end all wars, which it did not, they put their shoulder to the wheel, and they said: We are going to build schools, and we will make sure that children have an opportunity.

We now have an obligation, and I want to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi's 4th district (Mr. SHOWS), for some comments on what is happening in his area as it relates to this whole education agenda that we are working on.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, what I would like to say, too, as an educator myself that has spent a long time ago, we appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina's bill. As an educator back in Mississippi back in the 1970s when we had a tremendous problem of overcrowding in schools then and some of the facilities were not what they needed to be, and still today, as I went through the district during the campaign and visited some schools that I thought have been outdated years ago, they are in terrible need.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that a lot of times we look at what we do to create a good environment around a business place where we do build new buildings to increase business, and it increases learning, and the same thing could be said for education.

But, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving me the opportunity to express my support for the efforts to improve the education of America's children. In the past few months in

Mississippi, and especially in my district, we have had several plants that employed thousands of hard-working people in my district shut down, and in rural areas like mine in southern Mississippi a plant closure can devastate an entire community and county.

The international marketplace is here today. A new technology continues to change the face of business and employment opportunities. American jobs continue to migrate across our borders. We cannot stand idly by and let honest, hard-working Americans suffer because we are not preparing them for this reality. We must work together to do whatever it takes to make sure that our young people have the education and training to perform good jobs at competitive wages.

One obvious way to accomplish this is to build new schools that make the most of modern technology available to our students. The Etheridge School Construction Act provides tax credits to help finance school construction bonds. This legislation would provide almost \$30 million in school construction bonds from Mississippi alone, and we can use every bit of it, and we need that help. For children in Mississippi's 4th District this would mean the opportunity to move out of old and overcrowded schools that are in need of repair and to new schools with new technologies in their classrooms. It would mean having classes in actual classrooms and not in temporary trailers.

I feel like this is a bipartisan bill and a cost-effective way to help our States meet their educational needs, and we need to pass this bill quickly. It is for the future of not only Mississippi, but for this great country.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, now to my friend from the 19th District of Illinois (Mr. PHELPS). He understands how important quality education is, how important it is, how the assessment, what growth means and the need for new school buildings. He has been a hard worker since he has been in here in Congress. I had the occasion when our Chief State School Officer worked with his Chief, so I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to participate in this discussion on a very valued issue to all of us, education; and, Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support the Democratic initiatives to improve education for our children through better schools and smaller classrooms.

As a former teacher and a husband of a teacher, I have always believed that the single most important challenge we face as parents and as the citizens of this Nation is the education of our children. I have seen as a teacher and later as a State legislator the problems our schools face and the limitations as States and local school districts struggle to overcome them on a daily basis.

As a teacher, my first year I taught school in Harrisburg, Illinois, Unit 3 District. I walked into a classroom of

42 children. What a challenge. We had them lined up in what we used to call the old cloakroom, as my colleagues know, where you would have students even out of my sight. It was then that I learned to realize that the quality of education is so much compromised when you cannot look that child one on one in the eye and get their undue attention and the respect first because everything after that, not very much can be accomplished without that.

Mr. Speaker, I valued those first years in knowing that, however we invest in education, we can help parents and communities work together to provide better learning environments for our children through school modernization and construction. That is really the key and, of course, more specifically, smaller classrooms, as I alluded to from the problems of a large classroom.

Our commitment today to funding for more teachers will help the local school districts provide a smaller, more enriching learning experience for our kids. It was almost impossible, as many kids that I had that first year and my wife has in high school English class in Eldorado, our hometown now, to really relate to the kids in an individualized way. I believe that it is impossible to have a mentorship, if my colleagues will, for kids. This is how they relate. They get involved with a teacher. If the teacher is allowed to get to know them personally, and I believe that that is a value beyond description, it is hard to put a value on, because I personally feel that some of our problems that we are experiencing throughout the Nation with our kids rebelling in one way or another in the most vicious way is violence, that we see the school shootings, the dropout situation, the lack of attendance. The whole attitude is because many teachers do not get a chance to know those children, know those kids and the problems that they are having in their home life.

In the small rural areas, such as Eldorado, Illinois, a town of 4,000 people, my wife has made it a point to find out what is troubling the child when they seemingly are not caring what is going on, or missing school, or have a different attitude from one day to the next. She has found, to get to the heart of the matter, what is troubling that child. Smaller classrooms will afford us to do this, possibly even avoiding the most extreme expression of violence.

I really believe that. So it goes to the heart of discipline.

I know we talk about quality of instruction in the classroom, but smaller classrooms can be one of the major tools of discipline because most kids are really saying: Give me your attention. And many times their misbehavior is out of getting attention.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. If the gentleman will yield for a moment, because I think he is on to something. Let me raise a question with him because he talks of the 42 students he had when he

started, and I think every teacher in America can identify with the statement he just made. Without dating him, and I will not do that, but he was talking about when he started teaching.

The diversity of the student population in our schools have changed dramatically in recent years, and the home life of so many of our students have changed because we have two-parent households, both are working, or even if it is a single-parent household, and I thought his point as it relates to the children having someone to really identify with, to let that teacher or in that classroom be their friend today as it was years ago when they had some time.

Let me ask this question because I think it is important. As we reduce the class sizes, as we have started to do and we need to continue, and provide for the good learning environment where when one goes to school, if it is the nicest place one goes to that day, that is what it ought to be.

□ 1500

Then certainly that is not only going to help the discipline problems we see that we are spending money on, but more importantly, as the gentleman just alluded to, discipline and achievement go hand-in-hand. We will see achievement go up dramatically.

Mr. PHELPS. The gentleman's expertise is much beyond mine in education, and I value the gentleman's opinion, so he can relate to what I am saying.

But just as one who has had formal experience in a classroom, and coming from a family of educators, I have two brothers that are public school administrators, similar to the gentleman's capacity in his home State before he came here. So I learned from not only them but my own experience.

I can only tell the Members, the way I relate to what we were talking about, mentorship, is in fact a coach's success. Let us take coaches, for example. It is not so much from one coach to the other, that they do not have the key plays, because they are pretty much passed from one school or university to another, but it is the way the coach motivates his team or his or her team to accomplish the end result to win.

That motivation only occurs when the coach takes that student aside and says, hey, how are things going? Do you want to meet me out for a round of golf? Let's go fishing Saturday. Because they can identify where some child may have a lack of attention, and just take that buddy under their wing.

I have seen myself, in my short tenure, in talking to coaches and teachers that have had that individualized partnership, friendship, that has made the difference to kids excelling who may not have had the support at home to begin with, to try to overcome that, or reinforce what is there.

Another matter that really, as a State legislator, I bring here, and I

want to talk more on this later about school infrastructure and our needs there, but it has always astounded me and I am still bewildered why we as a society are so willing to fund the building of prisons, and yet not only hesitant but stubborn to fund building schools.

I guess we react to it; we all want to reduce crime, and get to the heart and the source of crime. We do not want to have fear in our neighborhoods. I think that is why in my area we have risen to the occasion to fund prisons, but at the expense of schools, in many regards, in Illinois, I can attest to that.

To me, if we invest in education, or usually an investment of any nature in the private sector or in our own lives or homes, we expect to benefit, to reap benefits. When we invest in education, I think the benefits from the governmental standpoint of expenses to taxpayers will be less for crime, for prisons, less for welfare, and unemployment will be reduced, to benefit productive society members.

That is what the value of education is. I hope to be part of this 106th Congress, and in solving these problems.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois. He has well stated the foundation that I think that we all can agree with as it relates to improving the educational opportunities for all of our children in this country, to make sure that the 21st century will be bright for all students, and ultimately, as he has indicated, make sure that our social security system is sound, that everyone is productive and working and paying into it, and will make a difference.

Let me touch on a couple of points, and then I want to turn to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, for a couple of comments on this educational piece.

I talked earlier about the Conn experience. There are a couple of other points that I would like to make, especially on a school that is in the inner city, they are working hard, they have formed what they call CONNECTIONS, advisory committees, where each group has to work together to bring the parents in; or if they happen to be in a foster care home, whomever is responsible for the child, they have a responsibility to come and work with the individual assessment of those teachers, so that every child can get extra care and extra time on those core subjects.

They are working to reduce class sizes, where they are getting more individualized attention and a feeling of belonging on the part of each student. My friend, the gentleman from Illinois, just talked about those advisory groups that are showing up as hard evidence and data on results for children.

I think sometimes we tend to forget that. It is not in isolation. We have to do it altogether. Their assessment measures are working. They are on track on a year to year assessment that has been going on long enough now that this absolutely is working.

They have documented their performance in a systematic way. That has enabled them to show what they are doing.

Let me say that it is happening in a school and in a county that is seeing some of the most rapid growth in student enrollment population in the Nation. As a matter of fact, North Carolina is the fifth fastest growing State in the Nation over the next 10 years, as documented by the U.S. Department of Education, for student enrollment in high school. Wake County alone has added over 30,000 students in the past 14 years, and gained anywhere from 3,500 to 4,500 students every year, this is the size, and larger than some school systems.

When we start talking about building buildings, they have an ongoing project that they have not gotten out of. They are bursting at the seams. They cannot get enough space. We can imagine what that does to each individual school.

Since 1990 alone, Wake County has seen 29.9 percent growth in student population, but every county that touches Wake County in my district has grown over 20 percent in the last 8 years. That is why Congress I think needs to step up this year and follow through on the proposal the President has talked about for providing school construction for our students.

I have a bill that I will be introducing later this week called the Etheridge School Construction Act. We now have 55 sponsors, and I hope to have more before it goes in tomorrow. It will provide for \$7.2 billion in school construction bonds for growing States and localities that are hurting.

Now, some of my colleagues will say, that is not the Federal government's responsibility. I would ask them, what did we decide when we did not have electricity and we did not have telephones? There was a time we did not have canals in this country, and we put in a system in the Federal Government to make sure we had water transportation. Finally we got to the interstate system, thank goodness for Eisenhower, who pushed us into it. There are a lot of things we have gotten into in recent years that we were not in.

I will say to the Members, our soldiers who came home from World War II decided we needed to build some schools. They put their shoulders to the wheel. It is now our responsibility as we move towards the 21st century to make sure that the baby boom echo does not have to be taught in lean-tos and in shacks and in rundown buildings.

We need to build some school buildings to make sure these children have a good place to go to school. They need to have as good an environment to be taught in as my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, talked about that we are sending our prisoners to. When we talk about sending children to school, and they ride by a \$30 million prison to go to a \$4 million school, they are not very dumb. They can figure

that one out. Our priorities are misdirected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who is a champion if ever there was one, for education, to share with us some thoughts she has on this subject.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I want to commend my colleague for the leadership role he has taken on the issue of education. It is not just this evening, but it has been since he arrived in the Congress, he has made this a principal part of what his efforts are here. I congratulate him for that.

I am delighted to join with the gentleman. Just on the point he was mentioning, I think it is interesting to note that the gentleman is so right, this is not about the Federal Government getting into the school construction businesses, nor about just bricks and mortar and bells and whistles and newfangled buildings and all of this.

I will just tell Members about my part of the country. I am from the Northeast, from Connecticut. We did a school survey. We found that in my community the age of the school buildings is rather staggering. The average age of the elementary school buildings is 50 years old. More than half of the elementary schools regularly hold classes in areas not designed to be classrooms, including cafeterias, hallways, mobile or temporary rooms, and storage areas. The average class size is 23 students. So that I happen to live in the part of this country where the infrastructure, and whether that is the roads, the bridges, whatever it is, including our schools, are old.

What does that mean in terms of the future? If we just take one small aspect of that, that is technology, we have some buildings where the thickness of the walls is so big and so dense that to wire these schools up so that we can really be connected with the Internet, and put in the kind of computer and advanced technology that our young people need today, is either prohibitive, or there are some places where the computers are stored in boxes in rooms because they do not have the ability to get them wired up.

What are we talking about with school construction? It is modernization, it is providing the kinds of facilities that are going to lend themselves for that future opportunity for our young people.

I am going to use myself. I am old. My kids are computer literate. My grandkids will be computer literate. We have little tots that know more about computers than I probably will ever know. I want to talk about a classroom that I went to this past week.

But the fact of the matter is, what was a textbook to me, to my generation, and the importance of that, is what the computer is to our kids today, so looking at modernizing our schools so we can deal with this new technology is critical.

Now, that having been said, school construction. What we are offering here is not to build the schools, not to say where they are going to get built, not to preempt any local control of this effort. But what we will try to do as a proper role for the Federal Government is to say to the locality, you have to float bonds to be able to modernize or to build.

What we want to do is to provide you with a tax credit. Use the tax code to help to pay the interest on those bonds. Therefore, you can float the bonds, you can get some financial resources to pay the interest, thereby cutting down the costs to local communities and taxpayers and what they have to pay in terms of modernizing or building those classrooms.

It is good for the community, it is good for the tax relief and local property taxes, and we get to where we want to be in modernizing facilities for advancement for our young people. It makes perfect sense. It makes sense to use the tax code in a way that facilitates the direction we want to go in in trying to meet a goal and a value, because education is about values and who we are as a country. Secondly, it is to provide the kinds of tax relief to struggling local communities in this effort.

So this is one of the most logical pieces of legislation that has come along, with the perfect match between local control and Federal government partnership in an effort. No one is suggesting that the Federal Government get into the business of constructing schools.

I just want to make one more point on computers and teacher training, which we allow for in this families first agenda and our budget. I did go into a classroom, and I watched a first-rate teacher who takes every opportunity that she can to avail herself of information and learning herself to be skilled, and then transmitting these kinds of skills to young people today.

As I said, we can provide and we can get involved in getting all of the hardware into these schools, and if we do not have competent and qualified teachers who can teach our youngsters about how to use the machinery, then they are just going to stay in the boxes and it is not going to amount to a hill of beans. It really will not.

So that the training, that we have competent and qualified teachers to train in this area, is critical to where we want to go. In addition to which, it says to parents and says to local taxpayers, we want to make sure we are keeping our kids up to date, that the standards rise, that there is accountability on behalf of the schools and the children and the teachers, so that we make sure that our children are competent and qualified for those opportunities of a new century that we do not know what of, it is going to have so many promises and opportunities for young people. We would be foolish to squander these opportunities.

That is why I am excited about this families first agenda that we have embarked on, with education being at the center of it. I know the gentleman is going to continue to make this battle in the next year and a half, and I look forward to joining that battle with him. I thank the gentleman for letting me participate with him tonight.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut, because she has been on the forefront of this issue. She understands as much as anyone in this Congress that education, public education for our children, is the one thing that levels the playing field for all people. It makes no difference what their economic or ethnic background is, when they get an educational opportunity, it is very difficult to ever close that door again. I thank the gentlewoman for her time.

Now let me turn to my friend, a new Member of Congress, and yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), from the First District, who has taken on this issue of education again, because she fought for it in her home State before she came here.

Ms. BERKLEY. Yes. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to speak with him about an issue that I have a great passion for.

I believe that the Democratic agenda, which puts families first, is absolutely pivotal to the success of my district. I would like to tell the Members a little bit about the district that I represent, because in order to understand how important educational issues are to the people of southern Nevada, Members need to know a little bit about the district that I represent.

I have the fastest growing district in the United States. We have the fastest growing school-age population in the United States.

□ 1515

There are 5,000 new residents that come to Las Vegas, Nevada, every single month, and there is no end in sight to the growth. We have to build a school a month in order to accommodate the growth, in order to make sure that our students have a place to go to school. So the issues that we are discussing in our education agenda are absolutely pivotal to the success of our schoolchildren in southern Nevada.

There are certain areas that are of particular importance, and I would like to highlight those. The fact that I do have the fastest growing school age district in the United States and one of the largest school districts in the United States, with 210,000 students going to school in Las Vegas, Nevada, that means that school construction is absolutely necessary in order for us to make sure that our kids have a place that they can go to school.

We need to get them out of the portables, get them out of the trailers and get them into a classroom environment where they can thrive. So the school construction component that

has been proposed by the Democrats is very, very important for our needs in southern Nevada.

Also, the fact that we want to modernize our schools. What is the use of having a belief that we need to have computers in every classroom and connect everybody in the United States to the Information Highway if we have schools that are obsolete and do not have the ability to bring in the technology that is so important? This is especially true for a community like southern Nevada where we have some schools that are a little bit older.

In order to accommodate the technology which is going to take us into the 21st century and that our children absolutely must be trained to be educated on, that is a very, very important issue for us.

Mr. Speaker, another important issue is the hiring of new teachers. Next school session, when our schools open up next September, we are going to be 700 teachers short of the amount that we will need in order to teach the number of students that we have in southern Nevada. So the President's initiative to hire an additional 100,000 teachers, that is very important for southern Nevada and I suspect for many school districts across the United States.

The two perhaps most important issues in my mind are the after-school programs and the summer school programs. For a large number of my school population, they are going home to empty houses. They are latchkey kids, because their parents are working, and we have a working class environment in southern Nevada. So these kids are coming home to empty homes with nobody to help them, nobody to take care of them.

If we can provide after-school programs for these kids, it actually satisfies two needs that we have in southern Nevada. One is that it gives them a wholesome place to come after school, but the second thing is it gives them an opportunity to get additional mentoring so that they can learn the material that they have to learn in order to pass to the next grade.

Mr. Speaker, we are opposed to social promotion, but if we are opposed to social promotion we are going to have to do something to help these kids so that they can, in fact, be promoted with the rest of their class. That is why summer school programs are so important as well.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield at this point for a moment, let me ask a question. It sounds like Nevada is doing some creative things, and North Carolina has done some of these same things. I assume that they are doing after-school tutoring in some areas right now for those students who need extra help to stay up with the other students, and probably some early morning tutors, too.

Ms. BERKLEY. We are doing some, but not half enough. And if we could

get some help from the Federal Government in order to do that, that would be absolutely wonderful.

Another important thing is, of course, the summer school programs. Because the very students that need the summer school programs are often those who can ill afford them, and if they have to pay for the summer school program then those students who actually need it might not have the opportunity.

Those are the issues that I find very, very important and compelling; and those are the reasons that I came to Congress, in order to make sure that the people of southern Nevada are protected.

Mr. Speaker, if I may have one more minute, the education that I received in southern Nevada was wonderful. It was wonderful for the life that I am leading today. It will be obsolete for the life that my children are leading.

It is important for us as the leaders of this country to make sure that the students that are going through school now will have the tools and the opportunities that they need in order to succeed in the 21st century. We have a golden opportunity in this country to make a difference, make a difference in the lives of millions of children that are crying out for help, crying out for quality education, crying out for a good life.

I, for one, am going to join with the gentleman from North Carolina to do everything I can to make sure that these students are taken care of so that they can take our places in the 21st century and lead this country to a new horizon and new beginning and greater heights.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Nevada. She understates her hard work, because she has worked hard since she has been here. She had a record of support for education before she came, it preceded her, and she is doing an excellent job.

Mr. Speaker, I think the point that the gentlewoman made, that education is no longer a K-12 or K-16 through four years of college or master's or doctorate. It is a lifelong process. All we need to do now is talk about the new technologies and recognize those of us that are rusty with computers have to get up to speed on those computers because most of our children are ahead of us.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) just talked about it, but the truth is that is the way of life for all of us now, and we have to do a better job.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, with the help of the gentleman from North Carolina, and hopefully with the help of those across the aisle, we can work together in a bipartisan way to make sure that all of these children in our great country have the same opportunities that the gentleman and I had when we were growing up.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. The point the gentlewoman makes is absolutely correct.

If we think about it, when most of us were growing up, our world was much smaller in the sense that we thought about the competition being maybe the community next door, the county next door, or maybe even the State next door. For our young people today, that is not so. It is the whole world.

We talk about the world having shrunk. It has only shrunk in that time has shrunk. Because if something happens today on the far side of the world, within seconds it is front page news in Washington, D.C., or hometown, U.S.A. This means that for our children and for us as adults, we have to learn to deal with issues differently. That puts an extra burden on our public schools and on our teachers.

When we were talking earlier about the teachers and having training to deal with computers, it really means that the teacher has to be able to integrate their teaching techniques on that computer. Otherwise, the computer is a tool that will not be used.

Ms. BERKLEY. Interestingly enough, I go home every weekend. Last weekend I was home, and I had an opportunity to read. It was Reading Readiness Week, and, of course, in Las Vegas we are working very hard to read to our children and give parents an opportunity to read to our children as well.

I was one of those people who went into the classroom to read to a group of kindergarten students, and I can say that not only were the kindergarten students absolutely superb to read to, but I was particularly impressed with their teachers and the amount of training necessary in order to be able to pass on the skills that these children are going to need.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very excited. When I look at those kindergartners, when I look at my own children, I can only imagine what a magnificent life they have ahead of them. But before they can have any life at all, we need to make sure that they have the tools to prepare them to lead the life that they are going to be leading in the 21st century.

And as the gentleman has so correctly demonstrated in his comments, that technology component is so vital. In order to not only succeed in the 21st century, but merely to survive in the 21st century, they are going to need to have those skills. And if we do not give them to our students while they are in school now, I am afraid they are going to be terribly disadvantaged and unable to compete in the global world that we now live in.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments, and she is correct. Education is the key to opportunity in the future. We have worked at it in North Carolina, and she has worked in Nevada, and all of us have to work at it in this country because of the mobility of our population.

For a child in North Carolina today, they may be going to school in Nevada next week or California or New York.

We have to work our system together so we have some parity across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), my colleague from the Seventh District, to share with us some of his thoughts on education.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, we know that education is the key to the future of this country. And when I think about the words of Robert H. Jackson, the Supreme Court Associate Justice, who once said that, "Education should be a lifelong process, the formal period serving as a foundation on which life's structure may rest and rise."

We realize when we talk about this foundation and the structure of life we have to ask ourselves what kind of message are we sending to our children? What are they learning now that will make them the leaders of tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker, I think there are three important ingredients that we here in the Congress and we here in the Nation should consider, that it does take the people, the purpose, and the partnership in working together.

First of all, the people. We realize that it is not just up to the educators alone. They need our help and support. But it is also up to the people of the community and the people in government, the people in business, the people in all sectors of society who will come together and provide that positive example of commitment. People who are willing to go and help the teacher, call up a teacher and say, I want to know how I can come help.

And when we decry the lack of role models for our children today and we wonder what are they seeing? Are they just seeing the athletic heroes and the movie stars? But where are the future businesspeople and the future nurses and doctors and the future teachers, the future people that will be working in the communities?

Mr. Speaker, they are out there in the communities now, and our children are looking at us, and they are wondering, are we going to provide some kind of example for them? Are we volunteering our time to go into the schools and help?

I know the last 18 years that I have been spending as a volunteer in the school, I continue to do so even now in Congress when I am home during a recess, to spend time with kids, to volunteer personal time, to show support for our teachers and, most of all, support for our children.

With the people working together, we can share a common purpose, a purpose that instills and inspires in our children the idea that they can become what they dream they might become one day because they see in us an example of coming to them. Why would that person come and spend time in our schools? He is too busy. He is a doctor. Or why would that businessperson take time to come talk to us about marketing?

Mr. Speaker, when we take time to invest ourselves, we set an example that pays more than money could buy.

Third, we put together with that a partnership. We here in Congress are looking at issues affecting school construction. We are looking at issues affecting the reduction of class size. We are looking at issues that will affect private business being able to donate computers and being able to get tax deductions for doing that, much like they can for other charities and other organizations now.

So the question is, will we be willing to work together in that partnership? I know it is a challenge for us here in Congress, but it is a challenge that we are well up to and that we can do on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I know that Robin Cooke once wrote that, "Education is more than a luxury, it is a responsibility that society owes itself." Education is something we cannot just leave up to one group or one organization and expect them to handle it for us. It is an investment that has to come from the heart and from the hands and from the heads of all of us putting ourselves into the educational process to work together to strengthen the foundation of the future of this society.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his comments, and certainly education is that critical linchpin that fuels our economy, gives us opportunity, and the reason we are the kind of society we are to reach out and help the people around the world.

Any of us that travel any places know how people admire Americans, and part of it is because we have a system that says everyone who shows up will have an equal opportunity.

Today we have talked about a number of issues of the Family First agenda of education, and one of them being the linchpin of school construction. Too many times when people want to talk about education, they fail to talk as our colleagues have today and have reminded us, that the teacher is the heart of that issue and the students are why we are there.

But the truth is, if we ask teachers what is most important to them in having the opportunity to teach children, it is not always salary first. Recognizing that certainly they pay the same for food or shelter as we do, but they need a good environment to teach, and children should have a good place to learn.

Also, they need the latest in technology, simply because the young people that leave those classrooms are going to be coming into the workforce. And if anyone wonders why business has stepped up and decided that education is the most important issue on their agenda besides making a profit, all we need to do is look at our public schools. They are going to be employing these young people; and, secondly, they are also going to be their consuming public.

Finally, as we talk about the staff shortage we are going to be facing, we are going to be facing some, we have to recognize if we are going to keep some of these people longer than the years after their retirement, we have to make sure that we change our retirement policies for them and make sure that their employment opportunities are where they ought to be, and they get the ample training to make sure that they can deal with our young people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina for a comment.

□ 1530

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say two other things briefly. We in the Congress can also support our local school districts where we have military bases. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I hope that we will challenge ourselves to support impact aid for direct appropriations to school districts with military children.

Secondly, I hope all of my colleagues will do something that we did, and that is host an education summit in your district. I have held two over the last 2 years. We even had the U.S. Secretary of Education come down. Listen to the parents and the children themselves talk about their needs, and that way we will know that what we are doing is making a difference back home.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying thank you for this opportunity to share with you, with our colleagues and with the American people hopefully an issue that is so critical to the future of this country, educating our young people, providing a rich opportunity for each one of them, making sure that we have teachers in front of those classrooms who are well trained, who are well equipped, and they have an environment in which to teach effectively, and for children to have a place to learn the way they should learn in this place we call America for the 21st century.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 707, DISASTER MITIGATION AND COST REDUCTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. DREIER (during the Special Order of Mr. COBURN), from the Committee on Rules submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-41) on the resolution (H. Res. 91) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 707) to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize a program for predisaster mitigation, to streamline the administration of disaster relief, to control the Federal costs of disaster assistance, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SURPLUS SHOULD GO TO SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I found the previous hour very enlightening. Many of the things that I heard I absolutely agree with.

But the subject I came to talk about today is something that oftentimes is overlooked by the American public, and that is the fact that one hears in the press and one hears on this floor all the time that we have a surplus, that there is a surplus of money in the Federal Government today. I am here to tell my colleagues that that is not true. There is not a surplus in the Federal Government today. In fact, the monies that are shown in surplus actually belong to the Social Security system, the retirement system.

What I have before me is a graph that shows my colleagues actually what is happening right now and what is projected to happen with Social Security monies. This chart, my colleagues will see, is from the Social Security Trustee's report, and it was issued this last year.

If my colleagues will notice, what they see is somewhere around \$70 billion to \$75 billion per year actual more money coming in to the Social Security system than we are paying out. That is, everybody that is working in this country is paying a FICA tax, and everybody that they work for is paying a portion of that FICA tax that comes to the Federal Government. This last year, it was about \$480 billion that everyone who worked in this country paid in.

When you look at this graph, what actually happened is we paid out somewhat less than that to the seniors who are presently on Social Security. What we have before us in Washington today is a shell game.

How do we confuse people about what is going on with Social Security? When I talk to seniors in my district, as a matter of fact, when I talk to seniors anywhere, I have not found anybody that wants that money spent for anything except Social Security.

We continue to play a shell game by not being truthful with the American public. What one will see is, when we get to the year 2013, this surplus of money that is paid in versus the money that is paid out on Social Security starts running a deficit.

As we can see, with the baby boomers, of which I am one, by the year 2030, the Federal Government is going to have to come up with some \$750 billion a year to fund the Social Security program.

All right. So we have a problem that is coming to us. The first thing I was taught by my father as a young boy is that a half truth is a whole lie. The half truth is that there is a surplus. Yeah, there is more money in Washington than what we are spending out. But

it does not belong to the Congress to spend any way it wants to. It belongs to the Social Security system.

What is going to happen if we continue with this half truth-whole lie is that the children that are going to be 30 years of age, that are going to be born this next year, are going to have a FICA tax rate of 28 percent instead of 12 percent.

That means that if we made \$100,000, \$28,000, not income tax but payroll tax, will have to go just to keep even to fund the Social Security system in this country.

So before we can ever begin to hope to solve the Social Security problem, we have to be honest about what it really is. What it really is is the surpluses that were seen last year and the surplus that we are going to see this year is made up entirely of Social Security money.

The next diagram shows you what actually happens to Social Security money. Right now, the Federal Government uses excess Social Security to pay for more spending or to pay off the debt.

Last year, we did retire some external debt. We borrowed Social Security money. We gave them a note that bears interest. We used that money to pay off people outside of our government, outside of our Nation, who have loaned us money to run at a deficit. We are paying that off. So we are putting in IOUs, credited to the Trust Fund.

It is important to note that, last year, we took \$26 billion of the Social Security Trust Fund and spent it on non-Social Security programs, which stole \$26 billion of the seniors' Social Security money and spent it on other programs.

That is why it is so interesting to hear that we have to spend all this additional money on education where, in fact, if the Congress would live up to its obligations that it made in 1973 on IDEA that we would fund 40 percent of the cost of the special ed in this country, we would free up billions of dollars in local monies to be spent on education, and we would not have to have a Federal program to build schools, because the schools would have the money to build it, because we have not kept up our end of the bargain.

So what is going to happen in 2013, we are going to spend more money than what comes in. We are going to have to either go borrow money, or we are going to raise taxes. It is real simple. Actually, we are going to do one of three things, and let me show my colleagues what that is.

So how do we solve the Social Security program? How do we solve this problem so that the money that goes into Social Security is used for Social Security? How do we solve it so that the people who are working today can have a retirement benefit that is supposed to be guaranteed to them?

As they poll young people under 35 and they ask them, "Do you believe that you will get Social Security

money, or do you believe that there are UFOs out there," more people believe there are UFOs flying around than believe they will see their Social Security money. That is a condemnation on Congress that we have let down the American people.

So what are our options? Save the hundred percent of the Social Security surplus and transition it into some instrument that earns more money, one. What we can do is repay the money taken by the fund by raising taxes, and that is exactly what I outlined, that we are going to have a 28 percent effective FICA tax by the year 2015 to pay to meet the obligations that we have committed to under Social Security.

Or, finally, we can do all sorts of things to Social Security. We can back up on our agreement to Social Security. We can raise the age at which it is available. Nobody wants that. Or we can lessen the benefits.

Our seniors now can hardly get by on the Social Security money that they are receiving. So option three is not any good. Option two, all it does is transfer our lack of physical control, our lack of ability to do what we were sent up here to do, and sends it to our grandchildren.

As I talked to seniors, three things come to their mind. They do not want the Social Security money spent on anything but Social Security. Number two, they want the debt paid down. Number three, they do not want to saddle their grandchildren with the excesses of our inability to do what we were sent up here to do.

So let me draw you a comparison.

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

Mr. COBURN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman goes on, I see this next chart up on spending, but for one second I would like to go back to that first chart that he was holding up on the surpluses or lack thereof themselves. Because what I think is interesting about that chart is that, while we may not get it in Washington, folks back home in Oklahoma or folks back home in South Carolina or folks back home across this country really understand this chart; and that is, Washington says we are running a surplus. Yet, when I talk to folks back home, what they tell me is, if we went down the street and there was someone living on our street that had to borrow against their pension fund reserves or retirement reserves to put gas in the car or food on the table or rent money down, we would say that family was not running a surplus.

In the business world, if we actually borrowed against our pension fund reserves to pay for the current operations of the company, we would go to jail based on Federal law.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, that is right.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, what I think the gentleman from Oklahoma is

pointing out here is something that really the American public is way ahead of us on. Unfortunately, he is exactly right in that this is beginning to show itself in the confidence that people have in government.

Because I do not know if my colleagues have seen the Roper poll, but there was a Roper poll. It has been commissioned every single year, basically, for the last 30 years. In that poll, back in 1963, they basically said to the American public, "Do you have confidence that people in Washington, that your government, will make the right decision?" And 73 percent of Americans said, "Yes, we believe that Washington, our government, will make that right decision."

That poll, when it was taken last year, what people found was that 19 percent of Americans thought that Washington would make the right decision. That is reflected in the UFO poll that the gentleman mentioned.

I saw some other crazy questions that were asked in a recent poll. One of the questions was, "Which of the following is more likely to happen: You collect all the Social Security money that you are entitled to, or a pro wrestler is elected President?" Believe it or not, more people thought that the pro wrestler would be elected President.

Another one was, "If you had \$1,000 to bet on the Superbowl or \$1,000 to pay into the Social Security system, which one would give you a better return on your money?" Again, I think this is horrible, but more people believed in the Superbowl bet than the Social Security bet.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me interject something, because the American public does not know this. The actual rate of return, real dollar rate of return on one's money that one puts into Social Security over the last 30 years has been less than 1 percent per year. It has been six-tenths of 1 percent. Well, one could loan the money to one's grandkids at 2 percent and do three times better than what the Federal Government has done with one's Social Security money.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, what I think is interesting about that is that is not a fault of the designers of Social Security. In other words, back in 1935, when they created this system, I mean nobody could have anticipated that a baby boom generation was coming our way.

So I think that they did create a great system. It did a lot of good for my mother, for my grandmother. But the question now is, because of what has been going on here, in other words, because of the way Washington has been borrowing against these Trust Fund balances, we have a real problem. The question that the gentleman correctly raises is, what are we going to do to protect those balances?

Last year, when Washington borrowed \$101.3 billion from the Social Security Trust Fund, they did it without

people making a lot of noise back home. A lot of people did not realize that, one, the money had been borrowed, or those that did, it did not feel that real. It did not feel like it was out of their pocket.

But if that same money was housed in individual accounts, and I do not mean *laissez faire*, good luck, hope-you-make-it-when-you-retire kind of accounts, but accounts with a lot of controls, just as all Federal workers have, for instance, with the Thrift Savings Program, if we had those controls in place and people got a monthly statement and they knew to the penny how much was in their Social Security account, and then Washington came up \$100 billion short, and they said, "Well, let us see, Mr. COBURN, your pro rata share of that will be \$734.53. Would you mind cutting a check and sending it to Washington?" people would go berserk.

So I think that, as Alan Greenspan, chairman of the Federal Reserve, very correctly pointed out, we need to create a real firewall that protects basically people, Social Security money from the political forces in Washington.

□ 1545

Mr. COBURN. Let me add one other thing. The Social Security System, as designed, was a good system. We had a lot of people working to pay for very few people getting benefits.

We have two Members here that are term-limited that are talking about this issue. We are citizen legislators. We are both in our last term. We have been here 4 years. These are our last 2 years. One of the things that has happened is this body, because of politics rather than because of American spirit, has promised things for votes without asking the taxpayers to pay for it. So we have seen a lot of expansions in Social Security, which are not bad, but they did not have the political courage to say, if we spend more, we have to pay for it. So, therefore, the system's expenditures went up without a concomitant increase in the revenues to pay for it.

So now we have two problems: We have, one, the population shift with the baby boomers; but we also have the lack of true integrity by the Congress to pay for the things that they pass on as a benefit. So the way to get re-elected is to send the pork back home, tell people that we are doing something for them, but their grandchildren and their great grandchildren are going to be hassled, and their standard of living is going to be markedly decreased because we did not have the courage to say, if we are going to do something, we have to pay for it.

This gets me to the next slide: why we have to control spending. This is the Federal budget, excluding Social Security. These are the real numbers. This is no hokeypokey. There is nothing other than CBO numbers here and OMB numbers. President Clinton's budget and the actual CBO projections.

What we see here is if we do not restrain spending, then we are going to continue to spend more and more and more of the Social Security money on programs that are not related to Social Security.

Now, I happen to believe that this year or early next year we will run what is called a true surplus. That is, we will have more money coming into the government than we spend, excluding Social Security. The CBO budget projects that somewhere between 2000 and 2001. That is this green line. But if we follow what President Clinton wants to do, he wants to spend 38 percent, and, actually, it is more than that, it is about 45 percent in the next 5 years, of the Social Security surplus on new programs.

Now, I come from a district that is a Democrat district. I am a Republican, but my district is 75 percent registered Democrats. My Democrats, my constituents, do not want that money spent. And what will we see as we do this? What happens to the national debt? The national debt goes up. What is it that our children are going to have to pay back? They are going to have to pay back the national debt. Under President Clinton's program he is going to raise the national debt hundreds of billions of dollars. The total debt.

Now, sure, he is going to shift some of it, but at the end of this last year, when we went through, and even though we spent Social Security money and we paid off some external debt, our national debt actually increased \$22 billion. Now, what is the reason for that? We passed spending proposals that were off budget. Emergency supplementals.

Whenever we hear those words, "emergency supplemental", what that means is our grandchildren are getting ready to get it. Because it is not going to be paid for, except in rare instances. This Congress, since 1994, has offset two of those, but the vast majority have not been offset, so they will end up paying for that. And the next year, that money that was spent comes in to raise the baseline of spending for that year.

So the reason the national debt went up \$22 billion, even though we retired external debt, is because we borrowed more than what we showed on the books. There was another \$22 billion that was spent that we were not honest with the American public about who was going to pay for it. And it is our grandchildren.

I have two little grandchildren, a 3-year-old and a 1-year-old, and the last thing I want to do is leave them a legacy where they have an income tax rate of 30 percent and a working tax rate, a FICA tax rate, of 25 percent, and that their standard of living is going to be markedly lower than ours.

What is the answer to that? Let me just finish this point. The answer is the Federal Government is not efficient. I have asked about that around this

country and nobody says, yes, the Federal Government is efficient. Well, if it is not efficient, why do we not cut spending within the Federal Government to make it efficient so that we will not spend Social Security money?

The education dollars that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) wants to spend, and which we need to invest in education, I do not think we will find anybody that disagrees with that, we can find that money through the inefficiencies of the Federal Government.

One last example. If this country were to go to war tomorrow, we would all, as a Nation, hunker down and say, we have an emergency, we can do things better, we can do things more efficiently, we can do things in a way that costs less.

We have an emergency right now equal to any world war we would go to, and that emergency is we are taking away the opportunity, we are taking away the future of our grandchildren by not having the courage to stand up and cut the spending where it does not need to be spent and spend the money where it does need to be spent.

Mr. SANFORD. On that point, I think it is interesting that Economist magazine, which is certainly well regarded, ran an article in the last 2 weeks called "Counting Your Chickens Before They're Hatched", and what the article talked about are the projected surpluses that are supposed to one day materialize and yet how maybe that might not happen. And, therefore, if we commit it to other forms of government spending, in other words, these projected surpluses, if we commit them to different forms of spending, we are kind of locked into a situation that could cause us to leave this place running big massive deficits.

Larry Lindsey, who was a member of the Fed, wrote an interesting piece about 6 months ago breaking out the revenue stream to the Federal Government. In other words, the taxes that are sent in by Americans across this country up to Washington. His argument was that a large part of this job of balancing the budget has, as the gentleman correctly pointed out, not been done by folks in Washington by actually cutting spending but it has really been done on the shoulders of working Americans.

Because what had happened is the historic average, basically since the time of World War II, in other words, government's take as a percentage of all the activity in America, what they call GDP, has been about 20 percent. We have been basically at or slightly below that number. Well, right now we are at a post-World War II high in terms of Washington's take as a percentage of the collective activity of working Americans. And if we actually really break out the number, what we see is a large part of that income stream to the Federal Government is due to capital gains income and it is due to bonus income. It is tied to this bull market.

Well, most certainly, at some point, this market is going to cool off. And Mr. Lindsey's argument was that when it does so, all of a sudden, since it is income tax that is solving the problem rather than spending cuts, it is going to cause us to run big deficits again. So the importance of what the gentleman is stressing here, which is actually keeping a lid on government spending, I do not think can be overemphasized. Because here we have a member of the Fed saying how important this is, which is exactly what the gentleman is saying right now.

Mr. COBURN. I think what is important for everyone to understand is all of this red in the President's budget comes from social security taxes. Every bit of it. And what he has said is that we are only going to spend 38 percent of social security taxes on something else, rather than we are going to take Social Security and put that money in Social Security and have the fiscal discipline to control the spending in the Federal Government.

Mr. SANFORD. And could I add on that point? I do not know if the gentleman has looked at the analytical perspectives within this year's budget, but there are assumptions that could make those red numbers, frankly, a lot bigger. Because one of the assumptions built into the Social Security plan is that domestic discretionary, which is basically every other spending outside of Medicare and interest and Social Security, is going to go dramatically down.

Right now it is about 7 percent of GDP, again, the collective activity of all working Americans, and what they assume is that it goes down to 3 percent. Now, they had to assume that, because to keep the amount of money going into Washington within historic bounds, which is about this 20 percent number, and given the fact we have 70 million baby boomers starting to retire around 2012, and we know entitlement spending is going to go up, to keep it within that realm of reasonableness, they had to shrink the other number.

I think that is a crazy assumption. Because what it means is if all of a sudden Congress does not get real tough in this other area of government spending called domestic discretionary, what that means is a tax cut down the road, which goes straight back to the gentleman's grandkids.

Mr. COBURN. Absolutely. There is another thing which is important to note. And this is not a method to try to beat up on the President's budget. That is not my point. My point is to draw a contrast. Even within this, there is \$50 billion worth of tax increases, in fees and licensing fees and tax changes. So that if, in fact, the \$50 billion in tax increases were not added, we would be stealing \$75 billion or \$80 billion from the Social Security based on the spending.

The Congress agreed with the President in 1997 that we would have 5-year budget caps that were locked into law.

It was an agreement. Last year the omnibus reconciliation package broke that agreement. The President signed it, this House signed it. Neither of these two gentlemen that are talking today agreed with that. We did not vote for that bill. The point being, as we start the 2000 budget, with the administration's budget, they break the spending caps by \$30 billion.

So we have to get back to this idea that we have to restrain spending. The fact is there are lots of programs within the Federal Government that are ineffective, that have not been looked at, that do not accomplish what they were set out to do, that have not had an oversight hearing to make sure they do that. The Congress has failed to do its job for the last 20 years in terms of oversight. There have been very few programs that have been started that have ended, number one; and there have been even many more of those that have been started that we have never looked at to see if they were accomplishing the very goal we set out to accomplish.

So if, in fact, we can constrain spending, by the year 2001 we will have a real surplus, and then we can decide what we do with that real surplus. Do we pay down the debt, as most of the seniors in my district want us to do? Do we give some money back to people who are working poor and working? Because they are having trouble making it now. Do we give some of this money back to them? Do we expand selectively some of the government programs?

Our goal should be to let us not spend anything until we are in this stage. We are spending money we do not have now and we are stealing from the Social Security System.

I see the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is here. Would he like to jump in on this?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Well, I just wanted to thank my colleagues, number one, for doing the special order and for, number two, inviting me to participate in this process.

I am part of the Committee on the Budget, and as we enter the next couple of weeks the decisions that we make are going to be critical. Do we stay within the spending caps, the agreed-upon level that a couple of years ago we said we can live within this; that we can get done what we want to get done in Washington if we spend at this level?

I know a couple of years ago some of us had a very difficult time voting for those spending caps because we thought it was too much money. We said we need to get to a surplus quicker and we ought to rein that spending in a little. But as part of a bipartisan compromise, the President coming to the table, our colleagues on the other side coming to the table, we said, all right, we will give, we will let us have a little more spending. And now we get to 1999, the economy has been good, Washington has been collecting more

in taxes than what we expected we would, and the first inclination here in Washington is, times are good, let us spend it.

Mr. COBURN. Show me the money.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Show me the money, and out the door it goes. Again, we have kind of set the priorities in the wrong place, because we have said the first place the money goes is to us, this generation, this generation of citizens and this government in Washington. And, really, what we ought to be doing is we ought to be taking care of the sins of the Congresses in the 1980s who built up this \$5.5 trillion debt. We ought to take care of those sins and start paying down the debt.

I agree with the gentlemen. In my district people are saying, nobody is talking about paying down the debt. They say we are talking about reducing taxes, we are talking about more spending, but nobody is talking about paying down the debt. We ought to take care of the sins of the 1980s and start paying down the debt. And when we do that, that is good for seniors, because we strengthen Social Security; and that is good for our kids, because it takes this \$5.5 trillion debt off their back.

□ 1600

Mr. COBURN. I think again, just to reemphasize the point, first, if we do not put all the Social Security money into Social Security, one, if we do not address the problems with Social Security, we are going to see at least \$800 billion per year in increased taxes on working Americans just to pay for Social Security. That does not have factored into it any inflationary spirals that might be higher than what we think they are going to be.

So to get \$800 billion in 2030, \$780 billion in 2029, what do we do? What that means is the constituents in my district, my grandchildren, they are not going to get to do anything except barely eat, barely sleep and have a roof over their head if they want to pay for my generation's Social Security.

So the hard work has to start now. The hard work has to be associated with restraining spending, not necessarily new spending on new programs but paying for it by cutting spending somewhere else that is not effective, rather than spending more of our grandchildren's money.

Mr. SANFORD. I know that the primary focus of our brief visit this afternoon is on government expenditure, it is on truth in advertising, if you want to call it that, because the government has been, I think, disingenuous with the way it has called this a surplus, because this is not what folks at home would call a surplus, it is not what business would call a surplus. But tied to it is this issue of Social Security. There is one point that I think is worth mentioning, because it frankly sounds alluring. As you mentioned earlier, which is not related to reserving the surplus for Social Security but in the

larger context of the Social Security problem, that the trustees, not what I say, not what you say, not what the gentleman from Michigan says but what the trustees have said is that if we do nothing to save Social Security, it is going to have real problems down the line. The choices are fairly limited as we all know. You can cut current benefits, you can raise taxes, or you can grow the assets of the trust fund at a higher rate than they are now growing at.

Mr. COBURN. Let me ask the gentleman a question. If all the money coming into the Federal Government, real surplus plus Social Security, was saved, we still will not have enough money to take care of Social Security, will we?

Mr. SANFORD. Correct.

Mr. COBURN. That is an important point that the President has never mentioned. No matter what the surpluses are in the future, no matter how great they are, saving all Social Security money for Social Security plus all the rest of it will never save enough money to be able to meet the obligations for the babies born from 1942 on. We will never get out of the hole. So something has to happen. I think that is the gentleman's point.

Mr. SANFORD. Of the available choices, I mean, it seems to me that the most reasonable of those three choices would be growing the assets of the trust fund at a higher rate. And then the question simply is, well, do we do that collectively, which is essentially what the President had proposed with investing a portion of the trust fund in equities, or do we do that through individual accounts?

I just think it is worth stressing that in my look at this problem, the idea of an individual account and not a *laissez faire*, good-luck-grandmom-hope-you-make-it-when-you-retire kind of account, but the idea of a controlled personal account with a lot of different safeguards, just as a janitor here on Capitol Hill would have through the Thrift Savings Plan.

Mr. COBURN. The whole idea is with a guarantee that nobody would ever get less than what they are committed to now in terms of Social Security. There will always be that guarantee there.

Mr. SANFORD. The reason I think that is so important is, more than anything, and this is again what the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, said, that you have to create a firewall between political forces in Washington and that money. If there is not a firewall, most certainly the money will be borrowed against, which is what has been happening over the last 30 years, to fund other areas of government. So if you are going to create that firewall, again I come down on the side of individual accounts, not only because of the firewall but also because of the way this place works.

It is interesting, it sounds enticing, let us invest collectively, we will get

the higher return and we will take risk out, but by leaving it there, it leaves Washington's hands in it and that means a couple of things. It means, one, I do not think you can serve two masters. Microsoft stock, for instance, last December, not this December but the December before, between December 18 and December 23 dropped by about 14 percent. It did so when the Justice Department announced that they were bringing suit against Microsoft. If the Federal Government was invested in Microsoft through the form of the Social Security trust fund, then all of a sudden you are going to have AARP calling you up, their representatives saying, "Wait, don't bring up that suit because my trust fund money is in that." In other words, it is very difficult in Washington to serve two masters. I think we ought to think about that. For that matter it is very difficult in Washington to serve one master.

The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) to his credit cares passionately about the issue of tobacco smoking. I cannot imagine him disappearing and not caring what the trust fund was invested in because he cares about the issue. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) from the Republican side cares passionately about the issue of abortion. I cannot imagine him sitting idly by while the trust fund was invested in a pharmaceutical company that had a pill related to abortion. In other words, from all sides there would be political influence in the trust fund. What I think you have to look at in a trust fund is how are you going to get the highest return so that one can enjoy the best return.

Mr. COBURN. Let me just summarize, if I can. The whole purpose of talking to the American public about this is it is called daylight. Knowledge is powerful. The more Americans know that we are actually taking Social Security money and spending it on something other than Social Security, the more reaction that we are going to get to say, "Don't do it." Because we know not to do it, but the tendency in Washington is to spend money, not conserve your money. The tendency is to think in the short term, not the long term. I want us thinking about our grandchildren, and I want us to ensure that we live up to every commitment that we have made to seniors. We can only do that if we are honest about the problem that faces us. To be dishonest will compound the problem for another generation past this one.

Any fix that is going to happen on Social Security cannot be a short-term fix. It has to be a long-term fix. And it has to recognize the reality which is the government cannot continue to take 22 percent of the gross domestic product without holding down growth, holding down opportunity, holding down job creation and holding down capital investment.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield, I think the other thing that

we have to take a look at is now is a wonderful window of opportunity. Much like we did a couple of years ago when we did the balanced budget agreement, we can and we found common ground, we did it with welfare and when we found the common ground, we were able to move forward and 3 years later we are finding out that those programs have been very successful. When we worked to cut spending, when we worked to do the budget agreement, we said we can get to a surplus by 2002. Under those rules, we were there in 1998. Now I think we can apply that same kind of creativity in a much different environment because we have made so much progress on spending, we can take that creativity and apply it to Social Security and I think the values and the principles that the gentleman was articulating are exactly what we want to do. We want to make sure that we don't impact seniors' benefits. We want to really restore the integrity of Social Security for 50 to 75 years. We want to make real progress on those issues.

The other thing that we know that we can do is that we can make a lot of other progress. The interesting thing is we get to a surplus, is that we forget about the \$1.6 trillion that we are currently spending and we naturally assume that all that money is being spent wisely. Today in the Education Committee we marked up what we call an ed flex bill which is going to allow the States a much greater degree of flexibility. Why? Because when they get involved in reporting back to Washington from a State or a local level every dollar that we collect in taxes for education, only 65 cents of it reaches a child. And that if we apply the same kind of creativity to that \$1.6 trillion that we are spending today, we open up all kinds of opportunities to better educate our kids so that no child will be left behind, that we then would have room for Social Security, to save Social Security, and then if we really are serious about taking a look at that \$1.6 trillion that we are spending today, we would also have room for tax cuts, by saying we can get the same impact for education.

We took, and my colleagues are both familiar with this, on Education at the Crossroads, 39 different agencies administering something like 700 programs, losing 35 cents of every education dollar to bureaucracy, not to educating children. Just think about changing that process and focusing on the kids. We can get 35 percent more Federal money into the classroom just by taking a look at the process here and saying, it is not the process that is important, it is not the bureaucracy that is important, it is our kids that are important and we are going to get there.

This is really a wonderful era right now that we ought to grasp and we ought to take a look at every issue. We ought to save Social Security, but we cannot forget about going back and

taking a look at the \$1.6, \$1.7 trillion that we spend each and every year.

Mr. COBURN. I think the other point that the Education at a Crossroads made to me is not all our problems in education are going to be solved by money. I have a daughter who is not teaching now, she is fortunate enough to be able to be home raising her children. But what she told me was two things about education. One is, is I got to spend about a third of my time filling out paperwork for the bureaucracy. The second thing is I do not have the tools to control the discipline in my classroom.

So it does not matter how much money we spend, if we do not fix those two problems where teachers can teach, then we are not going to solve the problem. It is easy to get a vote from a constituent saying I am spending a lot of money on education. It is very difficult to talk about what the real problem is, because it requires us to change. It requires all of us to participate and do something.

I just wanted to make one other thing. I am into my sixth decade. I proudly have joined an organization called AARP. I did that not because they necessarily represent all my viewpoints but I wanted to be able to have input as we say this, I am interested in getting my Social Security. I am a baby boomer. I have an investment in my retirement. Since I am not going to have a retirement from Congress, I am going to want my Social Security money. So to me it is important that we create the truthful paradigm that we are trying to make sure the American public knows today about where the Social Security money is, where it is going and how big the problem is for the future.

Mr. SANFORD. I would follow up with, as we look at ways of doing that, I think it is very important that we focus on the big problem. At times in Washington, we get so caught up in actuarial balance of the trust fund and it will extend it from 2030 to 2035 and 2030 to 2045, all kinds of strange numbers focused only on the trust fund but not really focused on the big picture. The big picture to me would be that Roosevelt when he and others designed this system, the promise was we will create a system that creates for you a better lifetime in retirement. In this whole debate, I think we ought to keep focused on not just actuarial balance of trust funds, because we can do that. We can do that by cutting benefits a little bit, raising taxes a little bit. In other words, we can get to actuarial balance in the trust funds fairly easily. Taxes have been raised almost 50 times or benefits cut almost 50 times within the system since it was created. But I think we could do that and still miss the main point. The main point is are we or are we not keeping Roosevelt's promise of a better lifetime in retirement?

As you correctly pointed out, there was a recent UCLA study that showed

for a young person born in 1970, they would have to live 110 years just to get their own Social Security taxes back out. Not even a return on the Social Security but just the taxes themselves back out.

Mr. COBURN. Let us say that in a little plainer words. If you put X amount of dollars into Social Security and you were born in 1970, what that says is you would have to live to be 110 years old until you got that money back. That is not in real dollars, that is in dollars from 1970, which means you would probably have to live to 130 or 140 to get it back in real dollars, not counting earning any interest on the money that you had invested.

Mr. SANFORD. So some of these looks at fixing the problem may fix the trust fund but make it so that somebody has to live 150 years to get their return. That is not the promise of Social Security. What I am hearing from constituents back home is Social Security taxes are the largest tax 73 percent of Americans make. Consequently what they are telling me is for me, it is the largest investment I will make. Therefore, you need to make this stuff count. Because some people say, you need to focus on additional savings outside of the roughly 10 percent of what you earn every day, every week and every month on Social Security. You need to make additional savings. They are saying, "Mark, you can only squeeze but so much blood from a turnip. I am struggling between gas money, rent money, food money, education money. I don't have any other savings. Therefore, I've got to make Social Security count."

So we have got to stay focused not on actuarial balance but on the promise of Social Security which is to make sure it is not a system that guarantees somebody a negative rate of return or a 1 percent rate of return but something higher than that.

□ 1615

Mr. COBURN. Let me share with my colleagues, as they both know, I practice medicine on Mondays and sometimes on Fridays and on the weekends, and I cannot use the patient's name because I would be breaking a confidence, but I am going to call her Mattie. Mattie, she has diabetes, she has hypertension, she has congestive heart failure. She is getting her Social Security. Her husband recently died. There is no way she can have on today's payment an adequate living to care for her without her children helping her out.

Mr. Speaker, just to fix Social Security we are going to get back to that point, let alone meeting the obligations that we really have for our seniors. So what we are really talking about is getting people back up in the future to meeting what was originally promised and meeting that commitment, but it does not solve all our problems with our seniors.

Mr. Speaker, the government cannot solve all those problems. That is why

family support is so important, and this young lady, she is 86 years old, would not make it if she did not have a family.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman would yield, I think what our colleague has pointed out is the awesome responsibility you have. As my colleagues know, at the Federal level, at the State level and at the local level we are going to working Americans and saying:

The first 40 cents you own of every dollar is ours.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have got an awesome responsibility as to how we spend that money, how we spend it today, and also the commitments and the promises that we make. So, as my colleagues know, we are in many ways making a lot of choices for those people on how their money is going to be spent because we have taken it from them, and we do not give them a choice as to whether they are going to use it for education, for homes, for an investment or for their retirement.

Mr. COBURN. Let me get the gentleman to yield for a minute, if he would. That to me says we certainly do not want to waste this money and that we want that in the green so they will have more of that flexibility. And that is the contrast here. Hundreds of billions of dollars of additional Social Security being spent on non-Social Security programs versus no Social Security money being spent on anything except Social Security, and when we do get to a true surplus, then deciding what we do with it.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, we have the commitment then not only for how we spend the current dollars, the 1.6-1.7 trillion, but then we also have the commitment that our colleague was talking about, the promises that they inherently believe that we have made. I mean, every week they are paying 12-13 percent to Social Security and Medicare, expecting that somewhere along the line they are going to receive a benefit from that. But we know from all the surveys that most young people do not believe they will ever see a penny of it, and that means that we are not really keeping the faith with the people that are paying those taxes today because they do not believe that they will ever get it, that we will ever solve, if the gentleman will fetch that chart back up, as my colleague knows, they do not have a degree of confidence that we are going to take care of that blue part of the chart.

Mr. COBURN. So let me ask the gentleman from Michigan a question. Can we solve the Social Security problem and can we meet the obligations to seniors in this country and can we do that honestly?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Absolutely.

Mr. COBURN. Absolutely.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The opportunity is here today to do that.

Mr. COBURN. And that means we have to be honest about what the numbers are. We cannot use this as a political tool to win a political race. We have to be honest. This should be above politics. This should be above, about keeping our commitment to our seniors, and making sure we ensure a future for the working people today, and making sure we ensure the opportunity for our children and grandchildren for tomorrow. I believe we can do that, but it is going to take political courage. It is going to take the courage of statesmen, not politicians, to come up here and do that. The American public is going to have to measure whether or not we did that or not.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would say again, and I do not want to go off the subject, which again is rightly focused on honesty in accounting, and that is if we, as my colleagues know, if we have to borrow money to get to run the surplus that we are running, most folks would say we are not running a surplus and therefore it is important to do something about spending. That is the primary thing we are talking about.

But tied to that again is this issue of Social Security, and I think it is so important that when we look at security for Social Security, of the available choices which are cut benefits, raise taxes or grow the investment at a higher rate than we are growing at, that we simply take a page out of the Federal book, if my colleagues want to call it that. Because everybody from a senator to a janitor here on Capitol Hill has the option of going into basically a 401(k) plan, a savings plan, and in that plan they have got a limited number of investment choices. One can have a Treasury fund, a corporate bond fund or an equities fund; and with all that, nobody can put all their eggs in one basket, nobody can go out and say, I have got a hot stock tip from my brother-in-law, and I think I am going to invest my Social Security money in that or, in this case, their thrift savings money in that. Nobody can say, I hear the Singapore derivatives are a hot investment right now; I think I will go into that. It is all very much controlled, and what is interesting about that, as a result, there are no horror stories of janitors on Capital Hill losing everything that they have.

So I think it is important that we look at the idea of putting to work what Einstein called the most powerful force in the universe, and that was this power of compound interest.

As my colleagues know, there was this woman a couple years back, and I do not know if my colleagues remember the story, a woman by the name of Oseola McCarty, and she was from Hattiesburg, Mississippi, and yet she ended up on the front page of the New York Times, not for axe murdering a cousin or a nephew, but for a great reason, and that was she went down to the local university and said, I would like to help out. And she was a woman of very

humble means. She had never made a lot of money over her lifetime. In fact, she had washed clothes over the bulk of her lifetime.

So, therefore, the people at the university figured, yes, she is going to make us a cloth doily or a napkin, maybe something that she has hand-made. Instead, she strokes them a check for about \$100,000. They are flabbergasted, and the reporter there from the New York Times is asking:

How in the world did you do this?

And she says:

Well, I just put a little bit away over a long period of time.

Mr. Speaker, that power of compound interest is something that we ought to take advantage of when we look at cures for Social Security.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman would yield, I think, and also as we take a look at it, I do not think there are any proposals here that are saying take all of the Social Security money and do that with all of the Social Security funds. It is most of the proposals, if not all of them, are very modest proposals to take advantage of the exact benefit that the gentleman is talking about, and they all have structured in them protections for the individuals who will be on Social Security so that they will not get less money than what they get today but will have the opportunity to earn higher returns and have a higher payout when they get to be 65 or 67.

Mr. SANFORD. And, most significantly, I think they would keep in place the safety. The key issue with Social Security is safety of Social Security. If we were to draw a financial pyramid, the safest investments ought to be there at the foundation, if my colleagues will, of the investment, and Social Security is that foundation.

So I think the most important thing is the safety, and I go again straight back to what Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, said:

If we leave the money in Washington, political forces will probably find a way to get their hands on that money, which is what has been happening for the last 30 years.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman would yield, I just want to make one point that I do every time.

I have had a lot of meetings with seniors in my district because I wanted to start with seniors because I want to make it very clear to them that what we are talking about. We are not talking about, if you are getting a Social Security check today, we are not talking about changing their system. As my colleagues know, they are not going to next month or next year get a letter saying, you know, you have got this money and you have to figure out how to invest it in these kinds of things. No. If they are on Social Security and they are getting a check today, we are not messing with that.

What we are doing is we are talking about how we are going to save Social Security for our kids and for our

grandkids, and it will be a transition process. It is not going to affect you. It is probably not even going to affect people who are 60 years old today. It is going to affect the people who are younger than that who are going to have time to understand any changes, will be a dialogue with them. We will process through these types of changes, and we will not jeopardize their Social Security either. But for the people who are getting a check today, it is not going to change.

Mr. COBURN. We are about to run out of time. I just want to leave the American public with something that Martin Luther King said in his last speech at the National Cathedral. He said that cowardice asks the question, is it expedient? And we have seen a lot of expediency in this body through the years. And he said vanity asks the question, is it popular? And we have seen a lot of things done because they are popular but not necessarily good for the Social Security system or not good for the future of our children. But he said conscience asks the question, is it the right thing to do?

The debate this year about the budget and about Social Security cannot be based on expediency, cannot be based on popularity. It has to be based on what is right and best for all three generations concerned.

I want to thank the gentlemen for sharing this time with me, and I hope we can do it again.

SALUTE TO A. LEON HIGGINBOTHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is an honorable place; and our biggest challenge, of course, is to ensure the people's wants and desires are our first priority. In this very historic place have been major debates: the decision to move into World War II, the Korean confrontation, the Vietnam war.

But the mighty issues of the 1960s, post Brown versus Board of Education, and the civil rights marches and the march on Washington in 1963; I might imagine that there were emotional debates around the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voter Rights Act of 1965.

It is fitting in recognizing this honorable place and those enormous challenges that we met that we bring attention to a gentleman who throughout his life played a pivotal role in changing the lives of so many Americans. He was part of that debate, although he was not a Member of the United States Congress. His words, his opinions, his convictions were all interwoven in the success stories of what we ultimately accomplished, those who served in the United States Congress during that time frame.

We lost him last year.

So it is my honor to be able to rise today and salute A. Leon

Higginbotham, a warrior, a jurist, an intellectual giant, a committed American; most of all, a lover of the Constitution. And I believe today, as we proceed to honor him, we will find enormous inspiration no matter what side of the aisle we may come, Democrats or Republicans, Independents, in what he stood for and how he loved this Nation.

I know that his wife and best friend, Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, misses him greatly. To her I say, and her children, Karen and Nia, Stephen and Kenneth, who are listening today, watching today, this is not done out of a sense of officialdom, but it is a privilege, it is an honor to be able to salute this great American and to commemorate him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for he has touched so many lives.

I am going to start, and as I start I want to make note of the fact that one of his employees, if I might say, one who joined him in so many fights, has joined me on the floor of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON). By the way, his wife looks forward to the tribute of which she will be organizing this coming April. She is excited about it and looks forward to it.

□ 1630

Let me begin, and then I will yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia. This is, I think, the best way to introduce many Members to a person who all of us will assume is our friend and was our friend, and that is, A. Leon Higginbotham, Junior.

His book, *In the Matter of Color, Race and the American Legal Process: A Colonial Period*, is a giant of a statement on American history. But I would be remiss not to share with you about the man. The preface of this book reads as follows. It gives us a sense of what molded him, what caused him to be so convicted and so committed.

This book has been in the writing for almost 10 years. But if isolated personal incidents really do play the dramatic role in redirecting lives they often seem to have played, I have to go back for the book's very beginnings to a painful memory that comes out of my freshman year at college. Perhaps it was not the incident itself but the proper legal basis upon which the personal affront was rationalized that may turn out to have been the seed out of which this work has grown slowly.

Let me take you back to 1944. I was a 16-year-old freshman at Purdue University, one of 12 black civilian students that was attending that school. If we wanted to live in West Lafayette, Indiana, where the university was located, solely because of our color, the 12 of us at Purdue were forced to live in a crowded private house rather than, as did most of our white classmates, in the University campus dormitories. We slept, barrack style, in an unheated attic.

One night, as the temperature was close to zero, I felt that I could suffer the personal indignities and denigration no longer. The United States was more than 2 years into the Second World War, a war our government promised would make the world safe for democracy. Surely there was room enough in

that world, I told myself that night, for 12 black students in a northern University in the United States to be given a small corner of the on-campus heated dormitories for their quarters. Perhaps all that was needed was for one of us to speak up, to make sure the administration knew exactly how a small group of its students had been treated by those charged with assigning student housing.

The next morning I went to the office of Edward Charles Elliott, president of Purdue University, and I asked to see him. I was given an appointment. At the scheduled time I arrived at President Elliott's office, neatly but not elegantly dressed, shoes polished, fingernails clean, hair cut short.

"Why was it," I asked him, "that blacks and blacks alone had been subjected to this special ignominy?" Though there were larger issues I might have raised with the President of an American university, this was but 10 years before *Brown vs. Board of Education*. I had not come that morning to move mountains, only to get myself and 11 friends out of the cold.

Forcefully, but nonetheless deferentially, I put forth my moderate or modest request, that the black students of Purdue be allowed to stay in some section of State-owned dormitories, segregated if necessary, but at least not humiliated.

Perhaps if President Elliott had talked with me sympathetically that morning, explaining his own impotence to change things but his willingness to take up the problem with those who could, I might not have felt as I did. Perhaps if he had communicated with some word or gesture, or even a sigh, that I had caused him to review his own commitment to things as they were, I might have felt I had won a small victory.

But President Elliott, with directness and with no apparent qualms, answered, "Higginbotham, the law doesn't require us to let colored students in the dorm, and you either accept things as they are, or leave the university immediately."

As I walked back to the house that afternoon, I reflected on the ambiguity of the day's events. I heard, on that morning, an eloquent lecture on the history of the Declaration of Independence and of genius of the Founding Fathers. That afternoon I had been told that under the law, the black civilian students at Purdue University could be treated differently from their 6,000 white classmates. Yet I knew that by nightfall, hundreds of black soldiers would be injured, maimed, and some even killed on far-flung battlefields to make the world safe for democracy.

Almost like a mystical experience, a thousand thoughts raced through my mind as I walked across the campus. I knew then that I had been touched in a way I had never been touched before, and that one day, that I would have to return to the most disturbing element in this incident, how a legal system that proclaimed equal justice for all could simultaneously deny even a semblance of dignity to a 16-year-old boy who had committed no wrong. Shortly thereafter I left Purdue University and transferred to Antioch College. Ultimately I chose law as my vocation, and in 1952, I graduated from Yale Law School.

On that opening note, let me say that not only was his life changed, but he helped change the lives of Americans. So that is why today we take the challenge of trying to commemorate his legacy in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be given to his family and to honor him appropriately.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the esteemed, honorable gentlewoman

from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), who will provide us with her own insight of Judge Higginbotham.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding, and I thank her for her hard work on this special order in tribute to a great American. It is, I think, quite appropriate that there should be a special order for Judge A. Leon Higginbotham here on this very Floor of the House of Representatives. He testified shortly before his death here in the House. His work for many Americans and their right to representation in this body after he left the bench also entitles his memory to be noted here.

May I say that this is only one of many commemorations that are being held for Judge Higginbotham around the country. I myself was at such a memorial for him just 2 weeks ago at the Yale Law School. There are memorials at the several law schools where he taught, in addition to the many other things that he did in his life.

There will also be a memorial here in the House sponsored by the Congressional Black Caucus for Judge Higginbotham in April, and Members will receive notice of that memorial. We expect that his wife, herself a distinguished scholar, Dr. Evelyn Higginbotham, will be here.

The man we commemorate on the Floor this afternoon is a man of rare talent and humanity, an extraordinary American, an astute scholar, a great Federal judge. I would like to say a few words about his role as a judge and his role as a scholar, as Members may come to talk about the role he played in lawsuits that were brought by Members in order to secure their places here as representatives in the House of Representatives.

When Judge Higginbotham was appointed, initially named to the bench by President Kennedy, who then was assassinated, and had his name moved forward by President Johnson, he was one of the youngest men ever appointed to the bench, and one of the first African Americans ever appointed to the Federal bench.

But I must tell the Members that this was not the kind of superlative that Judge Higginbotham was after in his life, the youngest or the blackest or the first of a kind. He spent his life being the best. He gave real meaning to a word we throw around without always being able to document it, the word "excellence."

Who is Leon Higginbotham? Leon Higginbotham was a poor black boy from Trenton, New Jersey, whose parents had no education, elementary school education, but whose life tells us that all you need is a mother and father who care deeply that you get an education in order to reach your own potential.

He had deep racial experiences as a child, even in the north, as Trenton, New Jersey, is located. But in a real sense, his own dedication to racial equality goes far beyond the personal.

It is very easy for me to be against racial segregation, because I went to segregated schools. That is hardly a principled position. It is a very important stimulus, and it is a very compelling way in which to understand racial segregation.

But Judge Higginbotham understood equality in racial terms out of his own life, and understood and was dedicated to equality as a universal principle. He felt as deeply about equality for women, for example, as for African Americans. He did not believe that the word or the idea of equality could be segmented.

It was my great privilege to know Judge Higginbotham up close when I was a young woman just coming to the bar, because I was privileged to be his first law clerk. Every student out of law school wants to clerk somewhere, and particularly for a Federal judge. But I have to tell the Members that there are Federal judges and there are Federal judges. The experience of clerking for an energetic, young, principled, brilliant Federal judge was a very important one for my own professional development.

Judge Higginbotham had already been the first black to serve on the Federal Trade Commission, but he had not had a lot of experience with young people. He was very young himself. He immediately made me into his apprentice, an extension of the judge. Of course, clerks do research for the judge, but we did research together. We wrote together. He would give me something that he wrote to edit. I would give him something that I wrote to edit.

The experience of working that closely with someone that accomplished is a wonderful way to get initiated into the profession. He was a consummate professional, a first class technical lawyer, which is something every young person could do with when you get out of law school and are, in effect, first then learning to be a lawyer.

Moreover, Judge Higginbotham was a wonderful mentor. That is not the word we used then. Mentoring has become something that is often spoken of today. It was simply a natural way to proceed for the judge, for I was the first of a very long line of clerks, research assistants, interns. We are all over the country now. Many of them worked on his books. Some of them assisted in his chambers. All of them learned from him.

At the same time, Judge Higginbotham, who will be known for his boldness on racial issues after he left the bench, enjoyed enormous respect at the bench and at the bar for his work as a judge.

First of all, there was his prodigious capacity for work. Then there was the thoroughness with which he went about his work, first as a lawyer, and then as a judge. Although we know the judge for his deep racial views, he is one of the most respected judges or was one of the most respected judges in the

United States for his principled interpretation of the law.

If you are a judge, and ultimately Judge Higginbotham became the chief judge on the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, you have to follow precedent if you are abiding by the rule of law, the rule of the law.

Let me quote from the Chief Judge of the Third Circuit today, Judge Edward Becker. I am quoting:

His jurisprudence was always anchored in the record. He could be and was eloquent in opinions when he was vindicating civil rights, but he didn't reach for the result. He was a good craftsman and an altogether solid judge.

Now, as judges go, Judge Higginbotham, I think, when one evaluates his work, will be remembered as an activist judge. I am proud of that. I know the gentlewoman is. But the fact that he could do that within his craft, adhering to the rule of law in a principled fashion, says everything about why he was so highly regarded everywhere among his peers who serve or have served on the bench.

Make no mistake about it, A. Leon Higginbotham was a black man, and understood himself as a black man. The gentlewoman has spoken about and has read from his own works about some of his early experiences. This is a man who would never forget that he was a black man.

□ 1645

Yet, his approach to equality coming out of his treatment as a black man was universal because it taught him that everyone had to be treated in just the same way as he demanded to be treated.

One of his opinions that I believe will become an American classic was a case where the defendant sought to disqualify the judge because of his racial views off the bench. The judge had no prejudicial racial views off the bench, but he was known to speak before groups about his feelings about racial equality.

The judge responded to this request that he recuse himself from hearing the case about racial discrimination with an exhaustive opinion. Here was a judge that just did not say that "I am not going to do it, and I resent the fact that you want me to get off the case simply because I am black and believe that black people should be treated equally and have deigned to say so." That is not how the judge did it. He wrote an exhaustive opinion showing why he should not be disqualified.

One of the lines from that opinion I want to read: "Black lawyers have litigated in the Federal courts almost exclusively before white judges, yet they have not argued that white judges should be disqualified on matters of racial relations."

But I would like to say a word about Higginbotham the scholar. The gentlewoman from Texas read from a book by the judge, "In the Matter of Color." I have an autographed copy here that is

very precious to me, and it is a book that was 10 years in the making because it documents the way in which the law was as enmeshed in all of our racial doctrine and practices.

What he demonstrates through a detailed evaluation of the case law and the statutory law in about a half dozen of the colonies is that without the law every step of the way, slavery, and later discrimination, would have been impossible. Law was the handmaiden of slavery and discrimination. Facilitated it. Augmented it. Made it possible.

Here was a man who loved the law. Loved the law enough to expose the law for the role it had played in the deepest injustice in our society so that we could understand it, throw it off, as will be the case when we do understand the derivation of an issue.

Leon Higginbotham lived several lifetimes all in one for his 70 years. I believe that his role as a scholar of the history of the law will be remembered as least as much as his role as a lawyer and a judge, because of these two monumental books, "In the Matter of Color," and the second book, "Shades of Freedom." He had intended to do about a half dozen such books. He got two done.

Essentially, what Higginbotham did was to look at 300 years of law. And when I say "law" I do not mean reading decisions of the Federal courts. I mean looking at every single case in the colonies, every single statute in the colonies, and in the process he unmasked what was and can only be called a jurisprudence of racism that is part and parcel of our law and was there from the very beginning. He showed how it was there even at the time of the writing of the Declaration of Independence which, of course, does not mention race at all.

Thus, what Higginbotham did as a scholar was to show us the law at its worst and our law as it is now becoming as its best. In effect, what he shows are the extraordinary, huge contradictions in our law and that these contradictions survived even the Civil War, which after all was fought in part to erase slavery and contradictions based on race. Instead, a new case law came into being and fortified discrimination to follow slavery.

In a real sense, Leon's time on the bench and his scholarly investigation is what undergirded his passion against racial discrimination. It is, as I have indicated, easy enough to have passion against racial discrimination that is felt. What was extraordinary to see was how Higginbotham was animated by what he had read about slavery, what he had discovered about the role of the law in perpetuating slavery and discrimination.

At the end of his life, that is what propelled him. It was intellectual curiosity at its best. And as one of his former law partners have said, he died working, which is what he wanted to do. He died in love with the law, exposing the law, wanting to let everyone

know what was wrong with it so that we could make it right. And he spent much of his life doing what it will take to make it right.

Like the gentlewoman, I would like to close by reading a couple of passages from "In the Matter of Color," because these passages document what I have been trying to convey about why the judge wrote about the law's imperfections.

I am quoting here: "Specifically, this book will document the vacillation of the courts, the State legislatures, and even honest public servants in trying to decide whether blacks were people and, if so, whether they were a species apart from white humans, the difference justifying separate and different treatment. I am aware that an analysis of cases, statutes and legal edicts does not tell the whole story as to why and how this sordid legal tradition managed to establish itself. Nevertheless, there is merit in abolitionist William Goodell's statement: 'No people were ever yet found who were better than their laws, though many have been known to be worse.'"

Finally, let me read the last passage I want to bring to the attention of this body. The judge goes on to say, "While I do not represent what I put forward here as a complete picture of the practices of the society, that canvas will never be painted unless someone first treats adequately the interrelationship of race and the American legal process."

Mr. Speaker, we are a part of the American legal process. To the extent that we come to grips with the scholarly discoveries of Leon Higginbotham, we will avoid the pitfalls out of which we have just come. Leon Higginbotham served us in so many ways. As a lawyer, as a judge, as a scholar, enlightening us, humanizing us in each and every role.

This special order simply brings to the attention of this body the role that a great man has played in the life of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for both her passion and her distinct eloquence.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear, after her rendition, why I thought it was so important to come to the floor and honor this great American. I am delighted as well that other Members are joining us, and I wanted to comment on some of the points made by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) in that she defined a special role and responsibility and interaction that she had with Judge Higginbotham.

I guess I can call myself a product of Judge Higginbotham's work, for in the State of Texas I would venture to say that it would be difficult to count more than 20 African-Americans on our entire State elected judiciary. Judge

Higginbotham and his research helped enunciate or make plain those difficulties.

The existence of this 18th Congressional District is by the very fine works of Judge Higginbotham and his supporting team, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, who argued against the demise of minority-majority districts which, for some reason, has gotten a bad name in our legal system and all we see it is as an attempt at representation.

But I think that it started early in his life, his recognition of the fact that he had to be a fighter. I am glad the gentlewoman ended on the fact that he was a great American. He, as a child, wanted to be a firefighter. But it was a time when racism and bigotry would not allow this dream to become a reality. And it is somewhat ironic that we have the ugliness of racism to thank for this advocate of civil rights. Thus, as he wanted as a youth to be a firefighter, he became in the end the responsible person for the dampening of the fires of racism.

As a jurist and as an author, Leon Higginbotham's dedication to civil rights of all Americans was unmatched. Judge Higginbotham reminded us in poignant terms and with his powerful voice of our Nation's tortuous and still unfinished struggle to live up to its constitutional mandate of equal justice under the law. He realized that the Constitution was an inclusive document designed by our founding fathers to include all Americans and he fought with all his might and intellect to protect his principles and guarantees.

One can imagine our perspective in the House Committee on the Judiciary during the impeachment proceedings when he brought this eloquence, this statesmanship, this intellect into those impeachment proceedings. Everyone to a one, Republicans and Democrats alike, respected this giant intellectual. And he handled us in that committee. And it was not with insult, but it was with straightforwardness. He knew the Constitution. He had lived it and he shared his vision with us. I thank Judge Higginbotham for that.

He was an African-American judge and we just finished celebrating African-American History Month. He is the kind of person that I know in years to come I will go into the halls of our elementary schools and middle schools and rather than seeing some of the age-old heroes that all of us support from the 1800s and early 1900s, and maybe the new ones, the athletes of the 20th century, we will begin to understand the role of Judge Higginbotham. And I can imagine that his face will be plastered all over the schools of America: Here we see a popular judge.

As a judge, he authored 600 opinions in 29 years, first on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania then on the Third U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, and finally as that court's Chief Judge.

He was a judge hero. He won awards. The Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1995, the Raoul Wallenberg Humanitarian Award, and he was so respected as a humanitarian that in 1994, South Africa President Nelson Mandela called him to be an international mediator in that country's first election.

He would never turn down anyone without a voice. At the height of racism in our country, Judge Higginbotham was able to break the color barrier and become an influential member of our society. He serves as an inspiration. And so it is important that we honor this soldier, born on February 25, 1928, in New Jersey. He was a son of New Jersey, and he liked to tell people before his death that there were only two books in his home, a dictionary and a Bible.

Higginbotham's personality and character are taken from his parents who believed that a man should be kind to everyone, regardless of their social class, and that they should be strong in their convictions. His father was a simple plant laborer who worked at the same plant for 45 years, and Judge Higginbotham would say that his father was late to work only once during that tenure.

Judge Higginbotham acquired his father's work ethic which few matched during his career as a judge, author, lawyer, professor, humanitarian.

□ 1700

But, oh, how he loved his mother. She had a sixth-grade education. He gave his mother credit for his appreciation of the value of education and compassion for his fellow man. His mother as well contributed to young Leon Higginbotham's work ethic. She not only raised him but also the children of the people for whom she worked.

Judge Higginbotham would often say of his mother that, if she had been given the opportunity, she could have been a lawyer or great psychiatrist. He would often refer to the lost opportunities of his mother and other African Americans by referencing the story of Saint Peter and Napoleon.

The story goes on that Napoleon happened upon Saint Peter one day in heaven and said he was the greatest general in the history of the world. Saint Peter responded to Napoleon, "No, you are not the greatest general."

Two days later, confused how he could not be the greatest general with his numerous victories, he asked Saint Peter if he could meet this individual. Saint Peter took Napoleon to meet this individual. To Napoleon's surprise, he recognized this person. Napoleon commented to Saint Peter that this individual had only made shoes for his army, and that Saint Peter must have been mistaken.

Saint Peter replied, "No, I am not mistaken. If this individual had been given the opportunity, he would have been the greatest soldier the world would have ever known."

Judge Higginbotham was a soldier but, as well, in his humble beginnings,

became a great jurist. So in his enrolling in Yale Law School, that further refined his desire, his intellect for service in the civil rights war.

He indicated that a janitor at Yale moved him to his ultimate commitment to civil rights. One of the greatest legal minds that this country had ever seen was convinced by a janitor that he made the right decision to attend Yale.

What most people do not realize is that, during that conversation that Judge Higginbotham had with this janitor, the janitor told Judge Higginbotham that he had worked sweeping those floors at Yale for 25 years in the hopes that he would see the day when an African American entered the doors of Yale. Judge Higginbotham did that in 1949 and graduated in 1952, going on to his first job as an Assistant District Attorney in Pennsylvania, going on to Special Deputy Attorney General for Pennsylvania, appointed by John F. Kennedy to the Federal Trade Commission, all firsts, and then ultimately to the 1964 appointment to the U.S. District Court in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. President Kennedy had nominated him in 1963, but a Mississippi Senator blocked his appointment for a year.

I want to just note for the RECORD a comment by Bernard Wolfman on Judge Higginbotham when he invited Judge Higginbotham to teach at Pennsylvania Law School. He described his aptitude and skill as a professor with the following description: "He has demonstrated by his life's work how one can love and serve the law at the same time as he makes a proper target of stringent criticism because of his prejudice, assumptions and dogma and because of the harm it inflicted on the people of color whose slavery in America the law had embraced and whose ultimate freedom the law was slow to promote or assure."

What an apt description of Leon Higginbotham. So much you could say, so much we want to say, so many denials to him, but yet so much a warrior and a victor, but yet a kindly man, astute with his own learning, but humbled by his own experience.

I am gratified today, Mr. Speaker, that Members of this House have come to join us in honoring Judge Leon Higginbotham. With that, I am delighted to yield to my esteemed colleague, the gentlewoman from Cleveland, Ohio (Mrs. JONES) who has joined us in this special order.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for this opportunity to be a part of this special order regarding the great, late Judge Higginbotham.

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) should be commended for organizing this special order, because we are paying tribute to one of America's greatest jurists and legal scholars.

I will always remember him as an advocate of civil and human rights. He

was a shining example of integrity and set the standard which all African Americans who aspired to be a Federal judge should meet and the standard that any person aspiring to be a Federal judge should meet.

Judge A. Leon Higginbotham was appointed to the Federal bench in 1964. In 1989, he became the chief judge of the United States Third Circuit Court of Appeals, which covers Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

He retired from the bench in 1993 but never from the struggle. Judge Higginbotham used his courtroom to display his dedication to human and civil rights. He enforced the broad constitutional protections of individual rights and personal liberties in tribute to his roll model, the late Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall.

It would only be interesting and axiomatic that, in fact, Judge Higginbotham had the opportunity to comment with regard to Judge Marshall's replacement on the bench and the need to never forget from whence you came.

History will recognize him as more than an outstanding jurist. He was an outstanding African American. He used his intellect as a tool to address the wrongs in America.

According to a noted Harvard law professor, Charles Ogletree, "He was the epitome of the people's lawyer. Despite his individual merits and accomplishments, he never hesitated to lend a hand to the poor, the voiceless, the powerless, and the downtrodden."

As a child, the Judge learned firsthand that separate and unequal reduced opportunities had cast a shadow on the horizon of African Americans. Judge Higginbotham credits his mother with instilling in him the importance of education. Education was the key that could unlock the door.

Soon after joining the Federal bench, Judge Higginbotham began teaching at the University of Pennsylvania. My colleagues have talked about his career prior to the bench and after the bench. But he would eventually author more than 100 Law Review articles and author a book, as has previously been said, entitled "In The Matter of Color." In Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, I had the opportunity and privilege to serve as a judge for more than a decade. He inspired me, Judge Higginbotham, to stay in the court, to be willing to make the right decision even when it was not the popular decision, to be a judge who was not content to hide behind the cannons of ethics, but willing to speak out on matters with respect to the legal system without violating those cannons of ethics.

I am pleased and privileged to stand before my colleagues today and to tell them that the last time I had a chance to see Judge Higginbotham was in Cleveland at Case Western Reserve University. He was delivering the Judge Frank J. Battisti lecture.

It is something that Judge Frank J. Battisti was, in fact, the judge who

made the decision in Cleveland that the school system had unfairly, unconstitutionally segregated schools for African American children.

Here it was Judge Higginbotham delivering that lecture. I have to tell my colleagues the room boomed. He delivered that address, stood tall above everyone else. I was pleased to have had an opportunity to be in the audience.

Judge Battisti's wife said, as she introduced Judge Higginbotham, no one could better deliver the lecture on behalf of her husband who took a lot of flack for saying that the schools in the City of Cleveland were unlawfully and unconstitutionally segregated.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for organizing this special order. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the opportunity to be heard. I ask all Americans to join us in celebrating a great American hero, the great, late Judge A. Leon Higginbotham.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for her passion, her enthusiasm, and the excitement that she has generated around the life and legacy of A. Leon Higginbotham. This is very special to have the gentlewoman's participation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Orleans, Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), the next governor of the State of Louisiana. And I hold in my hand one of the cases of Judge Higginbotham, the State of Louisiana versus Ray Hayes.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for yielding to me and for that very accurate description of me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great American, Judge A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., a man who was a giant in stature, a giant in intellect, and a giant in his unparalleled achievements.

Physically, Judge Higginbotham was a towering man who stood over 6 foot 4 inches tall and possessed a booming voice that was both awesome and inspiring. At a memorial service held for him in Philadelphia, there were many references to the voice, the Judge's booming baritone that commanded respect and attention in every setting.

Intellectually, Judge Higginbotham's peers heralded him as one of the most brilliant jurists, historians and scholars in the history of American jurisprudence. His numerous accomplishments include almost 30 years of distinguished service on the Federal bench, coveted teaching positions at both the University of Pennsylvania and Harvard University, and two renowned books and numerous articles on race and the American legal process.

In service, Judge Higginbotham was always a person of compassion, principle, and integrity. Though his work schedule was legendary, Judge

Higginbotham found the time to serve as a mentor, as a teacher, as an advisor, and as a friend to countless many.

In my own personal experience, Judge Higginbotham has come to this Congressional Black Caucus on numerous occasions to provide us advice, lectures, and to be involved in our Congressional Black Caucus weekends and stir us to a great achievement. He has been an inspirational figure for our Caucus for many years and was one who was always ready to give of his time.

In my own personal work for the Black Caucus, Judge Higginbotham joined with me and with Lou Stokes and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) to help in a project to raise money and to explain to the giving community how important it was to support reinforcement efforts around the country through that giving and through their support.

He traveled with us to New York and to Philadelphia to make the case as to why it still made sense for the community at large to give in this very important endeavor.

I can tell my colleagues, and on a more personal note, for my daughter Jamila, who was a student at Harvard Law School when Judge Higginbotham was there in his last years, he was her third-year paper advisor and was one who took the time to help her to get through her third year preparation and to graduate well from Harvard Law School. So I thank him personally for what he did for my family, particularly for my daughter.

Undoubtedly, Judge Higginbotham's personal attributes and professional accomplishments qualify him as a great American. However, I believe that his legacy lies in the fact that he used these attributes not to enrich himself but, instead, to enrich America.

He used his remarkable talents to mount an intellectual challenge to all vestiges of racism in society and the law and to provide constructive critique of those who chose to feign a color-blind vision of society and politics in America as an excuse for not dealing with the tough racial issues that face us all.

In his own words, "One of the biggest problems for American society during the 20th century is our not recognizing the consequences of racism and that the real test of the 21st century is our being able to move from equality in the abstract to equality in significant results."

It is not an overstatement to say that, in the last several decades, whenever the issues of social injustice were to be dealt with in this country, at the core of the debate was Judge Higginbotham, standing and speaking out on these very important questions.

Judge A. Leon Higginbotham was an extraordinary human being, who, in 1995, received the Nation's highest civilian honor, the President's Medal of Freedom.

Although he is gone, his legacy will live on in the many individuals whose

lives he has touched. We all shall remember him fondly, Mr. Speaker, and we shall miss his work with us, and God bless his family and keep him high in our memory.

I recall, as I stand here, the words of Frederick Douglass, which I think speak well to how we should remember Judge Higginbotham, and speaking about a fairly different issue, but nonetheless one that is related, the issue of liberty and freedom.

Frederick Douglass said something like this, "When it is finally ours, this freedom, this liberty, more usable to man than earth, more important to man than air, when it is finally ours," he said, "then when it is more than the mumbo jumbo of politicians," he said, "when it is diastole, systole, reflex action, when it is finally ours," he said, "then this man, this Douglass, this negro, beaten to his knees, but yearning for the day when none are enslaved, none are alien, none are hunted, then this man," he said "this Douglass will be remembered, oh, not with the statuted rhetoric," he said, "and not with wreaths of bronze alone, but with lives, grown out of his life, with lives fleshing his dream of this beautiful needful thing."

□ 1715

And so Judge Higginbotham's life will flesh our dreams of freedom and liberty in this country and we will live and work in the future and achieve because of the life and the legacy of this great man.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for those very moving closing remarks and the words that would be attributable to Judge Higginbotham.

I now want to yield, Mr. Speaker, to the chief constitutionalist on the Committee on the Judiciary, also a Yale law graduate and certainly friend of Judge Higginbotham, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEL WATT).

(Mr. WATT of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE), for organizing this special order in tribute to a wonderful human being and statesman, Judge Higginbotham.

Let me start by just expressing condolences to Judge Higginbotham's wife, Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, and to his two sons and his two daughters. They stood with him and by his side and enabled him to provide a service to our country that, in my estimation, is unparalleled in many respects.

This is a very sad occasion for all of us, when we pay tribute to a fallen hero, and Judge Higginbotham, indeed, was a hero for us. He was a man who practiced tolerance, and he practiced it because he had experienced many episodes of intolerance and he understood

the impact that intolerance and prejudice breeds in this country.

While he was a student at one university he complained about substandard housing for black students and was told by the president of the university, "The law doesn't require us to let colored students in the dorm, and you can either accept things as they are or you can leave, immediately."

Despite his outstanding academic credentials, he was denied employment by two major white law firms when they realized that this man, with these credentials on paper, was a black man.

So his tolerance and fight against intolerance grew out of himself being discriminated against and experiencing the negative impact of intolerance.

We can often tell a lot about a man by what other people say about him, and it was interesting to me some of the things that people said about him.

Here is Thurgood Marshall. Thurgood Marshall, former Justice on the United States Supreme Court, said of Leon Higginbotham: "A great lawyer and a very great judge." Not a long accolade, just concise and to the point.

President Clinton on Judge Higginbotham. "One of our Nation's most passionate and steadfast advocates for civil rights."

People were always calling this man a hero, but he was also a very humble man. Professor Charles Ogletree, "The epitome of the people's lawyer. Despite his individual merits and accomplishments, he never hesitated to lend a hand to the poor, the voiceless, the powerless, and the downtrodden."

This was a man who could command the respect of all of us, and did command the respect of all of us, yet he fought all the way to the end for ordinary common people.

I remember very well when my Congressional District was in the midst of litigation, and he said, "You know, we need to convene a group of people to talk about the importance of having minority representation in the Congress of the United States." About 2 weeks after that I got a call telling me that scholars and historians and professors and college presidents were convening to have a discussion about this issue in North Carolina.

He had just gotten on the phone and called systematically people that he knew would have an interest in this, and they all interrupted their schedule to come and have a discussion about how we would communicate to a court the importance of having minority representation in the Congress of the United States after North Carolina had been without a minority representative in Congress for over 90 years. What would one say to a court that would communicate the importance of the decision the court was being asked to make?

That was the kind of command that Judge Higginbotham had of people around him. They respected him so much that they would drop other things and respond to his request.

I remember very well the last encounter I had with Judge Higginbotham. I knew he had had a heart attack, and he had gone through an extended recovery period. All of a sudden, we were having a hearing on the impeachment matter in the Committee on the Judiciary and there was Judge Higginbotham expounding on the historical significance of the impeachment clause in the Constitution.

When it was over, I went to him and I said, "Judge, what are you doing here; shouldn't you be at home in bed?" And he said to me, "You know, I can't quit fighting about the things that are important, and you know how I feel about the United States constitution. I got to keep fighting for that."

Within 2 weeks after that Judge Higginbotham passed away, but he was fighting to the very end, and we owe him just a tremendous debt of gratitude.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time to make these comments.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman, and I do see that this is not enough time, Mr. Speaker, to be able to commemorate such a giant.

Let me simply say, and I am delighted that our minority whip has come to the floor, but let me thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for his words and simply say that, likewise, I chatted with Judge Higginbotham on that day in the Committee on the Judiciary when we held hearings on the impeachment, and what I noted most of all was his attempt to show his young students, six of whom he had brought with him, to show them to us and us to them and to get them to understand his passion.

Let me close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we who knew him, miss him, admire him, and love him, but we know Evelyn and the children have an even greater feeling, and so I would simply want to bring this to my colleagues' attention: He was a giant of a man with a baritone voice. He had a way of impacting many of us. When he donned his judicial robes and he spoke from the bench, one got the sense that God was speaking up. Those were the words of one of his law clerks.

Judge Higginbotham was not God but, Mr. Speaker, he certainly was a great American who went beyond the call of duty to fight on the battlefield for equal justice and opportunity.

There are few greater tributes this esteemed body can pay an American than to recognize that individual's life and work in the public forum established by our Founding Fathers. Mr. Speaker; I rise along with several of my colleagues to pay honor to the legacy of Judge A. Leon Higginbotham.

How fortunate America was to have such a dedicated soldier in the struggle for civil rights. As a child, a young Leon Higginbotham dreamed of being a firefighter. But it was a time when racism and bigotry would not allow this dream to become a reality, and it is somewhat ironic that we have the ugliness of racism to thank for this advocate of civil rights. Thus, as a youth he wanted to serve as a fire-

fighter but in the end he answered a higher calling by "dampening the fires of racism."

As a jurist and as an author, Leon Higginbotham's dedication to civil rights of all Americans was unmatched. He tirelessly worked to ensure that there was one rule of law that applied to all individuals—no matter their race, their gender, or their disability. Judge Higginbotham reminded us, in poignant terms and with his powerful voice, of our nation's tortuous and still unfinished struggle to live up to its constitutional mandate of equal justice under the law. He realized that the Constitution was an inclusive document designed by our Founding Fathers to include all Americans, and he fought with all his might and intellect to protect its principles and guarantees.

As an African-American judge on the federal bench he would adhere to his vision on one rule of law that applied equally to all Americans. As a jurist, Judge Higginbotham authored some 600 published opinions in 29 years, first on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, then on the Third U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals and finally as that court's chief judge.

Among his many accolades, Judge Higginbotham was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1995 and the Raul Wallenberg Humanitarian Award. He was so respected as a humanitarian, that in 1994, South African President Nelson Mandela asked Higginbotham to be an international mediator during the country's first election in which blacks could vote. But despite these achievements he was never one to turn away from those without a voice.

At the height of racism in our country, Judge Higginbotham was able to break the color barrier and become an influential member of our society. The accomplishments of Judge Higginbotham serve as an inspiration for all Americans but especially for African-Americans who strive to be leaders in our society.

It is fitting that my colleagues and I pause today to honor A. Leon Higginbotham because his life provides a legacy of leadership, impartiality, equality, and dedication for all public servants, and indeed, for all of humanity. The foundation for this legacy comes from two individuals who provided Judge Higginbotham with a nurturing and loving environment. Judge Higginbotham's beginnings were indeed humble, but I am sure he would describe them as his perfect fortune.

Born on February 25, 1928, Higginbotham was raised in Trenton, New Jersey. It is said that in his home there were only two books—a dictionary and a bible. Higginbotham's personality and character are taken from his parents, who believed that a man should be kind to everyone regardless of their social class, and that he should be strong in his convictions.

Judge Higginbotham's father was a simple plant laborer. He worked at the same plant for 45 years and Judge Higginbotham would say that his father was late to work only once during that tenure. Judge Higginbotham acquired his father's work ethic, which few matched during his career as a judge, author, legal professor, and humanitarian.

The mother of Judge Higginbotham completed her education only to the sixth grade level. Judge Higginbotham gave his mother credit for his appreciation of the value of education and his compassion for his fellow man.

And his mother, as well, contributed to young Leon Higginbotham's work ethic—she not only raised him, but also the children of the people for whom she would work.

Judge Higginbotham would often say of his mother that if she had been given the opportunity, she could have been a lawyer or a great psychiatrist. He would often refer to the lost opportunities of his mother and other African-Americans by referencing the story of St. Peter and Napoleon. The story goes that Napoleon happened upon St. Peter one day in heaven and asked if he was the greatest general in the history of the world. St. Peter responded to Napoleon, "no you are not the greatest general". Two days later confused as to how he could not be the greatest general with his numerous victories, he asked St. Peter if he could meet this individual. St. Peter took Napoleon to meet this individual and to Napoleon's surprise he recognized this person. Napoleon commented to St. Peter that this individual had only made shoes for his army and that St. Peter must have been mistaken. St. Peter replied, "no I am not mistaken, if this individual had been given the opportunity he would have been the greatest soldier the world would have known".

Judge Higginbotham referenced this story to highlight the many lost opportunities of African-Americans like his mother. He also referenced this story to spur young people today to take full advantage of their own opportunities. Judge Higginbotham was able to take full advantage of his limited opportunities, which made themselves apparent during his life.

The first of these opportunities came with Judge Higginbotham's acceptance into the Yale Law School. Despite his father's dismay at why his son turned down a full scholarship to attend Law School at Rutgers, Judge Higginbotham still enrolled in his first year at Yale in 1949. That year, he was one of only three African-Americans to enroll at Yale and one of only five African-Americans to enroll at any of the five Ivy League law schools.

Despite the daunting challenges of racism, not to mention the riggers of the academic curriculum at Yale, Judge Higginbotham thrived in his new environment. He received more oral advocacy awards in his tenure at Yale than any law student to that point in the school's history. Anytime doubt crept into his head regarding whether he had made the right decision, Judge Higginbotham reminded himself of a conversation he had with a janitor. Yes, that is right—janitor. One of the greatest legal minds that this country has ever seen, was convinced by a janitor that he made the right decision to attend Yale. What most people do not realize is that during that conversation that Judge Higginbotham had with this janitor, the janitor told Higginbotham that he had worked sweeping those floors for twenty-five years in hopes that he would see the day when African Americans entered the doors of Yale. Therefore, failure was not an option that Higginbotham could accept, and he forthrightly earned his law degree from Yale in 1952. He would eventually become the school's first black trustee in 1969.

Upon graduation, perhaps because of his humble origins, or because of the words of that janitor, or because of the racism that he himself experienced, Judge Higginbotham made a passionate commitment to the goal of equality for all human beings. This ideal became the hallmark of his life and his career as

he sought to help all Americans, no matter how rich or how poor, no matter how influential or how powerful.

In his lifetime, there is not much that Judge Higginbotham did not do—and do well. He has been described by his friends, “as performing in each of his roles in the first rank, with ability, dedication, energy, imagination, and courage.” His first job as an attorney came in 1952 as an assistant district attorney in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for two years. He would later become a partner in a law firm there. His prestige grew when, in 1956, Higginbotham became special Deputy Attorney General for Pennsylvania.

His rise to national prominence came in 1962, when President John F. Kennedy appointed him to become a commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission. President Kennedy's appointment of Higginbotham marked the first time that an African-American had become the head of a federal regulatory commission.

In 1964, Higginbotham was appointed to the U.S. District Court in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. President Kennedy had nominated him in 1963, but a Mississippi Senator blocked his appointment for a year, supposedly because of his age. After Kennedy was assassinated, President Lyndon Johnson re-nominated Higginbotham to the bench and in 1964, at the age of thirty-five, he became the youngest federal judge to be appointed in some thirty years. Judge Higginbotham was only the third African-American to be appointed as a federal district judge.

In 1977, President Carter appointed him to be a judge on the Third U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. In 1989, he became Chief Judge on that same panel, which has jurisdiction over Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware. He retired as chief judge in 1991 and stayed on as senior judge until 1993.

He was one of the most prominent and visible African-American judges on the federal bench. The late Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall once called Judge Higginbotham “a great lawyer and very great judge.” What made him a great jurist was his desire to see that the rule of law was fairly applied and that all received equal treatment in his courtroom. I am sure that his law clerks would all agree that despite a busy schedule, he always made time for people irrespective of the person's status or station in life.

Judge Higginbotham's career as a professor of the law was no less astonishing. As a part of his legacy, Judge Higginbotham leaves numerous attorneys who have benefited from his knowledge and experience. By his example, his writing, and his teachings—students who have had the good fortune of sitting in his classrooms have undoubtedly learned the values of careful research, and of honesty and fairness. Bernard Wolfman, who invited Judge Higginbotham to teach at Penn Law School, described his aptitude and skill as a professor with the following description:

He has demonstrated by his life's work how one can love and serve the law at the same time as he makes it a proper target of trenchant criticism because of its prejudiced assumptions and dogma and because of the harm it inflicted on the people of color whose slavery in America the law had embraced and whose ultimate freedom the law was slow to promote or assure.

Perhaps his greatest accomplishment as a professor was to instill in his students the be-

lief that they can and will make a difference in their careers as attorneys. He would reference his experiences in South Africa to illustrate his point. In a 1982 trip to South Africa he had an opportunity to speak before a group of future black attorneys. In his introduction and greeting to these students he commented that it was a pleasure to meet the future Supreme Court Judges of South Africa. His audience laughed at this notion because at this time South Africa was still under the rule of apartheid. Just a few years later, Judge Higginbotham would return to South Africa at the invitation of Nelson Mandela, to become an international mediator for issues surrounding the 1994 national elections in which all South Africans could participate for the first time. On that visit, there is no doubt, that Judge Higginbotham must have thought about those students whom he had addressed in 1982.

Judge Higginbotham often referenced this story to point out to law students that one does not truly know when his or her opportunity will present itself. He wanted all potential lawyers to realize the importance of their service to the Constitution and the laws of this nation.

Judge Higginbotham is also acclaimed for his multi-volume study of race, “Race and the American Legal Process.” In those books, he examined how colonial law was linked to slavery and racism, and examined how the post-emancipation legal system continued to perpetuate the oppression of blacks.

Just recently, Judge Higginbotham testified before the House Judiciary Committee where he demonstrated his firm commitment to the Constitution before an esteemed panel of lawyers, judges, and legal historians. I do not think that there was an American who, after they heard him speak, did not turn away with a profound respect for his convictions, his considerable intellect, and his passion.

With his baritone voice that drew the envy of singers everywhere, Judge Higginbotham was often said to be larger than life when he donned his judicial robes. “When he spoke from the bench you got the sense that God was speaking up there,” said Edward Dennis Jr., who clerked for Higginbotham in the 1970's. And although I am sure Judge Higginbotham would have frowned on that comparison, I am sure there are many lawyers and clients who would not. While the thoughts and memories of his fierce questioning surely continue to instill fear and respect from those lawyers that advocated before him, I seriously doubt that any of them would ever challenge his judgement, or his fairness.

Judge Higginbotham championed equal rights and the Constitution with unmatched passion and energy. Rest assured, although there will never be another A. Leon Higginbotham, there remain many disciples who will continue to follow in his legal tradition. I can only hope to be considered amongst them.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable A. Leon Higginbotham, who recently passed away at the age of 70, was a highly esteemed jurist, renowned scholar, noted lecturer, and civil rights leader.

But the citizens of central New Jersey had a special connection to Judge Higginbotham. For them, particularly the African-American community, he served as a shining example of hope for the future.

A native of Ewing, New Jersey located in my Congressional District, Judge Higginbotham was widely known in his youth as a talented musician and excellent student. At a time when professional and academic possibilities for blacks were severely limited, his outstanding accomplishments represented hope that such success was within the reach of all our children.

The African-American community knew that he was forced to live in an unheated attic room because his college had no housing for blacks. They knew of the struggle he endured at Yale Law School and during his early years in the legal profession.

But his perseverance and refusal to settle for anything less than excellence made Leon Higginbotham a living symbol of the possibilities for all children.

I am proud to take this time to salute Judge Higginbotham, and on behalf of all the citizens of the 12th Congressional District, would like to express my condolences to his family.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a giant within American jurisprudence, Judge A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr. He was a civil rights champion who died with his boots on; it was only a few weeks before his death that Leon Higginbotham testified before the House Judiciary Committee in protest of its impeachment process.

Judge Higginbotham's contributions to the law, both as a peerless judge and superb educator, were immense. His love for the cause of justice made him a colossus of the civil rights movement. In his impeccably coherent and flawlessly logical testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, Judge Higginbotham reminded the nation's lawmakers, and the American people, of his legal brilliance.

The achievements of Leon Higginbotham should serve as an inspiration to Americans of all ages. His legacy is a stellar example of a meritocracy at work, that diligence and opportunity can be an equalizing force against the vestiges of racism. After obtaining a brilliant record as a civil rights attorney, he was first appointed to a federal judicial post in 1964. His performance as one of the country's most consistent and fair judges led to his appointment to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. As a mediator in the 1994 South African elections, that country's first post-apartheid experiment with democracy, Judge Higginbotham shared with the world his judicial expertise and impartiality. The entire country paid him tribute in 1995, when President Bill Clinton awarded him the Presidential Medal of Freedom. There is no question that Leon Higginbotham belongs to that group of exceptional people which any nation would be proud to call its own.

His outspoken courage and passionate opposition to racism were unceasing. Judge Higginbotham's condemnation of the damage that discrimination and disregard for individual civil rights does to the justice system made his “Race and the American Legal System” one of the most important and influential legal texts in the history of our country.

I am honored to join my colleagues in saluting the living legacy of Leon Higginbotham. His compassion and respect for the individual, combined with his unrivaled knowledge and love of the law, make him a person I am proud to have known. We shall forever be indebted to Judge Higginbotham for his superior commitment to justice and his impeccable example of judicial scholarship and service.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the true heroes of our time, and a personal hero of mine, Judge Leon Higginbotham.

One of the proudest moments of my life was in January of 1989, after having won election to the U.S. House of Representatives for the first time, when Judge Higginbotham administered the oath of office to me at a ceremony in the Rayburn Foyer. Being sworn in as New Jersey's first African American Congressman by a man of Judge Higginbotham's Stature, who had achieved such a place in history, is an honor I will always remember. Earlier in my career, Judge Higginbotham nominated me for President of the National Council of YMCAs and I remain grateful for that honor as well.

It was characteristic of Judge Higginbotham that no matter how high he rose, he was always available whenever anyone needed his help or guidance. He never missed an opportunity to encourage young people to achieve their goals.

Judge Higginbotham was a man of great intellect, ability and passion for justice. He was a native of my home state of New Jersey, where he grew up in the segregated society of Trenton. With determination and fortitude, he forged ahead, graduating from Yale Law School in 1952. During President John Kennedy's Administration, he was appointed as the first African American to head the Federal Trade Commission.

In 1964, President Lyndon Johnson nominated him to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. He joined the Third Circuit Court of Appeals in Philadelphia in 1977, where he retired as Chief Judge in 1991.

President Clinton awarded Judge Higginbotham the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1995 and in 1996, he was honored with the NAACP's Springarn Medal.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Higginbotham was truly larger than life. Let us honor his memory and carry forth his proud legacy.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this tribute to Judge Higginbotham.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISCRIMINATION CONTINUES AT AMERICA'S AIRPORTS

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, let me just begin by echoing the comments of the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) about a real giant in our history, Judge Higginbotham, who was a noted defender of civil rights; who went on to

become one of the country's most prominent African American judges; and who, through his long and distinguished career, stood on the side of those who needed help.

He, as we have heard, was awarded numerous awards, including the Medal of Freedom for his work and also the Wallenberg Humanitarian award.

He was a giant, and he certainly will be missed, and I thank my colleagues for remembering him and bringing his spirit to light again so that the country can appreciate this remarkable man.

□ 1730

It is with that that I would like to make a transition to another issue, but the transition is easy because it is a civil rights issue, Mr. Speaker.

In the Washington Post today, I read that five workers, all Muslim women, have filed a religious discrimination complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Apparently, according to this article, it was in the Metro section, I believe, of the Washington Post, they were fired from their jobs as screeners of passengers and luggage at Dulles International Airport because they refused to remove the head scarves they wear for religious reasons.

Their employer, Argenbright Security, Incorporated, told them they would have to give up their head scarves or give up their jobs. Now, faced with such a choice, they chose to honor their religious commitment.

As a result of the women's complaint to the EEOC, Argenbright Security is now backtracking. The company has issued a statement denying religious discrimination and inviting these five women to return to work.

What this incident does, though, is raise a larger issue, and, that is, of the widespread and systematic discrimination against Muslims and Arab Americans at airports all across this country. Under current procedures, security companies like Argenbright are used to enforce profiling standards to ensure airport security.

But you have to ask yourselves that if firms like Argenbright cannot even treat their Muslim employees fairly, how are we to believe they will treat Muslim passengers whom they do not even know in a fair and courteous manner?

Now, we all understand that airport security is a must. But the people who are responsible for it should be trained in a way that ensures cultural sensitivity and fairness as they carry out these important responsibilities. This profiling issue is a huge embarrassment and problem, especially in the Detroit metropolitan airport. We have, as many of my colleagues may know, in the State of Michigan a large Arab-American and Muslim population, almost 700,000, close to 8 percent of our State.

Because of the incidence of stopping these women and gentlemen as they come through the airport, I had a hearing at the airport, organized it, and I had Jane Garvey, the Director of the FAA, Federal Aviation Administration, come with her top people, and she heard stories from folks who told how they were stopped, denied passage because they fit a certain profile.

One family, a good family, friends of mine, Dr. Basha and his family have been stopped on several occasions as they traveled on vacation to the Middle East. Another woman told of her son who was an Olympic rower going to a meet for a trial for the Olympics in Cincinnati and he was detained, missed the flight, missed the opportunity for the Olympics, because he fit a certain profile. We had another person who was a police officer in the Detroit area who was stopped and detained because he fit a profile.

Now, let me say that this is not the first airport and this is not the first incident that led me to believe that airport security is being contracted out to companies who do not have a commitment to treat all Americans with fairness and dignity.

I just want to applaud these five women for standing up for their religious beliefs and for their rights, for their rights on the job. I intend to contact the FAA about this situation and to insist that companies providing security at our airports do so without discriminating against Americans regardless of their religious faith or their ethnic heritage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. This submission includes the budget aggregates and allocations to the Committee on Appropriations that were not included in my submission on February 25.

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 set at current law levels. They reflect legislation enacted through the end of the 105th Congress 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 concurrent 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.

APPROPRIATE LEVELS

	Fiscal years	
	1999	1999–2003
Budget Authority	1,443,821	(1)
Outlays	1,392,861	(1)
Revenues	1,368,374	7,284,605

¹Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for Fiscal Years 2000–2003 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES

	Budget Authority	Outlays
Appropriations Committee		
Fiscal year 1999:		
Nondefense*	287,107	273,837
Defense*	279,891	271,403
Violent Crime Reduction*	5,800	4,953
Highways*	0	21,885
Mass Transit*	0	4,401
Total Discretionary Action	572,798	576,479
Current Law Mandatory	291,758	283,468

* Shown for display purposes only.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES
Committees Other than Appropriations

Budget year	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Total 1999–2003
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	14,885	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	4,955	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	5,230	21,096
COMMERCE COMMITTEE						
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						
Current Law:						
BA	10,924	9,888	9,982	9,557	8,711	49,062
OT	12,162	11,516	10,860	10,415	9,698	54,651
GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE						
Current Law:						
BA	57,886	59,661	61,516	63,577	65,822	308,462
OT	56,644	58,365	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						
Current Law:						
BA	93	90	90	90	93	456
OT	56	262	49	13	57	437
RESOURCES COMMITTEE						
Current Law:						
BA	2,296	2,391	2,370	2,319	2,351	11,727
OT	2,253	2,254	2,332	2,205	2,326	11,370
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE						
Current Law:						
BA	4,759	4,548	4,550	4,539	4,631	23,027
OT	4,578	4,371	4,461	4,617	4,622	22,649
TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE						
Current Law:						
BA	49,121	48,697	49,721	50,714	51,714	249,967
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

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES—Continued
Committees Other than Appropriations

Budget year	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Total 1999–2003
OT	16,114	16,021	16,026	15,834	15,722	79,717
SCIENCE COMMITTEE						
Current Law:						
BA	38	38	35	32	32	175
OT	33	36	36	36	34	175
SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE						
Current Law:						
BA	-414	0	0	0	0	-414
OT	-585	-156	-140	-125	-110	-1,116
VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE						
Current Law:						
BA	1,182	1,144	1,077	990	931	5,324
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	2,164	2,641	3,179	10,998
WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE						
Current Law:						
BA	671,063	676,265	692,412	705,685	728,575	3,474,000
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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EVANS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and for the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

Ms. SANCHEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and March 4, on account of official business.

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal business.

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. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BOSWELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOEFFEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes today.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes each, today and March 4.

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

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

S. 314. An act to provide for a loan guarantee program to address the Year 2000 computer problems of small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 4, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the third and fourth quarters of 1998 by Committees of the House of Representatives, as well as a consolidated report of foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during first quarter of 1999, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Gary Condit	8/21	8/26	Egypt		1,254.00		(3)		679.84		1,933.84
Hon. Bob Smith	8/21	8/26	Egypt				(3)		559.84		559.84
Hon. Tom Ewing	8/21	8/26	Egypt				(3)		559.84		559.84
Hon. Bill Barrett	8/21	8/26	Egypt				(3)		559.84		559.84
Hon. Collin Peterson	8/21	8/26	Egypt				(3)		559.84		559.84
Paul Unger	8/21	8/26	Egypt				(3)		559.84		559.84
Lynn Gallagher	8/21	8/26	Egypt				(3)		559.84		559.84
Jason Vaillancourt	8/21	8/26	Egypt				(3)		559.84		559.84

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1998—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Brian MacDonald	8/21	8/26	Egypt								
Andy Baker	8/21	8/26	Egypt								
Committee total										6,972.40	6,972.40

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

BOB SMITH, Chairman, Feb. 18, 1999.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES
 Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAN BURTON, Chairman, Feb. 1, 1999.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Lloyd Jones	11/3	11/10	Australia/New Caledonia/Western Samoa/New Zealand.		1,596.00		7,574.13				9,170.13
Manase Mansur	11/3	11/10	Australia/New Caledonia/Western Samoa/New Zealand.		1,596.00		7,574.13				9,170.13
Bonnie Bruce	11/14	11/28	Spain		1,700.00		1,750.23				3,450.23
Sharon McKenna	11/14	11/23	Spain		1,700.00		1,407.23				3,107.23
Committee total					6,592.00		18,305.72				24,897.72

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Jan. 29, 1999.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Phil Kiko	11/13	11/17	New Zealand		1,070.00		1,936.00				3,006.00
William Stiles	11/17	11/21	Antarctica								
	11/21	11/22	New Zealand								
	11/14	11/17	New Zealand		875.00		2,394.67				3,269.67
Steve Eule	11/17	11/21	Antarctica								
	11/21	12/01	New Zealand								
	11/14	11/17	New Zealand		875.00		2,376.00				3,251.00
Hon. George E. Brown, Jr.	11/17	11/21	Antarctica								
	11/21	11/22	New Zealand								
	12/5	12/13	Mexico		1,919.00		829.76				2,748.76
Michael Ouear	12/5	12/13	Mexico		1,919.00		829.76				2,748.76
Myndil Gottlieb	12/6	12/12	Mexico		1,422.00		713.94				2,135.94
Committee total					8,080.00		9,080.13				17,160.13

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr., Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Elizabeth Larson	11/30	12/10	Europe		3,250.00		(3)				3,250.00
Michael Meermans	12/2	12/3	Europe		213.00						213.00
	12/3	12/6	Middle East		405.00						405.00
	12/6	12/8	Europe		306.00						306.00
	Commercial airfare						4,029.24				4,029.24
Merrell Moorhead	12/2	12/3	Europe		213.00						213.00
	12/3	12/6	Middle East		405.00						405.00
	12/6	12/8	Europe		306/00						306.00
Commercial airfare						4,029.24				4,029.24	
Catherine Eberwein	12/9	12/12	Europe		1,042.00						1,042.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1998—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial airfare											5,325.97
Committee total					6,140.00		13,384.45				19,524.45

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

PORTER J. GOSS, Feb. 12, 1999.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HOUSE DELEGATION TO SOUTH KOREA, INDONESIA, HONG KONG, AND JAPAN, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 8 AND JAN. 19, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jim Kolbe	1/10	1/11	South Korea		260.82		(3)				
Hon. Doug Bereuter	1/10	1/11	South Korea		260.82		(3)				
Hon. Connie Morella	1/10	1/11	South Korea		260.82		(3)				
Hon. Jim Moran	1/10	1/11	South Korea		260.82		(3)				
Hon. Jim Greenwood	1/10	1/11	South Korea		260.82		(3)				
Hon. Jerry Weller	1/10	1/11	South Korea		260.82		(3)				
Hon. Earl Blumenauer	1/10	1/11	South Korea		260.82		(3)				
Hon. Steve Kuykendall	1/10	1/11	South Korea		260.82		(3)				
Everett Eissenstat	1/10	1/11	South Korea		260.82		(3)				
Jamie McCormick	1/10	1/11	South Korea		260.82		(3)				
Mike Ennis	1/10	1/11	South Korea		260.82		(3)				
Hon. Jim Kolbe	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		554.31		(3)				
Hon. Doug Bereuter	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		554.31		(3)				
Hon. Connie Morella	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		554.31		(3)				
Hon. Jim Moran	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		554.31		(3)				
Hon. Jim Greenwood	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		554.31		(3)				
Hon. Jerry Weller	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		554.31		(3)				
Hon. Earl Blumenauer	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		554.31		(3)				
Hon. Steve Kuykendall	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		554.31		(3)				
Everett Eissenstat	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		554.31		(3)				
Jamie McCormick	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		554.31		(3)				
Mike Ennis	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		554.31		(3)				
Hon. Jim Kolbe	1/14	1/16	Hong Kong		888.21		(3)				
Hon. Doug Bereuter	1/14	1/17	Hong Kong		888.21		(3)				
Hon. Connie Morella	1/14	1/17	Hong Kong		888.21		(3)				
Hon. Jim Moran	1/14	1/17	Hong Kong		888.21		(3)				
Hon. Jerry Weller	1/14	1/17	Hong Kong		888.21		(3)				
Hon. Earl Blumenauer	1/14	1/17	Hong Kong		888.21		(3)				
Hon. Steve Kuykendall	1/14	1/17	Hong Kong		888.21		(3)				
Everett Eissenstat	1/14	1/17	Hong Kong		888.21		(3)				
Jamie McCormick	1/14	1/17	Hong Kong		888.21		(3)				
Mike Ennis	1/14	1/17	Hong Kong		888.21		(3)				
Hon. Jim Kolbe	1/17	1/19	Japan		577.16		(3)				
Hon. Doug Bereuter	1/18	1/19	Japan		238.00		(3)				
Hon. Connie Morella	1/17	1/19	Japan		577.16		(3)				
Hon. Jim Moran	1/17	1/19	Japan		577.16		(3)				
Hon. Jerry Weller	1/17	1/19	Japan		577.16		(3)				
Hon. Earl Blumenauer	1/17	1/19	Japan		577.16		(3)				
Hon. Steve Kuykendall	1/17	1/19	Japan		577.16		(3)				
Everett Eissenstat	1/17	1/19	Japan		577.16		(3)				
Jamie McCormick	1/17	1/19	Japan		577.16		(3)				
Mike Ennis	1/17	1/19	Japan		577.16		(3)				
Committee total					22,930.90						

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

JIM KOLBE, Feb. 2, 1999.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HOUSE DELEGATION TO FINLAND, GERMANY, FRANCE, AND AUSTRIA, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 9 AND JAN. 18, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Peter Davidson	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
Chaplain James D. Ford	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
Total					3,134.00						3,134.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BEN GILMAN, Feb. 10, 1999.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO PERU, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 9, AND JAN. 14, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Robert Van Wicklin (Rep. Amo Houghton's Office)	1/9	1/14	Peru		1,224.00		3,260.40				4,484.40

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO PERU, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 9, AND JAN. 14, 1999—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Committee total					1,224.00		3,260.40				4,484.40

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RON KIND, Feb. 22, 1999.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

846. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting certification that the Department of the Navy has converted the Fisher House Trust Fund to a non-appropriated fund instrumentality (NAFI); to the Committee on Armed Services.

847. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report containing information on the retention of members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

848. A letter from the Principal Deputy, Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report on operations of the National Defense Stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

849. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 98-36: Exempting the United States Air Force's operating location near Groom Lake, Nevada, from any Federal, State, interstate, or local hazardous or solid waste laws that might require the disclosure of classified information concerning that operating location to unauthorized persons, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6961; to the Committee on Commerce.

850. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Re-issue of the Early Planning Guidance for the Revised Ozone and Particulate Matter (PM) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)—received February 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

851. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Quality Assurance Guidance Document 2.12—Monitoring PM 2.5 in Ambient Air Using Designated Reference of Class I Equivalent Methods—received February 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

852. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on the nondisclosure of Safeguards Information for the calendar year quarter beginning October 1 and extending through December 31, 1998, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2167(e); to the Committee on Commerce.

853. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Spent Fuel Heat Generation in an Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation—received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

854. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions; Revised Treatment of Severity Level IV Violations at Power Reactors [NUREG-1600, Rev. 1] received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

855. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—OTC Derivatives Dealers [Release No. 34-40594; File No. S7-30-97] (RIN: 3235-AH16) received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

856. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Bureau of Export Administration's "Annual Report for Fiscal Year 1998" and the "1999 Foreign Policy Export Controls Report," pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2413; to the Committee on International Relations.

857. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Exports of High Performance Computers under License Exception CTP [Docket No. 981208298-8298-01] (RIN: 0694-AB82) received January 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

858. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revisions to the Commerce Control List: Changes in Missile Technology Controls [Docket No. 990112008-9008-01] (RIN: 0694-AB75) received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

859. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Schedule of Fees for Consular Services, Department of State and Overseas Embassies and Consulates—received February 1, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

860. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-574, "Home Purchase Assistance Step Up Fund Act of 1998" received February 23, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

861. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-580, "Equal Opportunity for Local, Small, and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises Act of 1998" received February 23, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

862. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-629, "TANF-related Medicaid Managed Care Program Technical Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 1999" received February 23, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

863. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-576, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 371, S.O. 96-202, Act of 1998" received February 23, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

864. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-586, "Sex Offender Registration Risk Assessment Clarification Amendment Act of 1998" received February 23, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

865. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-628, "Advisory Neighborhood Commissions Management Control and Funding Temporary Amendment Act of 1999" received February 23, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

866. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-607, "Health Benefits Plan Members Bill of Rights Act of 1998" received February 23, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

867. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-397, "Establishment of Council Contract Review Criteria, Alley Closing, Budget Support, and Omnibus Regulatory Reform Amendment Act of 1998" received February 23, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

868. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-380, "Assault on an Inspector or Investigator and Revitalization Corporation Amendment Act of 1998" received February 23, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

869. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-633 "Closing of Public Alleys in Square 51, S.O. 98-145, Temporary Act of 1999" received February 23, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

870. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-632 "Bethesda-Welch Post 7284, Veterans of Foreign Wars Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Temporary Act of 1999" received February 23, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

871. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-631, "Annuitants' Health and Life Insurance Employer Contribution Temporary Amendment Act of 1999" received February 23, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

872. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-609, "Comprehensive Plan Amendment Act of 1998" received February 23, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

873. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Potomac Electric Power Company, transmitting a copy of the Balance Sheet of Potomac Electric Power Company as of December 31, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 43-513; to the Committee on Government Reform.

874. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's report for fiscal year 1998 listing the number of appeals submitted, the number processed to completion, and the number not completed by the originally announced date, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 7701(i)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

875. A letter from the Director, Office of In-sular Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the fourth annual report on the Federal-CNMI Initiative on Labor, Immigration, and Law Enforcement; to the Committee on Resources.

876. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting a request on behalf of the Judicial Conference of the United States that Congress approve the consolidation of the office of the bankruptcy clerk and the office of the district clerk of court in the Southern District of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

877. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Magnetic Levitation Transportation Technology Deployment Program [FRA Docket No. FRA-95-4545; Notice No. 2] (RIN: 2130-AB29) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

878. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Policy and Procedures Concerning the Use of Airport Revenue [Docket No. 28472] (RIN: 2120-AG01) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

879. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Office of General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Board of Veterans' Appeals: Rules of Practice—Notification of Representatives in Connection with Motions for Revision of Decisions on Grounds of Clear and Unmistakable Error (RIN: 2900-AJ75) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

880. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Federal Register Certifying Officer, Financial Management Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Acceptance of BONDS Secured By Government Obligations in Lieu of BONDS with Sureties (RIN: 1510-AA36) received January 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

881. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting CBO's Sequestration Update Report for Fiscal Year 2000, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-587); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget.

882. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Environmental Security), Department of Defense, transmitting a report listing all military installations where an integrated natural resources management plan is not appropriate; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Resources.

883. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report entitled "Satellite Controls Under the United States Munitions List"; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and International Relations.

884. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report entitled "Pension Plans for Professional Boxers"; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 701. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize a program for predisaster mitigation, to streamline the administration of disaster relief, to control the Federal costs of disaster assistance, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 106-40). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 91. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 707) to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize a program for predisaster mitigation, to streamline the administration of disaster relief, to control the Federal costs of disaster assistance, and for other purposes. (Rept. 106-41). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 950. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the quality of beaches and coastal recreation waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 951. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide assistance and slots with respect to air carrier service between high density airports and airports not receiving sufficient air service, to improve jet aircraft service to underserved markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BASS:

H.R. 952. A bill to amend the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to preserve State and local authority over the construction, placement or modification of personal wireless service facilities; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BOEHLERT (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. WISE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FILNER, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. DANNER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. FROST, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. QUINN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HORN, Mr. STARK, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. POMBO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. MICA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. LEE, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. KLINK, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BARCIA, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FORBES, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. ROTHMAN):

H.R. 953. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for the protection of

employees providing air safety information; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for expenses incurred by taxpayers in transporting food to food banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 955. A bill to expand the geographic area of the TRICARE Senior Supplement demonstration project for certain covered beneficiaries under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to include one additional site; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 956. A bill to designate the new hospital bed replacement building at the Ioannis A. Lougaris Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Reno, Nevada, in honor of Jack Streeter; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HULSHOF (for himself, Mrs.

THURMAN, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. WELLER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. EWING, Mr. MINGE, Mr. POMBO, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. OSE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. TALENT, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. BONO, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BERUTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. FROST, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. KLINK, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. LEACH, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. COOK, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. METCALF, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H.R. 957. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Farm and Ranch Risk Management Accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. STARK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FORD, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. SANDLIN):

H.R. 958. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to restore the non-applicability of private contracts for the provision of Medicare benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, 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. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 959. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the maximum Pell Grant; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SABO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. STARK, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. FALDOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 960. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to ensure the recovery of our Nation's declining biological diversity; to reaffirm and strengthen this Nation's commitment to protect wildlife; to safeguard our children's economic and ecological future; and to provide assurances to local governments, communities, and individuals in their planning and economic development efforts; to the Committee on Resources, 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 Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 961. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for programs regarding ovarian cancer; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WISE, and Mr. TRAFICANT):

H.R. 962. A bill to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to establish a Capitol Visitor Center under the East Plaza of the United States Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and 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 Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (for herself, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BERETTER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. FROST, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WALSH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. VENTO, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 963. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit for a portion of the expenses of providing dependent care services to employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUINN:

H.R. 964. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the Federal minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. QUINN:

H.R. 965. A bill to provide that December 7 each year shall be treated for all purposes related to Federal employment in the same manner as November 11; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 966. A bill to provide for the disposition of land deemed excess to a project for flood control at Matewan, West Virginia; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 967. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for Federal jurisdiction of certain multiparty, multiforum civil actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. WISE) (all by request):

H.R. 968. A bill to authorize appropriations for hazardous material transportation safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SOUDER (for himself, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. WELLER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. COX, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 969. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the charitable contribution deduction, to allow such deduction to individuals who do not itemize other deductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THUNE:

H.R. 970. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to the Perkins County Rural Water System, Inc., for the construction of water supply facilities in Perkins County, South Dakota; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 971. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to protect the Nation's electricity ratepayers by ensuring that rates charged by qualifying small power producers and qualifying cogenerators do not exceed the incremental cost to the purchasing utility of alternative electric energy at the time of delivery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 972. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 709 West 9th Street in Juneau, Alaska, as the "Hurff A. Saunders Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KOLBE (for himself, Mr. PAS-TOR, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution honoring Morris King Udall, former United States Representative from Arizona, and extending the condolences of the Congress on his death; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. OSE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SAWYER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HORN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. BRADY of Texas):

H. Res. 92. A resolution recommending the integration of the Republic of Slovakia into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO); to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CARSON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KLING, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VENTO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H. Res. 93. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding strengthening the Social Security system to meet the challenges of the next century; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NETHERCUTT (for himself, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 94. A resolution recognizing the generous contribution made by each living person who has donated a kidney to save a life; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H. Res. 95. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that American families deserve tax relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H. Res. 96. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a two-thirds vote on any bill or joint resolution that either authorizes the President to enter into a trade agreement that is implemented pursuant to fast-track procedures or that implements a trade agreement

pursuant to such procedures; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 8: Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. TALENT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Ms. DANNER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. NEY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CRANE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. JOHN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KASICH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. SKEEN, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. BOEHRER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PACKARD, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. WELLER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. BONO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. NORTHPUP, Mr. COOK, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. COBLE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. WATKINS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. GORDON, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. RILEY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PEASE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. OSE, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. COX, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LINDER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. EWING, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.R. 14: Mr. KING of New Jersey, Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 25: Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LAZIO, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 27: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 44: Mr. OLVER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 45: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 46: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 58: Mr. WEYGAND.

H.R. 65: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 82: Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 117: Mr. LARGENT.

H.R. 142: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 175: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. NEY, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. RILEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr.

BURR of North Carolina, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BASS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. TANNER, Ms. DANNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. SRYDER.

H.R. 184: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 212: Mr. METCALF, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 220: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 224: Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 274: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 275: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 303: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. DUNN, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 306: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABO, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 315: Mr. BROWN of California and Mr. SCOTT.

H.R. 325: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HOFFEL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 346: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 347: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 351: Mr. ROGERS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. NEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 352: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 355: Mr. BARCIA, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. DANNER, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 357: Ms. RIVERS and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 371: Mr. SABO.

H.R. 372: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 393: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 403: Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 410: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. STARK, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 417: Mr. FILNER and Mr. LARSON.

H.R. 430: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 443: Mr. NADLER and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 448: Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 461: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 472: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 483: Mr. HOUGHTON and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 491: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 492: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 502: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 506: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MICA, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 516: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 528: Mr. CAMP, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 534: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 540: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. LAZIO.

H.R. 542: Mr. PETRI, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 550: Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 552: Mr. METCALF, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. LEE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WEINER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 561: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. STARK, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 566: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DIXON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 568: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 571: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 600: Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MICA, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 655: Mr. LAMPSON and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 659: Mr. FROST, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. EHRlich.

H.R. 683: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GOSS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. FORD, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. DIXON, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 685: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 732: Mr. PORTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 745: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 746: Mr. FROST, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 749: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DEMINT, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 750: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 760: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 762: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FROST, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. STARK, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FORD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. HAYWORTH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 783: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. BALDACC.

H.R. 786: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 805: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 815: Mr. MICA, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Ms. DUNN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 832: Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 835: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 845: Mr. SHOWS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. FROST, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 853: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 872: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 884: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 886: Mr. STARK and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 894: Mr. PORTER and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 903: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTERT, Ms. DUNN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. OXLEY, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. POMBO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DEAL of

Georgia, Mr. DELAY, Mr. CRANE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 914: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 935: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 941: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. BERMAN.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. MANZULLO.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. REYES, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LARSON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr.

FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HYDE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DEMINT, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. OLVER.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. DEUTSCH and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H. Res. 35: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FORD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. LEE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ROEMER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H. Res. 41: Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BERMAN, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 55: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H. Res. 82: Ms. NORTON.

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. 41: Mr. LINDER.