United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 1999 No. 42

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

''For the beauty of the Earth,
For the glory of the skies,
For the love which from our birth
Over and around us lies;
Lord of all, to Thee we raise
This our prayer of grateful praise.''

We are thankful, O God, for the beauty that surrounds us and for the grace which makes us whole. May our lives never become so cluttered that we fail to see Your divine glory in the world and Your perfect love which is freely given to us and to every person. Bless us, O God, this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin 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.

IMPRISONED CHINESE PASTOR XU YONGZE

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the second anniversary of the imprisonment of Pastor Xu Yongze by the Communist authorities in China. Today also marks the fifth time I have come to the floor to urge the Chinese Government to release this decent man of God.

Last week, I met with the Chinese Ambassador to once again raise my disappointment with China's refusal to release Pastor Xu, who is often called the ''Billy Graham'' of China. Unfortunately, the Chinese still cling to the belief that Pastor Xu is a cult leader because he believes in a judgment day. But, Mr. Speaker, the belief in a judgment day is a basic tenet of Christianity, a belief held by billions of Christians around the world, including myself. Now that would be one big cult.

Pastor Xu is a respected and honorable man and one incredibly brave Christian. So once again I ask President Jiang Zemin to release Pastor Xu, as I humbly ask my colleagues and fellow Americans to remember Pastor Xu in their prayers.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 119) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 119

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

JANICE SCHAKOWSKY, to the Committee on Government Reform.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHEN MEDICARE WITH THE SURPLUS

(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, when Medicare was created in 1965, fewer than half of all American seniors had health care coverage. Today 99 percent are covered. Medicare has enabled millions of seniors to live their retirement years with dignity, financial independence, and peace of mind.

Unless we prepare for the baby boom's strain on the system, Medicare will go bankrupt in the year 2008, only 9 years away. The Democratic proposal for the Federal surplus would use 15 percent of that surplus to bolster Medicare, to strengthen Medicare. This plan will extend the life of Medicare by a decade.

In contrast, the Republican plan is to spend that surplus on a one-time, trillion-dollar tax break while Medicare withers on the vine. It is irresponsible. Giving tax breaks while Medicare dissolves is akin to fiddling while Rome burns.

Mr. Speaker, we should use the surplus to strengthen Medicare. This is a responsible plan for our current seniors and for future generations.

VOTE AGAINST UNION-ONLY LABOR CONTRACTS

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the President and the Vice President have worked diligently in the past few years to link Federal projects to union-only construction firms. Unfortunately, the Los Angeles Unified School District is following suit by proposing a new major $2.4 billion school construction initiative, using only unionized contractors.

I say this is unfortunate because union-only contracts increase the cost of construction projects by limiting competition, which results in higher

Printed on recycled paper.

labor costs. It has been estimated by some that the union-only project labor agreement could increase the construction cost by 10 to 15 percent. This means that funds aimed at building and renovating some of Los Angeles' schools would actually be lost to artificially high labor cost.

I am a firm believer that the lowest qualified bidder for these building projects should be able to win the construction job, regardless of union affiliation. Quite frankly, I find it against the American spirit of healthy competition to put rules in place that work otherwise.

I hope that when this project labor agreement is voted upon on the 23rd of this month, the Los Angeles Unified School District will vote for the best interest of their students and against an anti-education project labor agreement.

SCHEDULE GHB AND STOP TEENAGE DEATHS

(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 rise again this morning to encourage my colleagues to move swiftly to schedule GHB. GHB is a drug that many of us are not aware of but has killed teenagers across this Nation.

I have legislation called the Hillory J. Farias bill, H.R. 75. I am working with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and others to ensure that we move quickly to have this drug scheduled and made illegal. What is the reason?

Hillory J. Farias was a 17-year-old bright teenager who went to a teenage club and drank a soft drink. Unbeknownst to her, the lack of taste, the lack of smell GHB drug was placed in her drink. The next morning, Hillory was found dead in her bed.

This drug has been given a lot of pluses. For example, it is found on the Internet described as a relaxing agent. They liken its effects to alcohol. Some even consider it to be a form of treatment to the effects of alcoholism. One site claimed that the drug was better than alcohol because it did not cause damage to the brain or liver. There are many misconceptions about this drug.

I ask my colleagues to help stop the death of young people. Let us schedule GHB and pass this legislation quickly.

REVITALIZING THE MIAMI RIVER

(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, the Miami River project should be a priority in this year's consideration of the Water Resources Development Act. The Miami River Commission and the Miami River Marine Group remind us that it is vitally important that we act to provide the necessary Federal cost share so that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' 1990 recommendations for navigational maintenance dredging of the Miami River be implemented as soon as possible.

Congress must clarify the language of the Act so that the intended 75 percent Federal and 25 percent non-Federal cost share formula will be applied in the Miami River project to the cost of navigational maintenance dredging, including disposal costs.

The removal of these toxic sediments will have the added benefit of eliminating a significant pollution threat to Biscayne Bay, one of our most pristine environments.

The Miami River is the fifth largest port in our State of Florida. Any further delay in dredging could endanger one of our Nation's most critical shipping links to the Caribbean and Latin America.

We must maintain this environmental river, as well as restore the environmental quality of a key part of south Florida's ecosystem.

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's Social Security system has traditionally been a safety net for citizens hoping to live long and fruitful lives. However, changes in our society's economic and social conditions warrant reform.

The facts are abundantly clear. The trust fund will be depleted by 2032. As such, the current debate is not about the necessity of reform, but what structural revisions will preserve the system long-term.

I believe that reform should be synonymous with guarantee; that is, guaranteed minimum benefits for decades to come. Reforms that do not ensure system solvency or include pension or private savings plan without such a guarantee, frankly, are indefensible.

Today I urge my colleagues to support reform that, as Franklin Roosevelt said, takes care of human needs throughout the next millennium.

SUPPORT OUR SERVICEMEN AND SERVICEWOMEN BY PROVIDING FUNDING

(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 the state of our Nation's military, because the readiness of our military is in perilous danger.

This Nation cannot continue to turn a blind eye to underfunding of our armed forces while asking our military men and women at the same time to keep doing more and doing more with less and less.

A recently released accident report of the 12 airmen who lost their lives in a tragic accident of their rescue helicopters last September in Nevada is a reminder of the perilous readiness environment that our armed forces are required to operate in.

It is up to this administration and this Congress to provide our service men and women with the right tools, the right training and the resources to accomplish their mission, and nothing less.

For my part as a veteran, I honor these men and their families and the 66th Rescue Squadron for their great service to this country. I believe we must honor their legacy by ensuring our military men and women have the resources to do their jobs. Support our servicemen. Support our servicewomen by providing full funding to our military.

USE SOCIAL SECURITY MONEY FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, both parties have a plan to save Social Security. Quite frankly, neither plan is adequate. There is no budget surplus. There is a deficit. The only surplus that exists is in the Social Security account. I say it is time to pass an amendment to the Constitution that says Social Security money can only be used for Social Security and Medicare, and no politician or no administration could reach in and use that money.

It is not Republicans' money, it is not Democrats' money. It is the people's money. If we could, in fact, do it for term limits on presidents, and if we could do it for every other reason that exists, we can protect the most important account of the American people and save Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back all the IOUs in the wastebaskets of the Social Security center.

SOCIAL SECURITY MONEY BELONGS TO OUR SENIORS

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we do have to protect Social Security. The President has been saying over and over he wants to save Social Security, but he keeps spending it on foreign giveaways. I would just say, Mr. President, you cannot have it both ways.

Unlike the President, however, this year's budget resolution will set aside fully 100 percent of the Social Security surplus to strengthen that vital program for our seniors. Seniors have paid a lifetime of earnings into Social Security, and we promise to protect it for them. We are committed to that promise, and we cannot allow Social Security money to be frittered away on foreign aid.

The President just wants to use Social Security surplus funds as a slush fund for his failed Social Security policy, for his failed foreign policy as well. Mr. Speaker, that money belongs to our seniors. American seniors need it and deserve it, and we must make sure that they get it. Mr. President, do not spend away our Social Security money.

□ 1015

CONGRESS MUST REMAIN COMMITTED TO BRING PEACE TO ALL OF IRELAND

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my condemnation of the brutal March 15 killing of human rights attorney and mother Rosemary Nelson.

Rosemary Nelson died after a bomb ripped apart her car in Lurgan, County Armagh in the north of Ireland. Forty year old Rosemary, mother of three, had previously represented the nationalist Garvaghy Road residents coalition in nearby Portadown over the long-running Drumcree Orange Order Protest. Her death mutes a powerful voice in the quest to bring lasting peace to the north of Ireland.

Congress must remain strongly united in its commitment to the condemnation of bombings and acts of terrorism and continued human rights abuses. We must remain committed to bringing peace and justice and prosperity to all of Ireland.

That is why we must pass my resolution, H. Con. Res. 54, to honor the 1-year anniversary of the Good Friday Peace Accords. I urge my colleagues to stand firm on the United States' support of Irish peace by joining the 77 cosponsors of H. Con. Res 54, and the U.S. Senate is passing that resolution today.

STOLEN NUCLEAR SECRETS

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, this New York Times headline says it all: ''China Stole Nuclear Secrets for Bombs, U.S. Aides Say: Espionage Case at New Mexico Lab is Said to be Minimized by the White House.''

Why would a case that intelligence experts consider to be worse than Aldrich Ames be minimized by the White House?

The reason is clear to all those who have followed the campaign finance scandal of 1996. It would also be clear to all those who followed the administration's China policy.

First, when this scandal came to light in 1995, and then more conclusively in April of 1996, the White House was under fire for taking campaign cash from the Communist Chinese army.

Second, this stunning revelation of nuclear espionage would have threatened the administration's policy of what they call engagement with Communist China.

That is why the White House would have a clear incentive to avoid notification of Congress and to reject the clear evidence that our most sensitive nuclear secrets have been stolen.

CONGRATULATIONS TO AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SPORTS MEDICINE ON NEW HEADQUARTERS IN INDIANAPOLIS

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

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the American College of Sports Medicine on the completion of a vast new addition to its headquarters building in Indianapolis.

In the early 1980s, Indianapolis' corporate leaders and city officials advanced a visionary plan to make the city the amateur sports capital of the Nation.

We have had immense support from the corporate community in Indianapolis. On December 15, 1983, Mayor William Hudnut broke ground for the ACSM National Center, which has become one of the anchor projects of the Canal area redevelopment. He referred to it as ''A cornerstone in the Amateur Sports Capital.''

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the American College of Sports Medicine on the completion of a vast new addition so that it would be able to advance the immense amount of work that it has done in terms of sports medicine.

CAMPAIGN CASH AND ESPIONAGE SCANDAL

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the outrage continues to grow over the campaign cash and espionage scandal involving the Chinese and this administration.

Quoting the lead editorial from this morning's Wall Street Journal, ''Bad enough that the Chinese have stolen the technology for a nuclear warhead that will make their own missiles more threatening to U.S. national security; far worse is the casualness with which the White House greeted the news. Sandy Berger says he was briefed on this in April of 1996, which happens to be the same month Al Gore traveled to California for his infamous Buddhist fundraiser.''

And from the lead editorial in this morning's Washington Times. ''It is clear that Sandy Berger has no credibility. Rather than cooperation, he offers blame shifting. Rather than credible explanations, he offers excuses.''

Mr. Speaker, we say to the President, Sandy Berger must go.

BUDGET DETAILS NEGLECT MEDICARE

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, the details of the budget being prepared by the majority are finally beginning to leak out. They include an embracing of the Democratic initiatives on Social Security and $1 trillion in tax cuts. I like tax cuts just as much as the next person, but what was missing from the budget was any mention of Medicare.

While Social Security does reach crisis perhaps in the year 2032, Medicare is lacking today. In fact, seniors pay more out of their own pockets for health care costs than they did when John F. Kennedy declared a health care emergency and initiated a Medicare program.

Now, the Democrats are proposing and the President is supporting the notion of covering prescription drug and using a portion of the surplus to shore up Medicare for seniors today.

Now that the majority has embraced Social Security, perhaps they should embrace Medicare as well.

REPUBLICANS BELIEVE IN TRUTH IN BUDGETING

(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, obviously, my friend from the other side of the aisle has confused St. Patrick's Day with April fools when he talks about the Republican budget.

Let me talk to my colleagues. There is philosophical and mathematical differences between the way the Republicans and Democrats use numbers. It is best illustrated by this story.

One of the Democrats' leading budget hawks went to go buy some worms. He was going fishing. He walked up to the bait store and said, ''How much are your worms?'' The guy said, ''You can have all you want for $1.'' So the Democrat said, ''I will take $2 worth.''

That is the problem. We almost need national testing when it comes to truth in budgeting with the Democrats.

Let us go through this little quiz on Social Security: Republicans want to preserve 100 percent; Democrats 62 percent.

Fill in the blanks: Which is greater, 62 percent or 100 percent?

True or false, 62 percent does not equal 100 percent.

True or false, 38 percent will be spent on non-Social Security items under the President's budget.

This is true. The President wants to preserve 62 percent, Republicans want

to preserve 100 percent of the Social Security balance. We believe that it is worth fighting for our grandparents to do the right thing and not spend their money on pork.

STEEL IMPORTS AND ILLEGAL DUMPING

(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 first chart tells us the story, I guess in black and white, on steel imports and why this Congress must act today to do something about steel imports and illegal dumping.

We can see, from 1997 to 1998, the large increase in steel imports, and particularly because of illegal steel dumping.

This just tells the story in a bar graph and in black and white. Let us tell the story in terms of human suffering. For instance, at Wierton Steel, in which the headlines we have blown up show, ''Wierton Steel layoffs hit 775 workers.'' It is actually more by now. ''Wierton Steel announces more layoffs,'' layoffs that are occurring throughout the Ohio Valley and the Mon Valley.

Mr. Speaker, this House must act today to stop illegal steel dumping. We have the opportunity to send the message not only to the administration but to foreign nations. If others will not act, Congress will.

Let us act today for Wierton and for a whole lot of other steel producing communities in the United States.

RELEASE IMPRISONED CHINESE PASTOR XU YONGZE

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

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to that of the House majority whip who spoke earlier calling for the release of Pastor Xu in China.

It is indeed sad that, as we find ourselves just 1 year away from the 21st century, there are still places in this world where a person can be locked away merely for expressing their faith in God. Mr. Speaker, Pastor Xu serves as a reminder to us all of how precious our freedom truly is, especially our freedom to worship as we choose.

The Chinese government claims that Pastor Xu is dangerous merely because he believes in a judgment day. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not find that crazy or dangerous. A belief in judgment day is a basic belief not just of Christians but of so many religions around the world.

This week Pastor Xu begins his third straight year in prison simply for preaching the gospel. If the Chinese are serious about strengthening the ties between our two countries, they must learn to respect religious freedom.

I urge President Jiang Zemin, please, release Pastor Xu and let him return to his family.

MEDICARE COMMISSION FINISHES WORK WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

(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, yesterday the Medicare Commission finished its work but did not come out with a recommendation. It did not come out with a recommendation because the thrust of the commission was to privatize; that is, to get rid of Medicare as we have known it and move it into the private sector. Now, the people pushing that idea are the very people in this House who have opposed the Patients' Bill of Rights.

If we are going to take all the senior citizens in this country, and the disabled, 39 million people, and throw them into the private sector, and will not give them the protections of a Patients' Bill of Rights, there is no justice in that kind of system.

The Commission rightly rejected it. The Commission refused to consider the President's addition of 15 percent of the surplus. The Commission refused to consider the President's proposal regarding people between the ages of 55 and 65. This House now has to come to grips with it.

HAPPY ST. PATRICK'S DAY

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish everyone a happy St. Patrick's Day and celebrate the great accomplishments made by Irish Americans to our republic.

Across America, whether we are Irish American or not, we honor the sacrifices made by so many Irish Americans and really celebrate their accomplishments.

It was not always easy, though, for the Irish who came to our shores. It was not long ago the Irish seeking employment were met with the infamous warnings, ''Irish need not apply.'' But the goodness that is America prevailed, and generations of Irish Americans have made this country the greatest in the history of the world.

With their solid work ethic and belief in personal responsibility, love of our Nation, respect for honor, and a gentleness towards the weak and infirm, I, like millions of Americans, proud of my Irish heritage, understand how lucky we all are to be Americans. I wish everybody a happy St. Patrick's Day.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, sometime during the year 2013, the funds we pay out to Social Security recipients are going to exceed the funds coming in to finance the system.

Despite the White House war room rhetoric, the Clinton budget does nothing to save Social Security. If my colleagues do not believe me, they should listen to this. In February, David Walker, the Comptroller General of the United States, stated, and I quote, ''The President's proposal does not alter the projected cash flow imbalances in the Social Security program.''

It is true. The President's proposal does not save Social Security. The only way that Clinton's numbers add up is through a faulty double-counting scheme.

This is not a Republican complaint. Some of Social Security's chief defenders, members of the President's party, have said that the President's approach is based largely on imaginative accounting.

We do not need any more shell games and number schemes for Social Security. We just need a system that can ensure tomorrow's seniors that their savings will be there when they retire without government interference. We desperately need the President to be a leader on the tough issues.

We cannot waste this historic opportunity to preserve the Nation's Social Security program. Unfortunately, the President's budget represents his typical rhetoric and sloganeering at its worst.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET PROPOSAL WILL NOT WIN ANY AWARDS

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps the old teacher in me, but whenever I see something like a budget proposal that has been submitted by the President, I want to give it a grade. And I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that this President's budget proposal will not win any accounting awards.

□ 1030

It will never be used in any economics class unless to show students just how slippery a politician can be with retirement money.

The President's budget proposal for Social Security contains more phoney numbers than a Millie Vanilli soundtrack. $2.4 trillion in double counting. That is even more double counting than the administration's unconstitutional census sampling scheme. And it gets worse from there, Mr. Speaker.

GAO and CBO are both on record stating that the President's proposal for Social Security might actually make the problem worse. The problem, of course, is that the baby-boomers will soon retire and Social Security will

greet that event by going belly up faster than can you say Jeff Gordon.

Seniors deserve better. Instead of reassuring seniors that Social Security will be put on a sounder financial footing, the President's proposal sends a message that the politicians will have to deal with the mess after he is gone. The President's Social Security proposal gets an F.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 820, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 113 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 113

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. 820) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes. 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. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), my friend and colleague, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I notice an outbreak of the wearing of the green around the Hill today, and I want to especially extend a happy congratulations for St. Patrick's Day to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), who has a very strong interest in this subject I am advised.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present another noncontroversial wide open rule from the Committee on Rules under the benevolent leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for purposes of amendment. It authorizes the chair to accord priority of recognition to those Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is an option available to all Members.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. It is a good rule and it should not engender any opposition. The subject matter is important.

Mr. Speaker, while the Coast Guard is the smallest of our armed services, its responsibilities are great and vitally important. It is an agency with many missions. We ask the Coast Guard to be responsible for such critical areas as the navigation and safety of our waterways and emergency search and rescue.

As a branch of the Armed Forces, the Coast Guard has also helped defend America in every war since 1790. It has a brave and long tradition. To maintain an effective and ready force, H.R. 820, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1998, authorizes 44,000 active duty military personnel by the end of fiscal year 2001.

Most important to today's debate is the evolving role the Coast Guard is playing on the war on drugs. Last year this Congress reached an agreement with the White House to win the war on drugs, not just trim it back a little and settle for a stalemate. We want to win it. We intend to win this war that is so critical to the future of our youngsters, and this particular legislation helps us on that path.

As so often in this city, we have discovered that talk is cheap. The Clinton White House has submitted a budget that is negligent on the war on drugs and abandons the commitment made by the Clinton White House just last fall to help win that war on drugs. In fact, the Clinton budget request does not implement anything within the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act beyond that contained in last year's omnibus bill.

H.R. 820 puts our money where our mouth is. It fully funds the Western Hemisphere effort, with an additional $290 million in operating expenses for the next 2 years. This money will have a direct impact at the source of the drug scourge, including additional coastal patrol boats, the creation of a regional law enforcement center in Puerto Rico, several maritime patrol aircraft, several cutters and vessels to be received from the United States Navy. Americans have a right to demand results, not more talk, but results on the war on drugs and H.R. 820 delivers.

A recent study by the Institute for Defense Analysis examining effectiveness of cocaine interdiction found strong links between supply disruptions and rising street prices in the United States. It also found that, when street prices rise, use falls, especially among casual users. We know that interdiction works and that taking dead aim at the supply side must be a large piece of our effort. That does not diminish from the efforts, of course, on the demand side that we also must make. H.R. 820 makes good on our commitment on the supply side.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule that allows open debate and consideration of all germane amendments. I urge a yes vote on the rule as well as the underlying bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), my dear friend, who I hope stays with me in the House for a few more years, for yielding me the customary half-hour.

Mr. Speaker, today is March 17. It is not only a great day for the Irish, but it is a great day for the Coast Guard. Mr. Speaker, during the last 84 years, the United States Coast Guard has been protecting people at sea and enforcing United States law.

This bill for which the rule provides consideration will authorize funding for the Coast Guard for another 2 years, including $380 million for drug interdiction efforts in keeping with last year's Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. It will also provide funding to finish the design work and the replacement for the Great Lakes icebreaker *Mackinaw*.

This bill will authorize 40,000 active duty Coast Guard personnel who perform all kinds of services, including safety inspections of freighters, transporting sick or injured people to medical attention, measuring the catch of a commercial fishing boat, searching for sailors lost at sea, breaking ice in the northeastern rivers, and on and on and on.

The first Coast Guard district in my hometown of Boston oversees 30 cutters, 11 aircraft, and more than 200 small boats to ensure boaters' safety. Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues, these people earn their keep. Every day the Coast Guard saves an average of 12 lives. Each year they save about $2.5 billion in property, which is nearly the entire operating budget.

Earlier this month, a Coast Guard cutter saved an 85-foot tug off the coast of Sakonnet Point in Rhode Island that was taking on water and absolutely would have sunk if the Coast Guard did not come on the scene.

Last month, Coast Guard personnel responded to a 200-gallon gasoline spill in New Haven Harbor; and before allowing the boat to load any new cargo, the Coast Guard ensured that that boat had been properly repaired before it went underway.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year a Coast Guard helicopter rescued from a New Bedford fishing vessel a fisherman whose arm was hanging off because it was injured in a severe accident by a winch and they flew this injured seaman to a Rhode Island hospital, where he recovered.

In January, the United States Coast Guard crew saved six people on a 72-foot sailing vessel in trouble seven miles south of Glouchester, Massachusetts. And every day the Coast Guard is out there protecting people on American waters. They do us a wonderful service, and this bill would keep them up and running.

I would like to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for putting together a truly bipartisan bill which should pass the House with very little opposition.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will enable the Coast Guard to continue its great work, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

I join my colleague from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in heaping praise on the Coast Guard for extraordinary work under extremely difficult conditions. Anybody who has been in New England in the winter knows just what he speaks of when he talks about being out there on the high seas.

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

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

This is a great day for the Irish, a great day for the Coast Guard, a great day for the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), and maybe a great day for America's steel industry and steelworkers. I support the rule on the Coast Guard. But I also plan to speak out of turn on the rule that will follow since it is limited for time.

Ronald Reagan came to my district in 1980. He stood on a flatbed truck. Struggling steelworkers were pleading with the President for help. Ronald Reagan made a pledge. He said, ''I will support the steel industry. I will make significant investments to help retool the steel industry.'' And he said, ''I will also make significant investments to retrain steelworkers so they can deal with the new steel technologies.''

Those steelworkers did not even support Ronald Reagan. Ronald Reagan lived up to every word. From the investment tax credit, to retraining money, Ronald Reagan lived up to his word.

In 1992, a candidate named Bill Clinton came through my district all through the steel Rust Belt and went down through Wierton, West Virginia. He said, ''I will ban illegal trade to protect the steel industry.'' And he even said, ''I will stop and I will ban scab labor.''

In 1993, President Clinton had a Democrat House and a Democrat Senate. There was not one word about scab labor, regardless about how we feel on the issue. And in 1999, Bill Clinton has not done one thing about illegal trade.

Labor unions and working people supported this President by more than 95 percent. Today's legislation is not perfect. Not all of us are totally enamored with all parts of it. But until this moment, the President is saying he may not support it. I say, on the House floor, labor unions have been the suckers. How many more cock-and-bull stories are they going to hear?

Now, the only statement I will make is I want to support this bill. I support this rule even though it is a closed rule. And it is time for Congress to take one other stand. See, I do not believe we should be debating illegal trade. I do not believe we should be legislating illegal trade. I think illegal trade should be banned and we should have taken this opportunity to send a message to the world.

The only thing that bothers me about the bills since I have been in Congress is I keep hearing Members say, ''it is the best we can do.''

□ 1045

What I say is if the best we can do is not the best for America, then it is not the best we can do and we should not do it.

I am going to support this bill. I believe if this President vetoes this bill, his veto should be overridden, and if he vetoes this bill, I think the American worker better take a good look at a lot of promises that have been made over the years by this administration that have not been lived up to.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Lest Members might be a little confused, the gentleman who just spoke so passionately and eloquently about the steel matter and talking about a closed rule was not talking about the rule that we have on the floor now. This is a wide open rule, and I urge its strong support by all Members.

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. 975, REDUCING VOLUME OF STEEL IMPORTS AND ESTABLISHING STEEL IMPORT NOTIFICATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 114 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 114

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 975) to provide for a reduction in the volume of steel imports, and to establish a steel import notification and monitoring program. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) ninety minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend from South Boston, MA (Mr. MOAKLEY) who obviously is on a roll here and is wearing a much greener tie than any of us, showing his great, great celebration of St. Patrick's Day. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time that I will be yielding will be for debate purposes only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 114 is a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 975, a bill to reduce the volume of steel imports and establishing a steel import notification and monitoring program. This rule was adopted unanimously by the Committee on Rules yesterday afternoon.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule further provides 90 minutes of debate in the House equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on

Ways and Means. It is the understanding, Mr. Speaker, of the Committee on Rules that both the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means intend to yield this debate time in a fair manner. This will ensure that Members on both sides of the aisle who are on different sides of this very important issue are provided the opportunity to have their voices heard.

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

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America has the strongest, most prosperous economy on the face of the earth. There are many reasons for that. We have the world's most skilled workers. We have entrepreneurial investors and inventors in unmatched numbers. We have the largest single market anywhere. And, we are riding on that great wave of the information revolution.

Mr. Speaker, these are all keys to our prosperity and growth, but they are not enough. Right at the heart of our prosperity is the openness and dynamism of our economy. We accept the reality of change and adapt to it better than anyone else. Western Europe and Japan are big and rich with millions of skilled workers, but they suffer from slow growth and massive unemployment. Why? They are not as open and dynamic as we are. They fear inevitable change. And what happens? Their people lose because of that fear of change.

Now, there is no question that an open, dynamic economy offers as many challenges as it does opportunities. International commerce is increasingly a fact of life in our economy. It means new markets and it means very stiff, tough competition. But no question, no question about it at all, Mr. Speaker, we as a Nation are succeeding. U.S. jobs have increased by 6 million in the years since the North American Free Trade Agreement and the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade were passed. Trade now accounts for 30 percent of our gross domestic product and 25 percent of jobs in this country. We would not enjoy our job and wealth boom if we did not have open trade and competition.

Given our leading role in the global economy, turmoil such as the financial crisis that swept through many developing countries in the past 18 months has a major impact right here at home. Today, we are going to consider legislation that specially selects the U.S. steel industry for special protection to assist them in dealing with the challenges posed by that foreign financial situation. It is clear to me that a majority of Members of this House want to have this debate. It is my hope that as we delve into this issue, the House rejects this special interest legislation.

Mr. Speaker, let us take my State of California. Our State, I am very proud to say, is on the cutting edge of our Nation's 21st century economy. Almost half of every dollar in the largest State of the union of economic activity is connected to trade, a 50 percent greater share than the Nation as a whole. The neighboring ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles combine to be the second largest seaport in the world, second only to Singapore. More than 15 percent of southern California's small businesses export products and services to other countries, many to Asia. This is five times the national rate.

Given our State's stake in exports to Asia and Latin America, California has been challenged more than most by this global economic turmoil. Shipments to Asia account for half of the State's merchandise exports. Asian problems represent a real threat to our State's economy. In California, millions of working families depend on producing computers, electronic components, industrial machinery, communications equipment, aircraft, semiconductors, textiles, apparel, automobiles, glassware, engineering and management services, and a whole range of agriculture interests that have been challenged by the impact of currency devaluations and financial turmoil. They are fighting to meet the challenge by becoming more efficient and diversifying their markets.

The steel industry should do the same. The fact is 40 times more American workers are employed in U.S. industries that use steel than in the industries that actually make steel. When we use protectionism to shield one industry, 40 times more Americans are injured. Remarkably, today, U.S. steel production and demand are at record levels. Let me underscore that again. U.S. steel production and demand are at record levels. Revenue per ton of steel was stable in 1998, not declining. Yes, there were fewer steel jobs at the end of 1998 than at the beginning, but that is a reality of the industry as it modernizes. Since 1993, jobs have fallen by 9,000 per year while production of steel has actually increased.

Mr. Speaker, protectionism is not the answer to the pain caused by economic turmoil overseas. Special interest protectionism will kill the goose that laid the golden egg that is our growing economy. The sponsors of H.R. 975 are asking us to start down a well-worn path to economic despair. Protectionism is fool's gold.

Mr. Speaker, I advocate passage of this rule. We need to engage in a very serious debate to talk about this issue, and then I hope that this House will reject this legislation.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very dear friend from California who has agreed to wear a green tie for sake of harmony today for yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the United States economy is booming. Economic growth is strong, job creation is at an all-time high, but not every American is sharing in the good times. At the same time the stock market is flirting with the 10,000 mark, 10,000 American steelworkers lost their jobs last year, 10,000 hardworking American families lost their paychecks, and 10,000 steel families face a very uncertain future.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one reason for this. It is the flood of cheap foreign steel being dumped into our markets in violation of the international trade laws, and it is drowning our steel industry.

Mr. Speaker, back in the 1970s, the American steel industry faced another crisis, a crisis of competitiveness. The American steel industry invested $50 billion to modernize plants and equipment. They also downsized, giving up about 200,000 good jobs. They innovated. American steelworkers made themselves more efficient. American steelworkers made themselves more productive. As a consequence, Mr. Speaker, America now produces the highest quality steel at the lowest cost per ton. Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker. American steelworkers produce the highest quality, lowest cost steel in the entire world. But even the most productive workers cannot compete with countries that do not play by the rules. The surge of unfair dumping of cheap foreign steel imports is costing America jobs and costing America money, and it is time that we take some very tough action.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has recently taken steps in the right direction. The administration found that Russia, Japan and Brazil had been dumping steel and issued rulings against these countries. The President has virtually stopped imports of hot-rolled steel from Russia and Japan, imports from Brazil are down by 76 percent, but at the same time cheap imports from China, South Africa and Indonesia have skyrocketed.

Mr. Speaker, even though the administration has taken some very good steps, there is much more to be done. This bill directs the President to take the steps to roll back the level of imported steel to the pre-July 1997 crisis levels. This bill leaves it to the President whether these steps involve quotas or tariff surcharges or restraint agreements or any other measures.

This bill also establishes a steel import monitoring program to make sure other countries comply with anti-dumping laws and provides information to help industry, labor and government respond to surges in imports.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and the other sponsors of this bill for their efforts. And I want to thank my dear friend from California who has granted this rule despite his objections to the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for action. American steel is much too important and American steelworkers deserve better. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from St. Clairsville, OH (Mr. NEY).

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for the fact that we have this on the floor today. Although we would differ in opinion, the process is going to work by having us here.

Mr. Speaker, as a coauthor of the Visclosky-Regula steel legislation, I am committed to standing up for steel. This legislation brings back the integrity of our antidumping provisions of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1930.

But this bill is not about free trade versus fair trade versus protectionism. It is about illegal dumping. And that is a big difference. This bill is pro-worker and it is pro-American.

Eleven thousand steelworkers, as we noted before, have lost their jobs. Eleven thousand steelworkers are trying to decide today, and one more per hour, how they feed their families, how they help their communities, how they survive.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because the President had lack of courage. In a combined effort with my colleagues we introduced legislation to freeze steel imports at pre-July 1997 levels. This legislation would do what President Clinton has not done, and that is to stand up for steelworkers and put America's interests first for a change. In October we had 344 Members on a bipartisan basis in October that urged the end of this. Yes, the administration is now starting to do some things 11,000 steelworkers later, and I cannot trust that if we do not push through this legislation and pass it, that it will not go back to the way it was.

So, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is absolutely critical.

There is a solution; it is a simple one. We must enforce our trade laws. That is it. The U.S. steel industry is not asking for special protection, and, quite frankly, they do not need it. Our working men and women can compete with anyone on this planet. They can and will compete against any steel in the world. But we cannot go against illegally-dumped steel.

But let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, and tell my colleagues why we are here today, how we got to this point.

We are here today because we are going to stand up for Main Street today, not Wall Street. That is why this bill is here. It is here because of leaders like Mark Glyptis, and George Becker, and Chip Antonacci, and Larry Mallas and John Sanders and Dave Gossett stood up and spoke out, and we are here because thousands of steelworkers and citizens would not let this issue go, would not let this issue die. Thousands rallied back home in a multi-state area, and they came here to the streets of Washington, D.C., 7,000 strong. They brought their children. People came here from all walks of life, Republican, Democrat, Independent, the wealthy, the poor, the unemployed, the workers, the students. Students made phone calls. People protested. They stood up for their rights.

That is why we are here today, Mr. Speaker, because people spoke out. The steelworkers, and the citizens, and the students and the people of our communities have said to their government: Stand up for us for a change.

It is very simple in my mind. We are today going to support Japan or we are going to support Weirton, West Virginia. We today are going to support Brazil or we are going to support Steubenville, Ohio. This is a bill about the fact that America today speaks out. The people speak out on the floor, the people win and America wins.

Support the rule and the bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 975.

Mr. Speaker, we are here because of policies which have failed to protect the American steel industry and workers from unfair competition. The administration could have prevented this bill from coming to the floor by initiating its own restrictions on the surge of cheap imported steel, but the administration would not go to such lengths to protect the steel industry. But they have gone the distance and more to protect the banana industry.

Mr. Speaker, does the banana industry employ 160,00 American workers? No. Are foreign bananas crowding out the American banana business? No. This has not stopped the administration from making every effort to protect the banana industry.

Bananas did not build America. Steel did. Steel helped build our automotive industry. Steel helped build our defense. We cannot build a tank with a banana, we cannot build a plane with a banana, we cannot build ships with a banana. We did not build cars with bananas. We did not build bridges with bananas. We did not build America with bananas. We built America with steel. But the administration has ignored the steel industry that employs 160,000 Americans that have suffered the loss of 10,000 jobs since the import crisis began and that has endured the undercutting of its American market. The administration cares more about bananas than about steel. Such a trade policy is, in a word, bananas.

Our approach is different from the administration's. H.R. 975 is the only action that will directly confront the major cause of layoffs in the steel industry. Our bill is America's best hope of averting an economic crisis of our own.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule, and I urge support for H.R. 975.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Madison Village, Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for not only giving me the time, but also for bringing this rule to the floor, and, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of both the rule and also the bill today before us. I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and everyone else who had a hand in bringing this bill before us today.

I do want to express some concerns about the manner in which H.R. 975 addresses the steel dumping issue. There is no doubt many speakers will talk about the fact that 10,000 steelworkers have lost their jobs as a result of steel dumping, but for every one steelworker in this country there are 40 downstream employees in the metal forming and metal stamping business, and I want to chat about them for just a minute in this 3 minutes.

The U.S. steel industry, even when it is going full guns, is never able to meet all of our steel demands in this country. At current levels the estimates are maybe 75 percent, which leaves us with a shortage of 17 to 24 million tons each and every year. There are some contracts and applications that call for nondumped, but foreign, steel. There is a metal foreman in my district that has a contract that calls for Dutch steel, for instance, and he says that if we put in restrictive quotas in certain situations, well then that company will just have the goods stamped over in the Netherlands, and we will have imported into this country a finished product. If steel is unavailable or a specific kind of steel is unavailable for a given application, our downstream manufacturers will lose contracts, and imports will come into this country on a finished basis.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage in a brief colloquy with the chief sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), and I would ask the gentleman:

Given the concerns of a short supply, why is it that he looked at in H.R. 975 the quotas, tariffs and other remedies to control the amount of steel coming into this country rather than focusing on dumping margins which are contained in Section 201 of the 1974 trade act?

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's concern.

The reason we looked at a quantitative and global approach is because, if we look at a product, if we look at a specific country based on a price, we are not going to resolve the crisis.

I would point out, for example, on a country basis steel exports from India suddenly increased to 70 percent in

January of 1990 compared to just December of 1998. Exports from Australia increased 31 percent in that last month. Exports from Korea increased by 25 percent.

So we are going to have to look at shifting within countries of various product lines as well as in people following behind if we do achieve success with one country coming in with new quantities of steel and again would remind the gentleman we are giving the administration 60 days to fashion their initiative, and they have great flexibility as to the design of that final plan.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his answer, and I also thank the gentleman very much for his courage in bringing this bill forward.

I would ask as a further courtesy, as this bill proceeds, if we discover that the quotas in place by H.R. 975 have an adverse effect and cause a short supply for our end users in this country, that we be willing across the aisle to work and address that issue, and I am certain that we can do that.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Absolutely.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman from Indiana very much.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for the time, and I rise in support of this rule and also in support of this resolution. In the last 12 months 10,000 American steelworkers have found out firsthand that fair trade is not fair and free trade is not free. The cost of those 10,000 American workers was more than their jobs. It was the loss of a lifestyle, a loss of the retirement savings, a loss of a promising future, and for some the cost was a lose of their home and even their family.

Mr. Speaker, it has not stopped yet. Thousands of more jobs will be lost if we do not act now. Ten thousand, and still counting, steelworkers have lost their jobs, not because of fair competition, but because of unfair competition. Employers and employees worked and sacrificed together to modernize the American steel industry, making it once again the most efficient steel industry in the world. They are willing to compete fairly, but they do not have a chance unless their government once again makes the playing field level. Foreign countries facing recessions and owing interest on American loans have targeted America as a place to raise hard cash. Countries where it takes $400 to make a ton of steel are dumping it here in record amounts for $200 a ton. Stopping that is not protectionism. It is ending an illegal business practice, one we would not allow one American company to do to another.

Mr. Speaker, if this administration will not show the same compassion for American workers as they do for the economies of Japan, Korea and Russia, they would stop this dumping now. They already have that power. I am troubled that we need to legislate an end to the dumping because legislation takes time, and time is something the American steel industry and its workers are running out of. The world tried this once before, and the greatest free trader of all, Ronald Reagan, put a stop to it. Now they are trying it again, and because this administration is more concerned about the world's economy, it is letting them do it.

Mr. Speaker, this administration will not stop this, so it is up to us. Let us act quickly.

This Administration cannot continue to hide behind ''overall'' rosy economic statistics while dismissing certain sectors of the economy as having troubles. Not when it already has the power to help those certain sectors—like the steel industry.

Yes, people are being hired in record numbers. But, for what kind of jobs? Too often, people are being hired at a Wal-Mart so then they have the money to eat at McDonald's—who in turn hire people to serve those Wal-Mart employees—allowing these new McDonald workers to take their salary and spend it at Wal-Mart—who can then hire more low wage employees.

We should not even talk about the low wage jobs being created at Wal-Mart and McDonalds, but we should speak loudly and forcefully about the good high paying, benefit rich jobs these people had before they were laid off.

A 20-dollar an hour jobs with benefits at a steel mill cannot be replaced by a 6-dollar job at Wal-Mart. But that's what's happening.

And don't tell me about the average income of an American worker, when included in that average is a 100 million dollar severance pay to a Hollywood insider, a 20 million dollar bonus for a corporate executive who's rewarded for chopping down his workforce, and a 70 million dollar contract to a professional athlete.

Ten thousand, and still counting, steel workers have lost their jobs, not because of fair competition but because of unfair competition.

Employers and employees worked and sacrificed together to modernize the American steel industry—making it once again the most efficient steel industry in the world.

They are willing to compete fairly but they do not have a chance unless their Government once again makes the playing field level.

Foreign countries facings recessions and owning interest on American loans have targeted America as a place to raise hard cash.

Countries where it takes 400 dollars to make a ton of steel are dumping it here in record amounts for 200 dollars a ton.

Stopping that isn't protectionism—it's ending an illegal business practice—one we wouldn't allow one American company to do to another.

If this Administration would show the same compassion for American steelworkers as they do for the economies of Japan, Korea, and Russia, they would stop this dumping now.

They already have the power.

I'm troubled that we need to legislate an end to this dumping because legislation takes time, and time is something the American steel industry and its workers are running out of.

The world tried this once before, and the greatest free trader of all—Ronald Reagan—took his eyes off the balance sheets and focused them on the American families and he said that's wrong and put a stop to it.

Now, they're trying it again and because this Administration is more concerned about the world's economy, it's letting them do it.

But what if that's not enough? If they're willing to let the steel industry be undercut by foreign competitors acting illegally, what other industries will they allow the same thing to be done to?

The Administration won't stop this—so it is up to us.

Let's do it quickly.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mapleton, Utah (Mr. CANNON).

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of our steel industry. The administration, Mr. Speaker, is compromising our national security by failing to enforce our trade laws. Our steel industry is critical to our national security. American steel companies across the Nation are going bust. Yet without American steel companies to supply our Armed Forces, our national defense is useless.

Let me cite some statistics. In the Gulf War the U.S. Army relied on the steel in 5,000 tanks, Bradleys and other armored personnel carriers. At the peak of the conflict in the Persian Gulf, the U.S. Navy deployed 120 ships made almost exclusively of American steel. Because the administration has failed to do its job in implementing import controls, Congress has to step in today to legislate trade policy and safeguard our defense.

A vote in support of this legislation today is a vote to uphold our national security and stop illegal foreign dumping. This will allow our steel industry to rebuild and our workers to go back to work and save our families. I urge a yes vote.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying Visclosky legislation, H.R. 975. It is necessary for this Congress to act to bring fairness to the steel industry, fairness in our trade policies.

I support open trade markets, but only fair trade, not free trade.

In the 1980's the steel industry came under heavy assault by countries dumping their steel here in the United States. The United States did nothing. We almost lost our steel industry. In my district, we mine iron ore, and we make iron ore pellets. To make the steel, Mr. Speaker, we need the iron ore pellets. Without our iron mines, there is no steel industry in the United States.

In the 1980's, prior to the illegal dumping, there were over 4500 miners in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

Today our mines employ less than 2,200 miners. We cannot absorb any more losses.

That is why Sunday I joined approximately 2,000 of my friends in Negaunee, Michigan, to stand up for steel. I want to see this and other anti-steel dumping legislation come to the floor of this House for a vote.

Now I have heard some Members say that they are reluctant to vote for this bill because they do not want to be perceived as anti-free trade. The question is not about free trade, it is about fair trade.

I say it is time to stand up for fair trade. Join us and stand up for our miners and steelworkers so they can rebuild the financial security they are fighting hard to achieve. Stand up for the steel companies who have worked to be the best steel producers in the world. Stand up for the workers and industries across a broad segment of our economy who need to see us get tough with foreign countries who have betrayed our good-faith efforts to promote open and fair trade.

□ 1115

It is time to stand up for our constituents, stand up for our communities, stand up for the Iron Range, stand up for steel and stand up for America. Vote yes on H.R. 975.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 20½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the closed rule and in support of the legislation before us. Once again, we are here pleading for some action by the Congress and the administration to step in and take care of a problem that has been hurting the hard-working steelworkers of the First Congressional District of Arkansas and across this country for far too long.

We are here today because the legislation we are debating will directly address the surge of unfairly traded imports. We must pass this legislation, and the administration must support it.

I cannot even count how many times we have stood here asking for the same thing, enforce our trade laws, stop illegal foreign dumping of steel in the United States. The administration has stood by for months now with their hands in their pockets doing nothing for the thousands of steelworkers in the First Congressional District of Arkansas and across this country who have lost their jobs, people who have families to feed.

We have been promised action time and time again but have seen nothing. I urge support of this legislation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule on the bipartisan Steel Recovery Act. Over the last several months, we have waged a battle on the issue of illegal dumping of foreign steel on American markets. I firmly believe that no American steelworker should have to sacrifice their job or their livelihood because of a foreign importer that breaks American trade laws. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand firm in support of U.S. steel, U.S. steelworkers and their families as the steel industry confronts an onslaught of unfairly traded steel imports.

Collapse of demand in Asia, Russia and Brazil have resulted in historic global overcapacity. Foreign producers choking on a global steel oversupply are desperate to sell steel and are willing to dump it at whatever price possible, to whatever market is open to them; in other words, the United States. Last year alone, imports from Japan, Korea and Russia soared by nearly 170 percent, 137 percent and 70 percent respectively.

Mr. Speaker, I urge full support of the rule and for the bill.

As a result, the U.S. steel industry is in a fight for its life. Steelworkers in Utah, Pennsylvania, and Alabama have been the hardest hit with each State losing several thousand workers. In Indiana, the Nation's largest steel producer, providing 23 percent of the raw steel made in the United States, up to 3,000 of its 30,000 steel workers—10 percent—have had to accept shortened work weeks, lower-paying job assignments, or early retirement. The Department of Commerce recently reported that 11,000 steel workers have already been laid off. That's 11,000 x's the American families who now face uncertain futures because we did not take action when we could have.

We must take all measures necessary to halt the flood of unfairly traded steel into the United States. Congress and the Administration must work together to enact stronger trade laws to prevent surges of dumped and subsidized foreign steel from devastating our workers and companies again. And, most immediately, Congress must act to slow these imports now before our steel industry is too seriously injured to recover.

America's hard-working families are looking to us to be their voice. Mr. Speaker, I intend to stand up for them and vote for H.R. 975. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and in favor of the bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, support for the Steel Recovery Act is not protectionism; it is a vote for fair trade in steel, fair trade in the U.S. and international marketplace. 1999, for the steel industry in America is what Yogi Berra once called deja vu all over again. We are seeing 1980 being repeated in 1999.

In 1980, we had produced 120 million tons of steel, the highest steel production in the history of this country. Imports devastated the steel industry down to 80 million tons; 350,000 steelworkers lost their jobs. 10,000 people in my district, 10,000 workers in the iron ore mines of Minnesota, lost their jobs permanently. We went from a $450 million payroll down to less than $100 million in 18 months. We are not going to stand for that again.

Look at what is happening just this year in the iron ore mining company: Eveleth Tachonite Company forced to have layoffs because foreign steel is taking away the market in the domestic United States, subsidized foreign steel.

We have spent $50 billion in the steel industry in this country modernizing America's steel mills. We have the highest productivity, the highest quality steel, the lowest cost per man unit of steel produced in America in the whole world, and yet Russia, Brazil, Japan, Korea, other countries, are dumping steel in this country at $250 a ton less than we produce it right here at home. They are subsidizing and exporting their unemployment, dumping it on our shores. When it hits at home and when it hits your friends and your neighbors, then you have got to stand up for fairness in steel.

We have invested over $2 billion in modernizing the iron ore mining and processing plants on the Mesabi iron range of northern Minnesota, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) said about his State. We should not stand for having that investment, that modernization of our industry wiped out by having foreign countries dump their unemployment on our shores, wiping out our American jobs.

Steel is the most important building material in an industrial society. We cannot engage a war, we cannot build our highways, we cannot construct our airports without steel. We are not going to have American bridges, American ports, American airports built with foreign steel subsidized to take away jobs from American workers when we have made the investments to modernize with private venture capital this greatest steel industry in the whole world and this finest iron ore mining industry in this whole world. Vote for the Steel Recovery Act.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I express my appreciation to the members of the Committee on Rules, the Committee on Ways and Means, to the leadership and to the Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), for their fair treatment on this issue. I know that the substance of the Visclosky steel bill may be of concern to some of these

Members so I am gratified to see this bill brought to the floor for consideration.

The subject of foreign steel dumping in the American market is simply too important, with an impact on too many areas of this country, for it not to receive consideration by the full membership of this House. This is the kind of bipartisan cooperation we need to see to solve the problems affecting American families, and I was especially gratified that the members of the Committee on Rules accepted our request for more debate time on this bill, as well as a closed rule.

On the substance of the bill, let me just say at this point that the Commerce Department has already issued its determination that illegal dumping and foreign government subsidies have occurred in Japan, Brazil and Russia. This constitutes the best, most informed judgment so far by the U.S. Government that illegal dumping is, in fact, occurring. We are playing by the rules but we are losing jobs to those who are not. Support fair trade. Vote for the rule and vote for final passage of H.R. 975.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and underlying legislation H.R. 975 which has been brought to us by our diligent colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA). I wanted to thank our good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) also for helping move this through the Committee on Rules. It is time to put steel back into the spine of America. 10,000 American steelworkers losing their jobs is beyond belief. The administration's delay to enforce dumping laws in this country, unforgivable. Since 1997, a glut of dumped imports on our shores, Indonesia up 612 percent, Japan 157 percent, Australia 156 percent, South Africa, 107 percent and Korea 105 percent; most of those countries are not covered by the administration's agreement.

If we in this Congress cannot stand up for our own when they are being unfairly dumped on, it is fair to ask, when do we stand up for anyone? Support the rule. Support H.R. 975.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) join me in a brief colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, I want Members to know that this is a good bill and I support the bill but I do have some concerns about its impact on the steel producer in my district who has told me about problems in obtaining the types and quantity of steel that they need from domestic producers. In the past, the government has been able to make very specific case-by-case exceptions to the import restrictions to allow manufacturers with legitimate short supply problems to continue producing their products and employing their workforce at full strength.

I believe there are conditions which may warrant further examination along these lines in the bill before us today and I would appreciate the assistance of the gentleman in working to rectify these problems.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) for his response.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate, first of all, the support of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) for the legislation, as well as his expression of concern.

The issue of short supply is an issue that we have considered from the inception of the original legislation and do believe that it is covered under the bill itself. The fact is, the administration, following enactment of H.R. 975, will have 60 days in which to fashion a comprehensive program that will still allow one out of every four tons of steel sold in the United States to be exported from another country.

Additionally, the reason we wanted to give the administration that flexibility and to put all of the countries and all of the products on one table is to make sure that companies such as the gentleman's in the State of Washington, earlier we had a gentleman on the other side, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), indicate he had a problem as far as possible short supply, that those can be addressed.

The reason we have looked at quantitative restrictions is, again, to make sure that we do not have people who are trading illegally under our trade laws following in behind someone else who is now obeying the law. That would be the responsibility of the administration, and I do appreciate very much the concerns the gentleman raised.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the consideration of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) on that. I appreciate, again, his hard work on this bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), who is the perfecter of the amendment that will be heard on the floor.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for the recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I would want to use this time not only to express my support for the rule but to make a number of thank you's in all sincerity. I think the coming together of Members in this case in a very bipartisan fashion, to work together selflessly over a period of nearly 8 months, to engender the support again in a bipartisan fashion of this House, can lead the way to the legislative calendar for the next 2 years and simply want to again thank the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) particularly for their consideration. I know they have reservations about this legislation.

I want to make sure that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) is thanked and particularly the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader, for their inestimable help in this matter, and finally the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) who I again know have very serious reservations about the legislation, as well as the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

I would finally want to thank the steelworkers everywhere who have worked diligently throughout this crisis to make sure that the voice of workers in this country is heard, and those who have participated in the steel working group.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader of the House.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 975, a bill which is designed to reduce the flood of steel imports coming into the United States, and I would like to commend the work of especially the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Visclosky) for all the hard work that he has done in bringing this measure to the floor today.

□ 1130

Today, the House has the opportunity to send a strong message of support for American steel company workers and steel communities across this country.

Mr. Speaker, more than 10,000 high-wage and high-skill Americans in the steel industry have lost their jobs since the onslaught of foreign imported steel began about 2 years ago. H.R. 975 will grant real tangible relief for this industry that is vital to our industrial base and indeed, our national security. It will also aid the efforts of steel workers and companies to bring about stronger action to help the United States steel industry.

Mr. Speaker, an economic collapse has swept the globe, first striking in Asia, but now impacting Latin America and other developing countries as well. During the debate over IMF emergency funding to stabilize these economies, I warned that import surges would result from the Asian economic crisis and that a plan would be needed to combat the unfair imports. Unfortunately, no such plan has been forthcoming.

Between 1997 and 1998, steel imports have risen nearly 100 percent from key countries like Japan and Korea. Thus far, 10,000 jobs have been lost, but thousands more jobs are threatened as an

oversupply of foreign-made steel sits on our docks. Our steel industry is the most productive industry in the world. The U.S. should not be forced to unilaterally take in a massive global import surge.

While the Clinton administration has taken some much-needed steps by expediting relief to the steel industry via traditional U.S. trade laws, I am concerned that the administration has not done enough to promote a global solution to this problem. I believe this bill can help us find that solution.

The bill we are debating today simply limits imports to pre-crisis levels. It promotes a fair and level trading system for the United States steel industry by putting an end to the practice of foreign producers flooding our market with cheap steel that puts our industry and its workers in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing our ongoing efforts with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the Steel Caucus, the Clinton administration, and all interested parties to develop a strong and realistic global solution to this crisis. Today's floor debate reminds us of the magnitude of the crisis in the steel country, and the passage of this bill will hopefully bring about the action which is needed to help reverse this economic calamity for thousands of workers and their families.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend my friend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) for all of his outstanding work that he has done on behalf of this particular bill and on behalf of the steel industry.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 975, the bipartisan Steel Recovery Act. This much-needed legislation will protect the U.S. Steel industry from unfair dumping of foreign steel into the United States market.

Since 1997, I and other Americans have watched Asian, Russian and Latin American countries dump their steel into this Nation. From 1997 to the present, U.S. Steel imports rose to 66 million tons, and it started out at 20 million tons. Over the past year, East Asia, Russia, and Brazil have illegally imported steel into this country at very low prices. Due in principal part to a lingering financial crisis which has devalued their currencies, these countries, East Asia, Russia, Brazil and others, have been getting away with murder.

Today, these unfair acts must come to an end because our Nation's citizens are the losers. In the State of Illinois, Acme Metals has filed for Chapter XI bankruptcy because it could not compete with the surge in steel imports. In my district, many steel companies have slowed down production. Some companies have even laid off workers or shortened their hours. We cannot sit idly by, Mr. Speaker, and let these countries destroy our steel mills. I support H.R. 975.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE).

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, this chart I think tells the story well. It begins in 1996 and finishes in January of 1999, and it is steel imports. Look at this line and how it suddenly shoots up.

Well, let me tell my colleagues what that line right there means, Mr. Speaker. That line does not tell us about the almost 1,000 Weirton Steel workers that are laid off, and they did exactly what our country asked them to do. They downsized, they invested, they became an ESOP, they played fair and they asked for a level playing field, and now there are 1,000 of them laid off because this government has not kept by its bargain and fought illegal imports.

It is not just Weirton, it is Wheeling Pit, it will be workers in Shinnston and Follansbee, and later it will be in Ravenswood at Century Aluminum and on down the Ohio River.

So, Mr. Speaker, this Congress must act today. It must send a clear, resolute message to this administration and to the world: We will not tolerate this line going any higher. We want those workers back to work, and the Congress will begin that process today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the debate has begun, and we have had Members on both sides of the aisle who wanted us to proceed with consideration of this legislation, and so we have done that. We start during this rule, and I am happy to say that in the rule we extended, as I said, by 50 percent the amount of time that would normally be called for, an hour of general debate, we have extended that to an hour and a half, and I think that this discussion will continue. So I am going to urge strong support of the rule.

As those who have been following this debate know, Mr. Speaker, most of the discussion has been over the measure itself, and I have to say that seeing the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, come on to the House floor, it is nice to have him here, because it buoys me up in my very strong opposition to this ill-conceived measure.

In fact, today the U.S. steel industry benefits from very vigorous U.S. enforcement of our trade remedies. One-third of the 300 antidumping and countervailing duty orders administered by the Commerce Department address steel products. In addition, we have seen a great reduction in the last 4 months of imports from those countries in question: Japan, Russia, and Brazil. We also have to recognize that overall we have seen this reduction in steel imports, and that decline is one which seems to be continuing, and the numbers are phenomenal. If we go from November of 1998 to January of 1999, they have dropped by 93 percent from Russia, 49 percent from Japan, 30 percent from Brazil, and 8 percent from Korea.

Mr. Speaker, we also have to recognize that 1998 was a banner year for the U.S. steel industry. In fact, 102 million tons of U.S. steel were shipped. Guess what the demand was? It was for 141 million tons. There is a demand out there that is greater than what is actually being produced, and yet, in 1998, this country produced the second highest amount of steel that we have ever produced in our Nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that this country today is economically strong because of our openness and our dynamism. We should not let fear create the kinds of problems that it has throughout the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, we look at the fact that there are many skilled workers in Western Europe, and yet their economies are faced with very, very great difficulties. Why? Because of the fear, because of the protectionism that they have imposed, and they do not have the kind of openness and dynamism that we have as a Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at all of those downstream workers, 40 times as many as there are in the actual steel manufacturing industry in this country. The auto manufacturers, they also are in large part, as the Wall Street Journal pointed out in an editorial yesterday, responsible for this. The 54-day strike that took place with General Motors obviously decreased that opportunity for production during last fall's strike. So it seems to me that we need to recognize that consumers would be devastated by going down this slippery slope.

We have other industries, the oil and gas industry. As I said, in our State of California, our economy, because of the cuts in defense and aerospace over the past several years, hinges on our involvement in the international economy. Our State is the gateway to the Pacific Rim and Latin America. If we were to pass, move ahead with this legislation, it could be potentially devastating to the largest State in the Union, and I believe to this entire country.

So let us stand with our Nation's openness, diversity and dynamism, which has, in fact, given us the strongest economic growth that we have seen in many, many years.

With that, I urge support of the rule.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman at the microphone, for his fairness in the presentation of this rule. He did extend the time, and he did allow the bill to come to the floor, even though he personally is opposed to it.

I also thank the gentleman for the timing, because as he knows, in 15 minutes the President of the United States

is going to join all Irishmen, Congressmen of Irish descent in the Rayburn Room for a March 17th dinner. So I thank the gentleman for that too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DREIER. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 96–388, as amended by Public Law 97–84 (36 U.S.C. 1402(a)), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council:

Mr. GILMAN of New York;

Mr. LATOURETTE of Ohio; and

Mr. CANNON of Utah.

There was no objection.

REDUCING VOLUME OF STEEL IMPORTS AND ESTABLISHING STEEL IMPORT NOTIFICATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 114, I call up the bill (H.R. 975) to provide for a reduction in the volume of steel imports, and to establish a steel import notification and monitoring program, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 975 is as follows:

H.R. 975

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

SECTION 1. REDUCTION IN VOLUME OF STEEL IMPORTS.

(a) REDUCTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall take the necessary steps, by imposing quotas, tariff surcharges, negotiated enforceable voluntary export restraint agreements, or otherwise, to ensure that the volume of steel products imported into the United States during any month does not exceed the average volume of steel products that was imported monthly into the United States during the 36-month period preceding July 1997.

(b) ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—Within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, through the United States Customs Service, and the Secretary of Commerce shall implement a program for administering and enforcing the restraints on imports under subsection (a). The Customs Service is authorized to refuse entry into the customs territory of the United States of any steel products that exceed the allowable levels of imports of such products.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) CATEGORIES.—This section shall apply to the following categories of steel products: semifinished, plates, sheets and strips, wire rods, wire and wire products, rail type products, bars, structural shapes and units, pipes and tubes, iron ore, and coke products.

(2) VOLUME.—Volume of steel products for purposes of this section shall be determined on the basis of tonnage of such products.

(d) EXPIRATION.—This section shall expire at the end of the 3-year period beginning 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. STEEL IMPORT NOTIFICATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall establish and implement a steel import notification and monitoring program. The program shall include a requirement that any person importing a product classified under chapter 72 or 73 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States obtain an import notification certificate before such products are entered into the United States.

(b) STEEL IMPORT NOTIFICATION CERTIFICATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to obtain a steel import notification certificate, an importer shall submit to the Secretary of Commerce an application containing—

(A) the importer's name and address;

(B) the name and address of the supplier of the goods to be imported;

(C) the name and address of the producer of the goods to be imported;

(D) the country of origin of the goods;

(E) the country from which the goods are to be imported;

(F) the United States Customs port of entry where the goods will be entered;

(G) the expected date of entry of the goods into the United States;

(H) a description of the goods, including the classification of such goods under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States;

(I) the quantity (in kilograms and net tons) of the goods to be imported;

(J) the cost insurance freight (CIF) and free alongside ship (FAS) values of the goods to be entered;

(K) whether the goods are being entered for consumption or for entry into a bonded warehouse or foreign trade zone;

(L) a certification that the information furnished in the certificate application is correct; and

(M) any other information the Secretary of Commerce determines to be necessary and appropriate.

(2) ENTRY INTO CUSTOMS TERRITORY.—In the case of merchandise classified under chapter 72 or 73 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States that is initially entered into a bonded warehouse or foreign trade zone, a steel import notification certificate shall be required before the merchandise is entered into the customs territory of the United States.

(3) ISSUANCE OF STEEL IMPORT NOTIFICATION CERTIFICATE.—The Secretary of Commerce shall issue a steel import notification certificate to any person who files an application that meets the requirements of this section. Such certificate shall be valid for a period of 30 days from the date of issuance.

(c) STATISTICAL INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall compile and publish on a weekly basis information described in paragraph (2).

(2) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—Information described in this paragraph means information obtained from steel import notification certificate applications concerning steel imported into the United States and includes with respect to such imports the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States classification (to the tenth digit), the country of origin, the port of entry, quantity, value of steel imported, and whether the imports are entered for consumption or are entered into a bonded warehouse or foreign trade zone. Such information shall also be compiled in aggregate form and made publicly available by the Secretary of Commerce on a weekly basis by public posting through an Internet website. The information provided under this section shall be in addition to any information otherwise required by law.

(d) FEES.—The Secretary of Commerce may prescribe reasonable fees and charges to defray the costs of carrying out the provisions of this section, including a fee for issuing a certificate under this section.

(e) SINGLE PRODUCER AND EXPORTER COUNTRIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce shall make publicly available all information required to be released pursuant to subsection (c), including information obtained regarding imports from a foreign producer or exporter that is the only producer or exporter of goods subject to this section from a foreign country.

(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Commerce may prescribe such rules and regulations relating to the steel import notification and monitoring program as may be necessary to carry the provisions of this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 114, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. 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. 975.

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

There was no objection.

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

(Mr. ARCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 975 directs the President, in effect mandates the President, to establish quotas to limit steel imports into the U.S., and I urge its defeat. This is more than rhetoric, this is a serious matter, and what we do today will have considerable impact not only on our own economy and our leadership in the world, but on the rest of the world.

□ 1145

A Wall Street Journal editorial yesterday called the bill, and I quote, ''the

most radical American protectionist act since Smoot-Hawley.'' Need I remind the Members that Smoot-Hawley passed in the late 1920s, contributed mightily if did not cause the great worldwide depression. That is why I strongly oppose this legislation.

I am pleased that the Clinton administration also opposes this bill. Mr. Podesta, White House Chief of Staff, wrote to me last week saying he would recommend that President Clinton veto this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD Mr. Podesta's letter, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, Mar. 10, 1999.

Hon. BILL ARCHER,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ARCHER: I want to convey to you the Administration's opposition to H.R. 975 and, in particular, its mandate that the President take action to roll back steel imports to the average monthly import levels preceding the current import surge.

The President is determined to maintain the U.S.' strong manufacturing base and the good jobs it provides. The President shares the co-sponsors' deep concern about the impact on our steelworkers, communities and companies of the surge in steel imports. He believes that the best way to address the current steel crisis is by insisting that other countries play by the international trade rules, just as the United States will continue to abide by those rules. The President's commitment to effective, vigorous and timely enforcement of our trade laws is producing results. Imports of carbon hot-rolled steel have fallen 70% between November and January. Imports of these products also have virtually ceased from Russia and Japan (down 98% and 96% respectively) and declined 76% from Brazil. We are committed to sustained implementation of this plan and the expeditious resolution of pending cases.

Quotas imposed outside of the World Trade Organization (WTO) consistent processes contained in our trade laws (section 201 safeguards law or the quota suspension agreement provisions in our antidumping and countervailing duty laws) violate our international trade obligations. These quotas would not be based on a determination of whether the imports are causing or threatening serious injury, or whether unfair trade or subsidization is involved as required by WTO. Moreover, our current trade laws already provide the means for U.S. industry and workers to request an investigation and, if a threat of injury is demonstrated, quotas or other trade remedies can be imposed in a WTO consistent manner. In addition, when the orderly and thorough procedures mandated by our trade laws are followed, we can take into account the full range of U.S. industry and worker concerns and fashion remedies that do not result in additional market distortions, import shortages, excessive price hikes or retaliation that could harm U.S. export industries and customers.

We believe that implementing H.R. 975 constitutes violation of our international obligations under the WTO and is not be in our nation's economic interest. Because of these concerns, the President's senior advisors would recommend that the President veto the bill.

Nonetheless, the steel crisis has demonstrated that there is room for improvements to our trade laws to ensure they deliver strong, effective relief in an expeditious manner, while maintaining their consistency with our international WTO obligations. We believe the legislation proposed by Congressman Levin constitutes a constructive approach, and we stand ready to work with him and other members of Congress to develop a bill that we could recommend the President sign.

Sincerely,

JOHN PODESTA.

Mr. Speaker, likewise, a majority of Members on the Committee on Ways and Means recommended that the House defeat this bill and the committee reported it on a voice vote adversely, unfavorably.

As we will hear today, our steel industry is going through some tough times, and I am sympathetic to that. But the steel industry is not alone. I am from Texas. I know full well of the problems plaguing our oil industry, which has lost many, many more jobs than the steel industry. Likewise, our farmers and ranchers are still recovering from one of the worst periods in a long, long time. So we must be very sensitive to the steel industry's situation also. But there is a right way and a wrong way to address this problem. This bill is the wrong way.

As usual, there is more to the story. There is a matter of steel users and manufacturers, both large and small. American workers in these steel-using industries, transportation equipment, industrial machinery, metal products, and construction, outnumber employment in steel producer companies by 40 to 1. In fact, I am deeply concerned, and I do not say this lightly, that this bill might threaten national security, because quotas will reduce steel products needed for military supply.

While the policy behind this bill is fatally flawed, the specifics break down as well. There are absolutely no exceptions to the quotas in this bill, even if emergencies arise or if a product is simply not made in the United States. This will cripple many American companies and their workers, including, for example, one in my district, Quality Tubing Incorporated.

Quality Tubing Incorporated is the first American company to manufacture steel coil tubing for the oil and gas industry. It buys roughly 70 percent of its hot-rolled steel from Japan. Why? Because U.S. industry simply does not manufacture the very specialized product that QTI needs. QTI pays a premium for the Japanese product because of its specialty nature.

This bill would be a double whammy for QTI. First it tells QTI it cannot go expand its business because it cannot get more of this specialty product than it did in 1997. Second, it would raise operating costs because prices for this steel product will undoubtedly soar.

Why should this company and its workers have to pay this heavy price? It should make absolutely no difference to the domestic producers whether or not QTI can get its product from overseas because U.S. producers do not make the product. This bill works like a sledgehammer, providing no exception for companies like QTI. We will hear more about many, many, many other companies if this legislation becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, at the direction of Congress, President Clinton, Vice-President GORE and their top economic and foreign policy advisors studied the steel situation very closely. After that thorough examination, the President chose not to set unilateral quotas which are in violation of the WTO rules. Yet, this bill mandates that the President do exactly that.

The President's logic is clear. If the U.S. sets up trade barriers in violation of WTO rules to which we agreed to at a time of fragility in the world economy, we could have a much, much bigger problem on our hands that would affect thousands and thousands of American jobs and threaten our economy.

In addition, we would set a terrible example for countries in real economic trouble, countries whose leaders are under tremendous pressure to retaliate against American made products. Brazil is a good example of this. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan shared these concerns when he testified before the Committee on Ways and Means in January.

My colleagues, the danger of drifting or, in this case, racing towards protectionist policies are very real. As I mentioned, the Committee on Ways and Means on a voice vote reported this bill unfavorably, adversely. I urge Members to oppose this steel quota bill. There are better ways to address the problem within the WTO rules. This bill will not make anything better. In fact, it will make things much, much worse.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 975. I agree with the gentleman from Texas (Chairman ARCHER) that there are problems with this bill. The administration has pointed that out.

I myself would prefer that we be considering legislation today that is consistent with our international trade agreements and that would have more of a chance of being enacted into law. This is especially so if we expect other nations to live up to our obligations.

However, it is abundantly clear that our steelworkers and companies have suffered immense harm, including as many as 10,000 jobs lost, severe production cutbacks, and several companies have gone into bankruptcy as a result of the import surge over the last year.

We as a country should have responded more quickly and more effectively. The administration's response over the last few months has been commendable, applying our trade laws aggressively and effectively within the bounds of the international trade rules. But that response is really too late in coming, and so we have the enormous concern and the frustration that led to the introduction of this legislation that we are considering here today.

We need to find a solution to the steel problem, and I hope we all agree on at least that much. However we vote on this bill today, let us try to work together in the coming weeks also to address in a systematic, sustainable fashion the underlying problems our steel firms and workers and other industries face.

Where our trade provisions like section 201 need to be strengthened and fine-tuned so that we can respond more effectively going forward in this problem and the next time around, let us fix them quickly.

Where our ability to protect and predict this kind of import surge can be improved, we should do that, too.

In short, we should look beyond the vote today to a long-term sustainable effective solution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Trade, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to yield time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 41½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 22½ minutes of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to allocate time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here under somewhat unusual procedure, but it is important that we talk about the substance. First of all, I want to emphasize the facts are clear that there was a surge of steel imports. This first chart shows the imports of hot-rolled steel from all countries. If my colleagues look at 1996 and 1997 and 1998, it becomes clear there was this surge, this is of hot-rolled steel a dramatic increase in imports.

Secondly, this chart shows the import of all steel products. Once again, I think it is very clear from this chart there was a very substantial overall increase; indeed, a surge. It was most dramatic with hot-rolled steel, but overall, the same was true.

Also it should be clear that there was a serious impact from this surge. Ten thousand workers lost their jobs. Three companies went into bankruptcy. So we are talking about American businesses, American workers who suffer because of this surge after the steel industry and its workers together had taken unusual steps to improve the industry, to downsize it, to make it more effective, indeed to make it the most productive in the world.

It is also clear that the government reacted slowly. One reason it did is because our antisurge laws are weak, and I will come back to that.

In September of last year, petitions, antidumping petitions were filed. The administration at that point whipped into quick action, and they invoked a provision of the law, a critical circumstances provision, that has rarely been used. As a result, the whole effort to determine whether or not there was dumping of steel, that whole effort was very much accelerated. The result was, in a short order of time, preliminary antidumping margins were announced.

I want to show everybody what happened. I will turn it this way so we see it on all sides of the aisle. This is when the surge hit its peak right here, November. We can see the spike up. Red is Russia, Green is Japan, and blue is Brazil. We can see this spike upward.

When the antidumping margins became evident, we see the tremendous downturn in imports from those three countries. So our antidumping laws began to work.

I want to emphasize to my colleagues that what happened with the surge was not globalization. That is here to stay. But it was manipulation of the market by those countries selling below their cost. It was not competition. It was distortion.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and the industry and the steelworkers and others here have done a real service to spotlight what the problem is. But here is the problem, and that is what is proposed by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) in this bill is not a viable solution.

□ 1200

Under WTO, the executive cannot, and we as the Congress cannot, invoke a quota by fiat. We simply cannot do that. Under WTO rules, safeguard measures can be put in place and, as a result of those safeguard procedures, if they are followed, action can be taken, including, in some circumstances, quotas. But it is very clear under our WTO obligations that this cannot be done simply by a bill of this nature or by the executive acting on his own.

Now, the bill of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) does focus on the problem that the dumping laws can be circumvented. Countries that are subject to them can substitute other products, or other countries can come into the gap. And so what we need, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) said it, we need to do something better, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) said the same thing.

There is something we can do that is better within the WTO. We need to reform our anti-surge provisions so that they are faster and they are more effective. That option is available to us, and I hope very much, as a result of this debate today, that we will take everybody at their word and move on to see if we can find and implement a solution that is within our WTO obligations. I am convinced that there is.

Indeed, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) and I have been in dialogue with the administration for over a week now. And yesterday, the gentleman from New York, a Republican, and I introduced legislation that would reform our anti-surge laws so that if there is a major circumvention, a major circumvention, of our dumping laws by other countries, or the countries that are subject to them, there will be something that we can utilize and implement quickly. And it will also take care of the issue of other products in addition to steel if a surge occurs.

Look, the steel surge shows that there is a serious problem, and there remains that. A serious problem needs a viable answer, one within the rule of law governing the trade between nations.

I want to close with a personal comment. I have been working with others in this body over these years to try to craft trade laws that are responsive to international rules and responsive to American needs. It goes back many years, in fact more than a decade, when we were able to pass the 1988 trade bill that strengthened our laws.

I think that the international rules have to be opened up so that they take into account new problems, problems that are happening because of our evolving trade with these evolving economies. The laws have to and the rules of competition have to take into account the competition from countries with very different capital and labor and environmental structures. I am dedicated to continuing that effort.

We need to carry on that battle, and we need to have within our laws a response available to surges like we have seen in steel for the good of this country, its workers and its businesses. But if we move in a way that clearly violates our obligations under WTO, and that is the basis of the administration letter indicating that a veto would be coming, we are going to, I think, undermine these efforts to improve our laws.

In a word, because of the way this has evolved, because of the spotlight that has been turned on our anti-surge laws, we now have an ability in this next few weeks, I hope, if not a few weeks no more than a month or two, to put together a bill that will respond to this problem.

So I echo what the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) said; and I echo in a sense what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) said at the Ways and Means markup: Let us take this moment, and whatever happens today, and dedicate ourselves in the days ahead to making sure that we have the laws, within the international rules that respond to this kind of a surge problem. I am going to dedicate every moment I have to helping that come about.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to control the time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I want to start out by saying that we all, I think, share the feelings of those who have lost jobs in the steel industry and those businesses that have suffered setbacks.

I cannot personally, though my grandfather grew up near the district of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and worked for the steel mills on the south side of Chicago, but my wife's grandfather worked in Gary, Indiana Mills in the gentleman's district. So we in the Chicago area, especially on the south side where I grew up, have a special feeling about the steel industry.

For all of that, though, I think this effort that we are undertaking or considering today is misguided. And I say it is misguided because we have the laws on the books and we have exercised them in a way that has had a very positive effect. Some of that our colleague from Michigan already showed in graphic form.

The fact is, if we take hot rolled steel imports from the three largest exporters that were guilty of dumping in this country, namely Russia, Japan and Brazil, those are now down, from their peak level at the tail end of last year, 96 percent. Ninety-six percent. And if we take the reduction of the hot rolled imports from all countries, and this includes even those that are not subject to investigation, those have dropped since last November by 70 percent. Seventy percent. And that includes countries, as I say, that have never been charged or accused of any irregularity here.

I think that we have the capability of dealing with this sort of a problem, and it is one that we have to recognize. There was a surge, and that surge was in violation of our guidelines and our regulations, but we did address it in a positive way. And so that concern of what happened in the steel industry is basically history at this moment.

The fact is we are on a road to recovery already. If we look frankly at our steel production, the industry recorded last year its second highest level of production in the past 20 years. Second highest in the last 20 years was our steel production. Eleven of the thirteen biggest companies showed profits last year, notwithstanding that surge that occurred at the end of the year.

We must show a concern, an appropriate concern, and I think we all do, for the loss of 10,000 jobs. But we have to recognize how that contrasts with, say, the oil and gas industry and the projected losses that have amounted this past year to almost 50,000. But keep in mind that we are at full employment, and we have now increased the number of jobs nationwide last year by 2.5 million, 2.5 million new jobs, and we are at full employment.

I think it is important to recognize, too, that this can have an impact on those people who are consumers of steel products. I am thinking especially of the people who purchase steel; defense contracts and machinery, cars, construction equipment. They employ 40 times as many U.S. workers as the integrated steel mills do. We will be potentially putting their jobs at risk.

I think also it is important for all of us to recognize the cost. The Congressional Budget Office, as this chart indicates, estimates that this bill will result in higher steel prices that will cost the private sector nearly $1 billion, $1 billion, over the next 3 years.

I have a letter that I will refer to later in closing, but it is from Caterpillar, one of our largest manufacturers and consumers in the State of Illinois, and exporters. It is an insightful letter talking about what the damage, the overwhelming damage, could be to Caterpillar's ability to produce and to export in the world markets if we, sad to say, went along with this well-intentioned but misguided legislation.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who has been at the forefront of this effort.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we would not be here debating this bill if we would just enforce our trade laws according to the law. The European Union does, Japan does, why cannot the United States?

Foreign mills are dumping steel on the American market for $200 to $400 a ton less than it costs to produce. Dumping. That is what it is. It is illegal. And if the administration will not stop it, then the Congress must.

America's steel producers and steelworkers played by the rules. They made hard sacrifices in the 1980s to make this the most competitive, efficient and unsubsidized steel industry in the world. It is only because of illegal and unfair trading practices that our industry is being undercut here at home.

The need for action is clear, compelling and convincing. The bill before us, H.R. 975, is common sense and bipartisan. It will reduce steel imports to 25 percent of the U.S. market. That is the level that played in 1997, before the dumping began. It authorizes the U.S. Customs Service to refuse entry to any steel product that exceeds allowable levels.

It also includes Mr. REGULA'S language to establish a steel monitoring system, so that we can avert this situation in the future. This is good legislation and an appropriate response to this crisis.

Finally, I would note that because of the import flux produced by dumping and other illegal trade practices, 11,000 American steel workers have lost their jobs. I would also note that several steel companies have filed for bankruptcy, and more are teetering on the brink.

We must not stand by the wayside and watch the American steel industry exported out of business. This country was built with American steel and this country needs American steel.

We need a global solution to this crisis. H.R. 975 provides that global remedy. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of the Bipartisan Steel Recovery Act.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), who, again, has been vigorous in this effort from day one.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, first let me compliment the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations, for his real leadership in fighting for America's steelworkers and for our American steel industry. What a commendable job he has done.

Mr. Speaker, the steelworkers of the Ohio valley are frustrated. They are fed up and they are just about to lose faith in their government's promise to uphold its basic trade laws. Our trading partners have shown a shocking disregard of those laws, and that has created a genuine crisis in this country.

Those of us from steel districts have been working for months to put this issue on the agenda of the administration and the Congress of the United States. We have done so because this is not just a local issue, this is not just a regional issue, this is, in every sense, a national issue.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means alluded to this legislation as presenting trade barriers. I have high esteem for him, however, I disagree. This legislation is not about setting up trade barriers, it is about fighting unfair trade practices. It is about trying to prevent our trading partners from cheating; about preventing our trading partners from dumping, dumping thousands of tons of steel on our domestic market.

□ 1215

Preventing dumping, Mr. Speaker, the selling of foreign steel in this country at a cost below the cost of producing that steel in the foreign country.

This legislation is about creating a level playing field. We recognize that we are operating in an international economy. We welcome it. We also recognize that, for that international

economy to work for us, our foreign partners must play fair. They are not. We have lost, by conservative estimates, 8,000 steelworker jobs last year and that trend continues because of dumping.

If we do not act, Mr. Speaker, we risk losing our domestic steel industry. And so, I respectfully ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

First, let me compliment Mr. VISCLOSKY, a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee, for his real leadership in fighting for America's steel workers and for America's steel industry.

Mr. Speaker, the steelworkers of the Ohio Valley are frustrated. They're fed up. And they've just about lost faith in their Government's promise to uphold its basic trade laws.

Our trading partners have shown a shocking disregard for those laws. And that has created a genuine crisis.

Those of us from steel districts have been working for months to put this issue on the agenda of the administration and the Congress.

We've done so because this is not just a local issue. This is not just a regional issue. This is, in every sense, a national issue.

This is not about setting up ''trade barriers'', it's about fighting unfair ''trade practices.''

It's about trying to prevent our trading partners from cheating—about preventing our trading partners from dumping, dumping thousands of tons of steel in our domestic market.

It's about preventing dumping—the selling of foreign steel in this country, at a cost below the cost of producing that steel in that foreign country.

This legislation is about creating a level playing field.

We recognize that we are operating in an international economy. We also recognize that for that international economy to work for us, our foreign partners must play fair. They are not. We have lost, by conservative estimates, 8,000 steel worker jobs last year, and the trend continues because of dumping.

If we don't act, we risk letting foreign nations run American steel out of business. And that would put our Nation in an extremely vulnerable position—economically vulnerable—with massive loss of jobs and widespread bankruptcies—undermining an industry—the steel industry, the health of which is essential to our national security.

So I would say to my colleagues that even if you don't have a single steelworker in your district, it's vitally important that you support this bill.

I would like to compliment Mr. REGULA and Mr. VISCLOSKY for sponsoring this legislation. And I urge my colleagues to do what's fair, to do what's right, and vote for this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 10 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) has 19½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 33 minutes remaining.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) who is a member of our Committee on Ways and Means, who on this special day just reminded me that he is Irish notwithstanding his surname, which is ''English.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Today we are all Irish.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding the time.

I rise today to applaud the House leadership's decision to bring this bill to the full House of Representatives. I believe that the crisis facing the U.S. steel industry and the lack of an effective response by the Clinton-Gore administration has forced Congress today to take action.

I very much regret that circumstances have brought us to the point that Congressional action was necessary. I believe, and I think that many of the parties agree, that it would not be necessary for us to even consider this legislation today if the administration had used all of the tools available to it under current law and consistent with all of our international obligations.

I support this legislation. I urge its passage by the full House of Representatives, and I call on my colleagues to stand up for steel.

I have come to the conclusion that we need firm legislative action. Passage of H.R. 975 meets the test of addressing the current crisis in the short term and the import monitoring language that would help the U.S. steel industry and its workers discern future import surges while there is still time to prevent unnecessary damage to our economy. I believe that there is additional room for further legislative action in the future. This is a good starting point.

Let us be clear on something, Mr. Speaker. This legislation is not protectionism and its opponents are not here truly advocating free trade. The steel market is the most distorted on earth, with our competitors using a welter of preferences and subsidies to wall out their domestic steel producers from competition.

America has the most efficient steel sector on earth. But in the current trade climate, our steel producers are at risk because of the predatory trade practices of our competitors. In the face of naked mercantilism, American steel needs help.

I find it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that at this late date the administration and its representatives are actually threatening a veto of this bill and arguing that we should consider other legislative approaches to deal with this pressing issue.

I was a primary cosponsor of the Trade Fairness Act, which was recently introduced, and we would have been more than pleased to have had the administration's support while we were advocating this legislation and recruiting cosponsors. This approach is entirely WTO compliant and could not be colored as sending any sort of protectionist signal to our trading partners. Yet the administration was silent on our proposal and declined numerous opportunities to support it or work with Members from both the Republican and Democratic sides of the aisle to offer constructive criticism to strengthen and advance the legislation.

What has happened to cause this renewed focus by the administration on the steel crisis? We have put together a bipartisan coalition of over 200 members who are forcing this issue and that is why we are seeing action today.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all happy St. Patrick's Day to all of us. And let me thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) for his leadership on this very important issue.

We would not have been as strong as we were in World War II had it not been for strength of this nation in oil and steel. And so, I truly sympathize with the plight of the steel industry because we are currently seeing similar layoffs in the oil patch. I know how painful it can be, not only for the people who work in plants and mills but also for small businesses.

I am for trade. I am for fair trade. I am for American workers. We have been between 8,000 and 11,000 layoffs. And I would simply say that this is an anti-dumping piece of legislation. H.R. 975 does not violate the WTO because it specifically allows us to prevent any contracting party from taking any action which it considers necessary for the protection of essential security interests.

Let us work together in a bipartisan manner to make our nation strong in oil, in steel, in other industries so that he we can face the world fairly, not to eliminate opportunities for trade but to ensure that this nation engages in fair trade and that we protect American workers and American industries.

Today I rise to speak on behalf of this bill, which would enact various measures to support our steel industry—an industry that has been hard-hit in the wake of the global financial crisis.

My decision to support this bill was an incredibly difficult one. I fully understand why some of my esteemed colleagues, and the Administration, are opposed to this bill. Their arguments are reasoned, and take into account many important issues that I feel should always be a part of the calculus used to determine our policy on trade issues. Those issues include compliance with international law, and potential trade backlash by our neighbors.

However, there is one number that persuaded me to vote in favor of this bill. Since the beginning of this crisis, over 11,000 jobs have been lost in the steel industry. That number of lost jobs can decimate a community, and turn a local economy into an economic wasteland. I can truly sympathize with the plight of the steel industry, because we are currently seeing similar layoffs in the ''Oil Patch''—of which Houston is a part.

I have seen firsthand, because of my experiences with the struggling energy industry

where we have had thousands upon thousands of layoffs, how mass layoffs can affect the psyche of a community. I know how painful it can be, not only for the people who work in the plants and mills, but also for the small business owners around them who depend on these workers for their livelihood.

For those of my colleagues that still doubt the seriousness of this issue, let me bring to light some more, cold, hard numbers. The steel industry lost $23 million last year in the fourth quarter alone. As a result, they had to lay off workers in order to keep a semblance of an industry. The 11,000 layoffs have resulted in over a $16 million loss to steel towns across America. And that number does not include the cost to our Federal Government that will be spent on worker retraining programs and unemployment benefits. We must support this resolution, we simply cannot afford not to.

Furthermore, I believe that H.R. 975 is, contrary to the arguments by the opponents of the bill, not a violation of our World Trade Organization (WTO) agreements. Article 21 of GATT specifically states that ''Nothing in this agreement shall be construed . . . to prevent any contracting party from taking any action which it considers necessary for the protection of its essential security interests . . . and to such traffic in goods and materials as is carried on directly or indirectly for the purpose of supplying a military establishment.'' That means that any industry, which is strongly relied upon by the military establishment, can be protected by trade regulations in the interest of national security! I believe that is the case here today.

For those of you that do not realize how much the steel industry is relied upon by our military, here are some figures. During the War in the Persian Gulf, we deployed 95,000 tons of American steel in the form of battleships, aircraft carriers, tanks, aircraft, and artillery. We could not have been as successful as we were without the benefit of a robust steel industry here in the United States. We could not apply further pressure against Iraq, without the constant and ready supply of steel here in the United States. If we are to lose more mills, we run the risk of losing our ability to replenish our military resources, and therefore, diminish our level of national security.

I hope that all of you will agree with me that something must be done, and urge all of you to vote yes on H.R. 975.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MASCARA) who has been a leader in enabling us to get H.R. 975 on the floor.

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

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Speaker, it takes longer than a few minutes to express my outrage for the loss of steelworker jobs in southwestern Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, and around the country. We have lost, as many have said, over 10,000 jobs. I was there in the 1970s and 1980s when over 250,000 manufacturing jobs were lost in southwestern Pennsylvania.

I come from an area that out produced the world in coal and steel that helped win two world wars. But this steel dumping problem is just the tip of the iceberg. Wait until other industries, including farming, feel the wrath of the unbridled world economy, an economy led by the World Trade Organization.

The WTO either cannot or will not intervene in cases of subsidized industries and the dumping of products of steel. The WTO is a poor excuse for an international arbiter. Let us face it, we have the most efficient steel industry in the world. Our steelworkers are the most productive in the world. All that needs to be done is to enforce our trade laws.

We do not need protection. We need fairness. Our foreign trading partners cannot compete with American workers so they resort to illegal means like subsidizing and dumping.

Stand up, America. Are you not tired of being dumped on? Vote for H.R. 975.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) our distinguished majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I understand why some Members are in support of this bill. But, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully rise today to voice my opposition to this steel quota bill. The choice facing us is clear. Either we want protectionism or we want free markets. Protectionism not only stunts this country's growth but also hurts the very industries it tries to protect. Steel is no exception to that rule.

America's steel industry leads the world in productivity and quality today because of competition, not protection. Since 1982, the amount of man-hours it takes to produce a ton of steel in America has dropped from over 10 hours to less than 4 hours. America's steel companies still supply nearly three-quarters of the steel consumed in America. Even if they produce steel at full capacity, we would still have to import steel in order to meet America's needs.

Will America really be better off by meddling with this market? The United States is the world's largest exporter. We are inescapably linked to markets all around this globe, and most American industries depend on some imported materials.

It is doubtful that the capacity of some American industries could be sustained by American suppliers alone. Setting tariffs on steel only comes at the cost of other sectors of the U.S. economy. There is also a great danger to slapping tariffs on goods when the world economy is already unstable. All nations and all consumers are losers in trade wars.

If we close our markets, the markets of the world are then closed to us. No doubt such anti-trade developments are the real threat to our economy and to thousands of American jobs. Protectionism hurts American workers.

When we limit the ability of our trade partners to access our market, we destroy the very framework that is the foundation of vibrant, dynamic trade and cooperation. Tariffs and quotas only tie the hands of American businesses by limiting our business partners and destroying markets for American products.

Mr. Speaker, we should have no barriers to American ingenuity and no obstacles to American prosperity. Simply put, protectionism is an obstacle to our freedom. We cannot close ourselves off from the world. Trade is not a four-letter word. It is a fact of life.

Mr. Speaker, no nation was ever ruined by free trade, but many nations have collapsed because of failing trade. I urge my colleagues to vote against this anti-trade bill.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) another distinguished colleague from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, while one could say that the administration did not respond promptly enough nor aggressively enough, the administration has taken some tough actions with some impressive results, as my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) clearly outlined.

It is also true that the industry could have been more aggressive. They could have brought a 201 safeguard action. They are spending a million dollars a month on legal fees and they could have done more to help themselves. But this, my colleagues, what we consider here today, is truly madness.

I fought hard for voluntary restraint agreements for machine tools. I have worked hard on anti-dumping law. I was there when we passed the 301 capability. But this is madness. We pass this and the very next day a steel company in my district closes. Two hundred sixty high-paying UAW jobs will be gone in spite of the fact that this company invested $50 million in the recent past to modernize their equipment because they are dependent on a single source of raw carbon and alloy steel in Europe.

They had even given money to American steel companies to try to get the same quality steel produced in America. They have not succeeded. They have one source. It is foreign.

This bill makes no allowance for the importation of steel for which there is no source in America. How am I to explain to those employees that they are losing their jobs because they need steel from abroad that is not made in America? We are going to close them down, and we have no understanding, and the proponents of this bill cannot tell us, how many other companies there are in America like mine that are significantly dependent on foreign imports because the steel is not made in America.

And furthermore, they cannot tell me how many jobs will go under within 2 weeks after my shop closes because they cannot get the product my shop makes.

□ 1230

This is irrational. Furthermore, this is not about a bill that does not allow

any exception for no American supply and no exception for short supply, that is, American capacity that maybe is 20 percent of what our demand is. This bill makes no exception for those companies and those jobs will go out in a quick nanominute. Not only that but it will, over time, very rapidly reduce the amount of imports allowed, because it does not allow the same imports that were allowed in those years, part of 1994, 1995, 1996 and part of 1997. It cuts those imports. It says no more than the average. Well, that average, Mr. Speaker, was the average between low imports and high imports. If your new ''high imports'' is now the average, your new average import is going to be somewhere between low and average. That is going to cut the supply of steel to American companies so rapidly, you will not know what hit you, and you have no estimates of the job impact of that cut in imports.

This is irresponsible. We are going to undermine American manufacturing with this bill more aggressively than we have with any other action this floor has ever taken.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. HOUGHTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.) Coast Guard

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the gentleman from Indiana for bringing up this issue. It is an important one, we have to get at it, we have got to do something about it.

The issue is not over the hurt. The issue is how to cure the hurt. It seems to me from my experience that this bill has a heart but it does not have a head. What do I mean by that? First of all, it is not going to go anyplace. Even if it did, it is WTO illegal. Furthermore, the most important thing is we have sort of a reverse golden rule. We are doing unto others what we do not want others to do unto us. An example of that, of course, is the banana issue.

I have been in this situation personally. I have been in a company which almost went on its knees because of unfair trading practices, and I relate to that. There are two issues here, though. There is the antidumping issue, and there is the threatening of an industry issue. It is not just antidumping. This is an industry, the steel industry, which is threatened by its very existence, and this is a different part of the trade law and we have got to get at this. But this is not the way to do it, because it is not going to go anyplace. It is not going to be legal. It is going to hurt us long-term.

There is another alternative, and I really point to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) who has been extraordinarily helpful in this. There is a bill coming up within the next couple of weeks called H.R. 1120. It gets at the issue, it is legal, it is bipartisan, and I think it has the support of the administration. I think the important thing to know is that there is a mine field out there in international trade. It is not exactly clear, and you have to sort of muddle your way through it but you have to do it in consideration of the rest of the world and also our trading partners.

The bill that will be coming up that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and I are sponsoring does several things. First of all it shortens the time. If you have a 201 case, many times you will say, ''Why should I apply this, why should I file, because I can't afford it. It takes too long. It's very, very expensive.'' We are going to fix that.

Also, it creates an early warning system which is very, very important and anticipates these surges. The most important thing it does, and I think the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) indicated this earlier, if people work the laws on the books as they are now, then we would not have this problem. The administration for years and years and years has not done that. The last person out of the oval office is usually one of the top secretaries, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State and they are talking about the macro issues. In the meantime, the individual industries go under. This tends to put the onus on the President, on the administration to abide by and enact and do the things which are necessary under the laws.

I would encourage people not to vote for H.R. 975 but to wait for a couple of weeks because we have a good bill coming up.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this bipartisan resolution.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 975 and for America's steelworkers.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 975 and in support of the thousands of American workers who have lost their jobs because of our obsession with free trade.

Since the United States joined NAFTA and the WTO, over 200,000 Americans have seen their jobs exported abroad. These jobs have not become obsolete because of some advance in technology, but because we have deliberately pursued a trade policy that sacrifices productive American jobs for cheap foreign imports.

Last year the U.S. trade deficit was a whopping $168 billion, the highest in our history. Nineteen ninety-nine promises us an even larger trade imbalance, especially if we are foolish enough to give China membership in the World Trade Organization or inflict NAFTA-like trade provisions on Sub-Saharan Africa.

Yet the opponents of H.R. 975 are telling us the trade deficit doesn't matter. Just look around, we're told. Our economy is the envy of the world. Wall Street is booming. The stock market topped the 10,000 mark yesterday. And those cheap foreign imports, including hot rolled steel, are sending American shoppers into a buying frenzy.

Well, an unemployed steel or textile worker will tell you the trade deficit does matter. The booming economy is bypassing the American worker. These Americans don't have enough money to put food on the table, much less enough to invest in stocks and bonds.

While H.R. 975 is a good bill and should provide import relief to the steel industry, it does nothing to address the glaring need to regulate the global economy before the next major American industry has to close its doors to unfair competition.

We need trade agreements that act as if people mattered, and have an obligation to put the needs of American workers before corporate profit. We can start today by passing H.R. 975. Then we must reject every trade initiative unless it includes meaningful labor and environmental protection standards. This is the only way we can prevent higher trade deficits and protect American workers from the corporate trade agenda. Support H.R. 975, support a trade bill for Africa that benefits American and African workers, and reject Chinese membership in the WTO.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is a very curious bill brought out by the Committee on Ways and Means with a recommendation that it do not pass. Now, very seldom does that happen, unless it is a very political bill. And this is nothing but politics. The President has already said he is going to repeal it, and he really does it for several very good reasons.

H.R. 975 would impose quotas on steel imports outside our U.S. trade remedy laws and our U.S. obligations in the World Trade Organization. We would simply be running straight into the world trading rules headfirst, knowing it, and knowing that we are out of bounds. Now, that does not make any sense.

We heard from Members on the other side, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and others, about the problems created by an absolute quota without knowing anything about what the impacts of that are on those people who use the raw product for finished products.

When we built the trade center in Seattle, we needed a piece of steel to span the freeway to rest the building on. There was no place to buy that steel except Korea. That is where we bought it. Now, if you want to say to whatever construction project or whatever is going on in this country, if they do not make it in the United States, you cannot do it, this is the bill to support. Because you are not taking into account,

and one of the real problems with this debate is, there are lots of questions, none of which are being answered, but what do you do with the supplier or the producer who needs the raw material that is only obtained in another country?

Now, there is an additional problem and that one is a much more philosophic problem. We live in a world trading market. If we start this business of trade wars and we put up our barrier against somebody else and they put theirs up against us, we will soon see what Smoot-Hawley did back in the 1920s. We do not want to go back to that. Vote against this bill.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK). He has been very, very active on this issue.

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) has been a pleasure to work with on this issue as we have people in our district that are really suffering.

I just want to point out something. I saw this chart which I found quite curious. It is the fact that we now have seen a dramatic drop in the amount of imports that we are receiving from Russia, Japan and Brazil. This is all correct. But at the same time, imports from China have increased 552 percent, and imports from Indonesia have increased by 1310 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is a shell game. We are kidding ourselves. I come from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. We used to be the steel city. We are still bleeding from the loss of jobs in the 1970s and the 1980s. It is now an insult that we are not going to stand up against trade that is in fact illegal.

If I can go to the next chart, what I want to show my colleagues is that the trade we are talking about right now, the steel dumping that is occurring here is illegal trade. They are bringing steel over here, hot-rolled steel, cold-rolled steel, they are bringing over specialty steel and they are selling it below cost. They are putting thousands of workers out of jobs. I know some of the hundreds of thousands of workers who were displaced in the late 1970s and 1980s. It has caused a displacement in the communities, in the families, an increase in the level of violence. We are talking about a life-and-death situation. If we had a situation where these were our constituents and someone was breaking in their house and raping and robbing and pillaging them, we would want to send in a policeman to do something. In this instance, they are just coming in and taking their future, they are taking their jobs, they are taking all of their dreams away. There are people standing up saying, ''We're not going to stand up for these workers.''

We must pass H.R. 975. It is not only the 170,000 people who work in steel but the people who mine iron ore, who mine coal, who make coke, who work in transportation of steel products. We must stand up for the people of this Nation. We must stand up with a force of steel and with a backbone of steel.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say thanks to the Committee on Ways and Means and to the leadership for giving us this opportunity to debate this issue. I know that it was not something that the Committee on Ways and Means was supportive as evident by their recommendation, even our leadership, but they said in fairness—in fairness—people should have an opportunity to debate this issue and vote on it. For that, I express my appreciation.

We are here because we have a crisis in this Nation. We have a crisis of unfair trading practices. The issue is not protectionism. That word gets bandied around so easily. The real issue is fairness. We want our steelworkers and our steel industry and all the ancillary jobs and suppliers to be treated fairly. It is difficult to compete when the steel products coming into the United States are being sold at less than cost. Our steelworkers are the most efficient, the most competitive, the best quality in the world today. But all of those things do not mean a lot if the competition from overseas is saying, we will sell it for almost any price we can get, simply to earn hard currency.

We have heard speeches that say the sky is falling. The sky is not going to fall if we adopt this bill. It is going to give the President discretion to ensure that there will be fairness in the marketplace, that our steelworkers and the suppliers and the literally tens of thousands of jobs that are dependent on this industry will have an opportunity to compete on a level playing field. I think this bill just simply represents an opportunity for our industry to compete. It does have a 3-year time frame.

Let me just say, lastly, I think we need to take a look at our whole trading policy. We are in a different world when many of these laws were put on the books and we need to say prospectively we want fairness for American products.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the son of a Pittsburgh steelworker and in strong support of American steelworkers, the American steel industry and the Bipartisan Steel Recovery Act. The case is clear. The American steel industry and our steelworkers are in crisis and Congress must act.

Already, 10,000 steelworkers and iron ore miners have been laid off or have lost their jobs. Thousands more have had their workdays and paychecks cut. Several steel companies have been forced into bankruptcy. Our failure to approve this legislation and to end this crisis now risks the disappearance of the American steel industry altogether. We allow this to happen at tremendous cost to our economy and our national security.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, our obligation ultimately is to the thousands and thousands of hard-working American families who have served their country mining and producing this critical product, put bread on the table by the sweat of their brow, raised families, contributed to their communities and who now risk losing everything because of the current steel dumping crisis.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I urge President Clinton to be loyal to the hard-working American men and women who have been loyal to him and sign this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. CARDIN. First, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) for really making this possible for us to have a vote today on this very important bill. I would also like to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for his work on this area. I say to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) I like this bill, but it deals with a prospective problem. We need to deal with the current situation. We need to pass this bill and the bill that he mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to express my appreciation to the steelworkers at Sparrows Point in Maryland for their persistence in being here to demonstrate exactly what effect this illegal surge of imported steel has had on our work force. There is no question that this activity has been illegal. The imports are wrong, and there is no question of the harm that it has caused. Ten thousand jobs have been lost.

Mr. Speaker, Bethlehem Steel's fourth quarter financial reports show that this is certainly a very serious situation. It is not Bethlehem Steel's fault. They made the investments in the 1980's and early 1990's. They can compete with steel produced anywhere in the world as long as it is on a fair and level playing field. That is not the case.

The bill before us is an appropriate remedy, so for the sake of our U.S. steelworkers, for the sake of basic fairness, let us pass this legislation.

I will vote in favor of this anti-steel dumping bill. But before I do, I want to personally thank

Representative VISCLOSKY for his leadership on this issue. And I want to recognize the hard work of the steel industry in the last year. I want to congratulate union and management for their tenacity. They refused to let us forget what this dumping was doing to their lives.

If you looked up the definition of the word persistence in Webster's Dictionary you ought to find a picture of some of the steelworkers and managers from Bethlehem Steel's Sparrows Point division in Baltimore. Sometimes it felt like they were living in my front office during the last few months.

But they have made it clear to all of us that this problem is real. That they are frightened for themselves and their families. 10,000 jobs have been lost due to unfair dumping. We're told more will come if something isn't done soon. There are already slowdowns at Bethlehem Steel. The company's fourth quarter financial reports were anything but rosy.

These workers were not only frightened, they were furious. Furious at our inaction. Furious at our handwringing. Well, today we have the opportunity to act and get their industry back to producing quality steel on a level playing field.

It is hard to argue with their fury. Consider the numbers and the facts. U.S. imports of steel from Japan jumped nearly 162-percent from 1997 to 1998. 162-percent! I had a Beth Steel manager in my office last week who said that just as the levels for Russian steel imports began to decrease, the levels of Chinese dumped steel took its place. It's like that boardwalk game "Whack-A-Mole": you hit one, and another pops up.

The U.S. steel industry is an industry that has already taken its whacks—whacks it well deserved—and managed to reemerge stronger and more profitable because of it. I began my career here in Congress just as this revitalized industry returned to the fore in 1987.

But I also remember the darkness before the dawn. As Speaker of the House in the Maryland General Assembly at the time, I remember that painful process for Beth Steel and the steel industry as a whole. Between 1977 and 1987, 45 million tons of steelmaking capacity was lost due to bankruptcies, plant closures, and partial closures. Employment dropped 57 percent. Almost 300,000 steelworkers lost their jobs. The wages and benefits of those workers who survived were substantially cut as well.

I cite these figures to stress that these were fair blows the industry had to withstand. The industry had let itself lag behind other countries. It had failed to adopt new techniques and practices until these practices themselves were out of date. The industry needed to be shaken awake. A reinvigorated international steel industry did just that.

But, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. steel industry can't blame itself for the problems it faces today. And one month declines in the levels of steel imports are nice but I fear them to be a false dawn.

The blows this industry is being asked to absorb here are not fair ones. The United States has the only true open market in the world. But it is being forced to compete against countries whose steel producers are heavily subsidized or which work in cartels.

I support the Visclosky bill because it returns the field to the even level that the whole industry played on before July 1998. I appreciate the complexity of the global financial crisis which prompted this glut of imports. I appreciate the distress of steel workers all over Asia, South America, and Russia. But quite frankly it's my job to look after the distressed steelworkers at Beth Steel. They are my primary responsibility. They are our primary responsibility. We have to do more for them.

The steel industry has been sending SOS signals to the U.S. Congress for months now. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 975 and show these workers we hear their call and help is on the way.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague and neighbor, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, this bill, if it is passed, could have the law of unintended consequences. Let me explain. Kelly Springfield has a radial tire manufacturing facility in my district, and I would really appreciate if the House could listen very closely to this:

Mr. Speaker, steel wire rod for tire cord which goes into radial tires is not manufactured in the United States. It has to be outsourced from foreign countries. Kelly Springfield has a radial tire manufacturing facility in the district that I represent. Because this bill is so broad, it would slap import quotas on steel wire rod for tire cords and there have the possibility of laying off workers at American plants that make tires, that make radial tires. This is not the type of bill that we need.

In a neighboring county, McHenry County, Brake Parts was having rotors from China dumped in the United States. We encouraged Brake Parts to file a complaint with the International Trade Commission, got a retroactive order and stopped that practice. But we have to do something else. We have to pass the Regula bill so that any tariffs that are collected as a result of illegal dumping in this country not go to the coffers or to the Treasury of the United States, but go to the companies hurt and to the workers hurt thereby.

So the bill is imperfect in its form. It would actually hurt manufacturers, it would hurt employees in this country. Second of all, we need to work towards enactment of the Regula bill so that any benefit that comes as a result of sanctions against people who are dumping here go directly to the employees.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) who has been a leader on steel issues throughout his career here.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding this time to me, and I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) for the very strong leadership, determined effort and excellent grasp of the ramifications of steel dumping in this country has meant for our American worker and our American economy. Obviously I rise in support, Mr. Speaker, of this resolution and feel very strongly that it is vital in order to protect our American workers.

Steel producers, as we all know and has been said, in other countries such as Japan, Brazil and Russia are heavily subsidized by their government and thus are able to take advantage of America's open markets by dumping excess steel here resulting in closed bankrupt steel plants and throwing thousands of our steelworkers out of their jobs, unable to sustain their families and their quality of life. But aside from the closure of our steel mills and unemployed workers is the impact that this could have on the future stability of the U.S. and how it could inhibit our national security.

As has been said by others, we cannot sustain our Nation's armed forces, their equipment and weapons using Styrofoam and plastic. We have to have steel, particularly and preferably steel that comes from our own industry and our own workers, a known product, not from steel produced in foreign lands and dumped on our shores.

The bill before us today directs the President to take the necessary steps including imposing quotas, tariff surcharges or negotiated enforceable voluntary export restraints that cap steel imports. The bill also requires the administration to establish a steel import notification and a monitoring program.

Mr. Speaker, I am neither a protectionist nor a free trader. I believe in protecting our own labor force and our own industry, and H.R. 975 will do that.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for steel, vote for this bill and create a level playing field for Americans for a change instead of our foreign trading partners whose governments subsidize them while breaking our laws. I thank the gentleman again for yielding time to me and commend him for his excellent leadership.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by commending my good friend next door to me in Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) for his hard work and leadership on this very important issue.

First of all, what this issue is not about: It is not about American protectionism, it is about American principle. This is not about unfettered free trade, it is about enforcing our fair trade agreements. And this is not about corporate downsizing, it is about illegal dumping.

When the Clinton administration finally agreed and the Commerce Department to look into this matter, they found, and I quote from their news release in the Commerce Department, that the Commerce Department will instruct Customs to require importers of these products to post a bond or cash deposit of all imports entered during the 90 days preliminary to the determination. Unprecedented 25 days ahead of time the Commerce Department found that Japan and Brazil were engaged in this illegal dumping.

So I encourage in a bipartisan way our colleagues to stand up for this

American principle of enforcing our trade agreements.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The Chair would remind Members of both sides of the aisle to try to adhere to the time limits. We are extending the debate by not doing so.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from the CEO and Chairman of Caterpillar that I referred to earlier. I also have letters from other manufacturing companies in my general area around Chicago that I will include as a part of the RECORD.

CATERPILLAR INC.,
Peoria, IL, March 10, 1999.

Hon. PHILIP M. CRANE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CRANE: As one of America's largest exporters and biggest consumers of US-made steel, Caterpillar urges you to vote against the Visclosky-Quinn Quota Bill (H.R. 975). The company strongly opposes the legislation because it not only would hurt our competitiveness in overseas markets, but would lead to direct retaliation against Cat exports. It also would establish a system that rewards countries that engage in unfair trade practices, undermines the international trading system and jeopardizes the global economic recovery.

By imposing mandatory controls on steel imports from all countries—including fairly traded imports—the Visclosky-Quinn Quota Bill would severely restrict the availability of steel to U.S. manufacturers. When this type of protectionist scheme was attempted during the 1980s, it created an artificially restrictive steel market resulting in steel shortages and higher prices. At times Caterpillar had to fly-in steel from overseas just to keep our production lines running. On one occasion, we come perilously close to shutting down our largest plant while we waited for permission to import a type of steel that wasn't even made in the United States.

What's equally troubling is the impact the Quota Bill could have on Caterpillar exports. Because this legislation blatantly violates U.S. international obligations, our trading partners would feel justified in retaliating against American exports. Likely targets would be U.S. manufacturers—like Caterpillar—that export steel-intensive products. Since Caterpillar buys more than 90 percent of its steel from U.S. steel producers, such retaliation would further harm the American steel industry while severely damaging Cat's export markets.

Regrettably, the Quota Bill is structured in a way that could actually reward countries that engage in unfair trade practices. Unlike trade remedy laws that attempt to neutralize the effects of dumping or subsides, this legislation would reward countries with a guaranteed share of a restricted U.S. market. As a result, much of the quota ''rent'' generated by higher prices would go to foreign steel producers.

Finally, this legislation could have a catastrophic impact on the international economy. Today the U.S. economy is at full employment. Inflation is nonexistent. The Dow Jones average is near 10,000. Enactment of the Quota Bill would mandate the United States radically change the direction of its trade and economic policies. At a time when the U.S. is pressuring countries that are in far worse shape to keep markets open and free, the Visclosky-Quinn Bill would likely trigger a retreat into protectionism.

Representative Crane, we know the lure of quick-fix solutions can be appealing. But protectionism isn't the answer. By now, it's clear that U.S. unfair trade laws are working. By almost all measures the crisis in the steel industry has passed. Rather than focusing on protectionist measures like the Visclosky-Quinn Bill, we urge you to support initiatives aimed at improving the competitiveness of the U.S. steel industry. That way, the steel industry, American manufacturers, and U.S. workers and consumers all win.

Sincerely,

GLEN BARTON,
Chairman and CEO.

COMPLEX TOOLING & MOLDING, INC.,
KRASBERG METALS DIVISION,
Des Plaines, IL, November 30, 1998.

PHILIP M. CRANE,
Palatine, IL.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PHILIP M. CRANE: In the interest of Complex Tooling & Molding, Inc.-Krasberg Metals Division a producer of metal stampings and assemblies for over 50 years, and over 50 employees in the suburban Chicago area. We are also a member of the Precision Metalforming Association (PMA), the trade association that represents many users and consumers of steel and steel products.

The protectionist pressures currently being exerted by the ''Stand Up for Steel'' coalition give us great concern because they are aimed at restricting our ability to get the best steel available for a competitive price. We know that trade restrictions such as those advocated by protectionist interests will result in a net loss of U.S. jobs. We support you in your efforts to improve, not undermine the U.S. economy.

We need adequate and dependable sources of steel to maintain and expand our operations in the United States—sometimes that means that we must rely on foreign steel. At best, the U.S. steel producers are capable of meeting only 70–75 percent of U.S. demand. Actions that curtail imports of steel will seriously injure our industry and the economy as a whole through higher prices, fewer choices and job migration offshore.

We all agree that it is important to maintain U.S. jobs and job growth. Steel is no less important than other sectors. However, you should remember that the major U.S. steel using industries (stamped or fabricated metal products and others) employ some 8.3 million-production workers, nearly fifty times the number employed by U.S. steel producers. These jobs depend on maintaining competitive market conditions in this country. If steel imports are restricted, *imports of steel products* will certainly increase, and more jobs will be destroyed in this country.

In determining what is fair for steel producers, we ask you to remember that short-term benefits for the steel industry may have a long-term negative effect on U.S. jobs and the economy as a whole.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

DAN BERG.

TRU-DIE INC.,
Franklin Park, Il, December 21st, 1998.

Philip Crane,
Palatine, IL.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRANE: Our company Tru-Die Inc., is a metal stamping facility, that was started in 1964. We have approximately 75 employees that are concerned about their job security. We are also a member of the Precision Metalforming Association (PMA), the trade association that represents many users and consumers of steel and steel products.

The protectionist pressures currently being exerted by the ''Stand Up for Steel'' coalition give us great concern, because they are aimed at restricting our ability to get the best steel available for a competitive price. We know that trade restrictions such as those advocated by protectionist interests will result in a net loss of U.S. jobs. We support you in your efforts to improve, not undermine the U.S. economy.

We need adequate and dependable sources of steel to maintain and expand our operations in the United States—sometimes that means that we must rely on foreign steel. At best, the U.S. steel producers are capable of meeting only 70–75 percent of U.S. demand. Actions that curtail imports of steel will seriously injure our industry and the economy as a whole through higher prices, fewer choices and job migration offshore.

We all agree that it is important to maintain U.S. jobs and job growth. Steel is no less important than other sectors. However, you should remember that the major U.S. steel using industries (stamped or fabricated metal products and others) employ some 8.3 million production workers, mearly fifty times the number employed by U.S. steel producers. These jobs depend on maintaining competitive market conditions in this country. If steel imports are restricted, imports of steel products will certainly increase, and more jobs will be destroyed in this country.

In determining what is fair for steel producers, we ask you to remember that short-term benefits for the steel industry may have a long-term negative effect on U.S. jobs and the economy as a whole.

Thank you for your support.

DON BROWN.

OLSON INTERNATIONAL, LTD.,
Lombard, IL, December 1, 1998.

Congressman PHILIP CRANE,
Illinois 8th District, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRANE, our company, Olson International Ltd., is a precision metal stamping company that employs approximately two hundred twenty people in our Lombard, IL, facility. We have been in business for over sixty years and we are a QS9000 registered company.

We supply high quality metal parts to the automotive, appliance and electronics industry.

This letter is written to inform you that we are not in favor of protectionist measures that would attempt to restrict the import of flat roll steel products.

We are also a member of the Precision Metal Forming Association (PMA), the trade association that represents many users and consumers of steel and steel products. In addition, I am a Certified Purchasing Manager and a director of the National Association of Purchasing Management, Chicago chapter. (NAPM-Chicago). Also, I chair our local metal buyer's committee and can loudly state that a curb in imports of flat roll steel products would negatively impact fabricators in the Midwest.

The protectionist pressures currently being exerted by the ''Stand Up for Steel'' coalition gives us great concern, because they are aimed at restricting our ability to get the best steel available for a competitive price. We know that trade restrictions such as those advocated by protectionist interests will result in a net loss of U.S. jobs. We support you in your efforts to improve, not undermine the U.S. economy.

We need adequate and dependable sources of steel to maintain and expand our operations in the United States—sometimes that

means that we must rely on foreign steel. At best, U.S. steel producers are capable of meeting only 70–75 percent of U.S. demand. Actions that curtail imports of steel will seriously injure our industry and the economy as a whole through higher prices, fewer choices and job migration offshore.

We all agree that it is important to maintain U.S. jobs and job growth. Steel is no less important than other sectors. However, you should remember that the major U.S. steel using industries (stamped or fabricated metal products and others) employ some 8.3 million production workers, nearly fifty times the number employed by U.S. steel producers. These jobs depend on maintaining competitive market conditions in this country. If steel imports are restricted, imports of steel products will certainly increase, and more jobs will be destroyed in this country.

In determining what is fair for steel producers, we ask you to remember that short-term benefits for the steel industry may have a long-term negative effect on U.S. jobs and the economy as a whole.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

EDWARD C. FARRER C.P.M.,
Manager of Purchasing.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, on February 25 I testified before the Subcommittee on Trade panel of the Committee on Ways and Means regarding the crisis of the United States steel industry caused by the flood of illegal imports. At the hearing I stated that imposing quotas legislatively was a measure of last resort utilized when it is clear that other options will not suffice to enforce our trade laws. Unfortunately it has become all too clear that the Clinton administration has no intention of aggressively enforcing our trade laws. I would far prefer that the administration use the tools that Congress has given to enforce our laws. The administration could take unilateral action to address the illegally dumped steel coming into the United States, but they have not done so. Although I have misgivings about the potential for retaliation that the legislation may engender, Congress simply cannot tolerate the dithering by the administration while the United States steel industry continues to bleed.

American steelworkers are the most productive in the world. Investments in new technology in the 1980s and the training to reduced the hours of labor to make one ton of steel from 9.3 hours in 1980 to just 2 hours in 1999. The industry and its workers are the most efficient and productive in the world, and I ask my colleagues to support the Visclosky-Regula bill.

ISPAT INLAND, INC,
East Chicago IN, March 12, 1999.

Hon. STEPHEN BUYER,
Members of Congress,
Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BUYER, I wish to thank you again for inviting us and other steel manufacturing companies to meet with you last Friday, March 5, 1999. It was a welcome opportunity to be able to personally share with you our views on the current steel import crisis and its impact on steel industry jobs and markets in the United States. Thank you also for inviting me to again share those views with you in this letter.

There is an important historical perspective to the current issue. In the early and mid-1980's, the domestic steel industry was similarly faced with the spectre of massive imports of dumped and unfairly subsidized foreign steel products. At that time the industry was generally ill prepared to effectively respond to that challenge. As a result, the Congress and the Administration granted temporary relief in the form of stringent quotas placed on imported steel products. In effect, the domestic steel industry was granted sufficient time to re-make itself into a competitive player in the world market.

Years of painful, but necessary, restructuring ensued and today the steel industry has emerged as a highly competitive producer of world class products. For example, labor productivity has increased 5.5% annually since 1980, energy consumption has decreased by 45% in roughly the same time period, and environmental and safety performance far exceeds that of the steel industry elsewhere in the world. We can compete with anyone so long as the playing field is level. However, the dynamics of world economics are such that the playing field has been rendered unlevel today.

There has been a massive new wave of unfairly traded imports and a quick and decisive governmental response has not been forthcoming. In recent months, the industry has asked the Administration to help us prosecute a Section 201 case and to assure us that the President will impose a global remedy if we are successful. The Administration has refused this request.

In fact, in the case of the proposed Russian Suspension Agreement, the Administration has taken steps, over our objections, to limit our rights under existing trade laws. While we were successful in obtaining effective dumping margins against Russian steel imports, the Administration proposes suspension of that case while permitting Russia significant access to our markets. The resultant product flow into this country will be illegal under current trade law. I recognize that foreign policy issues are at stake, but the damage to our industry will be egregious.

The domestic industry's position is that we will continue to litigate against dumped and subsidized foreign steel, that we are in immediate need of a global solution, and that we would prefer a solution consistent with our international obligations with the World Trade Organization. We fully support free trade. If, however, the Administration continues to refuse to offer adequate solutions and to deny us the ability to enforce existing trade laws, we will have to reconsider our position and seek the most viable alternative solution to remedy this crisis.

Than you again for your continued interest on this issue.

Sincerely

DALE E. WIERSBE,
President and Chief Operating Officer.

The steel industry is crucial for our national security. Our planes, our tanks, our ships, our weapons, utilize steel. We have a responsibility to the protection of our citizens to ensure a viable steel manufacturing industry in the United States. It is impossible for the United States to retain its status as the world's sole superpower without steel.

I urge the House to adopt H.R. 975.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

(Mr. DOOLEY of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this measure, and I also take some exception to the criticism of the administration and their lack of action against the issue of the increased imports of steel.

As my colleagues know, if we really look at the facts, we have seen since the administration has taken action that hot rolled steel has fallen almost 70 percent between November of last year to January of this year. When we look at two of the countries that have been identified as problems, Russia and Japan, we see that their imports have dropped 98 and 96 percent, and in fact when we look at the U.S. imports of hot rolled steel from all countries, we find that our January 1999 imports are at the same level, in fact lower than July of 1997.

The real concern though of this legislation is the precedent that it would set. We are endorsing the establishment, the legislative establishment of quotas that go beyond the agreements that we have negotiated that come under the authority of the WTO. Passing this legislation sends a green light to countries throughout the world that they can put in place quotas that can work to the detriment of U.S. economic interests.

Mr. Speaker, we need to oppose this legislation.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to protect American workers. Opponents of this bill focus on protectionism for the steel industry. Let us remember our duties to the American people. So protectionism is key. We must protect our home, American jobs and families from the irreparable harm caused by unprecedented and unfair levels of steel imports.

The American steel industry is a $70 billion industry that employs 170,000 people nationwide. Moreover, the industry is critically interwoven into the fabric of our society. Steel is utilized in automobiles, medical equipment, homes and military systems. We must act now to provide the appropriate safeguards to prevent risk to these industries. Let us protect American families. Let us stop illegal dumping by voting in favor of this measure.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, this is one heck of a corrosive proposal, and I rise in steely opposition to it. The notion that we are victims of predatory and illegal dumping is a corrosive idea. We are told that the only way that this practice is going to cease is if we limit

or ban imports to some kind of an arbitrary level set in 1994, and that is very rusty logic for a number of reasons. So let me focus on a couple of facts.

Fact one: U.S. law provides clear trade remedies for industries that are harmed by dumping. In fact, the steel industry has already filed and won anti-dumping cases against Japan and Brazil, and it has negotiated a voluntary restraint agreement with Russia. The results of that are dramatically shown in this chart which shows imports from those three countries subject to investigations have dropped for hot rolled steel products. This drop over the last three months has been 98 percent, 97 percent in the case of Brazil and about 60 percent in the case of Japan, or more than that. So it has been almost cut to nothing.

□ 1300

Even as we debate, there are antidumping cases proceeding against France, India, Indonesia, Italy, Korea, Macedonia. More than a third of the 300 antidumping and countervailing duty orders address steel.

So here we can see in three months' time the reduction of hot-rolled steel products from all countries, from a total of 1.4 million tons per month in November of 1998 to 437,000 tons today.

Fact two, the remedies designed to deal with the sudden import surge, Section 201, wasn't even utilized by the industry. They did not even bother to file a case. Instead, the big steel bosses spent an unknown amount of money lobbying Congress for special protection.

Fact three, dumping is not inherently wrong. A product that is dumped is sold in the United States for less than it is sold in the home market or less than the cost of production. This means that foreign producers are selling steel to the United States at a great price, and that helps users of steel in this country. That is not inherently evil, but in order to protect certain industries dumping is not allowed under our trade laws.

Our solution is not a punitive one. The foreign producer is not thrown in jail, prohibited from selling in the market. Instead, the company is required to pay a duty equal to the amount of the discount. In effect, they are forced to raise the price of their product to more closely approximate the cost of our domestic producers.

By the way, U.S. steel companies dump steel abroad all the time. In fact, there are duties in place against 10 U.S. steel companies for dumping overseas. Believe me, foreign steel companies are watching this vote today. If this bill passes, if it became law, they are really going to ask their governments very quickly for Visclosky-type bans on U.S. steel.

Which brings me to fact four. This is not a free vote! A 1995 study found that U.S. antidumping and countervailing duties affected only 1.8 percent of U.S. merchandise imports. Yet, the cost to our economy? $1.59 billion dollars! The Congressional Budget Office estimates the Visclosky ban will cost one billion dollars over the next three years!

An aye vote today is a vote for a billion dollar tax on the American consumer. Every member that votes for this bill will have to explain to steel-users why they have to pay a billion dollar ''steel tax'' before they can buy the product.

And every member that votes for this bill will have to explain to farmers and exporters why they voted for a bill which puts their livelihood at risk by subjecting them to retaliation against U.S. products.

This is one of the most misguided and dangerous pieces of legislation I have ever seen.

The Visclosky quota sought today goes beyond ''fair'' trade. It applies to all steel imports, even those that are not dumped. And it creates billion dollar casualties along the way.

Where the damage stops, nobody knows. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this bill.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE), who has been a leader on H.R. 975.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of facts today about the steel import crisis, but there is one fact that I would like to stress above all: 12,000 Americans have lost their jobs to foreign competitors who have cheated.

This is not the first steel crisis. I remember the real suffering in the 1970s and the 1980s, in towns like McKeesport, Duquesne, Braddock, Clairton and many other communities in the Mon-Valley section of Pittsburgh. Those were desperate times.

I know hard working men and women, who never took a dime from the government, that were forced to go on welfare. I saw good families break up from the stress of not being able to support themselves.

Since that time, steel and our steel towns have recovered somewhat. We have done everything we have been asked. Labor productivity has improved tremendously, for one thing. Steel plants in my area have come back with probably one-fourth the number of workers they had, and the large percent of people that were let go many had to find work in the service sector or whatever other under employment jobs they could do, and no one shed a tear for them.

Steelworkers did everything they were asked to do because we were told we had to make U.S. steel competitive again. They had to work harder for longer hours, for less pay, and no one came to their aid, but steel came back. They got lean and mean and American steelworkers are now the most efficient producers of steel in the world.

We have played by the rules, only to have our jobs stolen by foreign companies who are breaking our laws and that is an incontrovertible fact proven by our Commerce Department's own findings.

Today we draw a line in the sand. We will not tolerate a steel policy that let us 12,000 Americans lose their jobs to competitors that are cheating, and if this administration is not going to take decisive action then we will.

As I stand in the well of this House on Saint Patrick's Day, I think about my grandfather, Mike Doyle, who came to this country from Ireland in the early 1900s and found work in Pittsburgh in the steel mills. He worked 43 years at the Carrie Furnace and along with his wife Beatrice raised three sons. His middle son, Mike Doyle, my father, followed him into the steel mills and worked almost 30 years at the Edgar Thompson Steel Works.

Aside from two summers when I was in college, I am the first Mike Doyle in my family not to work in a steel mill, but I remember vividly the sacrifices made by thousands of families who worked in the mills to build this country and keep it strong.

My father and grandfather are not here anymore. They are up there celebrating with Saint Patrick today, but I know they are watching and I know their Irish is up.

In their memory, and on behalf of thousands of American steelworkers and their families, I dedicate every ounce of strength I have to the passage of H.R. 975.

Mr. Speaker, it is up to us. We need to send a message. Stop this cheating. Stand up for steel. Support H.R. 975.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for this debate today. Although we are disagreeing on the issue he is letting the debate occur, and I appreciate that and thank him for it.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today I mentioned union officials and some steelworkers that have fought for this issue. I also want to mention Dick Redier, Greg Warren and Paul Bucha, who are just three of the many individuals from the company's end of it that have fought to get this bill to the floor today.

I think today is about Main Street America. The steelworkers got trampled on. We tried to respond in October. They got trampled on by foreign countries and, by the way, when the illegal dumping came in, Europe responded to support its mayors and its communities to protect them, but our steelworkers got trampled on and they fought back.

There are laws on the books. They talk about the laws on the books. The President of the United States ignored them. We would not be here today if he had followed those laws, but the steelworkers in our communities fought back.

We would like to talk about our children's future. We are responsible for our children's future and today is about our children's future and our communities back home.

We can be responsible to help our communities to stand up against illegal, again, illegal dumping. We can be responsible by standing up for steel, which is standing up for our communities. It is restoring faith. It is restoring America's path. By voting yes today, we are going to say to every worker in the United States that when foreign countries try to take an illegal path, we are going to stop it.

We are going to say, they do not have to beg their government anymore for help. We are going to prove it today on the floor of the House.

So this is an issue not about free trade. It is not about protectionism. This is truly an issue about illegal dumping. I am just sorry we have to be here today because the President should have enforced the laws in October, just like Ronald Reagan did when he was President of the United States. It is okay to have a give and take on the debate of trade.

If we stand by and let this continue, believe me these countries would have continued to dump, illegally dump, and we would lose thousands and thousands more of workers' jobs.

Our heroes today are those 11,000 people who have struggled through unemployment trying to feed their families, and our heroes today are the steelworkers and the companies and the people back home that forced this debate to the floor. I urge a yes vote.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), for bringing forth this piece of legislation and for allowing us this debate today.

Mr. Speaker, from looking over the different letters from different and various Members of Congress, I am not surprised to see claims that imports have dropped, claims that have been offered in an effort to convince all of us that the crisis in this country with steel dumping is over.

Let me be very clear on three points. First, when finally faced with a trade petition like the one filed in September of 1998, foreign countries which dump steel on the U.S. market simply switch from one category to another. All the while they are laughing at the slowness and the expense of our trade enforcement process.

Second, I appreciate the hard work of the Commerce Department but when we hear about an expedited trade process we must realize that this is merely shaving off 20 to 30 days off a 9- to 12-month process.

Third, by allowing dumping we are deliberately sacrificing productive, nonobsolete but productive United States jobs.

I would just ask my colleagues today, as they are looking over this piece of legislation, to look at it very closely before voting. Get a complete look at the issue of steel and the steel imports that have come into this country, and I think when my colleagues see an accurate picture of this they will be led to support this bill. I just ask for support today on H.R. 975.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) has 9½ minutes, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) 6 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) 7 minutes.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), good job. We passed an unbinding ban resolution in October and the imports dropped, but not enough.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a debate today about protectionism; it is about illegal trade. These countries have ripped us off. I do not understand the philosophical differences here, unless the Republicans are trying to set us up, get the President to veto this after he promised every worker in America he would put his foot down on illegal trade.

He also promised every worker in America he would pass a scab labor bill. He did not, either.

I want to give credit today to Ronald Reagan. I can remember him coming to my district telling our steelworkers that he would, in fact, reinvest in industry, and he passed the investment tax credit program, and he would provide money for training. He did that, and they did not support him.

As a Democrat, the White House, they are not called slick over there for nothing, Mr. Speaker. They may just go ahead and sign this because if they do not, unless they are trying to veto AL GORE's presidency, I do not know what is going on here today.

I want to make this point. I did not make a pledge in the World Trade Organization. I pledged an oath to the Constitution of the United States.

What bothers me the most is our unemployed workers, their taxes coming from their unemployment check are being used to bail out Russia, South Korea, Asia, Japan, and recently Brazil.

What is it with us? Are we nuts? This is illegal trade.

Quite frankly, I wanted to add a little amendment that would have banned it for 24 hours, just to let the world know that the Congress of the United States knows they are ripping us off and we are not going to take it any longer.

We cannot get anybody to take a look at the trade issue. Our companies are going overseas. Our jobs are going to Mexico, and I hear everybody talking about new jobs. Brassiere cup molder cutters, gizzard skin removers, pantyhose crotch closers, corncob pipe assemblers, cowboys, ashtray cleaners, yes, we have a lot of jobs. They are in that service industry and our good jobs are leaving hand over fist.

This is the right thing to do. I am going to make a statement on behalf of the steelworkers and all working people in America. This president made promises. Hold his feet to the fire, and if he vetoes this bill, by God, take it right out on AL GORE.

It is time they get a message from the Democrats in Congress. At least Ronald Reagan kept his promise. He never promised this type of legislation but he gave us the investment tax credit program and he retrained some of our workers and he reinvested in steel and made it profitable. We are allowing it to be decimated.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), that he should rethink the whole trade problem. I understand the gentleman is leaving. He has been a great Member. Before he leaves, this negative balance of payments is the greatest national security threat we have.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I include for the record an op-ed piece which I published in the Birmingham News and the Tuscaloosa paper.

Mr. Speaker, in this article the first thing I said is that this crisis is not a crisis brought on by our steelworkers or our steel communities. This is a crisis brought on by their government. It is not of their own doing.

Tragically, their government has failed to do two things. First of all, it has subsidized and spent billions of their money and our taxpayer dollars, much of that paid in by steelworkers, into the IMF. The IMF has sent billions of those dollars to prop up the foreign competition, which is now dumping steel on our steel industry.

Secondly, our government has contributed to this crisis and caused it, by not taking action under our own trade laws to stop these illegal, unlawful dumping of foreign steel.

□ 1315

It is against the law. Can that not sink in? It is against the law. How do we ask our steelworkers, our law-abiding steelworkers in steel communities who are law-abiding, how do we ask them to follow the law when we turned a blind eye to that law and allowed their jobs to be taken from them?

Second of all, it is a matter of sovereignty. We must send a message to the world, and that message is, we will not allow our trade laws to be broken, to be trampled. What is happening is illegal. It cannot be tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about fair trade; many people have said that. It is not about fair trade; it is about fairness. Our steelworkers are the latest victims, but they will not be our last.

Finally, it is a matter of national security. We cannot rely on foreign countries for the materials to build our ships, our aircrafts and our tanks. If the President will not take action, we must.

President Clinton's State of the Union address focused heavily on ways to spend every penny of the current budget surplus and all anticipated surpluses for the next 15 years. In 77 minutes, he proposed 79 spending programs totaling hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars. But he said only three sentences about one account where we have a deficit—the U.S. trade account—and the threat it poses to all of us, and specifically our steelworkers.

Last year, the U.S. trade deficit reached $300 billion. A large portion of the trade deficit results from the flood of illegally dumped foreign steel into our country. Steel imports have reached record levels, surging by 480 percent in the last year. The President's own economic advisors say this deluge of artificially-priced imports is responsible for 10,000 layoffs and bankruptcies at some domestic steel companies. Thousands of our steelworkers have seen their work hours and their paychecks cut—including those in Alabama. With the steel crisis deepening every day, it is only a matter of time before steel mills across the nation begin closing their doors, perhaps forever.

This crisis did not come about because American steelworkers are not productive. American steelworkers produce the highest quality steel in the world at the lowest cost per ton. This crisis did not come about because the U.S. steel industry has failed to seek foreign market opportunities. Our steel companies work hard to penetrate foreign markets. What success they have achieved has come despite the best efforts of some countries to erect unfair trade barriers to American-made steel.

Clearly, the crisis facing our steelworkers, our domestic steel industry and our steel communities is not of their doing. Tragically, much of this crisis is their own government's doing—the same government they support with their tax dollars.

How? First, by providing the International Monetary Fund billions of new dollars to bail out foreign nations and second, by not taking decisive action available under our trade laws to stop the dumping of foreign steel.

First, a little history. In 1984, foreign steel producers began dumping heavily into the U.S. and grabbed more than 26 percent of the U.S. steel market. President Reagan was not willing to see the U.S. steel industry die. He immediately imposed restraints that rolled steel imports back to 18 percent. This gave the U.S. steel industry the opportunity and the time to upgrade its operations. U.S. steel producers invested $50 billion to modernize their plants to make them more competitive. Steel management and steel union members worked together, and the U.S. steel industry came roaring back to recapture more than 80 percent of the U.S. market.

Then, the Asian financial crisis came, a crisis perpetuated by misguided IMF policies supported by the present administration. To bail out Japanese, Korean and Indonesian investors, the IMF sent billions of U.S. tax dollars into Asia and imposed austerity measures. Nations in austerity cannot buy their own steel, and countries in debt to the IMF need money to pay that debt off. The IMF solution? These nations must ''export their way out'' of debt by dumping products—at prices lower than it costs to make them—into the huge U.S. market. That way, these nations can quickly raise the money needed to pay back the IMF. The IMF also urged these nations to devalue their currencies. By devaluing a currency, a nation actually cuts the price of its products in American dollars. For example, if a nation devalues its currency by 40 percent, the price of its products sold here will be reduced 40 percent. While such a price war is welcome news to consumers, it is devastating to domestic producers and can literally drive them out of business overnight.

Congress recently approved the Clinton administration's request for $18 billion for the IMF. I was one of only about a dozen Republican and Democratic members who voiced strong opposition. We sincerely believe it is a horrible injustice to send the tax dollars from these steelworkers to the IMF, which in turn prompts nations to break both U.S. and international trade laws and dump their steel here. In his State of the Union address, President Clinton proclaimed he had ''informed the government of Japan that if that nation's sudden surge of steel imports into our country is not reversed, America will respond.''

Japan has not been impressed by this threat, and even if carried out it will likely bring little relief to our steelworkers, and the President knows it. That's because most of the steel imports are coming from South Korea, Russia, Brazil and Indonesia, all of which are the beneficiaries of an IMF bailout provided by U.S. taxpayers. The Clinton administration's strategy of bailouts via the IMF has failed on a massive scale, and the biggest losers of this strategy are American steelworkers.

To bipartisan applause, the President also said in the State of the Union, ''We must enforce our trade laws when imports unlawfully flood our nation.'' Yet, the White House has decided against taking firm and immediate action to do so despite pleas from the steel industry and Congress. Last year, the House and Senate passed resolutions calling on the President to enforce our existing laws against illegal imports and to take ''all necessary measures'' to respond to the increase in foreign steel. The House asked for a one-year ban on the import of all steel products from any country that violates international trade agreements with the U.S. Still, the White House refuses to enforce our trade laws and continues to stand by and do nothing.

If the President won't act, Congress must. Those of us in the Congressional Steel Caucus have proposed legislation that will freeze steel imports at the level they were in July 1997, before the flood of illegal imports began. By taking dramatic action as President Reagan did 15 years ago, we can roll back imports to pre-crisis levels and restore fair competition between American and foreign steel producers. The United States, as a matter of sovereignty, must send a message to the world that we will not allow our trade laws to be broken. What is happening is illegal and cannot be tolerated.

This is not about ''free trade.'' It is about fairness. If American steelworkers are allowed to compete on a level playing field, they will win. If we do not restore fair play and stop the flood of illegal steel imports, our steelworkers will be the latest innocent victims of misguided government polices. But they will by no means be the last victims. The security of the United States will be at risk. At its most basic level, this debate is a matter of national security, for if we allow the steel industry in this country to disappear we will be forced to rely on foreign countries for the material we use to build our ships, aircraft and tanks.

President Reagan showed the world that America would take strong action to protect its own in tough times. It's time to do so again and put an end to the steel crisis.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), our minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for yielding me this time. I also want to congratulate the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Let me just start by saying that the stock market hit 10,000 yesterday, and many people in America think that everything is okay, everything is well. Well, it is not. From the foundries of the Monongahela Valley to the mills in Gary, Indiana to the mills in downriver Detroit, River Rouge and other communities that we represent, thousands of steelworkers are losing their jobs and they are the victims of illegal dumping.

Three U.S. steel companies filed for bankruptcy last year. Six of 10 flat-roll producers posted losses during the fourth quarter of 1998, and more than 11,000 American steelworkers have lost their jobs in the past year. These are not just figures. These are human beings with families, with real needs, with real hopes, with real dreams.

They are people like Andrew Kamarec. He is 42 years old; he has a child with a brain tumor. He works at Weirton Steel in West Virginia, not far from here, and subsidized foreign steel has cost him his job. He has a friend who works there named Keven Tasey, 39, a coworker of Andrew's. He was laid off just before Thanksgiving. His wife is pregnant. Rob and Tammy Elliott, husband and wife, also worked at Weirton. Foreign dumping forced them out of work as well. They have two school-aged children.

The story goes on and on and on. There are 11,000 of these stories out there, and there is a lot in the making, and there is a lot of potential devastation for families across America if we do nothing. This steel crisis has devastated families all across this country, eliminating good-paying jobs in our communities.

So, we have to stand up to this issue. It is not too late to stand up.

Some might argue, well, the crisis has passed. They will say that the import numbers are dropping, the worst is over. Well, that is not entirely true. There is cheap imported steel piled up on our docks ensuring that this glut will continue for months, and while imports from Japan and Russia may be down, other countries are dumping more and more. When contracts that

prohibit lay-off expire this summer, and that will happen, we will have nearly 100,000 jobs at risk.

Now, we have been calling for action since last year. I joined the Stand Up for Steel march in Detroit and downriver Detroit last October. We had thousands of steelworkers and community members who marched for justice with us. We rallied at the Rouge plant, and management and labor stood side-by-side, and we called for an end to dumping, but it has not stopped. The steel industry is too important to America to let illegal dumping continue.

Steel has a direct $70 billion impact on this economy in this country. A strong steel industry is critical to a strong manufacturing base, and that means cars and trucks and machinery and construction and all of the things that make America work and tick in all parts of this country. It is essential to our national defense as well.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say in conclusion that steel employs nearly 163,000 Americans. Again, I say these are good jobs with good benefits, benefits like health insurance that are so critical to people like Andrew Kamarec whose child has brain cancer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to remember him and to remember his colleagues and to remember all of the people who are out there looking to us today for hope in order for us to stop what has gone on for far too long. We are too strong of a country; we have too many good jobs in this country to throw it away.

The time for talk is over. I urge my colleagues to vote for this very good legislation by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, we do not fight illegal trade by passing illegal penalties.

I rise in strong opposition to this illegal steel quota bill. Free trade is vitally important to the health of our economy, and we are in a position to lead and define a policy of free trade on a global level. We should not backtrack by erecting harmful barriers which will only increase the cost of goods and block economic development and growth.

I understand the concerns of my colleagues who have witnessed the tremendous influx of steel imports during the last three years, but our trade laws are working, and this legislation is not necessary. According to the Census Bureau, from November of 1998 to January of 1999, steel imports have declined 93 percent in Russia, 49 percent in Japan, and 8 percent in Korea. In fact, not only is this legislation not necessary, but incredibly harmful to our consumers and our workers. CBO estimates this bill will increase prices to steel purchasers by nearly $1 billion.

The bottom line is, the American steel industry leads the world in productivity because of competition, not protection. In my judgment, this bill will raise prices on consumers, adversely affect our businesses, harm our workers that use steel, and threaten the growth of our economy.

I might end, Mr. Speaker, by saying this fabulous growth that our Nation has experienced over the last 10 years is due, in large measure, to one man, Ronald Reagan, and his economic policies. He welcomed free trade. He welcomed trade without any artificial barriers, because he knew the United States could compete and compete effectively with anyone, and that ultimately, all Americans benefit from competition.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2 minutes; the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) has 4 minutes; and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) has the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) has the right to close.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to thank the Steelworkers of America; I want to thank Jack Parten and every last member of District 7 Steelworkers of America for their invaluable help on this issue.

A number of people during the debate today tried to define or mentioned what they thought the issue of the day is. I would like to do so also.

The issue is people. Whether we use the most conservative estimates established by the Congressional Research Service, which would tell us 13 people a day have lost their jobs since July 1, 1997; or some of the more larger numbers that we have heard on this floor, where up to 1 steel worker every hour, about 3 steelworkers today since this debate started have lost and continue to lose their jobs. That is the issue. Those people, their jobs, their families.

We have heard a lot today about the global economy, world trade, globalization of the Nation. I am worried about the globe too. I am worried about a place on the globe called Alabama. I am worried about a place on the globe called Arkansas. I am worried about a river valley on that globe, the Mon-Valley in the State of Pennsylvania, and I am worried about a place on that globe, Gary, Indiana, because they have all suffered, not through any fault of their own, but the failure of this government to enforce the law of the land against illegally-traded steel.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) mentioned names, and I think it is important that we not use statistics, but real people. Because Sherry Ferguson from the State of Illinois is unemployed today because of illegally-traded steel. She has six children in her household. Tell her the crisis is over.

Joey Bishop from Alabama has a 7-year-old daughter at home. Let us tell Joey Bishop's daughter that the crisis is over. We are here today because the President has not acted in a sufficient fashion. He has arrived at the game late, and he has certainly not carried the day.

Others suggest that the crisis is now resolved. One speaker indicated that steel traded from Japan is down 96 percent in the last 3 months, and I would not argue that point. Here is how bad the problem was and still is. From July 1997 to January 1999, six weeks ago, Japanese steel imports are still up 74 percent. Someone indicated that steel exports from Korea are down. I would point out that from July 1997 until January 1999, six weeks ago, Korean imports are still up 77 percent, and for the same period of time, imports from Indonesia are up 890 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, is that because they are playing by every last rule of international law and not violating our trade laws? I would suggest that is not true. Why are we here to take a global approach to put all of the countries and all of the products on the table? Because while some steel exports to the United States from some countries and for some product lines have declined, interestingly enough, just from December of last year to January of this year, suddenly, Chinese exports to the United States increased 24.2 percent, and exports from India increased by 70.8 percent in a 30-day period of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

The issue are the people we are sworn to represent. We cannot move them somewhere else on the globe. They are in places like Ohio and Pennsylvania and Arkansas. That is the President's responsibility, that is our responsibility. He has not met it. We today, in a broad-based bipartisan fashion, want to make him recognize his obligation so that when Keven Tasey's daughter or son is born, the gentleman mentioned by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), her or his father will have their job back.

I ask all of my colleagues to please support this legislation, the bipartisan Steel Recovery Act.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN).

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for yielding time to all of us, particularly since we are not on the same side of this issue. It has been a great debate and one that is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a thoughtful discussion, and one of the things I would point out as I have watched speakers today is that we are not dealing with Members of the House that one might consider reactionary or folks that we look at as sometimes being troublemakers here in the well in the House.

□ 1330

These are thoughtful legislators who have been attending the rallies that most of us have been at these last 6 or 8 months. We have been involved in petition drives, we have been involved in hearings and town meetings, meetings on the Hill, and working with the United Steelworkers.

We find ourselves in a position that, of all the other solutions that might be out there, none are taking place. There are other solutions besides this bill today, H.R. 975. We have asked for some of those other solutions to be done. Each time we ask in a thoughtful way to have them done, we get no reaction. In the meantime, good paying jobs are lost day in and day out.

So I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that as we see Members come to the well, when we look at some of those 200-plus Members who are on this bipartisan bill, I have to point out to my colleagues that they are thoughtful Members who are trying to make a difference, not reactionaries, not the troublemakers that are finding an opportunity now to get a bill on the floor, one that comes here under very unique circumstances, we would agree. But, Mr. Speaker, we have not been given any other choice.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) has taken the lead. Both of us in the Steel Caucus have had talks back and forth. We have changed. We have compromised. The gentleman from Indiana has bended when he had to. But we cannot wait any longer, Mr. Speaker. We have thoughtful Members here who want to make a difference. This is not about us saying there is something we have to have on this floor voted today. We tried to get the changes done month after month after month.

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, more than the 200-plus that have cosponsored the bill, to vote this afternoon to save jobs in a country, our country. It is not about doing the right thing or the wrong thing necessarily, Mr. Speaker. I think it is about us finally wanting to help ourselves.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, all of us have sympathy for companies that have been hurt through illegal trade practices and for employees who have lost their jobs. As I mentioned earlier, I have great sympathy, because I have seen the thousands of workers in the oil industry who have been displaced within the last 6 months.

But we must live by the rules that we agree to or others will also distort those rules against us, and the tidal wave of damage will sweep across this country in ways that will make us regret that we have violated the rules. This bill violates the rules.

Dumping that is wrong should be interdicted, but it must be interdicted within the rules and by the penalties that are authorized. It has been said that nothing has happened. Yet, the Commerce Department has already provisionally put in place tariffs which are the important, legitimate way to get at dumping. They have had an impact in reducing the amount of imports. That is in place today.

But quotas are limited to use under 201. No one has filed a claim under 201. The steel industry has not pursued 201, which addresses immediate surges that are injurious to this country.

Yes, it is about people, Mr. Speaker. It is about all of the workers in the United States and what can happen to them when we violate the rules. Because we cannot expect the WTO to enforce the rules on others if we are violators.

I would not be here today to defend this bill if the penalty was appropriate under the rules for dumping. Quotas could have been put in place when the surge occurred by simply invoking 201. The steel industry decided not to do that.

Now, after the appropriate penalties of tariffs have been put in place, at least provisionally, until there is a complete determination, we are asked to endorse and put in place on a mandatory basis quotas which will limit the importation of steel into this country for 3 years without any waiver or chance of change regardless of the circumstances that are based on what happened 2 and 3 years ago.

We risked triggering again justification on the part of others in the world to violate the rules against us. This is not the right way to go, Mr. Speaker. There is a right way to address illegal trade activities, and I stand prepared to do it. But I will not violate the rules that we agreed to by establishing illegal penalties.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House to vote against this resolution.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 975, I rise in support of this legislation and urge its adoption.

Today, there will be a great deal of debate regarding the question of free trade versus fair trade. As someone who concerned about how to promote international trade and at the same time make sure that trade is fair, I want to register my opinions on this important issue.

I have long been a supporter of free and open trade. However, my support of free trade is based on the understanding that our trading partners will not engage in unfair and illegal trading practices such as dumping. When our nation is confronted by unfair trading practices, I believe it is entirely appropriate to seek remedies that protect American companies and workers, whether by invoking provisions in our own trade laws or by other means of redress. While I am hesitant to take action that may further weaken already fragile foreign economies, I believe this legislation provides an appropriate response to reduce the flood of foreign steel imports, much of which has been illegally dumped into the U.S. market at prices below domestic costs, and in clear violation of antidumping trade laws.

Since July 1997 we have seen the collapse of numerous economies around the world. Foreign corporations from Japan, Korea, Russia, and other countries have been selling steel at as much as $100 a ton less than it costs to produce it. In one example, steel producers from Russia were allowed to dump 47 percent more steel on our market than was shipped in 1997. Due to massive steel imports from Japan, our trade deficit has climbed 33.4 percent to nearly $55.8 billion, while imports of all Japanese steel products in 1998 jumped almost 170 percent, accounting for 41 percent of the total increase in steel imports to the United States.

U.S. steel manufacturers are faced with a real crisis, one that threatens to undermine a key sector of our economy. This crisis has claimed more than 10,000 jobs in basic steel, iron ore mining coke production, and thousands have seen their work hours and paychecks cut. Several thousand more workers and their communities are jeopardized as steel companies are forced to either reduce operations or resort to bankruptcy. If the dumping practices of these foreign companies remains unchecked, this crisis will continue to claim the jobs of thousands of men and women employed in the U.S. steel industry. We simply cannot allow this to continue.

In the last 25 years, the U.S. steel industry has become among the most productive, most efficient, most innovative and cleanest in the world. America's steel companies and steel workers are the best in the world. Unfortunately, world trade in steel is more distorted by government intervention than in any other manufacturing sector. Foreign steel is being subsidized by foreign governments. Closed foreign markets mean that foreign overproduction surges into the U.S. market—the only truly open market in the world. Congress and the Administration must take action on this issue.

It is imperative for the United States to adhere to its trade laws and to implement them where and when the circumstances require it. To fail to do so will have consequences, both for American workers, industry and for the principle of free trade. If our domestic steel industry continues to suffer, we will see a political backlash against free trade, just at the time when we should be entering into free trade agreements with some of these very regions—Asia, Pacific Rim, and South America. This will only serve to set us back further from being the dominant player on the global marketplace in the next century.

For over a century, the steel industry has stood tall and served as a foundation of the American economy. The U.S. steel industry and the 226,000 Americans employed by it deserve nothing less than the full support of their country. I urge my colleagues to support passage of this important legislation.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 975, legislation to limit and monitor foreign steel imports. H.R. 975 would impose quotas on foreign steel imports equal to

their July 1997 import levels. Imposing quotas is a dramatic step. However, it is a step that must be taken.

Over the past 2 years, our Nation's steel industry has been decimated by the flood of cheap foreign imports. Between 1996 and 1998, steel imports increased from 26.4 million tons to more than 37 million tons—an increase of 42 percent. As a result of the surge, steel prices plummeted from $512 per ton to $40 per ton.

As a result of the price drop the domestic steel industry has been put into a state of crisis. Since the surge of foreign steel imports began 2 years ago, more than 10,000 steelworkers have been laid off from their jobs and more than 20,000 steelworkers have worked shorter hours.

Even more disturbing, three steel mills have been forced into bankruptcy. Even if steel prices return to their previous levels, those mills may never open again. The jobs in the steel industry are high-skill, high-paying jobs. When a steel plant closes down, a community struggles for years, even decades. Congress cannot idly stand by and watch thousand of quality jobs and our nation's communities vanish.

The crisis in the steel industry was caused by the global economic slowdown. In an effort to prop up their flagging economies, steel-producing nations such as Japan, Korea, and Russia exported an unprecedented amount of steel to the United States. Unfortunately, our Nation's trade laws did nothing to stem the tide of steel imports until it was too late. Mr. speaker, I have opposed many of our nation's recent trade agreements because of the potential for problems just like the one we now have in the steel industry. Congress cannot stand by and watch foreign nations take advantage of our weak and often ineffective trade laws.

Despite the pleas for action by the steel industry, its workers, and many in Congress since the summer of 1998, it was not until February 1999 that the administration announced it would begin imposing duties on steel imports in order to address the matter. Those months of delay and inaction cost thousands of steelworkers their jobs.

This bill takes the decisive steps to save our domestic steel industry from extinction. However, one point needs to be made clear. H.R. 975 is not designed to protect an outdated and inefficient industry. Over the past twenty years, the domestic steel industry has invested over $50 billion in modern plants and equipment. The American steel industry and its workers have produced the highest quality, lowest cost per ton steel in the world.

H.R. 975 simply levels the playing field. It does not ban all steel imports into the United States. Quite the contrary. H.R. 975 simply limits foreign steel imports to their July 1997 levels. In the years leading up to the crisis, the volume of steel imported into the U.S. averaged slightly more than 25 million tons per year. However, in 1998 more than 37 million tons of foreign steel entered the United States.

It is clear that the surge in imports had a dramatic effect on the production of the American steel industry. For example, the production capacity of the American mills was 90 percent—nearly full capacity—before the surge of imports. By November 1998, the production capacity of the mills had dropped to 74 percent. No wonder that three mills filed for bankruptcy, 10,000 workers were laid off, and thousands more were idled or had to take a pay cut.

H.R. 975 realizes that imported steel is good for the American economy. Many American businesses import steel products because similar products are not made domestically. Furthermore, the competition makes the American industry more productive and efficient. However, a flood of imports at prices below which the market demands is not healthy for anyone, and it must be stopped.

H.R. 975 also establishes an import monitoring program to ensure the government and the domestic steel industry are better able to track the volume and price of steel imports. Furthermore, the information gained through this program will be made available in a timely manner so all parties will be better able to respond to future problems in the steel industry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 975 and call upon the Senate to pass companion legislation so all steel products will be given fair treatment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Steel Recovery Act, H.R. 975, which I've cosponsored. This legislation, I believe, takes the necessary steps to prevent unfair foreign trade from continuing to undermine our steel industry and displace American steel workers.

Two decades ago, the steel industry faced a crisis. Thousands of workers lost their jobs and hundreds of companies went bankrupt. Out of this crisis came a major transformation within American steel mills. Capital investments were made, innovative products were created, facilities were modernized and methods were streamlined. American steel mills and American steel workers became among the most efficient in the world. This new and improved American steel workforce and industry is ready to effectively compete against its foreign counterparts. And America should have to compete in the market, just as everyone else does. Unfortunately, unfair dumping of steel in the past 18 months, subsidized by foreign countries, is creating an uneven global playing field; these sales are being made at below the cost of steel production.

The Clinton administration has attempted to stem the tide of foreign steel flooding the American market without causing disruption and dislocation in the global trading regime. However, while import figures may be improving for some nations and products, they are not improving across the board. Although imports from Russia, Japan, and Brazil decreased in January 1999, other markets shifted and acted to fill the void—imported steel products from South Korea, China, India, and Indonesia increased during this period. Stopgap policy agreement is simply not enough to resolve this trade phenomena. The U.S. government must do more to prevent the loss of yet more steel jobs and lessen the threat of bankruptcy for our steel mills. America can not afford to allow this important modern and efficient industry and work force to collapse completely, forcing us to become reliant upon foreign countries for all of our steel needs in spite of the painful restructuring and competitive status that the American economy has successfully achieved in regards to steel workers and the industry.

The Steel Recovery Act, H.R. 975, includes two important components to address the steel crisis. First, it would alleviate the current crisis by creating a quantitative standard for all nations who import steel into the United States. Second, it establishes a monitoring system which would allow a timely response to the fluctuation of imports in the future. By creating a trading system which is predictable and consistent, we are leveling the playing field so that all nations can compete on a fair basis. With the overcapacity in steel production globally, the extraordinary currency fluctuations in value and economic boom and bust cycles that have been spilling over the borders of the Pacific rim nations, the United States has an obligation to respond. Other steel consuming nations within the European Union have held their steel imports level. Beyond that, they continue to invest in their own capacity, often with outmoded technology and environmental standards, seemingly oblivious to the economic consequence. The United States of America can not be the dumping ground for careless decision making and volatile economic swings. Our economic and trade policy must not follow the lowest denominator. Good economics and common sense dictate that we act, not sacrifice our efficient business or good American workers on the altar to a false demigod of unrestrained and unthinking trade.

American workers and industry deserve a sound, fair and comprehensive plan to ensure that their jobs are no longer at the mercy of creative circumvention of trade laws, merely transparent schemes by foreign steel companies and countries. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation. Let's set a new policy, a fair path for steel and trade.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 975 to protect American jobs from unfair trade and ensure that the U.S. steel industry remains strong.

I would like to thank the Congressional Steel Caucus, the Steelworkers union, and leaders of the steel industry for the hard work they have done to bring this bill to the House floor for a vote.

The U.S. steel industry, which underwent a painful restructuring and reinvestment process in the 1980s to reemerge as a world leader, has been severely harmed by unfairly dumped steel. During the first 10 months of 1998, United States imports of steel grew to record levels as the global financial crisis led Japan, Russia, Brazil and other countries to dump their steel on the United States market.

As a result of the flood of imports, three U.S. steel companies flied for bankruptcy, and nearly 10,000 steelworkers lost their jobs. In my district, USS POSCO has lost millions of dollars in revenue and has imposed a hiring freeze. In December, USS POSCO was forced to furlough its employees for one week because of the import surge. Steelworkers and steel companies are suffering not because they can't compete, but because of unfair foreign trade tactics.

H.R. 975, the Steel Import Reduction Act, is an important step to ensure that American workers and companies do not continue to bear the brunt of unfair trade practices. The bill directs the president to take the necessary steps, including imposing quotas, to cap steel imports at precrisis levels. The bill also requires the administration to establish a steel import notification and monitoring program, so that we can quickly respond to any dumping in the future.

The administration has begun to take some small steps in the right direction, but more needs to be done. The Commerce Department recently issued trade case rulings against Japan, Brazil, and Russia and found that all three had dumped steel. Steel imports have now slowed, but not nearly enough. We need a global, comprehensive approach to end the crisis, one that addresses all nations and all steel product lines. The administration's piecemeal, one-nation-at-a-time approach forces us to spend our time putting out one fire after another and simply will not work.

For these reasons I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in voting for this bill and challenge the administration to protect U.S. steelworkers and support H.R. 975.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, the American steel industry is on the ropes, and the flood of steel imports from Brazil, Japan, Korea, Russia, and other countries has gone unchecked in recent months.

Last year, steel producers from Russia were allowed to dump 47 percent more steel on our markets than in 1997. Foreign corporations are selling steel at $100 per ton below their production costs.

While U.S. and international trade laws are being grossly violated by these foreign corporations, the President and his administration stand idly by, allowing thousands upon thousands of hardworking steelworkers to lose their jobs and their livelihood.

Last month, after watching the families of steel workers in my district suffer as a result of job losses, reduced hours and reduced production at the plant, I decided that I could no longer be a bystander to foreign steel dumping. Steel workers in Illinois work hard every day, every week, every year, and earn their living. They don't deserve to lose their jobs as a result of illegal trade practices.

Typically, I am hesitant to support trade and import restrictions which could disrupt the flow of commerce in our global economy.

However, because of the administration's inaction, and the gravity of the steel crisis before us, I decided to stand up for steel, and became a sponsor of H.R. 975, legislation to freeze steel imports at their 1997 levels and establish a steel import notification and monitoring program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the American steel industry, and that our steel industry is the most competitive and efficient in the world. Right now, the administration is turning its head while foreign competition is violating international trade laws to gain an unfair advantage.

That is why I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 975. On a fair playing field, American steel can win.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Bipartisan Steel Recovery Act.

Mr. Speaker, the surge in foreign steel imports last year seriously damaged the U.S. steel industry and put thousands of American steel workers out of work.

There is no doubt now of what many of us were saying last year—that foreign steel was being dumped in the United States at less than the cost of production. The International Trade Commission determined last November that the steel industry in the United States was threatened by steel imports from Brazil, Japan, and Russia, and the Commerce Department recently determined that dumping had, in fact, occurred. Commerce subsequently imposed duties on Japanese and Brazilian steel imports.

Unfortunately, the dumping surge has taken its toll. The damage that has been done will, in some cases, be hard to undo. Ten thousand American steelworkers have lost their jobs, and not all of them will get those jobs back. I think that that is a tragedy and a disgrace.

I have worked actively as a member of the House Steel Caucus since last summer to push for action against foreign steel dumping. I was an original cosponsor of H.R. 506, legislation introduced by Representative VISCLOSKY which would have directed the Administration to limit the volume of steel imports to pre-surge levels. This legislation forms the foundation of H.R. 975, the bill we are considering today. The monitoring provisions drafted by Mr. REGULA make this bill even stronger than the original Visclosky bill. As an original cosponsor of both H.R. 506 and H.R. 975, I am very pleased that we have managed to bring this bipartisan compromise bill to the House floor today.

This legislation strengthens U.S. trade policy against the dumping of foreign steel. It is much needed and long overdue. I urge my colleagues to support this important anti-dumping legislation.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives is considering a bill to establish import quotas on certain raw steel products coming into the United States. Presumably, this bill would help ''save'' the steel industry from foreign raw material being ''dumped'' on the domestic market at below market prices. Although I sympathize with the workers who are being affected by this situation, there are other remedies that can be utilized to combat this problem that will avoid the unintended consequences this bill brings about. Unfortunately, the Clinton Administration has been slow to act to use the tools at its disposal under the Trade Act and we now have before us a measure that violates the premise of free trade under which this country has flourished.

Let me provide you with one example of how this bill will negatively impact the economy in Washington State. In 1995, BHP Coated Steel Corporation invested $221 million in a facility located in Kalama, Washington to take advantage of increasing demand for coated sheet steel on the West Coast. The plant contains a galvanizing line, a coil coating line, and a pickling/cold rolling line and is widely recognized as the most modern and cost effective facility of its kind in the U.S. It provides 235 good, family-wage jobs in Kalama and has become an important part of the community.

Because of the requirements of their manufacturing process, BHP needs large coils of hot bank steel that meet certain specifications. Although they source some of this product from domestic suppliers, much of the raw material that fits their manufacturing specifications comes from Australia. H.R. 975 would seriously jeopardize their ability to access this material and threaten the ability of the Kalama facility to expand—something the company would like to do—or even continue to exist. The bill institutes import quotas based on the average amount of steel imported into the U.S. between July 1994 and July 1997. Unfortunately, the Kalama facility did not go ''online'' until November 1997, meaning those import levels do not reflect the demand created by the facility. With no domestic supply sufficient to operate its plant, BHP will find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to survive.

There are a number of reasons to oppose this bill, but I believe it is important to provide Members of Congress with real examples of the negative impact of its implementation. I urge my colleagues to join the White House in opposing this effort, which clearly violates our obligations under the World Trade Organization to maintain an import regime consistent with our existing trade laws.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand up for steel and support H.R. 975. This important legislation will provide for a reduction in the volume of steel imports and establish a steel import notification and monitoring program. This legislation is the result of a consensus reached by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and representative from the steel industry and unions. It is a welcome example of the way our system of government was designed to work. In addition, H.R. 975 identifies a clear path of resolving the steel import crisis that has burdened our country for more than a year. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bipartisan legislation and support U.S. industry, U.S. workers, and U.S. steel.

There are close to 1,500 steelworkers in my district in Missouri, and one plant has announced that it will begin cutting back hours on March 28th. This plant employs 1,000 workers. In addition to steelworkers, I have been contacted by quarry workers who are threatened by the steel crisis because lime is used to purify the steel in the production process. All across the country, workers are living in fear that today will be the day the layoffs affect them. We must show that we support these workers and stand up for the U.S. steel today.

The United States steel industry is the most efficient and most environmentally conscious in the world. Since the 1980s, the U.S. steel industry has increased efficiency to the point where it now takes only two man hours to produce a ton of steel, as compared to the ten hours needed to produce a ton of steel before the industry transformed itself. This transformation cost the industry much—tens of billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of jobs. We must recognize these sacrifices and show that this initiative was a good investment. We should value progress in such an economically vital industry.

The United States steel industry has also made great strides in its environmental policy. Recently, a group of 20 environmental organizations, including Wildlife Land Trust and Friends of the Earth, wrote to President Clinton in support of the U.S. steel industry. In that letter, the groups stated that U.S. steel companies are ''among the very cleanest, if not the cleanest, in the world.'' Further, they concluded, ''if you want to reduce global emissions from steel making, make more steel in America.'' Moreover, the U.S. steel mills are the cleanest in the world, steel mills in many other countries use outdated practices that are nothing short of an environmental disaster. Many mills still use ''blast furnace'' technology that is not only outdated, but is also a high pollution process.

A vote for H.R. 975 will not only support the American steel mills, it will support our global environmental goals.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support and as a cosponsor of H.R. 975, the Bipartisan Steel Recovery Act.

The United States has built a steel industry that has one of the highest productivity levels and lowest costs in the world. Unfortunately, our commitment to new technology and increased labor productivity is of little worth in a global marketplace that favors illegal trade. Our domestic markets are being flooded with cheap imports from Asia, Russia and Brazil who continue to defy international trade policies in order to prop up their own markets. We can ill afford to be the world's dumping ground for unfairly-traded steel. While I am concerned by the financial disasters in Asia, Russia and elsewhere, these countries should not be allowed to export their problems here. We must find other means to help our trading partners deal with their economic challenges; allowing unfairly-traded steel to flood our markets creates an imbalance that helps no one.

As a member of the Congressional Steel Caucus, I have worked diligently with my colleagues to urge the Administration to take a strong stand against illegally-dumped steel. The proposed agreement with Russia to reduce Russian imports of steel products by almost 70 percent is a good first step. However, it must be followed by continued pressure on other nations to reduce their dumping of illegally-subsidized steel. I am pleased the Administration has responded to those of us in Congress who continue to make steel a high-profile issue. The U.S. must continue to be vigilant in providing relief to our steel industry and its workers, after they have suffered from an unfair flood of foreign imports. However, let me be clear about this: the Administration's efforts to date are not enough. We must do more and we must do more immediately.

In my own district in Southwestern Illinois, steelworkers and their families and communities have stood up strongly for steel. Workers at Laclede Steel in Alton and National Steel in Granite City have faced difficult times since the surge in steel imports flooded our markets. Laclede is facing bankruptcy and efforts are underway just to keep the plant open. Orders have been down and prices have fallen at both plants. Unfortunately, these steel companies, like others across the nation, have been unable to avoid layoffs. Mr. Speaker, I represent approximately 4,000 USWA union members in my district. I cannot in good conscience report to them that we have done enough here.

Today, I have high hopes that I will be able to return to my district and announce that we in Washington are also standing up for steel. The Bipartisan Steel Recovery Act will stop foreign corporations from breaking our trade laws. It will save American jobs and save U.S. steel companies from bankruptcy. Passage of H.R. 975 will also ensure our national security. It is American-made steel that goes into Navy ships, aircraft, tanks, trucks and weaponry used by our military. We cannot afford to allow our steel industry to disappear and to then become reliant upon foreign countries for our steel needs.

U.S. steel companies and steelworkers are the best in the world. American steel mills are the most productive, the most efficient, the most innovative and the cleanest in the world. Given a level playing field, there is no foreign company that can compete with them. Foreign steel is being subsidized by foreign governments. Closed foreign markets mean that foreign overproductions surges into our market—against our trade laws.

The U.S. steel industry, steel workers and their families, and American consumers of steel products and its derivatives deserve a fair market for U.S. steel. Foreign dumped steel not only has immediate negative consequences on the steel industry, over time the impact on the U.S. economy in terms of lost production, high-wage jobs, and investment is irretrievable.

I hope this Congress and the Administration will take immediate action to end illegal foreign imports of steel. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 975.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, regardless of how strongly some will argue to the contrary, there is a crisis occurring in the U.S. steel industry. As a result of continued and persistent ''dumping'' of foreign steel into the U.S.—specifically by Japan, Korea, Russia, and Brazil—domestic steel producers have been forced to decrease production or lay-off workers or even file for bankruptcy.

Already, due to the continuation of illegal dumping, the steel industry has laid off 10,000 steelworkers across the country and three companies have filed for bankruptcy. Indeed, Mr. Speaker in my state of Alabama, Gulf State Steel has had to intermittently shut down its hot-strip mill and had laid off hundreds of workers.

Mr. Speaker this is a crisis that we can no longer allow to fester.

Unfortunately, while American workers have lost their jobs and American companies have been forced to file for bankruptcy, the Administration has waffled on its commitment to the steel industry and has only offered tepid, ineffective regulatory remedies. In pursuit of abstract geopolitical goals, the Administration has refused to aggressively enforce our nation's trade laws.

The time for Congress to act is now. Today's steel industry is not the inefficient, noncompetitive, and unproductive industry of the past. Since the steel crisis in the 1970's, the steel industry has painstakingly reinvented itself, with over $60 billion of capital investments. Today, the American steel industry is among the most productive, the most efficient, the most innovative, and the cleanest in the world. In contrast, the foreign companies who are illegally dumping their steel in our market and threatening the continued vitality of our domestic steel industry, rely upon outdated, inefficient and environmentally unsafe technology.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 975 is simple, straightforward, and fair. It protects American jobs, saves American steel companies from bankruptcy, and ensures a domestic source of steel necessary to maintain our military hardware.

I urge my colleagues to take a stand today to enforce our trade laws and to protect American jobs. I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 975.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 975, The Bipartisan Steel Recovery Act. While this legislation is not a perfect solution to solving the crisis faced by the steel industry, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 975 because to date the Clinton administration has failed to step up and enforce existing U.S. trade laws against illegal foreign steel dumping.

As you know Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I on the Congressional Steel Caucus have been begging the White House to take meaningful action to stem the flow of these below the price of production steel products for over a year. It was not until this Congress took action late in the last session before the White House and the Commerce Department would even acknowledge that we had a steel crisis.

Since Congress forced the Clinton administration to issue a report on the steel dumping problem, the Administration has only offered unwanted tax credits to the steel industry, more bureaucratic delays in resolving steel dumping cases, veto threats of any congressional action and not one new solution to save the jobs of the thousands of steelworkers who stand to lose their jobs if the crisis continues.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 975 is a bipartisan compromise bill combining the elements of Representative REGULA's bill H.R. 412 and Representative VISCLOSKY's bill H.R. 506. I am an original cosponsor of Mr. REGULA's bill H.R. 412, which I believe is the best long-term solution to the steel industry's problems and a solution to update section 201 of our trade laws to help American industry compete in a fair market as we enter the 21st century. I am especially pleased that the steel monitoring program and real time steel import data program contained in H.R. 412 have been included in H.R. 975.

While H.R. 975 would provide for some very tough medicine that most in Congress including myself would rather not have to administer, it is clear that the steel industry is at a crossroads. In just the last year over 10,000 steelworkers have lost their jobs. That's 10,000 families who have lost their livelihood, not to mention the impact these job losses have had on local steel communities.

In the 11th District of Illinois I have over 20 firms that produce steel products. Some are big firms like Birmingham Steel in Joliet, while others are small family owned operations like Bellson Scrap & Steel in Bourbonnais. I also have hundreds of steelworkers in my district who travel to the LTV plant in Hennepin, IL, and steel plants in Chicago and across the border in Indiana.

The steel crisis has had a real impact in my district. Small firms like Bellson Scrap and Steel have had to cut their workforce by 10 percent, while, big producers in my district like Birmingham have cut back to 32-hour work weeks, mandatory vacation periods, and are now only operating at 80 percent of precrisis production. Close to home Acme Steel of Chicago has filed for bankruptcy placing thousands of more jobs in the Chicagoland region in jeopardy in addition to the 1,000 Illinois steel jobs that have already been lost.

Mr. Speaker, the steel crisis is alive and worse than ever for thousands of steel families. Even by the numbers of the administration's own Commerce Department steel imports for January 1999 are up over 96 percent from Japan, 140 percent from China, 155 percent from Korea and 705 percent from Indonesia over the precrisis period. Just in the 1 month period between December 1998 and January 1999, steel imports are up another 6 percent and the administration hails these numbers as great progress. Ask Mark Pozan at Bellson if he thinks a 6 percent increase over already record levels of steel imports is progress.

Mr. Speaker I agree that H.R. 975 may not be the best remedy to solve the steel crisis,

but, this Congress can not stand by and watch our trade laws be continually violated and our industries continually weakened while, good paying jobs are destroyed.

The steel industry has rebounded from the financial difficulties of the 1980's that cost our country over 325,000 jobs. The American steel industry once in decline, now produces the lowest cost, highest quality and most environmentally sound steel on the planet. If we fail to ensure that American steel plays on a level playing field with the rest of the world, than we place American steel companies and American workers including the 400 at Birmingham Steel in great harm. I urge my colleagues to send the Clinton administration a message and pass H.R. 975.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support today for H.R. 975, the Bipartisan Steel Recovery Act of 1999.

As a Member of Congress, I am well aware that the American steel industry has been facing a crisis. With the full knowledge of the White House, foreign corporations from Korea, Japan, Brazil, and Russia have been illegally dumping underpriced steel in the United States market for the past 20 months. Already, over 10,000 steelworkers nationwide have been laid off or lost their jobs. In addition, the thousands of hard-working Americans in the steel industry that have endured the crisis have seen their work hours and paychecks slashed. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is time for Congress to act by enforcing existing trade laws—the same trade laws that the administration is reluctant to enforce.

With the reluctency of the administration to do anything, I see H.R. 975 as a viable solution to the current crisis. In addition to returning our steel imports to the precrisis levels of 1997, H.R. 975 also establishes a monitoring system that requires all steel importers to obtain a ''Steel Import Notification Certificate.'' This measure will effectively arm us with a mechanism to assist in monitoring the illegal dumping of steel and ensure that our current trade laws are not being violated. Moreover, H.R. 975 will return steel imports to precrisis levels, help us curtail illegal dumping and avoid a crisis situation in the future.

In conclusion Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in support of the Bipartian Steel Recovery Act and the American steel worker. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 975 and support America.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my serious concerns about this legislation before us.

I strongly believe that free and open trade between nations improves the world economy, creates high-paying jobs, and lowers prices for consumers.

I certainly understand the seriousness of foreign countries and companies illegally selling goods below the price of production in our country. The United States must fight these dumping violations and must hold countries accountable for these activities.

However, H.R. 975 isn't the answer. This illegal, quota bill won't help American industry and will harm American workers. We've lived through failed, protectionist economic eras.

I also oppose this legislation and the hasty retaliatory measures within it because it violates our World Trade Organization (WTO) obligations by creating quotas to limit the importation of steel. If the U.S. expects to maintain a viable economy free from retaliatory protectionism, we cannot break trade laws ourselves. A full scale trade war is in no one's interest.

This legislation would have real negative consequences for American consumers, manufacturers and the economy as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, while I believe every Member of the House is concerned about dumping and is willing to support strong actions against such occurrences, two wrongs don't make a right, and to retaliate with this illegal, protectionist measure is counterproductive to American workers and consumers.

At a time when we are fighting the Europeans for their flagrant violation of international trade law, we cannot thoughtlessly toss aside our own commitments to follow the rule of law. And we must make sure that we do not put in place measures that will hurt American workers and consumers.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this protectionist bill before us today.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 975, a bill which will control the amount of foreign steel imports entering the United States.

The U.S. steel industry is the foundation of many of the economic development engines across the country. While our economy is buzzing, we are in a position to get back in the steel business after the steel industry's downturn in the 1980's. People all over the world want quality steel ''made-in-the-USA.'' This bill is our attempt to revitalize the steel industry and provide a level playing field for our steel producers.

The steel industries in other countries get subsidies for their products. In doing so, several countries have taken advantage of the NAFTA rules to wreck havoc on our steel market. As a supporter and advocate of NAFTA, let me say as clearly as I can: free trade does not mean cheating. Free trade means fair trade. We are the world leader on economic and trade issues, and therefore must speak up when there is an injustice. Flooding a market with underpriced materials is unjust.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I want to remind the House that steel is the base product that we use in our warfighting equipment, as well as a host of our domestic transportation system needs. It is the steel industry that has made the United States what we are today, and it is the basis for much of the prosperity we currently enjoy.

In my South Texas district, there is one steel plant currently operating, providing economic development in the area. There is a prospective plant in the works in another part of my district, so the need for a quality product is out there, but Congress must support those who are in the business of making steel.

When other countries break the rules for fair trade policies, it is our job, our right, and our responsibility to speak up and demand that the rule-breaking end. NAFTA, the hot economy and smart economic policy enacted in 1993, have brought the United States to the front of the class when it comes to matters of trade. If we do not act to highlight these illegal practices and reverse them, we will see others get the impression they can get away with similar practices.

Free trade does not mean cheating. The United States and the House of Representatives will not allow it. Please join me in supporting H.R. 975.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, today there are hundreds of men and women in the 17th District of Illinois who are without work because we have failed to protect them from illegally dumped steel.

Last year, when the European Union felt the steel crisis blowing their way, they quickly sealed their borders to protect their industry and its employees. Yet, American steelworkers were left to twist in the wind as the administration dragged its feet on enforcing our antidumping laws and taking an aggressive approach to conquer the crisis.

As the months have passed, the crisis has steadily worsened. If we don't stand up for the working men and women of our steel industry, who will?

Today, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the answer to the steel problem. By imposing quotas, and establishing a monitoring system to uphold our trade laws, H.R. 975 accomplishes what should have been done long ago—protection for out steelworkers, our steel industry and requiring that other nations share the burden of the steel crisis.

I would also like to remind my colleagues of what caused this crisis: the International Monetary Fund's harsh austerity measures that cause developing countries to export cheap steel. Until we stop funding, promoting and enabling the IMF to wreak havoc on financially strapped nations with their ''bad economic medicine'', we will continue to watch our trade deficit skyrocket and Americans go without work.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Bipartisan Steel Recovery Act.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise is support of the steelworkers. I am a proud member of organized labor. Organized labor enabled me to finance my house, and to educate myself and my children. I live in America. I am an American Congressman. The people who sent me here live in America and I want the people of America to be able to have the same opportunity I had and my family had. Lets keep the steel workers of America working. And when and if the time comes when our American workers are all employed, then we can look abroad for their assistance. Lets take care of our home First!

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 975, The Steel Recovery Act. As a Representative from the State of Michigan and a member of the Steel Caucus, I am well aware of the impact that the flood of cheap steel has had on thousands of families across this country. 10,000 steelworkers have lost their jobs. The ironic aspect of this situation is that it has occurred as the U.S. Steel industry has remade itself into the worldwide leader. It is efficient, it produces a clean, high-quality product, and pumps $70 billion annually into the U.S. economy. Moreover, steel is a vital element of our national security. All the industry wants and needs is the ability to compete with the rest of the world on a level playing field. This is hard to accomplish when steel imports from Japan rise 170% in a single year.

Free trade does not mean that the United States becomes the dumping ground for inferior products sold at below the cost of production. We must stringently enforce the antidumping and countervailing duty laws to make sure that such practices do not continue to put American workers at risk. The trick of future trade policy is to ensure the viability of core

U.S. industries and the jobs associated with them while slowly penetrating markets that are in many cases overwhelmingly closed to us. I believe that trade and exposure to American products will help break down these barriers, but I also do not believe it is unreasonable to insist that current law be enforced as intended.

Mr. Speaker, standing up for the principles of fair trade will do more to promote a freer global trading environment than allowing our industries to bear the brunt of dumped products. This is the trade environment I will continue to push for, and this is the one we are voting on today. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 975.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 975, the Steel Import Reduction Act, because the need to protect the vital domestic steel industry is clear. Since the start of the Asian financial crisis two and a half years ago, imports of steel into the United States has risen dramatically—over 24% in 1997 and 30% in 1998. Nationally, at least 10,000 U.S. steel jobs have been lost in the past year. Furthermore, three American steel companies have filed for bankruptcy over the last year, and thousands more jobs are threatened because a steel oversupply remains on the docks from abroad.

Import surges have occurred from nations like Japan, Korea, Brazil and Russia, and this is not surprising when one considers that their normal Asian markets are now dry. The steel industries in these countries need a market, and the United States continues to have the strongest economy in the world. Therefore, these nations must, in effect, ''dump'' their steel on our thriving economy to the detriment of our domestic industry.

Mr. Speaker, the American steel industry is second to none in the world. Gone are the days when U.S. steel was non-competitive with other nations—the necessary infrastructure investments and facility improvements occurred over a decade ago. Were it not for the current global economic situation, I would not be standing today on the floor of the House urging passage of H.R. 975.

At the same time, I have real concerns with the legality of the measure vis-a-vis the World Trade Organization, or WTO. My support for free trade remains uncontested. However, I have always stated that along with free trade principles, fair trade practices must be enforced. This is not occurring as a result of the struggling economies in Asia, Russia, and Brazil. It is my hope that as this bill moves forward in the legislative process, a solution can be developed which will effectively shield American steel while keeping the U.S. out of the WTO dispute settlement system.

Finally, I want to express my concerns that imports of specialty steel will not be effected by passage of this bill. Industries in my district in the East Bay of California, for instance, have been importing high strength steel from Japan for many years. This steel is used for the under bodies of passenger vehicles, and it is processed in a way which is not readily available on the domestic market. It is my understanding that these imports would not be effected by the import reductions called for in this legislation, and I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for working toward a solution to this problem of great magnitude to a vital U.S. industry.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the thousands of hard working men, women and their families who have lost their jobs due to a practice some refer to as ''steel dumping'' and their families.

Mr. Speaker, America's steel companies and America's steel workers are the best in the world. Given a level playing field, there is no foreign company that can compete with them.

In the past year, three steel mills have filed for bankruptcy and over 10,000 workers have been laid off. Mr. Speaker, this is 10,000 too many.

If these imports continue, what does that mean for the families of these workers? What does that mean for the tens of thousands of jobs of those employed by the steel industry? We cannot—and we must not—turn our backs on American steel companies, American Steel workers and the communities they support.

The American steel industry and its workers are in a severe crisis, and as representatives of these workers, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on HR 975 and reduce the importing of steel.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to protect American workers.

The American steel industry is a $70 billion industry that employs 170,000 people nationwide. Steel is also at the heart of Maryland's industrial base and thousands of Maryland jobs depend upon the steel industry. Over the past 15 years, the U.S. Steel Industry has worked aggressively to streamline its operations, improve productivity and cut costs. Bethlehem Steel Corporation, which has long operated a plant at Sparrows Point in Baltimore, has been at the forefront of these efforts. Bethlehem Steel is also among twelve companies and the United Steelworkers of America who, in response to this crisis, have filed unfair trade cases. Workers at Sparrows Point, and many plants like it, are already feeling the dramatic effects of allowing this massive influx of foreign steel.

Ultimately, this matter expands beyond the steel industry. Steel is critically interwoven into the fabric of our society. It is utilized in automobiles, medical equipment, homes, and military systems. Thus, we must act now to provide the appropriate safeguards to prevent risk to these industries.

Opponents of H.R. 975, the ''Steel Import Reduction Act,'' have focused on protectionism for our steel industry. Let us remember, our duty is to the American people. So, protectionism is key. We must ''protect'' our home, American jobs, and families from the irreparable harm caused by unprecedented and unfair levels of steel imports.

Join me in protecting American workers and families. Let's stop illegal ''dumping'' by voting in favor of H.R. 975.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 975. When I was running for Congress last year, not one of my constituents asked me to vote to raise the prices of the goods they buy. I doubt that any of my colleagues' constituents did either. Yet that is exactly what we are asked to do today with H.R. 975. Quotas have only one effect—higher prices for consumers, our constituents.

What does H.R. 975 do, Mr. Chairman? Nominally, it imposes quotas on steel imports. But in truth, it does so much more.

H.R. 975 solves a crisis that does not exist. Imports are down, way down. In January, steel imports fell to about 2.6 million tons, below the monthly average of imported steel from the last ''pre-crisis'' quarter of April to June 1997. Our anti-dumping laws have worked.

H.R. 975 violates our international obligations under the World Trade Organization. Violations by the strongest proponent of the WTO will only lead to quid pro quo protectionism.

H.R. 975 benefits a few, at the expense of many. There are 266,000 steel workers in America who might be helped by this bill. There are 8.3 million workers in steel consuming industries, such as the automobile industry and the construction industry, that will be hurt by this bill. And when our foreign trading partners retaliate with quotas of their own, all of our workers suffer.

Mr. Speaker, our steel industry is not failing. In fact, it is the most efficient steel industry in the world. U.S. steel mills shipped 102 million tons in 1998, the second highest annual total ever, while increasing their share of global production from 12.3 percent to 12.6 percent.

What is not well known is that U.S. steel producers—the very ones who are laying off steel workers and asking for quotas—are themselves purchasing imported steel. On average, our domestic steel producers purchase 20 to 25 percent of all steel imports to satisfy their own accounts. Our own steel industry benefits from the lower prices brought on by imports.

Mr. Speaker, free trade is indispensable to our prosperity. We cannot allow ourselves to be turned from the path that has led to our remarkable economic success. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 975.

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 975, the Steel Import Reduction bill, of which I am proud to be a co-sponsor. This legislation requires the President to take action to reduce steel imports into this country to pre-1997 levels and directs the administration to establish a steel import notification and monitoring program.

Mr. Speaker, our steel industry is in crisis. Last year, 10,000 steelworkers found themselves out of work in this country, and more are losing their jobs each day. Steel companies are filing for bankruptcy, laying off employees and shutting their doors. In short, American businesses and workers are paying the price of illegal dumping of steel products by Japan, Brazil, Russia and other nations which are not being forced to comply with our trade laws.

I appreciate the attention which President Clinton and his administration have begun to give this issue and the steps which they have taken to address it. Sadly, their efforts will not be enough to end this crisis. Instead, we need to adopt the comprehensive, global approach embodied in H.R. 975 to ensure that our steel industry can compete in the global economy on a level playing field.

The steel industry is critical to our national security and to our economy. If we do not address this crisis now, the implications will only grow in severity. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation. It is time to send a signal that we will not tolerate violations of our trade laws, especially when they place the security of our workforce, our economy and our nation in jeopardy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The bill is considered read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 114, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and the 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. ARCHER. 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.

REPORT ON H.R. 1141, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1999

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (during consideration of H.R. 975), from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–64) on the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 1 of rule XXI, all points of order against provisions in the bill are reserved.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Pursuant to House Resolution 113 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. 820.

□ 1337

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. 820) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, with Mr. GILLMOR 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) 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 might consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is the 11th bill which the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has brought to the floor thus far in this new session. Indeed, the other 10 bills passed overwhelmingly. I believe that this legislation, the Coast Guard authorization, deserves the same kind of overwhelming support.

We are taking action today to authorize funding for one of the most important programs in the United States Government. This Act authorizes approximately $4.6 billion in fiscal year 2000 and $4.8 billion in fiscal year 2001 in expenditures for the Coast Guard operations. It provides funds for the Coast Guard at the levels requested by the President with additional amounts provided for drug interdiction operations.

Last year, the Coast Guard received about $250 million in emergency supplemental funds to boost drug interdiction resources in the Caribbean. I can report to the House that I personally have gone out on missions with the Coast Guard and have seen firsthand the outstanding job they do.

This legislation maintains the level of drug interdiction provided for fiscal year 1999 with additional amounts consistent with the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. This bill also contains additional funds for fishing vessel safety and to modernize the national distress and response system. The bill authorizes $128 million in fiscal 2001 to construct a replacement icebreaking vessel for the Great Lakes.

I certainly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I would like to close by sharing with my colleagues examples of what our Coast Guard accomplishes every day. In any given day, on the average, our United States Coast Guard saves 14 lives. It conducts 180 search and rescue missions. It keeps $7 million worth of illegal drugs out of our country. It responds to 32 oil spills or hazardous chemical releases. It stops hundreds of illegal aliens from entering our country.

So in a year, that is over 4,000 lives saved, over 65,000 rescue missions, $2.6 billion in illegal drugs stopped from entering America's streets, over 11,000 environmental cleanups or responses to pollution, and the stopping of tens of thousands of illegal aliens entering our country.

Indeed, in addition to this, it also is involved in conducting local boat safety courses, port inspections, support of U.S. military and humanitarian missions, and more, all with the stewardship of the resources that should make the taxpayers of America very proud of their investment in the world's finest Coast Guard.

So I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation. It is worthy of their vote.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this is very important legislation for this body. As the chairman of the full committee has pointed out, it is supported strongly in a bipartisan manner. That is because almost all of the Members of this Congress and certainly the Members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure share a common concern in the Coast Guard's activities and giving them adequate resources to fulfill the burdens that we put on them.

The chairman has already gone on at some length, but I think it should be restated just so people remember, the Coast Guard does everything from local boating safety courses to search and rescue. If one is in trouble out on the water, they are the ones who respond. Sometimes in very hazardous situations, sometimes to loss of life to members of the Coast Guard, they are attempting to save mariners in distress.

They safeguard our borders by watching for smugglers and people attempting both to enter the country illegally or to enter drugs and other substances illegally into our country. They are our first line of protection for our coastal resources and the environment.

That leads me to some comments that are very close to home for me. The Coast Guard has been involved now for more than a month in the wreck of the *New Carrisa* which went aground in stormy weather outside the largest port in my district, very close to the mouth of the harbor.

The Coast Guard is still working on its own internal investigation and summary of the events that led up to this tragedy. I think there will be much to be learned from that critical review, perhaps some further changes in authority for the Coast Guard, changes of law regarding insurance of these freighters and other ships.

Today a freighter carries as much oil, these larger freighters, as did a small tanker 20, 25 years ago. They often carry more fuel than they need to accomplish their mission, as did this ship in this case, for ballast.

So the potential for oil spill no longer just extends to tankers and tanker safety, but now the potential for catastrophic oil spills extends to large freighters. Yet, they do not have the same insurance requirements that we put on tankers, nor do they have the same hull safety requirements we put on tankers; and those are critical issues that we will need to look at in the future to safeguard our precious coastal resources here in the United States.

□ 1345

I am very pleased that this bill, with unanimous vote in the committee, and hopefully a similar vote here on the floor of the House, includes some modest initial amendments for changes in the law that I have proposed as I became educated as to what happens when a foreign ship is headed towards the United States. And in this case, had these provisions of law which are in this bill today by my amendment been in effect, we might not have had the New Carrisa tragedy on the coast of Oregon; we might not have despoiled our precious coastal waters.

The Coast Guard, under this bill, will now be notified 24 hours in advance before a ship crosses into our 12-mile territorial limit. The Coast Guard will have the authority to hold a ship at that 12-mile limit if they have questions about the safety of the ship, the competence of its crew, or other extraordinary circumstances are intervening that could jeopardize safety.

In this case, the New Carrisa was on a list the Coast Guard keeps called the ''Watch List''. The ''Watch List'' is composed of ships that are known to the Coast Guard to have problems or to be registered in countries that are known to abide or to basically not fully enforce, rigorously enforce, international maritime rules. Panama, in this case. Liberia and other countries are also in question.

This ship was on the ''Watch List'', and it would have been boarded once it reached the harbor. Unfortunately, it never reached the harbor because it went aground, I believe due to the misconduct of the captain, and it caused an ongoing and unfolding tragedy on the Oregon coast. This could happen anywhere in the United States of America.

Under my legislation, the Coast Guard would be able to hold a ship on the ''Watch List'', ask them a number of questions about the condition of the vessel, the crew, etcetera, out at 12 miles. And if the Coast Guard was concerned about their capabilities or conduct or their navigational capabilities, they could require a pilot be put on board. They could require other actions be followed by that ship once it has entered into our territorial waters.

In this case they may have well have told the ship to hold off out 12 miles, where it was safer, because there was a huge storm brewing and the pilot could not get out to them.

These are tools that the Coast Guard, I believe, will be able to prudently employ and, hopefully, avoid this happening again in Oregon or anywhere else in the United States. There may well be other measures we need to take, and next week, when we hold a hearing to review the oil spill liability legislation on the 10-year anniversary of the Exxon Valdez tragedy, I believe we will see a path to other changes in law that are necessary.

Beyond that, the money in this bill is a good amount of money. Personally, if I had license, I would give the Coast Guard more money to conduct their mission. I believe that, in fact, they are operating in a very frugal manner, particularly compared to the other uniformed services, and they are spending our taxpayer dollars wisely and in a way that most all Americans are grateful on a daily basis.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), and I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), be permitted to manage our time on this side of the aisle while I must absent myself.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my full support for this legislation and the amendments that will be proposed here in the next few minutes.

I also want to thank the chairman of the full committee for his support of this legislation, the full ranking member for his support of this legislation, and also the support of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the subcommittee, for his work over the last several months on this legislation. We have worked very well together and I look forward to the rest of the session.

Mr. Chairman, I will not specifically go into all of the funding details, because that will be in the statement I will submit for the RECORD, but what I would like to do for the Members of the House, those of whom are listening, is to go through the kind of things that this limited force does for the United States.

Number one, it is the U.S. Coast Guard that is directly responsible for the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 and all of its provisions around this country. Since the Oil Pollution Act went into effect, and since the Coast Guard has been monitoring this issue and enforcing this statute, oil spills in the world have dropped by 60 percent. It is through much of the effort of the U.S. Coast Guard in this area that is responsible for that drop.

I have visited Prince William Sound, the sight of the Exxon Valdez spill, and the infrastructure put in place mainly because of the Coast Guard activities is phenomenal.

Fifty percent of the cargo transported across our oceans is considered hazardous, and it is the Coast Guard that deals primarily with that particular issue.

It is the Coast Guard, which leads the U.S. delegation to the International Maritime Organization that deals with 153 countries around the world, that ensures that not only our coastal waters, and not only our coastal waters out 200 miles of our coastlines but the international regime of the IMO of these 153 countries, that enhances the quality of our international waters.

It is the Coast Guard that is directly responsible for patrolling the North Atlantic in something called ''The Ice Patrol'', so that not only the U.S. ships traveling in the North Atlantic can be safe from icebergs but the international community can be safe from icebergs.

The coastal fisheries, out 200 miles off our coasts, not only off the Florida coast or the California coast but the Oregon and Washington coast, in the frigid waters of the north Pacific, 200 miles of the Alaskan coast, 200 miles off our coast, we monitor the coastal fisheries. And the U.S. Coast Guard ensures that U.S. law is enforced out that far, and they do a great job.

Interdiction of drugs on the high seas. Just imagine the coastal waters of the United States; the Pacific coast, the Atlantic coast, the Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean. We have the technology, we have the resources to interdict almost all the drugs if the Coast Guard is given those resources. Within 5 to 7 years, I am convinced that we can interdict up to 85 percent of those drugs if the Coast Guard is given the right resources.

We talked about safety at life at sea. Not only is the Coast Guard responsible for safety at life at sea for U.S. fishermen, but they also do a good job in the international arena. On every river, looking at the Mississippi River, the Great Lakes, our estuaries, the Coast Guard is responsible for safety at life at sea.

Who inspects vessels, domestic and foreign? It is the Coast Guard. Who inspects these cargo ships, these container ships, these oil tankers, the bulk carriers, the small vessels? It is the U.S. Coast Guard. Who interdicts illegal immigrants being carried through to this country on the high seas? It is the U.S. Coast Guard. Who cuts ice in the Great Lakes; who cuts ice in the estuaries, like the Chesapeake Bay, around this country? It is the Coast Guard. Who cuts the ice leading to McMurdo Station in the Antarctic? It is the U.S. Coast Guard. Who cuts the ice in the Arctic Ocean? It is the U.S. Coast Guard.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that the U.S. Coast Guard does all of this with a force smaller than the New York City police force.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues not only to support this legislation, but to think about the silent service that does a magnificent job, and all they ask for from this body is that we know something about the magnificent job that they and that we vote for this legislation.

H.R. 820 was developed in a bipartisan manner, and deserves the support of all the Members.

The primary purpose of H.R. 820, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1999, is to authorize expenditures for the U.S. Coast Guard for fiscal years 2000 and 2001.

Section 101 of the bill authorizes approximately $4.6 billion in the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2000, and $4.8 billion in fiscal year 2001. The amounts authorized for fiscal year 2000 include funding for Coast Guard programs at the levels requested by the President, with certain increases. The funding increases over the levels requested by the President are primarily for drug interdiction and commercial fishing and recreational vessel safety.

Specifically, H.R. 820 contains an additional $380 million for drug interdiction, consistent with the provisions of the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act which was enacted by Congress last year. H.R. 820 authorizes an

additional $142 million in operating expenses for fiscal year 2000 and $148 million in operating expenses for fiscal year 2001. These funds will allow the Coast Guard to operate 15 additional Coastal Patrol Boats, a regional law enforcement training center in Puerto Rico, several maritime patrol aircraft, and six medium endurance cutters. The bill further allows the Coast Guard to construct 15 coastal patrol boats for $81 million and to begin construction of six medium endurance cutters for $100 million in fiscal year 2000. These new assets will allow the Coast Guard to execute its role under the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act.

I have supported increases in the Coast Guard's drug interdiction spending because I am convinced that the level of Coast Guard drug interdiction has fallen well below what is necessary to fight the War on Drugs effectively. The $46 million increase in drug interdiction resources requested by the President for fiscal year 2000 is not adequate to respond to the alarming level of teenage drug use in this country.

The bill also contains additional funds for voluntary fishing vessel safety personnel, and $100 million to accelerate the national distress and response system modernization project. Also, H.R. 820 authorizes $128 million in fiscal year 2001 to acquire a replacement icebreaking vessel for the Great Lakes.

Section 102 of H.R. 820 authorizes an increase of Coast Guard military personnel to 40,000 by the end of fiscal year 2000, and 44,000 by the end of fiscal year 2001, to allow the Coast Guard to aggressively fight the War on Drugs in the Caribbean.

Finally, there are a few noncontroversial provisions in the bill, including a provision to require vessel operators to give notice to the Coast Guard 24 hours before they enter U.S. territorial waters. I thank the ranking member Mr. DEFAZIO from Oregon for that addition:

At the appropriate time, I will offer a managers amendment which adds several noncontroversial provisions to H.R. 820.

I urge the Members to support this legislation.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise to bring to the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) a matter that concerns the city of Garden Grove and the United States Coast Guard. An oil spill has been detected in the Bolsa Chica wetlands, and the city, unfortunately, has been erroneously identified as the responsible party.

The discharge was caused solely by another party, who discharged waste oil product from his truck into the city's catch basin. This party's waste oil passed through the catch basin and into the public storm drain. The circumstances of this case remain ambiguous.

The city of Garden Grove cannot accept an open-ended obligation to pay future claims in an unknown and potentially enormous amount. The city's revenues are limited, as the gentleman knows, and it is difficult to expand that tax base. No reasonable public policy is served by having the taxpayers of the city of Garden Grove pay for the cleanup and the spill of a third party.

The office of the Orange County district attorney is continuing a criminal investigation into the third party and we hope that we will have results soon with respect to that.

I urge the gentleman from Minnesota to recommend to the Coast Guard that it closely monitor the situation and to pursue the true responsible party for the reimbursement of the costs and damages.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SANCHEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. We are certainly aware of the Garden Grove problem. The discharge of waste oil product is particularly deleterious to the Bolsa Chica wetlands, a very sensitive environmental area. I had experience with this type of thing in my own Congressional District near Duluth, the Arrowhead Refinery site. It has taken us years to fix up and to fix responsibility on the third parties for that cleanup.

We are particularly sensitive to the gentlewoman's appeal and to her concern. We adhere on this side vigorously to the principle of the responsible party pays: ''You make the mess; you clean it up.''

We will work with the gentlewoman and the Coast Guard to reach a reasonable conclusion that suits the gentlewoman's constituents, and will continue to work closely with her and the Coast Guard to monitor this situation.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and appreciate his remarks.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 820, the Coast Guard Reauthorization Act of 1999.

What is of special interest and concern to me, and a great pleasure, is that at long last, for 25 years of my service in the Congress, we are approaching the date when we can see on the Great Lakes a replacement for the Coast Guard icebreaker Mackinaw, now older than most Members of this body.

The Mackinaw was built during the 1940s. It is now 55 years of age. It has done valiant service keeping the shipping lanes on the Great Lakes open during the late fall and early spring season to move goods to market. But the Mackinaw, battered by five and a half decades of breaking ice, is badly in need of replacement.

This legislation provides a $3 million authorization for design competition for a replacement vessel. Not just a study, as we have done in the past and nothing has come of it, but design competition for a replacement vessel for the icebreaker Mackinaw; and $128 million authorization for the construction of that replacement vessel.

□ 1400

For those who are not familiar with the Great Lakes, this is home to 20 percent of all the fresh water on the face of the Earth. It is the locus of one out of every five industrial jobs in America. The Great Lakes states generate 45 percent of the Nation's agriculture and produce over a third of the Nation's exports. And to move those commodities, to move the 58 million tons of iron ore that moved from northern Minnesota, northern Michigan to the lower lake steel mills, the 23 million tons of stone that are used in the Nation's highway construction project, and 20 million tons of coal each year that move from upper lake to lower lake to fuel with low sulphur western coal, the demands of power plants in Illinois, Michigan, and Ohio with clean coal and the energy they need to keep their industry going, we have to keep those shipping lanes open in the late fall and the early spring to ensure the lowest cost delivery of these goods.

Water borne transportation is the lowest energy consuming means of transportation in our country and anywhere in the world and the Great Lakes waterways are critical to the needs of upper and lower lakes. And it is not just the ports on the Great Lakes that benefit from this, nor the industries, but the farmers of western Minnesota, of North and South Dakota, of Montana, of Iowa, where the grain comes into the Port of Duluth. Grain farmers from Canada, it comes down from Thunder Bay into Lake Michigan and onto lower lake port and ultimately exported to the seven seas of the world.

This Great Lakes waterway system is the great energy source for the national economy and for agriculture that reaches way west of the Mississippi and stretches far east of the Mississippi. The Mackinaw replacement project, a multipurpose vessel, will benefit the entire national economy. And I am delighted and I really appreciate the work of our chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), who has been very understanding of our need on the Great Lakes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman, who has been supportive of this initiative, and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), who has been very helpful on this initiative. And for all my Great Lakes colleagues who for years have joined together and supported, at last we can say the end is in sight, replacement for the Mackinaw is coming.

But this bill goes further. It provides the support for what I consider to be America's greatest return on investment entity, the U.S. Coast Guard. We get more for our dollar investment in the Coast Guard than out of any of the services, perhaps any other entity except maybe the Corps of Engineers. The return on investment in the Coast Guard is extraordinary.

Whether in safety in the inland waterways of the coastal regions or in

protection against drug runners, the interdiction role that the Coast Guard plays is extraordinary. The men and women who wear that special color blue deserve our total support, and this bill provides it.

The $44 million authorization in this bill to continue the design and development process for the Deepwater project is critical. This is an initiative to replace all of the Coast Guard's vessels and aircraft that operate more than 50 miles out from the U.S. coastline along the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf Coasts. This Deepwater initiative is really critical to keep the Coast Guard competitive, to keep it in line with all the additional responsibilities we in the Congress have saddled upon the Coast Guard, and to keep the United States vigilant in maintaining the integrity of our coastline.

I will not go into all the many other initiatives, the fisheries enforcement, migrant interdiction, drug interdiction along our coast that the Coast Guard carries out. We really salute the men and women with the special blue of the U.S. Coast Guard and do so in a very practical and realistic way in this legislation.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for bringing this legislation to the House floor.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) for yielding time.

First of all, I want to support the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) regarding the Mackinaw and a number of the other issues he raised. The Mackinaw indeed is a worthy ship, but it is also an old ship and will not be able to operate much longer. And the Great Lakes depend mightily upon the efforts of that ship, particularly in the colder months.

I would also point out in relation to the comments from the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) that the Great Lakes are really misnamed. They should be called the ''great seas'' because in fact they are seas. And that is why the Coast Guard plays such an important role in these bodies of water. It is very important to recognize their magnitude. And not only are they 20 percent of the world's fresh water supply, they are 95 percent of the United States' surface fresh water, and that is a very important factor in our country's future.

I also thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, for working with a number of us in resolving a major problem on Lake Michigan, an important component again of the Great Lakes. The administration, in submitting their budget proposal this year, eliminated helicopter service for the Coast Guard in the middle section of Lake Michigan.

Now, recognize that Michigan has more boats per capita, in fact more boats total, than any other State of the Union. Furthermore, recognize that Michigan has more lake shore mileage than any State of the Union except Alaska. A tremendous amount of boating activity on Lake Michigan. And the administration is proposing to remove the Coast Guard helicopter station at Muskegon, Michigan.

I appreciate the efforts of the subcommittee. That includes both minority and majority. We have been able to work this out and come up with a proposal within this that will maintain the Coast Guard station at Muskegon. That is extremely important. And not only that, but to look very carefully or perhaps reestablish the helicopter Coast Guard station in the Chicago area, which was shut down some years ago. Both are very important in terms of achieving what is one of the key missions of the Coast Guard, as outlined by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), and that is ensuring the life and safety of individuals at sea, whether on the oceans or on the Great Lakes.

Finally, let me register a concern about the general overall direction of the Coast Guard funding. The Coast Guard, as we just said, is responsible for the life and safety of individuals at sea. But yet the funding relative to other activities of the Coast Guard has steadily diminished, and the reason is very simple. The drug problem of this Nation and the drug interdiction responsibilities of the Coast Guard continues to drain resources away from the search and rescue operations of the United States Coast Guard.

And even though the drug interdiction is a very important part of their responsibility and very important to this Nation, all of us must recognize that we cannot continue to give more responsibility to the Coast Guard in this area, we cannot continue to require more drug interdiction from them and not give them the money to do that, because by doing that we are pulling men away from their search-and-rescue activities.

So if indeed we want to have the Coast Guard pursue their drug interdiction activities, fine, then good, but let's recognize that we have to provide the funding and not cut and chip away at the life and safety operation of the Coast Guard at the same time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would not only support the Coast Guard reauthorization and associate myself with the words of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) as to the importance of the Coast Guard not just on the Great Lakes but throughout this great Nation, but I want to bring to the attention an amendment that we are going to have a little bit later here, the Upton amendment, which I believe the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) is going to accept and be even part of his amendment. Anyway, I have had the pleasure of working with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), my colleague and friend, on this amendment.

I would like to maybe take a moment here and highlight the importance and need for the Upton amendment which would help to bring to light the current problem with the Federal Government's assistance for transferring lighthouses.

We have probably more lighthouses on the Great Lakes than anywhere else in this Nation. It helps to tell the story of our maritime history. They stand as a testament to the thousands of mariners who lived and died on these Great Lakes and to those who dedicated their lives to guiding them home safely. The modern technology is replacing the use of the lighthouses for navigational purposes. But there are many groups out there dedicated to preserving these monuments for posterity and history.

Unfortunately, once the Federal Government decides it no longer needs a lighthouse, there is no guarantee that the historical groups that have worked for years to maintain these structures will be able to acquire them, even though the group may have spent thousands of dollars and hours restoring the lighthouses and maintaining the property. They are not given that go-ahead to take the transfer from the Coast Guard as to the physical assets.

While we cannot change the system under this current bill, what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) is trying to do through his amendment and our support we are now considering, this amendment will help highlight the problem and, at the very least, ask the Coast Guard to provide us some advice and technical assistance for the organizations that want to preserve our maritime heritage.

I hope this will further the dialogue to change the way in which the Federal Government transfers the lighthouses, and I urge my colleagues to look carefully at the Upton amendment and to adopt that amendment.

And in final, I hope H.R. 820, the Coast Guard authorization bill, is transferred and approved by this House and we have a strong vote on it to show our support for the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with, basically, the comments on both sides of the aisle.

I want to tell my colleagues, the things about drugs, the things about illegals, California pays a big price for all of the above. And I would tell the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the greatest thing that we do

not have to deal with in San Diego is the ice cutters. They have to do that in Michigan. But I support his issue there.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and I will probably never vote for each other more than a handful of times, but this happens to be one of those times that we do. And I do think also that one of the things the Coast Guard does there is actually a requirement under OPA 90, where we have dual hull tankers. I hope some day we can enforce that so we do not have things like the Valdez.

And even our offshore oil, I put a requirement that the President supported that limited our offshore oil drilling off California because of the pollution not only in our wetland but our beaches. And we see every day these tankers going up and down from foreign countries that are leaking oil and coming on our beaches, and I worked with the gentleman to stop that.

Last year we honored two policemen that died here in defending our Capitol. But we do not hear much about just 96 miles from here right off Point Lookout we lost a Coast Guard cutter, a rescue ship, and people gave their lives in service to that, too. So I think that it is a little unsung part of security that we have in this country but we should not forget, especially them, and it is a reason that most of us on both sides of the aisle support this.

Another area in which they helped, we had a bipartisan vote. There is a Chinese shipping company that wanted to take over Long Beach. I am happy to tell my colleagues that the CIA has come out and said that, yes, there is a national security threat over Long Beach if they would take complete control. It is the Coast Guard that found that they were dealing chemical and biological and nuclear triggers.

So I rise in strong support and I thank the Members on both sides of the aisle for this legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

□ 1415

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, it has pretty well been said. The U.S. Coast Guard has made America a better place to live for 208 years. As members of this country's oldest continuous seagoing service, the men and women of the Coast Guard continue to do what they have always done, save lives and protect property at sea; ensure a safe, efficient maritime transportation system; protect and preserve our precious marine resources and environment; enforce laws and treaties in the maritime region; and defend our national security.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) has already indicated that the Coast Guard, numbers-wise, is smaller than the New York City Police Department. Yet our Coast Guard carries out their vital missions in this country's ports and waterways, along its 47,000 miles of coastline, lakes and rivers, on international waters or in any maritime region as required to support national security.

When I was a member of the Coast Guard, Mr. Chairman, we used to affectionately refer to the Navy as the Big Outfit. Conversely, they would refer to us as the Little Outfit, the Shallow Water Navy, the Knee-Deep Navy, the Hooligans Navy. They did it with tongues in cheek but they did it affectionately. There was good rapport between the two seagoing services.

This essential and fiercely proud service continues its 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week vigilance against a host of transnational dangers, including pollution, illegal migration, international drug trafficking and terrorism.

My friend from Minnesota mentioned the Mackinaw. The Mackinaw was synonymous with Great Lakes icebreaking, I guess, for four or five decades. He is right, the time has come to replace it. I am happy to see that that is going to happen.

I talked with a Coast Guardsman not too long ago who was the recipient of the Coast Guard gold lifesaving medal. I think he had rescued either four or five people in this particular rescue effort. In so doing, he suffered a permanent injury, and he is disabled. As I was talking to him about his heroic rescue, he was very unassuming about it. ''No big deal,'' he said, ''this is what I'm supposed to do.'' Well, it was a big deal to those whom he pulled out of the drink. I can assure you it was a big deal to them. Even though he is now disabled, he said, ''I did what I'm supposed to do. I went to the aid of those who were in distress.'' That is what the Coast Guard men and women have been doing for years, 208, to be exact.

I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, to say to my friend from Pennsylvania that the full committee and the subcommittee has done yeoman work in getting this bill to the floor. It is a good bill.

Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard's motto rings just as true today as it did in 1970, semper paratus, always ready.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 820.

In representing the Port of Houston in my district, the U.S. Coast Guard has the primary responsibility for ensuring the safety and security of the vessels not only in my district but in the ports and waterways around the country.

Also, in recent years the Coast Guard has been charged with the task of engaging in drug interdiction activities. In fact, just in late January, the Coast Guard intercepted and seized a Panamanian vessel 125 miles off the coast of Jamaica. The vessel was then escorted back to the Port of Houston and upon searching the vessel nearly five tons of cocaine with an estimated street value of $375 million was discovered. This was one of the largest drug seizures in both Texas and our Nation's history.

In this year's Coast Guard authorization, there is a 10 percent increase in the funds for discretionary activities. I am glad to see that. Hopefully this bill will pass very easily. That will mean approximately $400 million is earmarked for drug interdiction activities. That increase in funds will fully implement the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, enable the Coast Guard to operate an additional fifteen patrol boats, eight cutters and seven marine vessels to stop drugs before they enter our country.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and also in support of the Coast Guard's effort not only for the safety of our harbors and waterways but also for the drug interdiction activities.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 820—the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1999. This much-needed bill authorizes $3.1 billion in fiscal year 2000 and $3.2 billion in fiscal year 2001 for Coast Guard operating expenses to carry out numerous missions.

Included in this authorization is funding for the Coast Guard to Participate in search and rescue missions. The Coast Guard spends about 11.6 percent of its operating expenses on search and rescue missions. This is a critical function of the Coast Guard and one that saves the lives and property of many who find themselves in peril on the open seas—particularly the perilous seas off the coast of South Florida.

Recently, the Coast Guard launched a search and rescue mission off of the coast of South Florida in search of Haitian immigrants whose vessel capsized as they were trying to reach the United States. Unfortunately, although three Haitian immigrants were rescued from the Atlantic Ocean between the Bahamas and Florida, perhaps as many as 40 more Haitian immigrants were lost, despite the Coast Guard's best efforts.

Over the years, the Coast Guard has rescued hundreds of Haitians, Cubans, and others seeking freedom and a better life in the United States. Unfortunately, many die trying to secure their dream of freedom. The Coast Guard serves critical role in helping to save human lives in the straits of Florida. The diverse ethnic communities in Miami are most grateful for the Coast Guard's search and rescue efforts.

Search and Rescue is one of the Coast Guard's oldest missions. For over 200 years, the Coast Guard has responded to distress calls at sea. Minimizing the loss of life, injury, property damage, or loss by rendering aid to persons in distress and property in the maritime environment has always been a Coast Guard priority. Coast Guard search and rescue response involves multimission stations, cutters, aircraft and boats linked by communications networks.

The Coast Guard is the Maritime search and rescue coordinator and is recognized worldwide as a leader in the field of search and rescue. Each hour a U.S. Coast Guard

aircraft is aloft costs about $3,700—and several maybe used in a single search. It is critical that the Coast Guard has the resources it needs to maintain its search and rescue efforts. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 820, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1999. As a member of the Congressional Coast Guard Caucus, I am proud of the U.S. Coast Guard and all the hard work that each and every member selflessly gives each day to our nation. The United States Coast Guard is this nation's oldest and its premier maritime agency. The history of the Service is historic and multifaceted. It is the amalgamation of five Federal agencies—the Revenue Cutter Service, the Lighthouse Service, the Steamboat Inspection Service, the Bureau of Navigation, and the Lifesaving Service, which were originally independent agencies with overlapping authorities. They sometimes received new names, and they were all finally united under the umbrella of the Coast Guard. The multiple missions and responsibilities of the modern Service are directly tied to this diverse heritage and the magnificent achievements of all of these agencies.

The Coast Guard, through its previous agencies, is the oldest continuous seagoing service and has fought in almost every war since the Constitution became the law of the land in 1789. The Coast Guard has traditionally performed two roles in wartime. The first has been to augment the Navy with men and cutters. The second has been to undertake special missions, for which peacetime experiences have prepared the Service with unique skills. Today the Coast Guard is engaged on many open sea patrols in the war on drugs throughout the vast oceans and seas of the world.

The Coast Guard has helped to protect the environment for 150 years. In 1822 the Congress created a timber reserve for the Navy and authorized the President to use whatever forces necessary to prevent the cutting of live-oak on public lands. The shallow-draft cutters were well-suited to this service and were used extensively. Today, the current framework for the Coast Guard's Marine Environmental Protection program is the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972.

In 1973, the Coast Guard created a National Strike Force to combat oil spills. There are three teams, a Pacific unit based near San Francisco, a Gulf team at Mobile, AL, and an Atlantic Strike Team stationed in Elizabeth City, NC. Since the creation of the force, the teams have been deployed worldwide to hundreds of potential and actual spill sites, bringing with them a vast array of sophisticated equipment.

The 200-mile zone created by the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 quadrupled the offshore fishing area controlled by the United States. The Coast Guard has the responsibility of enforcing this law.

The Coast Guard additionally has the major responsibility for conducting and coordinating Search and Rescue operations and licensing and regulating safety and commercial boating rules. This enormous task is performed day in and day out by the dedicated men and women of the Coast Guard.

As you may be able to tell, the Coast Guard performs a complex but necessary array of missions that effect the very life blood of this nation in the areas of national defense, commerce, the environment, and lifesaving.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to particularly highlight one essential mission that the Coast Guard is performing right now in America's westernmost frontier, my home district on the island of Guam. During the past year, Guam has experienced a significant influx of Chinese illegal immigrants. Chinese crime syndicates organize boatloads of indigent Chinese citizens to illegally enter the United States for an exorbitant fee of $8,000–$10,000 per person. After undergoing an arduous journey under fetid, unsanitary conditions, the Chinese reach Guam dehydrated, hungry, disease-ridden and sometimes beaten. Upon arrival, the smuggled Chinese become indentured servants as they attempt to pay their passage to America.

Guam's geographic proximity and asylum acceptance regulations make it a prime target for Chinese crime syndicates. According to the INS about 700 illegal Chinese immigrants traveled to Guam last year. Since the beginning of this year alone, 157 have been apprehended by the Coast Guard, INS and local Guam officials. Since the INS does not have enough money to detain the Chinese illegal immigrants on Guam, they proposed to release them to the general populace without assistance. Fortunately, the Government of Guam has offered its already strained resources to detain the illegal aliens until they are ready to be adjudicated.

Mr. Chairman, Chinese crime syndicates have exploited Immigration and Nationality (INA) asylum regulations. Because Guam, through INA directives, has to accept asylum applications, Guam becomes a cheap and attractive location for shipment of smuggled Chinese.

The Marianas section of the Coast Guard, stationed out in Guam has been tasked to interdict, when possible, these wretched Chinese vessels that are transporting these illegals. The local command, which is currently undermanned and over extended, is doing the impossible under such circumstances.

In the Armed Services Committee, where I am proud to serve, we have as of late been discussing the high level of OPSTEMPO and PERSTEMPO to describe the state of overextension of manpower and the drain on resources within our military. In the case of these dedicated men and women of the Coast Guard on Guam, they are no exception to these discussions.

I recently had the pleasure of meeting with the Commandant of the Coast Guard, Admiral James M. Loy and I expressed to him the sentiments of the people of Guam as well as praised him for his leadership and dedication to this service. Along with my fellow Coast Guard Caucus Members, I promised to continue to support the fine work of our Coast Guard. I would additionally ask that Congress and Commandant Loy seriously look to find some additional resources for our beleaguered Coast Guard on Guam in order to more effectively contend with the growing onslaught of illegal Chinese immigrants and relieve the high level of OPSTEMPO faced by these Coastguardsmen and women. We are all very proud of the work that Captain Scott Glover, the CO of the Marianas Section, is performing on Guam as well as that of the entire Marianas Section of the U.S. Coast Guard for their compassion when dealing with these desperate Chinese and for their generosity in the performance of their duty. Si Yu'os Ma'ase.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I appreciate the work that the Chairmen of the full Committee and the Subcommittee and their staff have done in addressing safety needs in southern Lake Michigan. For many years, I have been working with the U.S. Coast Guard in addressing the concerns of my constituents and other residents through the reestablishment and operation of a seasonal air rescue facility in the southern lake area. As many of you may be aware, the boat traffic, both commercial and recreational, in this area is the most congested in all of the lake. An air rescue facility in this area would greatly increase confidence of boaters and recreational users and the chance for survival in the extremely cold and dangerous waters of Lake Michigan.

I am anticipating the completion of a report by the Coast Guard in the very near future to determine the best location for an additional facility in this area. In discussions with the Coast Guard, it appears that the regional airport in Waukegan, Illinois may be the ideal location as it is located very near the lake's shoreline thereby enabling a short response time and has additional hangars that could be leased to significantly reduce the cost of this rescue facility. In addition, the Waukegan Regional Airport offers a control tower, instrument landing system and twenty-four hour operation. However, I am very concerned with the cost estimate that the Coast Guard provided for this additional facility. The justification for this estimate includes some expenses that I believe can be reduced once we identify the location of the site, and I look forward to working with the Coast Guard on this.

This legislation is an important step in providing safety and confidence to the boaters in southern Lake Michigan, and I look forward to its implementation and the establishment of this rescue facility.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in favor of the Coast Guard Reauthorization Act. The Act provides the United States Coast Guard with authorization for the funding they need to accomplish the important missions that the Congress and the Nation have asked them to accomplish.

As a member with more than 120 miles of Lake Michigan coastline in my district, I fully understand the Coast Guard's mission and appreciate the fine level of search-and-rescue services that the Coast Guard provides to the boating and beach-going public in West Michigan.

I rise especially today to discuss the way that this authorization bill impacts the operation of the Coast Guard Muskegon Air Facility. The Coast Guard has operated this air facility on a seasonal basis from April 1 to October 1 each summer since 1997. Prior to 1997, the Coast Guard had operated an air facility or air station to cover southern Lake Michigan out of the Chicago area since 1959.

The bill before us today addresses the concerns of the Michigan and Illinois delegations regarding Coast Guard search and rescue air coverage on Lake Michigan. The bill provides that the Coast Guard shall continue to operate the Muskegon Air Facility and shall establish a Chicago area facility for operation through the end of FY 2001. In addition, the bill provides for a study of total search-and-rescue response on Lake Michigan and the establishment of a plan for the coordination of search-and-rescue response in the Chicago area.

I hope that the Coast Guard will aggressively move to take the actions necessary to operate both the Muskegon and Chicago air facilities in FY 2000. I also hope that the Coast Guard will, in the interim, provide a high level of search-and-rescue air coverage for southern Lake Michigan by operating the Muskegon Air Facility on a seven-day, 24-hour-per-day basis during the summer of 1999.

Finally, I want to thank Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman Shuster and the other subcommittee chairmen for their assistance in resolving the Lake Michigan Air Facility issue. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Ehlers, for his assistance on this issue and for helping to maintain the high level of boating safety enjoyed by those boating on Lake Michigan.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to take this opportunity to express my appreciation on the members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and its Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee, for the good work they have done in putting together this year's Coast Guard Reauthorization measure (H.R. 820).

As reported, this bill not only makes it easier to conduct the all-important war against drugs, which is so important to this nation's future, but it will also promote public safety in a way that is very important to a great many people in the Upper Midwest. In particular, I am referring to all those folks who fly over, or take to, the waters of southwestern Lake Michigan and the lakes and rivers north and/or west of Chicago.

Mr. Chairman, over 6 million people reside in the counties of northwestern Indiana, northeastern Illinois, and southeastern Wisconsin that border on Lake Michigan. Not only do many of them own a boat or enjoy going out on someone else's, but countless residents of, or visitors to, the region take advantage of the dinner voyages and sightseeing cruises that depart from Chicago's justly famous lakefront. On top of that, literally, hundreds of thousands of people fly in and out of O'Hare Airport and a number of other airports that dot the landscape from Gary, IN, to Milwaukee, WI. In short, there are people on or over southwestern Lake Michigan and nearby waters all the time—people who would be at risk in the event of a boating accident or an airplane crash.

Thankfully, over 40 years have passed since a major commercial airliner crashed into Lake Michigan. However, that is no guarantee against such an accident occurring in the future. Moreover, smaller planes have fallen into, or collided over, the Lake since then and there have been a number of instances where boats have capsized and/or sunk, not just in Lake Michigan, but in the Chain o' Lakes region north of Chicago. In fact, 26 people were killed in those sorts of accidents from October 1, 1995 to October 1, 1996, a figure which helps explain why so many citizens in the Chicago area were so concerned when the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) helicopter rescue unit stationed at the old Glenview Naval Air Station was transferred across the Lake to Muskegon, Michigan several years back.

Not to belabor the point, but those citizens had good reason to be concerned. Not only was that USCG helicopter better equipped and its crew better prepared to deal with accidents well offshore than local rescue boats and helicopters, but the unit was 15 to 30 precious minutes further removed from the northeastern Illinois shoreline than had been the case previously. Also, the fact that the unit could spend more time in the air searching for accident victims if it were closer to the Chicagoland area argued strongly for either moving it in that direction or bringing in a new USCG helicopter rescue unit to serve the region.

Having joined a number of my colleagues from both Illinois and Indiana in making that pro-safety argument, I am both pleased and relieved to see that the authors of this legislation have recognized its merits and have endorsed the latter course of action. According to the provisions of Section 204 of H.R. 820, a new USCG helicopter search and rescue (SAR) unit is to be situated on the southwest shore of Lake Michigan, where it is to remain until at least September 30, 2001. In the interim, a thorough study will be conducted to determine what SAR equipment will be needed in the region after the year 2001 and a comprehensive plan will be developed for the provision of the SAR services that are deemed necessary. As for the existing unit, it will continue to be based in Muskegon until at least September 30, 2001, thereby assuring the boating and aviation populations on both sides of Lake Michigan that timely USCG air SAR services will be more readily available than they have been heretofore.

Mr. Chairman, while this approach is not quite as definitive as I would have preferred, it has two major advantages that should commend themselves to my colleagues. First, by authorizing additional air SAR resources for the heavily populated (by boats as well as people) Chicago area, it addresses a very significant public safety concern. Second, by leaving the existing unit in Muskegon, MI, it means that people in that area will not face a reduction in their USCG SAR coverage similar to the one faced by Chicagoland residents several years ago. To my way of thinking, each of these advantages would be sufficient to justify enactment of Section 204 of H.R. 820. Together, they and the drug interdiction features of H.R. 820 make a compelling case for the entire measure.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 820.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 820

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION
Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 102. Authorized levels of military strength and training.
TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS
Sec. 201. Vessel NOT A SHOT.
Sec. 202. Costs of clean-up of Cape May lighthouse.
Sec. 203. Clarification of Coast Guard authority to control vessels in territorial waters of the United States.
Sec. 204. Coast Guard search and rescue for Lake Michigan.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are authorized to be appropriated for necessary expenses of the Coast Guard, as follows:

(1) For the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $3,084,400,000, of which—

(i) $25,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990;

(ii) not less than $663,000,000 shall be available for expenses related to drug interdiction; and

(iii) $5,500,000 shall be available for the commercial fishing vessel safety program; and

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $3,207,800,000, of which—

(i) $25,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990;

(ii) not less than $689,500,000 shall be available for expenses related to drug interdiction; and

(iii) $5,500,000 shall be available for the commercial fishing vessel safety program.

(2) For the acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore and offshore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $691,300,000, of which—

(i) $20,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990;

(ii) not less than $280,300,000 shall be available for expenses related to drug interdiction;

(iii) $100,000,000 shall be available for modernization of the national distress response system; and

(iv) $3,000,000 shall be available for completion of the design of a replacement vessel for the Coast Guard icebreaker MACKINAW; and

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $792,000,000, of which—

(i) $20,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990;

(ii) not less than $233,000,000 shall be available for expenses related to drug interdiction;

(iii) $110,000,000 shall be available for modernization of the national distress response system; and

(iv) $128,000,000 shall be available for construction or acquisition of a replacement vessel for the Coast Guard icebreaker MACKINAW.

(3) For research, development, test, and evaluation of technologies, materials, and human factors directly relating to improving the performance of the Coast Guard's mission in support of search and rescue, aids to navigation, marine safety, marine environmental protection, enforcement of laws and treaties, ice operations, oceanographic research, and defense readiness—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $21,700,000; and

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $23,000,000,

to remain available until expended, of which $3,500,000 shall be derived each fiscal year from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out

the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990.

(4) For retired pay (including the payment of obligations otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose), payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefit Plans, and payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $730,000,000; and

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $785,000,000.

(5) For alteration or removal of bridges over navigable waters of the United States constituting obstructions to navigation, and for personnel and administrative costs associated with the Bridge Alteration Program—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $11,000,000; and

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $11,000,000,

to remain available until expended.

(6) For environmental compliance and restoration at Coast Guard facilities (other than parts and equipment associated with operations and maintenance)—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $19,500,000; and

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $21,000,000,

to remain available until expended.

SEC. 102. AUTHORIZED LEVELS OF MILITARY STRENGTH AND TRAINING.

(a) ACTIVE DUTY STRENGTH.—The Coast Guard is authorized an end-of-year strength for active duty personnel of—

(1) 40,000 as of September 30, 2000; and

(2) 44,000 as of September 30, 2001.

(b) MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS.—The Coast Guard is authorized average military training student loads as follows:

(1) For recruit and special training—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, 1,500 student years; and

(B) for fiscal year 2001, 1,500 student years.

(2) For flight training—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, 100 student years; and

(B) for fiscal year 2001, 100 student years.

(3) For professional training in military and civilian institutions—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, 300 student years; and

(B) for fiscal year 2001, 300 student years.

(4) For officer acquisition—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, 1,000 student years; and

(B) for fiscal year 2001, 1,000 student years.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 201. VESSEL NOT A SHOT.

Notwithstanding section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 App. U.S.C. 883), section 8 of the Act of June 19, 1886 (46 App. U.S.C. 289), and section 12106 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel NOT A SHOT (United States official number 911064).

SEC. 202. COSTS OF CLEAN-UP OF CAPE MAY LIGHTHOUSE.

Of amounts authorized by this Act for fiscal year 2000 for environmental compliance and restoration of Coast Guard facilities, $99,000 shall be available to reimburse the owner of the former Coast Guard lighthouse facility at Cape May, New Jersey, for costs incurred for clean-up of lead contaminated soil at that facility.

SEC. 203. CLARIFICATION OF COAST GUARD AUTHORITY TO CONTROL VESSELS IN TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Ports and Waterways Safety Act (33 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 15. ENTRY OF VESSELS INTO TERRITORIAL SEA; DIRECTION OF VESSELS BY COAST GUARD.

''(a) NOTIFICATION OF COAST GUARD.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, a commercial vessel entering the territorial sea of the United States shall notify the Secretary not later than 24 hours before that entry and provide the following information:

''(1) The name of the vessel.

''(2) The port or place of destination in the United States.

''(3) The time of entry into the territorial sea.

''(4) Any information requested by the Secretary to demonstrate compliance with applicable international agreements to which the United States is a party.

''(5) If the vessel is carrying dangerous cargo, a description of that cargo.

''(6) A description of any hazardous conditions on the vessel.

''(7) Any other information requested by the Secretary.

''(b) DENIAL OF ENTRY.—The Secretary may deny entry of a vessel into the territorial sea of the United States if—

''(1) the Secretary has not received notification for the vessel in accordance with subsection (a); or

''(2) the vessel is not in compliance with any other applicable law relating to marine safety, security, or environmental protection.

''(c) DIRECTION OF VESSEL.—The Secretary may direct the operation of any vessel in the navigable waters of the United States as necessary during hazardous circumstances, including the absence of a pilot required by State or Federal law, weather, casualty, vessel traffic, or the poor condition of the vessel.''.

SEC. 204. COAST GUARD SEARCH AND RESCUE FOR LAKE MICHIGAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary of Transportation—

(A) shall continue to operate and maintain the seasonal Coast Guard air search and rescue facility located in Muskegon, Michigan, until at least September 30, 2001; and

(B) shall establish a new seasonal Coast Guard air search and rescue facility for Southern Lake Michigan to serve the Chicago metropolitan area and the surrounding environment, and operate that facility until at least September 30, 2001.

In establishing the facility under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall study Illinois sites in the Chicago metropolitan area, including Waukegan, Illinois.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to the other amounts authorized by this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation—

(A) for operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard air search and rescue facility in Muskegon, Michigan—

(i) $3,252,000 for fiscal year 2000; and

(ii) $3,252,000 for fiscal year 2001;

(B) for acquisition, construction, and improvement of facilities and equipment for the Coast Guard air search and rescue facility for Southern Lake Michigan established under paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) $8,100,000 for fiscal year 2000; and

(ii) $13,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and

(C) for operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard air search and rescue facility for Southern Lake Michigan established under paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) $5,505,000 for fiscal year 2000; and

(ii) $4,060,000 for fiscal year 2001.

(3) LIMITATION ON CLOSING OR DOWNSIZING OTHER FACILITIES.—The Secretary of Transportation may not close or downsize any Coast Guard facility for the purpose of accommodating the capability required pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) STUDY OF SEARCH AND RESCUE CAPABILITIES FOR LAKE MICHIGAN.—Not later that 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall study, determine, and report to the Congress the overall aircraft and vessel search and rescue capability for Lake Michigan, including—

(1) the capability of all Federal, State, and local government and nongovernment entities that perform search and rescue functions for Lake Michigan; and

(2) the adequacy of that overall capability.

(c) PLAN FOR SEARCH AND RESCUE RESPONSE FOR CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall prepare, submit to the Congress, and begin implementing a comprehensive plan for aircraft and vessel search and rescue response for Lake Michigan in the vicinity of Chicago, Illinois.

(d) USE OF HELICOPTERS FOR DRUG INTERDICTION.—During the portion of each year when the seasonal facilities required under subsection (a)(1) are not in operation, the Secretary of Transportation shall use helicopters assigned to those facilities for drug interdiction.

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?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILCHREST

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILCHREST:

At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. . VESSEL COASTAL VENTURE.

Section 1120(g) of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–324; 110 Stat. 3978) is amended by inserting ''COASTAL VENTURE (United States official number 971086),'' after ''vessels''.

SEC. . VESSEL PRIDE OF MANY.

Notwithstanding section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 App. U.S.C. 883), section 8 of the Act of June 19, 1886 (46 App. U.S.C. 289), and section 12106 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel PRIDE OF MANY (Canadian official number 811529).

SEC. . PROHIBITION OF NEW MARITIME USER FEES.

Section 2110(k) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking the last sentence.

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING OIL SPILL RESPONSE ACTIONS.

It is the sense of the Congress that to ensure that liability concerns regarding response actions to remove a discharge of oil or a hazardous substance, or to mitigate or prevent the threat of such a discharge, do not deter an expeditious or effective response, the President should promulgate guidelines as soon as possible under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 and other applicable Federal laws clarifying that a person who is not a responsible party (as that term is used in that Act) and who takes any response action consistent with the National Contingency Plan (including the applicable fish and wildlife response plan) or as otherwise directed by the President to prevent or mitigate the environmental effects of such a discharge or a threat of such a discharge should not be held liable for the violation of fish

and wildlife laws unless the person is grossly negligent or engages in a willful misconduct.

Mr. GILCHREST (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHREST. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, we have examined this amendment, and we are prepared to accept it on our side.

Mr. DEFAZIO. We would be happy to accept the gentleman's amendment. We have no problem.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for agreeing to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PICKETT

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PICKETT:

At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. . VESSEL NORFOLK.

Notwithstanding section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 App. U.S.C. 883) and section 12106 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation with a coastwise endorsement for the vessel NORFOLK (United States official number 1077852) before January 1, 2001, if—

(1) before that date the vessel undergoes a major conversion (as defined in section 2101 of title 46, United States Code) in a shipyard located in the United States; and

(2) the cost of the major conversion is more than three times the amount the owner of the vessel paid to purchase the vessel.

Mr. PICKETT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, we have examined this amendment and we are prepared to accept it on our side.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Likewise on our side, Mr. Chairman. We have no reservations.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would provide Jones Act status to a vessel that is U.S.-built, U.S.-owned, and U.S.-flagged, but which is not eligible for the coastwise trade of the United States because at one time it was flagged foreign.

Simply stated, my amendment would provide a Jones Act waiver for the tug "Norfolk" before January 1, 2001 only if before that date the vessel undergoes a major conversion in a shipyard located in the United States and the cost of this major conversion is more than three times the amount the owner of the vessel paid to purchase the vessel. I emphasize again that the vessel is U.S.-built, U.S.-owned, and U.S.-flagged.

I offer the amendment on behalf of Bay Gulf Trading Company, a locally owned Virginia corporation with its headquarters and principal place of business in Norfolk, Virginia. Jerry McDonald, a former U.S. Navy captain, is the chairman of the company. Bay Gulf is wholly owned by U.S. citizens. It is a small business that owns and operates 8 tugs and 10 tanker barges, and employs about 75 persons.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1920 provides that a U.S. vessel once sold foreign or placed under foreign registry cannot engage in U.S. coastwise trade. Only by special legislation can such a vessel built in the United States, flagged foreign, and reflagged in the United States be documented by the coast guard with a coastwise trade endorsement.

The *Norfolk*—built in 1975 at Mangone Shipyard, Houston, Texas—subsequently it was Norwegian flagged and American Bureau of Shipping classed until 1994. During the early 1990's it was sold and reflagged in Italy. In late 1995, the vessel experienced an extensive fire off the coast of Italy. Much of the interior spaces above the main deck were gutted. It was sold "as is" to a company in Ontario, and was towed from Italy to Canada. Repairs were never completed.

Bay Gulf acquired the vessel in December 1998. The tug was the only American built large tug available anywhere in North America. Bay Gulf proposes to use the tug for anchor handling, coastal/ocean towing, and salvage duties. The necessary repair work—estimated cost of $3 million—will be done in the Norfolk area by Norfolk shipyards and contractors. The work is estimated to cost $3 million, which is more than three times the amount the owner of the vessel paid for the purchase of the tug.

Mr. Chairman, existing U.S. law—the Wrecked Vessels Act of 1994—permits the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with a coastwise endorsement for any foreign-built vessel wrecked on the coasts of the United States when purchased by a citizen of the United States and thereupon repaired in a shipyard in the United States if the repairs are equal to three times the appraised salved value of the vessel. My amendment applies this standard in the case of the *Norfolk*, which is a U.S.-built vessel. So, I would argue that this amendment is eminently fair.

There is clearly no surplus of large anchor handling vessels in the U.S. coastwise trade. Based upon the best information that I can obtain, only one U.S. flagged, coastwise certified 8000 horsepower tug is available on the market, and it is not an anchor handling tug.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PICKETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOBIONDO

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOBIONDO:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. . DRUG INTERDICTION.

(a) VESSEL SHORE FACILITIES.—In addition to amounts otherwise authorized by this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 for the acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of shore facilities for Coast Guard vessels used for drug interdiction operations.

(b) ACQUISITION OF COASTAL PATROL CRAFT.—If the Department of Defense does not offer, by not later than September 30, 1999, seven PC–170 coastal patrol craft for the use of the Coast Guard pursuant to section 812(c) of the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act (title VIII of division C of Public Law 105–277), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation, in addition to amounts otherwise authorized by this Act, up to $210,000,000 for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the acquisition of up to six PC–170 coastal patrol craft, or the most recent upgrade of the PC–170 coastal patrol craft, for use by the Coast Guard.

Mr. LOBIONDO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very straightforward. It allows the Coast Guard to purchase six PC–170 coastal patrol boats, adding funding to the Coast Guard budget already approved by the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard's ability to effect drug interdiction is tied to this amendment. The Coast Guard with this amendment will bring six fast, highly maneuverable vessels to the front lines of the drug war in roughly 1 year's time. With the intensity that we hear of drugs coming into this country, Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity for my colleagues to be able to do something about it. We all want to talk, every Member of Congress, about how tough we are on drugs. We all talk about how the Coast Guard is the front line of drug interdiction. We all talk about how important it is to give them the resources. Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity to give the Coast Guard the resources they need.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and I also want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) and all the members of the committee for their help with this particular amendment. I urge full support of the amendment.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOBIONDO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the distinguished vice chairman of the subcommittee, we have examined this and we strongly support this amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we support the amendment. We do not want to see the

Coast Guard trying to perform this difficult and dangerous mission with equipment that is not suitable. This is the right equipment for this mission. We are supportive of the amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOBIONDO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, for far too long we have fought the war on drugs as if it were a short-term conflict. It is not. It is a long-haul conflict. We must make a 20-year commitment to drug interdiction operations. This amendment will help us do that. We support the amendment on this side.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for his support.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 113, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UPTON: at the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. . GREAT LAKES LIGHTHOUSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Great Lakes are home to more than 400 lighthouses. 120 of these maritime landmarks are in the State of Michigan, more than in any other State.

(2) Lighthouses are an important part of Great Lakes culture and stand as a testament to the importance of shipping in the region's political, economic, and social history.

(3) Advances in navigation technology have made many Great Lakes lighthouses obsolete. In Michigan alone, approximately 70 lighthouses will be designated as surplus property of the Federal Government and will be transferred to the General Services Administration for disposal.

(4) Unfortunately, the Federal property disposal process is confusing, complicated, and not well-suited to disposal of historic lighthouses or to facilitate transfers to nonprofit organizations. This is especially troubling because, in many cases, local nonprofit historical organizations have dedicated tremendous resources to preserving and maintaining Great Lakes lighthouses.

(5) If Great Lakes lighthouses disappear, the public will be unaware of an important chapter in Great Lakes history.

(6) The National Trust for Historic Preservation has placed Michigan lighthouses on their list of Most Endangered Historic Places.

(b) ASSISTANCE FOR GREAT LAKES LIGHTHOUSE PRESERVATION EFFORTS.—The Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Coast Guard, shall—

(1) continue to offer advice and technical assistance to organizations in the Great Lakes region that are dedicated to lighthouse stewardship; and

(2) promptly release information regarding the timing of designations of Coast Guard lighthouses on the Great Lakes as surplus property, to enable those organizations to mobilize and be prepared to take appropriate action with respect to the disposal of those properties by the Federal Government.

Mr. UPTON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise first to thank my kind colleagues the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the full committee; the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) who has been very understanding as we have worked through this language; the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), always a friend of the Coast Guard; and also my Great Lakes colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) in particular; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) and others that I conferred with before I offered this amendment this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in offering this amendment to protect Great Lakes lighthouses. As I am sure the chairman is aware, lighthouses are a very important part of Great Lakes culture and they stand as a testament to the importance of shipping in the region's political, economic and social history.

In Michigan alone, the U.S. Coast Guard plans to designate approximately 70 of these structures as surplus Federal property and turn them over to the GSA for disposal. Unfortunately, the standard Federal property disposal process is very confusing, complicated, and it does not facilitate transfers to nonprofits. This is especially troubling because in many cases, a local, not-for-profit historical organization has dedicated tremendous resources to preserving and maintaining those lighthouses.

In the city of South Haven, Michigan, this very situation occurred only last year. For years, the Coast Guard leased an historical lighthouse keeper's dwelling to the Michigan Maritime Museum that was going to be used as a curatorial center for maritime artifacts. The property was taken away from the museum, turned over to the GSA for disposal and after many months the GSA offered to sell the property back to the museum for $300,000. My colleagues have to be aware that they will be seeing this type of situation again and again as the Coast Guard hands these properties to the GSA for disposal.

Fortunately, a group of Michigan historical preservation leaders have formed a group known now today as the Michigan Lighthouse Project which is dedicated to lighthouse preservation and maintenance. I am glad to report that the Coast Guard has been working hand in hand with the Michigan Lighthouse Project and I applaud their current cooperation and encouragement for their continued involvement.

This amendment states that the Coast Guard shall continue to offer advice and technical assistance to organizations in the Great Lakes region which are dedicated to lighthouse stewardship. Specifically the Coast Guard is urged to promptly release information related to the timing of when a property is going to be excessed by the GSA. That is needed so that organizations can mobilize and be prepared to take action.

Mr. Chairman, I wish that this amendment might be able to go further, but I know that we are going to have some discussions when this bill goes to conference. It is my hope that this body will accept this amendment so that not only the Coast Guard but GSA and other Federal agencies will create a fairer and equitable Federal disposal process that in fact recognizes the historic nature of lighthouses and their wonderful contribution to Great Lakes history.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, we have examined this and we are pleased to accept this amendment on our side.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. Lighthouses are a matter of particular interest and importance to this Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The very first public works authorized by the very first Congress was done by the predecessor of our today Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure when that Rivers and Harbors Committee authorized the Fort Henry Lighthouse in 1790. Lighthouses have been a critical part of our navigation system in America not only for waterborne navigation but also from the mid 1920s to the mid 1930s, the Lighthouse Service provided the first navigational guide, aids to aviation navigation on land for airborne transportation.

□ 1430

It was the first nighttime guidance system provided by the lighthouse service to aviation.

For those and for so many other reasons lighthouses have such a fascination for the American public, a point of nostalgia. They are national treasures. They are linked to our maritime heritage. They are landmarks for travel and tourism, and where abandoned and replaced by our modern aids to navigation, lighthouses serve a multitude of purposes including benefits to local economy.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The time of the gentleman

from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) has expired.

(On request of Mr. OBERSTAR, and by unanimous consent, Mr. UPTON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, in my own congressional district the City of Two Harbors lighthouse along the north shore of Lake Superior in the Coast Guard Authorization Act last year was conveyed to the local Two Harbors and Lake County Historical Society which will be responsible for the upkeep of the facility while the Coast Guard maintains the light itself, and soon we are going to have a major bicycling event along the north shore from Duluth to another historic landmark, the Split Rock Lighthouse when we, hopefully this summer, convene the Split Rock century, arrived from Duluth to Split Rock and back.

Lighthouses serve many, many purposes. The gentleman's amendment will give the Coast Guard the authority it needs to further the conveyance of lighthouses to non-profit organizations that will have the resources, and the will and the desire to preserve these national treasures, and I compliment the gentleman from Michigan on this amendment.

Mr. UPTON. Just to finish up my time, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's support. I know that it has been there from the very onset, and we worked in a very strong bipartisan basis to make sure this was done, and as I live along the Great Lakes in St. Joseph, Michigan, and I think about all the harbors all the way up to Mackinaw and Lake Superior, these are needed, they are very precious, and this amendment, I think, will really help to preserve those in the future.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. UPTON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. UPTON. But as I think about all these lighthouses in so many different ports throughout the Great Lakes, Mr. Chairman, they are something that needs to be preserved, and we think about, too, the safety of all those boaters. Whether one sails across Lake Michigan at night, or Lake Superior, Lake Erie, Lake Huron, they are important, and they stand as a beacon for every community in terms of historical significance, and I appreciate the gentleman's support and also that of my Michigan colleagues that were instrumental in getting this amendment adopted.

Mr. Chairman, again I appreciate the help of the full committee here in helping me prepare the amendment and the time this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6(f) of rule XVIII, the recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), if ordered, will be a 5-minute vote.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SHUSTER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding we are rolling votes, and I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) wants to move to strike the last word. Are we not rolling votes now?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair was not aware of additional debate. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania may strike the last word.

Mr. SHUSTER. Except the gentleman wants to move to strike the last word I believe.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes prior to conducting the recorded vote.

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I want to stand in support of this legislation particularly because the managers saw fit to include a provision of mine which exempts the vessel, *The Pride Of Many*, from Section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. It is popularly referred to as the Jones Act. As my colleagues know, the Jones Act prevents all foreign-built vessels from participating in domestic, coastal and intercostal trade.

In 1975 the Youth Services Agency of Pennsylvania was established. This is a not-for-profit agency, and it runs four alternative community-based high schools for at-risk youth. The students who are referred to the agency either by their home high school after having established a pattern of negative behavior or by court order. The mission of the agency is to expose at-risk youth to a variety of activities and opportunities in an effort to help these students overcome social and/or personal hindrances so that they can achieve their full emotional, physical, intellectual and spiritual potential.

In an effort to provide the 500 students in this program with a sense of accomplishment, self worth and the need for self-discipline, they are being taught how to man a Canadian-manufactured tall ship similar to the famous *Niña, Pinta* and the *Santa María* which they christened *The Pride Of Many*.

Additionally, the vessel will assist in the youths' involvement in port-to-port community service activities. Not only will the nearby communities benefit from their efforts, but it will also contribute to the youths' realization of the importance of community.

In order to assure that the goals of the Youth Services Agency of Pennsylvania are realized, *The Pride Of Many* needs to be allowed to participate in commercial activities that will offset the expense of the vessel.

Mr. Chairman, the Youth Service Agency of Pennsylvania has already provided many tangible benefits for the local community and its students, and I know that *The Pride Of Many* will help continue their effort of good work. I ask all Members of the House join with me in support of this legislation.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) on which a recorded vote was ordered.

This will be a 15-minute vote and will be followed by a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 428, noes 0, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

AYES—428

Abercrombie	Cardin	Ewing
Ackerman	Carson	Farr
Aderholt	Castle	Fattah
Allen	Chabot	Filner
Andrews	Chambliss	Fletcher
Archer	Chenoweth	Foley
Armey	Clay	Forbes
Bachus	Clayton	Ford
Baird	Clement	Fossella
Baker	Clyburn	Fowler
Baldacci	Coble	Frank (MA)
Baldwin	Coburn	Franks (NJ)
Ballenger	Collins	Frelinghuysen
Barcia	Combest	Frost
Barr	Condit	Gallegly
Barrett (NE)	Conyers	Ganske
Barrett (WI)	Cook	Gejdenson
Bartlett	Cooksey	Gekas
Barton	Costello	Gephardt
Bass	Cox	Gibbons
Bateman	Coyne	Gilchrest
Becerra	Cramer	Gillmor
Bentsen	Crane	Gilman
Bereuter	Crowley	Gonzalez
Berkley	Cubin	Goode
Berman	Cummings	Goodlatte
Berry	Cunningham	Goodling
Biggert	Danner	Gordon
Bilbray	Davis (FL)	Goss
Bilirakis	Davis (IL)	Graham
Bishop	Davis (VA)	Granger
Blagojevich	Deal	Green (TX)
Bliley	DeFazio	Green (WI)
Blumenauer	DeGette	Greenwood
Blunt	Delahunt	Gutierrez
Boehlert	DeLauro	Gutknecht
Boehner	DeLay	Hall (OH)
Bonilla	DeMint	Hall (TX)
Bonior	Deutsch	Hansen
Bono	Diaz-Balart	Hastings (FL)
Borski	Dickey	Hastings (WA)
Boswell	Dicks	Hayes
Boucher	Dingell	Hayworth
Boyd	Dixon	Hefley
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Herger
Brady (TX)	Dooley	Hill (IN)
Brown (CA)	Doolittle	Hill (MT)
Brown (FL)	Doyle	Hilleary
Brown (OH)	Dreier	Hilliard
Bryant	Duncan	Hinchey
Burr	Dunn	Hinojosa
Burton	Edwards	Hobson
Buyer	Ehlers	Hoeffel
Callahan	Ehrlich	Hoekstra
Calvert	Emerson	Holden
Camp	Engel	Holt
Campbell	English	Hooley
Canady	Eshoo	Horn
Cannon	Etheridge	Hostettler
Capps	Evans	Houghton
Capuano	Everett	Hoyer

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

NOT VOTING—5

Hyde
Largent
Myrick
Pitts
Whitfield

□ 1455

So, the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOBIONDO

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 4, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

AYES—424

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—4

Paul
Royce
Sanford
Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—5

Houghton
Largent
Myrick
Pitts
Whitfield

□ 1507

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. HEFLEY, 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. 820) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 113, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for a recorded vote on the question of passage of H.R. 975.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 7, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

AYES—424

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—7

Chenoweth
Doolittle
Paul
Pombo
Royce
Sanford
Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—2

Myrick
Pitts

□ 1525

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 820, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 820, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 820, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section number, and cross-referencing.

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

There was no objection.

REDUCING VOLUME OF STEEL IMPORTS AND ESTABLISHING STEEL IMPORT NOTIFICATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of the passage of the bill, H.R. 975, 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 289, nays 141, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—289

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Chenoweth
Clay

Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefley
Hill (IN)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
LaTourette
Lazio
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—141

Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Burr
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Eshoo
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Green (WI)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hoekstra
Houghton
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Latham
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lofgren
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nethercutt
Northup
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pickering
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reynolds
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Spence
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Upton
Walden
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf

NOT VOTING—3

Myrick
Pitts
Vento

□ 1534

Mr. HAYWORTH changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for Roll Call Vote No. 56 on March 17, 1999. Had I been present for this vote on H.R. 975, the Steel Recovery Act, I would have voted ''yes.''

CONGRATULATIONS TO AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SPORTS MEDICINE ON NEW HEADQUARTERS IN INDIANAPOLIS

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

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the American College of Sports Medicine on the completion of a vast new addition to its headquarters building in Indianapolis.

In the early 1980s, Indianapolis' corporate leaders and city officials advanced a visionary plan to make the city the amateur sports capital of the Nation.

We have had immense support from the corporate community in Indianapolis. On December 15, 1983, Mayor William Hudnut broke ground for the ACSM National Center, which has become one of the anchor projects of the Canal area redevelopment. He referred to it as ''A cornerstone in the Amateur Sports Capital.''

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the American College of Sports Medicine on the completion of a vast new addition so that it would be able to advance the immense amount of work that it has done in terms of sports medicine.

The new wing will accommodate a videoconferencing center and more office space for the growing staff at the national headquarters of the world's premier sports medicine and exercise science organization.

The ACSM is a worldwide leader in the advancement of sports medicine, exercise science, physical activity, and health. The ACSM works closely with diverse organizations, including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the American Heart Association, and the Department of Health and Human Services. The ACSM is an association of people and professions sharing a commitment to explore the use of medicine and exercise to make life healthier for all Americans. ACSM is an organization founded in 1954 and committed to the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of sports-related injuries and to the promotion of physical activity. ACSM's mission is to promote and integrate scientific research, education, and practical applications of sports medicine and exercise science to maintain and enhance physical performance, fitness, health, and quality of life.

ACSM is the largest sports medicine and exercise science association in the world. Its more than 17,500 members worldwide work in a variety of medical specialties, allied health professions, and scientific disciplines. College members are divided into the following three categories: medicine, basic and applied science, and education and allied health.

The ACSM Board of Trustees was approached with a proposal to relocate its National Center from Madison, Wisconsin to Indianapolis. The Trustees agreed to move the American College of Sports Medicine to Indianapolis, lending the organization's considerable prestige to the city's growing reputation as the home of amateur sports in the United States.

In October of 1984, the building was ready for occupancy, thanks to major contributions from Lilly Endowment, Krannert Charitable Trust, City of Indianapolis, William B. Stokely Jr. Foundation, Eli Lilly Company Foundation, The Quaker Oats Company, and Nautilus, along with those from generous ACSM members.

In 1998, the College broke ground for a much-needed expansion to its Canal headquarters, dramatically increasing its programs and activities. The expansion, finished in January 1999, now houses a state-of-the-art videoconferencing center and several other amenities that support its worldwide reputation as the ''gold standard'' for sports medicine and exercise science. A 35-person staff and $6 million budget round out its Indianapolis presence.

ACSM's important work and innovations have improved the quality of life for Hoosiers and all Americans. I congratulate the organization on all of its accomplishments and for the significant contributions it continues to make to the Indianapolis community.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). 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.

SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 99, CONDEMNING LACK OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN CUBA

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. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on International Relations at this time is marking up a very important resolution condemning the Cuban government, the dictator Castro, for its latest and ongoing Stalinist crackdown against the internal opposition and the independent press.

Among the scores and scores and scores of well-known dissidents and independent press members who have been arrested in recent weeks are the most distinguished members of the internal opposition in Cuba, and the four best known and also very distinguished members of the internal opposition, Felix Bonne Carcasses, Marta Beatriz Roque Cabello, Vladimioro Roca Antunez, and Rene Gomez Manzano. These individuals were tried in a farcical and secret proceeding on March 1, and only a few days ago, this week in fact, Castro announced the sentences: 5 and 4 and 3½ year sentences for those dissidents.

Now, the internal opposition is working intensely and valiantly in Cuba to draw international attention to Castro's deplorable human rights violations and continues to strengthen and grow in its opposition to the dictatorship. At this time of great repression, it is indeed proper and necessary that the international community, as this Congress is doing at this time and will do next week, demonstrates its firm and unwavering support and solidarity with the internal opposition and the independent press.

What is remarkable and unexplainable and condemnable is that while, correctly so, even many of Castro's best commercial allies, such as Canada and the European Union and Latin American states, have rightfully condemned Castro's recent crackdown, and the government of Spain is reevaluating its decision to send the king of Spain there in the next weeks, and the members of the Ibero-American Summit are reevaluating their decision to go to the summit in Havana later on this year, while all that is taking place based on this crackdown by the Cuban dictator, what is the Clinton-Gore administration doing?

The Clinton-Gore administration has reiterated its intent to send the Baltimore Orioles to Cuba. I know that is unbelievable at this stage as well as in ultimate bad taste. I would say it demonstrates a perfidious bad faith. Because while the Clinton-Gore team says that it is a people-to-people exchange, the Baltimore Orioles will be going to Cuba to a stadium filled by Castro's people. Castro will decide who gets to go to the stadium, Castro will be at the stadium, and he will receive the public relations banquets that will be provided to him by virtue of the fact of this diplomatic gesture of the Clinton-Gore administration.

So I call upon the Clinton-Gore administration to stop its hypocrisy. If the administration is going to condemn the crackdown, condemn the crackdown. They should not say they are going to condemn the crackdown and then say they are sending the Baltimore Orioles, which is what they are doing. So I denounce that as hypocritical, and I denounce that as unconscionable.

At this time, more than ever, the Cuban people deserve and merit and require the unwavering support of the international community, including the government of the United States. I call upon this government to act in a way consistent with its moral and legal obligations to stop its hypocrisy; to cancel this game of Mr. Angelos and the other supercapitalists who want to go and do business with the apartheid economy of Castro, and to say that this is not the time, while the dictatorship is in its last gasps, to be sending little baseball games for the pleasure, entertainment and publicity feast of a moribund dictatorship.

So if there is any dignity left in that White House, I say cancel the Orioles' little game and be consistent with the ethical and constitutional and legal requirements of the moment and stand with a people who have suffered for 40 years and are deserving of the same democracy and self-determination and human rights that has spread throughout the rest of the hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, It is a privilege for me to join my distinguished colleague ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN in sponsoring this important and timely resolution along with its other distinguished sponsors from both sides of the isle.

The Cuban dictatorship's repressive crackdown against the brave internal opposition and the independent press must be condemned in the strongest possible terms. The internal opposition and independent press of Cuba have our profound admiration and firm solidarity.

This resolution by the United States House of Representatives condemns Castro's stalinist crackdown on the brave internal opposition and the independent press, and demands of the Cuban dictatorship, as the entire international community *must,* the release of all political prisoners, the legalization of all political parties, labor unions and the press, and the scheduling of free and fair, internationally supervised elections.

Martin Luther King rightfully declared that an injustice anywhere constitutes an affront to justice everywhere. Now more than ever it is incumbent upon the entire international community, as the U.S. House of Representatives is hereby doing, to demonstrate its firm solidarity with the oppressed people of Cuba and with the brave Cuban internal opposition and the independent press.

□ 1545

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, last week the House narrowly passed a watered-down House concurrent resolution originally designed to endorse President Clinton's plan to send U.S. troops to Kosovo. A House concurrent resolution, whether strong or weak, has no effect of law. It is merely a sense of Congress statement.

If last week's meager debate and vote are construed as merely an endorsement, without dissent, of Clinton's policy in Yugoslavia, the procedure will prove a net negative. It will not be seen as a Congressional challenge to unconstitutional presidential war power. If, however, the debate is interpreted as a serious effort to start the process to restore Congressional prerogatives, it may yet be seen as a small step in the right direction. We cannot know with certainty which it will be. That will depend on what Congress does in the future.

Presently, those of us who argued for Congressional responsibility with regards to declaring war and deploying troops cannot be satisfied that the trend of the last 50 years has been reversed. Since World War II, the war power has fallen into the hands of our presidents, with Congress doing little to insist on its own constitutional responsibility. From Korea and Vietnam, to Bosnia and Kosovo, we have permitted our presidents to ''wag the Congress,'' generating a perception that the United States can and should police the world. Instead of authority to move troops and fight wars coming from the people through a vote of their Congressional representatives, we now permit our presidents to cite NATO declarations and U.N. resolutions.

This is even more exasperating knowing that upon joining both NATO and the United Nations it was made explicitly clear that no loss of sovereignty would occur and all legislative bodies of member States would retain their legal authority to give or deny support for any proposed military action.

Today it is erroneously taken for granted that the President has authority to move troops and fight wars without Congressional approval. It would be nice to believe that this vote on Kosovo was a serious step in the direction of Congress once again reasserting its responsibility for committing U.S. troops abroad. But the President has already notified Congress that, regardless of our sense of Congress resolution, he intends to do what he thinks is right, not what is legal and constitutional, only what he decides for himself.

Even with this watered-down endorsement of troop deployment with various conditions listed, the day after the headlines blared ''the Congress approves troop deployments to Kosovo.''

If Congress is serious about this issue, it must do more. First, Congress cannot in this instance exert its responsibility through a House concurrent resolution. The President can and

will ignore this token effort. If Congress decides that we should not become engaged in the civil war in Serbia, we must deny the funds for that purpose. That we can do. Our presidents have assumed the war power, but as of yet Congress still controls the purse.

Any effort on our part to enter a civil war in a country 5,000 miles away for the purpose of guaranteeing autonomy and/or a separate state against the avowed objections of the leaders of that country involved, that is Yugoslavia, can and will lead to a long-term serious problem for us.

Our policy, whether it is with Iraq or Serbia, of demanding that if certain actions are not forthcoming, we will unleash massive bombing attacks on them, I find reprehensible, immoral, illegal, and unconstitutional. We are seen as a world bully, and a growing anti-American hatred is the result. This policy cannot contribute to long-term peace. Political instability will result and innocent people will suffer. The billions we have spent bombing Iraq, along with sanctions, have solidified Saddam Hussein's power, while causing the suffering and deaths of hundreds of thousands of innocent Iraqi children. Our policy in Kosovo will be no more fruitful.

The recent flare-up of violence in Serbia has been blamed on United States' plan to send troops to the region. The Serbs have expressed rage at the possibility that NATO would invade their country with the plan to reward the questionable Kosovo Liberation Army. If ever a case could be made for the wisdom of non-intervention, it is here. Who wants to defend all that the KLA had done and at the same time justify a NATO invasion of a sovereign nation for the purpose of supporting secession? ''This violence is all America's fault,'' one Yugoslavian was quoted as saying. And who wants to defend Milosevic?

Every argument given for our bombing Serbia could be used to support the establishment of Kurdistan. Actually a stronger case can be made to support an independent Kurdistan since their country was taken from them by outsiders. But how would Turkey feel about that? Yet the case could be made that the mistreatment of the Kurds by Saddam Hussein and others compel us to do something to help, since we are pretending that our role is an act as the world's humanitarian policeman.

Humanitarianism, delivered by a powerful government through threats of massive bombing attacks will never be a responsible way to enhance peace. It will surely have the opposite effect.

It was hoped that the War Powers Resolution of 1973 would reign in our president's authority to wage war without Congressional approval. It has not happened because all subsequent Presidents have essentially ignored its mandates. And unfortunately the interpretation since 1973 has been to give the President greater power to wage war with Congressional approval for at least 60 to 90 days as long as he reports to the Congress. These reports are rarely made and the assumption has been since 1973 that Congress need not participate in any serious manner in the decision to send troops.

It could be argued that this resulted from a confused understanding of the War Powers Resolution but more likely it's the result of the growing imperial Presidency that has developed with our presidents assuming power, not legally theirs, and Congress doing nothing about it.

Power has been gravitating into the hands of our presidents throughout this century, both in domestic and foreign affairs. Congress has created a maze of federal agencies, placed under the President, that have been granted legislative, police, and judicial powers, thus creating an entire administrative judicial system outside our legal court system where constitutional rights are ignored. Congress is responsible for this trend and it's Congress' responsibility to restore Constitutional government.

As more and more power has been granted in international affairs, presidents have readily adapted to using Executive Orders, promises and quasi-treaties to expand the scope and size of the presidency far above anything even the Federalist ever dreamed of.

We are at a crossroads and if the people and the Congress do not soon insist on the reigning in of presidential power, both foreign and domestic, individual liberty cannot be preserved.

Presently, unless the people exert a lot more pressure on the Congress to do so, not much will be done. Specifically, Congress needs a strong message from the people insisting that the Congress continues the debate over Kosovo before an irreversible quagmire develops. The President today believes he is free to pursue any policy he wants in the Balkans and the Persian Gulf without Congressional approval. It shouldn't be that way. It's dangerous politically, military, morally, and above all else undermines our entire system of the rule of law.

UNTIMELY DEATH OF HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL STAR, JOHN STEWART

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

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support and sympathy for the family of John Stewart, a young Indianapolis man who promised to bring glory to the game of basketball. Unfortunately and most tragically, last Friday night he collapsed at a basketball game and died from an undetected enlarged heart.

John Stewart just turned 18 years old, was an amazing young man gifted with enormous natural talent and he used those talents to the fullest. He was very friendly, had a good sense of humor. He was loved by both students and teachers at Lawrence North High School. He measured a full 7 feet tall and tipped the scales at nearly 300 pounds.

From 1995 to 1997, John was a ball boy for the Indiana Pacers. The Pacers continued to provide John Stewart with shoes even after his days with the team because his feet were so large his family had a hard time finding shoes that would fit him. It was reminiscent of Shaquille O'Neal, who had given his shoes to a young man not because they could not afford to buy size 16–17 shoes but because in the marketplace those sizes were very difficult to locate. John Stewart had led Lawrence North 24 to 2, with 22 points and 13 rebounds. The third-quarter numbers were 10 points and 7 rebounds.

The case of John Stewart reminds us how imperative it is to understand before kids enter the world of athletics, especially something as strenuous as basketball, that they have to have a thorough heart evaluation to forego a cardiac condition called hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. It is a disease of the heart that has some genetic tendencies. It causes a very enlarged heart. The normal treatment for that, of course, is to avoid strenuous physical activity.

John Stewart was second-ranked Lawrence North's star center. He collapsed Friday during the Wildcats' Class 4A regional championship game with Bloomington South at Columbus. Unfortunately, he never regained consciousness. He had also been awarded a scholarship to attend the University of Kentucky during the next school season.

So I wanted to say on behalf of the many people who will not have an opportunity to express their support for the John Stewart family, his mother, his father, his sisters, his brothers, his aunts and his grandparents, and to all of the students who are in shock and in bereavement at Lawrence North that there is a passage of scripture that often refers to a situation like this in that ''death has no democracy, it visits anyone regardless of what their ages are.''

But it could be that John Stewart's life was cut off prematurely to alert this Congress, this country, to the need for allowing children to have thorough heart examinations before they go in. The passage of scriptures says that perhaps John may have laid down his life so that others may live.

In closing, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would simply recall for the John Stewart bereaved family at this time the words that the poet who reminds all of us, ''for every drop of rain that falls a flower grows''; and certainly John Stewart has brought in the rain where a flower will grow, and said, ''somewhere in the darkest night a candle glows.''

John Stewart's remains will be laid to rest on Friday. And unfortunately, I cannot attend the Hershey event with my colleagues because I will be attending John Stewart's going home services if you will. But he does remind me that for every drop of rain that falls a flower grows and somewhere in the darkest night that a candle glows.

I know wherever John Stewart's spirit is at this time, regardless of the pain

that his departure has left, that his candle will continue to glow through the minds and the hearts of the John Stewart family and the Lawrence North High School community.

TRADITIONAL COUNTRY FOR SIX DECADES

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

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a small radio station with a big voice which has been broadcasting for six decades in Missouri. In Warrenton, Missouri, a small but growing community, Bill and Merle Zimmerman first established KWRE–AM–73, a radio station to serve the residents of east central Missouri 50 years ago. Playing tunes by Marty Robbins, Dottie West, and Jim Reeves, KWRE Radio officially hit the air waves in 1949 and has remained true to its motto of playing traditional country music ever since.

I would like to take these few minutes, Mr. Speaker, to honor those at this humble radio station who have reached out to people in Warren County, as well as Lincoln, Montgomery, Gasconade and Franklin Counties, deep in the heartland of Missouri's Ninth Congressional District.

Now, despite the demands of running a modern station, those at KWRE have maintained traditional homegrown values as their core operating method. As such, they have proven over the last 50 years that America still wants to hear wholesome traditional values and classic country songs.

In 1962, this hometown tradition was carried on by Vern and Lillian Kasper. The Kaspers bought KWRE Radio and were able to modernize the broadcast facilities, increase the community services offered by the station, and air award-winning editorials and other public service programs.

Those responsible for maintaining KWRE's traditional country image are people like Phil Summers, who brings a vast array of characters and endless trivia tidbits to the station's morning show each weekday. His award-winning show ranks as one of the best entertainment and local news shows in east central Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to highlight the quality of KWRE's morning programming. And currently, I and other locally-elected officials are regular guests on Mike Thomas' weekday ''Livewire'' program. ''Livewire'' is actually just that, a live wire. It covers a range of topics, from local school issues to international relations and everything in between. Every other week I am honored to be a guest on the ''Livewire'' show and help inform the listeners in east central Missouri about legislative action taking place here in our Nation's Capitol and how it affects folks at home.

Overall, there are several programs on KWRE that focus primarily on news and information. The station broadcasts at least 15 daily news broadcasts to all six counties in east central Missouri.

In addition to providing top-notch newscasts, KWRE is also known for its broadcast of agricultural information. And having grown up on a family farm in Missouri, I know firsthand how important it is to have up-to-date market information and how useful it can be for local farmers and those involved in agribusiness. KWRE does this as well as any and better than most.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, KWRE also acts as the public service medium to inform its listeners about upcoming nonprofit events listed on its free bulletin board. KWRE–73 Sports is the hometown sports voice for area schools, broadcasting approximately 60 high school football and basketball games each school year. The station broadcasts a live weekly sports show, ''Instant Replay,'' aimed at keeping the fan and sportsman in-the-know.

In summary, KWRE accommodates all ages of east central Missouri's residents whether it is the annual Senior Citizens Fair and Exposition or the annual Children's Christmas Party giving away thousands of dollars in toys to area children. The canned goods given for admission are distributed to local charities in time for Christmas delivery.

In conclusion, I want to express my admiration for those who have helped to maintain the hometown tradition since 1949. I wish KWRE in Warrenton, Missouri, all the best in their 50th anniversary celebration and hope they can continue to provide such wholesome, hometown coverage for east central Missouri for decades to come.

□ 1600

SUPPORT AMERICAN FARMERS

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, as we proceed with our work on Budget 2000, I want to take this occasion to pose the following question: Are we doing everything we need to do to support our American farmers? That is a question we all need to seriously think about.

In 1998, the agriculture sector of the economy suffered through one of the worst years in American history. Drought and other weather conditions, coupled with extremely low prices, significantly affected many producers in my home State, Texas. Farm and ranch production values declined more than $2.4 billion from 1997 in Texas. The resulting loss in agribusiness income is an $8 billion blow to the State's overall economy, mostly to the small rural communities like I represent in the 15th Congressional District.

Nationally, from 1996 to 1997, net farm income dropped 6.8 percent from $53.4 billion to $49.8 billion. Economists forecast a 15.7 percent drop from $197 billion to only $42 billion in 1998. To say the least, these declines are dramatic.

While weather conditions will hopefully improve, the current price situation for crops and livestock remains bleak. Virtually every commodity has continuing low prices, with little prospect for improvement.

When the Congress passed the 1996 Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act, certain other issues were to be addressed. Those included: Passage of fast track negotiating authority, relief of government regulatory burdens, and the repeal of capital gains taxes and death taxes. In the 3 years since the passage of the FAIR Act, those promises have not been kept. I mention all of this because I feel it is important to constantly be mindful of how vital agriculture is to our country. When disasters occur, yes, action is taken to respond to them, but what we saw last year was too little, too late. That is not a philosophy to which I subscribe.

Mr. Speaker, much more needs to be done for America's farmers, and the time to do it is now, as we are now working on the budget. Let us help provide a safe and secure future for our farmers. Agriculture is a vital part of our economic fiber in our country, and the men and women who comprise America's farming community are important to our Nation's character. It is our responsibility to make sure that they survive and that they have an opportunity to prosper. Let us provide an environment in which they can.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close my remarks by tossing out two thoughts for consideration. They evidence why we absolutely need to do the right thing. In the next 30 years, the world's population will increase by 2.5 billion and the demand for food will double. Who is going to feed them? Everybody eats.

PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENTS PORTEND GREAT COST TO ANGELENOS

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wear on my lapel just above the pin signifying that this is the 106th Congress a pair of black horn-rimmed glasses representing the memory of the late great Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater. Goldwater brought a simple, plain-spoken candor to public life, and, Mr. Speaker, I think it was typified by his straightforward declaration that as an American, people should have the right to join a union but they should likewise have the right not to join a union if they so desire. And mindful of some perilous trends in public policy, I rise on this occasion this afternoon.

California is the next-door neighbor of Arizona, and the Los Angeles Unified

School District is contemplating a move that portends great cost to the citizens of Los Angeles and portends a trend that should be fought by all means at the Federal level. I speak of project labor agreements. This is what is being proposed in Los Angeles. This comes to school construction. ''The contractor recognizes the council and its affiliated unions as the exclusive bargaining representatives for the employees engaged in project work covered by this agreement.''

Mr. Speaker, in the LA Daily News on the editorial page, it is noted that ''even a school board member who often sides with the teachers union can't turn a blind eye to this outrage.'' What is outrageous? Well, quite simply this fact, Mr. Speaker: The estimates are that this plan could increase construction costs by 10 to 15 percent in the district.

Now, lest you think this is only something that Los Angelenos should be concerned about, Mr. Speaker, I would commend to your attention something this House once saw in April of 1998, the Vice President of the United States, he who last week claimed that he was the father of the Internet, he who infamously claimed 2 years ago that there was no controlling legal authority given the outrage of alleged campaign donations to the Clinton-Gore team from foreign governments including the People's Republic of China, well, this selfsame Vice President announced that the Clinton-Gore team would aggressively pursue linking Federal projects to union construction firms.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that everyone should have the right to apply to do work and if a union shop is the bidder that is accepted based on its quality of work, that is well and good. But here is the problem with union-only agreements as the Vice President promised to Boss Sweeney and others: Not only is the blatant payoff, Mr. Speaker, but in fact it will end up costing the American taxpayer across the width and breadth of our annual budget an additional $5 billion a year.

Now, mindful of the florid rhetoric and the feel-good attitude that the President brings when he steps to this podium annually to offer his State of the Union message and mindful that sadly his rhetoric does not always square to reality, I would invite the President and the Vice President and others who claim that project work, or union-only agreements, would somehow be beneficial to step up and defend spending an additional $5 billion of taxpayers money. Because, you see, Mr. Speaker, there is a better way, indeed to use the President's term, there is a third way, but that would involve truth and merit rewards.

And again I say, lest there are those who misunderstand, if it is a union shop that steps forward with the best ability to do the work, well, then God bless them and they should be awarded a contract on their merits. But to restrict or to claim that this government or indeed any other governmental entity will deal only with union shops is to circumvent freedom of choice, freedom of association and fiscal responsibility. For to paraphrase Goldwater and perhaps change his phraseology, I believe that union firms have a right to bid on a contract but I also believe that open shop firms should have that same right. And if an open shop can do the work better, then they should be selected.

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

(Mr. WISE 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 North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina 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 Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

FOREIGN OIL REVERSAL ACT OF 1999

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it was a year ago today that I rose on this House floor to raise a concern with my colleagues with what is happening in the oil patch in our country. We are in the process of losing our domestic oil industry, which I believe is to our great detriment down the road and in fact today. The domestic oil industry, those small producers, those wells that are producing 2.2 barrels per day on the average, are currently being shut down and closed in. Since 1997, a little more than a year ago, we have lost over 41,000 jobs in the United States with more than 136,000 oil wells shut down. In my State of Kansas alone, the job loss is someplace between 5 and 8,000, with a loss of revenue this year of $955 million.

If the problem we face with our economy is not great enough, it is perhaps superseded by the problems we will face strategically in the future. The U.S. dependence on foreign oil continues to rise. We had problems, those of us who are old enough to remember the early 1970s, with long lines at the gas station and the oil embargo. At that time our foreign oil imports were only 36 percent of our U.S. consumption, while today 57 percent of the oil consumed in the United States is derived outside the United States. That estimate is expected to rise to 70 percent in about 10 years. We have set the stage for significant and serious problems in defending our country and in our strategic reserves.

Mr. Speaker, this issue needs the attention of the administration, of the Department of Energy and of the President of the United States. It also could use the attention of Members of Congress. Yesterday, I introduced legislation along with several other Members of Congress, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS), and this legislation mirrors legislation introduced last week by the distinguished Mr. DOMENICI.

This bill attacks the issue of foreign dependence upon energy, and by suggesting that when 60 percent of our consumption is derived from foreign sources that the administration, the President of the United States, must begin a process to determine the extent of the problems created by our foreign dependency on oil, must report to Congress those difficulties, his assessment, and must make recommendations to Congress to what we can do to minimize our dependence on foreign oil, issues such as tax reduction, regulatory relief and conservation measures. We have also included in this bill many proposals to react to the days in which the oil and gas industry was considered highly profitable and Congress and the administration then decided to, in a sense, gouge that industry, to take away its profits. And today when western Kansas crude is priced at $8 or $9 a barrel and the costs of breaking even for that production is $16, it is time to reduce, eliminate the tax policy in this country that discourages marginal well production and discourages this industry from remaining alive and solvent.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that over the course of the next few days and over the course of the next few weeks, Congress will begin to focus on the fact that we are losing an important industry in our country but perhaps more importantly focus on the fact that we are selling short our future, our children's future, our grandchildren's future by our reliance upon oil from other countries. It is clear that we spend billions of dollars protecting our foreign supplies but next to nothing in protecting domestic production.

Perhaps as troublesome to me as anything is the idea that the so-called surplus that results in this price of oil is derived from the fact that we are importing oil from Iraq. So on one hand we are trying to contain Saddam Hussein's activities and on the other hand we are providing the financial resources for him to pursue those activities, and at the same time we are hurting our own men and women employed

in the oil and gas industry in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 1117.

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

(Mr. FOSSELLA 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. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1615

MEETING THE NEEDS OF OUR VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the veterans in my district, Congressional District 1 in the State of Nevada. I represent Las Vegas, Nevada. Let me tell my colleagues a little bit about it. I have got the fastest growing district in the United States. I have the fastest growing veterans population in the United States. There are only three States that have an increasing veterans population in this country: Florida, Arizona and the State of Nevada. A preponderance of those veterans that are moving to those three States are coming to the State of Nevada. Let me tell my colleagues what the problems are.

First, I will tell my colleagues during my campaign the veterans took me under their wing and educated me about the problems that they are facing. We developed a relationship that transcends politics, and we become very close family, we become friends, and I have come here to be an advocate on their behalf.

In the State of Nevada, in southern Nevada, we have a wonderful new veterans' clinic, we have a wonderful new hospital, we have wonderful state-of-the-art equipment, and we have a brand new cemetery.

Let me tell my colleagues what we do not have. We do not have enough doctors, and there is not enough funding to hire doctors. I have got incidents after incidents of older veterans who come to the clinic because they have medical problems and they cannot get in to see a doctor. I have one incident of a veteran that has a lump, and when he went to the veterans' clinic to have a biopsy, he was told that he could not see a doctor, he could not get that biopsy for 5 months. Nobody, nobody, should have to go through the pain and anguish of not knowing what their medical condition is, particularly a veteran who has given so much and sacrificed so much on behalf of this country.

We do not have enough nurses in Nevada. I do not have enough technicians to work that wonderful new equipment. So the medical equipment that would help these veterans sits idle because there is no one that knows how to work the equipment.

I have a wonderful new cemetery, as I stated, but let me tell my colleagues I do not have enough equipment and there is not enough personnel to bury those veterans that are dying in southern Nevada, and as our veterans population ages, as those veterans keep coming to retire in southern Nevada, what am I to tell those families that are suffering because they have just lost a loved one? Do I tell that family during their most horrible time of need that we cannot bury their loved one because we do not have enough personnel at the cemetery? We do not have enough equipment to do this last act of honor for this great veteran? I cannot in good conscience do that.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have enough money for counselors, so when I have veterans that are coming to southern Nevada that need counseling because they have got a drug abuse problem, because they are suffering from alcoholism or they are roaming the streets of southern Nevada, downtown Las Vegas, because they are homeless that we do not have enough caring in this country, we do not have enough concern for these veterans to make sure that we do not have adequate counseling and help in their time of need?

The President's flat line budget that he submitted to Congress was wholly inadequate to serve the needs of the veterans in this country. I am opposed to it, but I fear that the meager increase that we have proposed here in Congress is also inadequate to meet the needs of our veterans in this country. The $1.9 billion that has been passed by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, a committee that I sit on and am honored to serve on, will not begin to make a dent in the problems that we are suffering and we are facing in southern Nevada.

I ask all of my colleagues to join with me to vote in favor of the alternative proposal, one that is supported by all of the veterans groups across our great country, to add $3.2 billion to the President's budget so that we can finally provide the services that our veterans justly deserve, that we have a responsibility to provide and one that all Americans who owe these great veterans our lives, our liberties and our American way of life. Let us unite together and help our veterans in their hour of need.

KOSOVA KILLINGS CALLED A MASSACRE

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the House very wisely passed a resolution giving the President the authority to send U.S. troops to Kosova as a part of NATO, and at the time many of us arguing in favor of the resolution said that it was necessary for the United States to be a leader of NATO and to show that we are the leader and to have 4000 of our troops, if necessary, participate in the NATO peacekeeping force which would only be 15 percent of the total and which would in essence be a poster child for burden sharing. When I got up to the floor, as did many of my colleagues, we talked about genocide and ethnic cleansing and said that it was important for NATO to have a presence in Kosova in order to prevent ethnic cleansing.

Today in the front page of the Washington Post there is unfortunately an article which says ''Kosovo Killings Called a Massacre,'' and I just wanted to read some of the article and then ask to have the entire article put into the RECORD, but the article starts off by saying:

An independent forensic report into the killings of 40 ethnic Albanians in the Kosovo village of Racak in January has found that the victims were unarmed civilians executed in an organized massacre, some of them forced to kneel before being sprayed with bullets according to western sources familiar with the report. The findings by Finnish forensic experts set to be released Wednesday in Pristina, the Kosovo capital, contradicts claims by officials of the Serb led Yugoslav government that the dead were armed ethnic Albanian separatists or civilians accidentally caught in a cross-fire between government security forces and separatist rebels. Western officials have blamed the killings on government police.

It has been apparent for many years now, but especially during the past several months, that ethnic cleansing and genocide has been going on in Kosova, and by the way I say ''Kosova'' because that is the way 92 percent of the people who live there who are ethnic Albanians pronounce it. They pronounce it ''Kosova'' and in my estimation, if that is what the people who live there call their land, that is what I call it. We have said that ethnic cleansing and genocide has been going on, and that is why it is just so important for NATO to be there. People who say that it is not in our vital interests, I would argue that it is in our vital interests to stop genocide and also in the U.S. vital interest to prevent a larger outbreak of the war which would surely, if given a chance, suck in many neighboring countries, including the potential to suck in NATO allies of Turkey and

Greece and Bulgaria and other countries as well. And so that is why the U.S. has a vital interest.

But I wanted to come to the floor today to point out the ethnic cleansing and the genocide and to say that when the United States has the ability to help prevent these kinds of atrocities we ought to do it.

Again this is an independent panel. This is not some panel that is hired by one side or another. This is an independent panel, independent forensic report, and it is what we said all along, that these are innocent civilians, unarmed civilians, men, women and children who are being ethnically cleansed who are being killed by the Serbian led forces under Slobodan Milosevic, who in my opinion is a war criminal and should be prosecuted by the International Tribunal at the Hague.

Mr. Speaker, I place the entire article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

[From the Washington Post, March 17, 1999]

KOSOVO KILLINGS CALLED A MASSACRE—SOME VICTIMS SHOT WHILE ON THEIR KNEES

(By R. Jeffrey Smith)

ROME, March 16—An independent forensic report into the killings of 40 ethnic Albanians in the Kosovo village of Racak in January has found that the victims were unarmed civilians executed in an organized massacre, some of them forced to kneel before being sprayed with bullets, according to Western sources familiar with the report.

The findings by Finnish forensic experts, set to be released Wednesday in Pristina, the Kosovo capital, contradict claims by officials of the Serb-led Yugoslav government that the dead were armed ethnic Albanian separatists or civilians accidentally caught in a cross-fire between government security forces and separatist rebels. Western officials have blamed the killings on government police.

Because of the extreme sensitivity of the case, leaders of the European Union, which sponsored the probe, have asked the forensic team to withhold some of its most potentially inflammatory findings when its members appear at a news conference Wednesday, officials said.

The request, they say, was made out of concern that the results will further polarize the two sides in the Kosovo conflict and impede the Belgrade government's acceptance of a peace agreement for the Serbian province at talks underway in France.

One Western official said the German government, which holds the rotating chairmanship of the European Union, had ordered the Finnish team not to release a summary of its probe, which includes details about how some of the victims appeared to have died. Instead, at Bonn's request, the team agreed to release only the voluminous summaries of autopsies it helped conduct on bodies of the victims.

The killings on Jan. 15 at Racak, an ethnic Albanian village southwest of Pristina, outraged the world and became a turning point in the year-long conflict between security forces and the Kosovo Liberation Army, the main ethnic Albanian rebel group fighting for Kosovo's independence from Serbia, the dominant republic in the Yugoslav federation.

NATO leaders condemned the killings at the time and renewed their threat to carry out punitive airstrikes against Yugoslav military targets. Days later, both sides in the conflict agreed to take part in peace talks in France sponsored by the United States, Russia and four west European nations.

On Monday, ethnic Albanian negotiators pledged to sign a draft peace agreement that would provide substantial autonomy to Kosovo, while Belgrade officials have continued to object not only to the language of the proposed political settlement, but also to a provision mandating deployment of 28,000 NATO-led troops in Kosovo to enforce its terms.

The forensic team's investigation, based on an examination of evidence at the site and autopsies conducted jointly with Yugoslav government pathologists, determined that 22 of the victims were slain in a gully on the outskirts of Racak, precisely where their bodies were found on the morning of Jan. 16. The gully is so narrow that these victims could only have been shot deliberately at close range, the sources said.

Although the bodies of some other victims in the village were moved into homes or a mosque before international observers arrived, the forensic experts were able to determine where all but four of the 40 victims had died. From the pattern of the bullet wounds on their bodies and other evidence—such as their civilian clothing and possessions—the team found no reason to conclude they were killed accidentally or were members of the Kosovo Liberation Army, said the sources, who asked not to be identified.

Western officials say the team found that the angle of the bullet wounds in the victims' bodies was consistent with a scenario in which some of them were forced to kneel before being sprayed with gunfire from automatic weapons. This ''spray pattern'' finding is among the sensitive details that officials said may be withheld at Wednesday's news conference. Wounds on the bodies of some other victims evidently suggest they were shot while running away, the sources said.

On Jan. 16, U.S. special envoy William Walker, head of an international monitoring mission in Kosovo, described the killings as a massacre by government forces, and Yugoslav officials ordered him out of the country. The order was later suspended after the West threatened punitive action.

Western sources subsequently disclosed that telephone conversations between top Yugoslav and Serbian officials about the slayings showed that the officials explicitly sought to contrive an explanation for the killings that would shift blame away from security forces.

The Yugoslav government invited the Finnish forensic team to conduct the investigation at a time when many countries were demanding an inquiry by the International War Crimes Tribunal in The Hague. Yugoslavia has refused to cooperate with the tribunal or recognize the legitimacy of its mandate over matters of Yugoslav territory, so the Finns were accepted as compromise.

Officials in Belgrade, aware of the potential impact the forensic report might have on foreign sentiment about the conduct of its army and paramilitary forces, have mounted sustained propaganda campaign to cast the forensic team's conclusions in a favorable, and, according to the sources, highly misleading light.

An article in today's editions of Politika, a Belgrade newspaper connected to the government, claimed for example that the team had established that all the victims all had fired weapons before their deaths and that the bodies of all of them had been moved. The chief public prosecutor for Serbia, Dragisa Krsmanovic, alleged similarly last week that forensic tests showed the victims all had been shot from a distance. As a result, he said, government troops could not be prosecuted for their actions in Racak.

The forensic team searched but found no evidence to support these claims. On the other hand, its findings cast doubt on the assertion of some Western officials, including Walker, that the bodies has been deliberately mutilated by government troops.

Although 45 people reportedly were slain at Racak, the Finnish team was given access to only 40 bodies. The investigators learned that at least five more bodies, including those of at least two women, were removed from the area and presumably were buried in a cemetery south of Racak, along with as many as seven others who apparently were wounded during the assault and died later.

AMERICA'S FARMERS FIGHTING FOR THEIR LIVELIHOOD

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am here today because our American family farmers are suffering. While the general economy is strong, the U.S. agricultural economy continues to experience significant declines in agriculture commodity prices that began over a year ago. The price declines experienced by wheat and cattle producers over the last couple of years have expanded now to all of the feed grains, oil seed, cotton, pork and now the dairy sectors at record all-time lows. Farm income is expected to fall from $53 billion in 1996 to $43 billion next year, nearly a 20 percent decline.

Mr. Speaker, last week I met with a number of farmers just from Ohio. One left me with a letter that I would like to read tonight. It says:

DEAR MS. KAPTUR: The purpose of my Washington, D.C. trip is twofold. Not only am I here today representing Ottawa County, but as a wife and partner of an Ottawa County farmer. I am very concerned about the plight of America's farmers. I can remember as a youngster back in the late 1940s all the farmers, eight full-time farmers within just 2 miles of here who lived on our road in northwest Ohio. They had dairy cows, hogs and chickens. At the present time within that same two miles there is only one full-time farmer. Since our numbers are dwindling and the American farmer only makes up 1.8 percent of our population, the American farmer is fast becoming an endangered species.

I want to know what is going to happen to the American farmer, and does Washington and our Nation really care? With the way our grain prices are falling and our costs are increasing, how is a present-day farmer going to continue and also encourage new generations to enter the farming profession? The prices are lower now than during the 1940s.

With the combination of low prices and the loss of productive agricultural ground to urban sprawl, most farming operations will cease to exist. Where is our Nation going to obtain its food? If the United States relies in greater and greater measure on foreign countries to supply its food needs, their food checkoff day will surpass the February 9 date.

Since U.S. consumers have never gone hungry, they have no concept if they lose the American farmer, their safe food supply could diminish or be completely cut off. How long can the average American farmer afford to spend $168,000 for just one piece of equipment?

With the statistics that I am enclosing the American farmer will not be able to stay in business. Therefore agriculture will not be one of America's major industries. We are fighting for our livelihood and need yours and Congress' help.

Does anybody care? Does anybody even know?

Regards,

DEE.

She also left me with a breakdown of their family farming operation, which I will place in the RECORD, but basically what it shows is their total production cost last year was $375,000, including what they had to pay for running their land, the cost of producing corn, the cost of producing soybeans and wheat, however their total income was only $317,430, leaving them with a negative income last year of $57,570.

The question to be addressed is how today's or tomorrow's farmer is going to continue to produce food for a Nation in the world if he or she cannot purchase needed equipment and meet the costs of doing business. How many other Americans have to purchase equipment like combines which retail at $211,000 minus dealer discounts equaling about $168,000 less trade-ins on equipment. So that leaves them with about $111,000 to finance for 10 years at 8.75 percent interest for an annual payment of $17,204.

□ 1630

How will they continue to make that payment when their negative income prohibits them from showing any profit?

There is an increasing concentration throughout agriculture today. This concentration is severely distorting the market signals that farmers use to know what to produce, when to produce and how to make a profit. This concentration is hurting the marketplace and free competition. These market conditions are deeply hurting our family farms and threatening the economic stability of real communities across our country.

Dee asks, what can we do? First I say Congress, this Congress and this executive branch, must recognize the faces of rural America and understand the crisis out there. We must increase market transparency on prices and we should revisit freedom to farm and provide these farmers who provide our food with the safety net against these kinds of international market manipulations.

THERE IS A CRISIS ON THE AMERICAN FARM

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

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), for the comments she has just made regarding the crisis on the American farm. Representing the State of North Dakota in this body, a congressional district that has more production acres for agriculture than any other district in the House of Representatives, I can only affirm all too well the truth of what she is saying.

There is a crisis on the farm. If we do not act as a Congress and act quickly, the face of farming in this country will be changed. We will move from agriculture production primarily based with family farmers to vast corporate farms, changing forever the way our food is produced and a way of life in much of our country.

The critical element that has made the low commodity prices so particularly hard on our farmers relates directly back to a change made by this Congress in the farm bill that we are presently under.

In 1948, Congress acted to establish some measure of price protection for farmers, recognizing that there is going to be great volatility in the prices commodities will bring given any number of circumstances, but more recently it has been the ebb and flow of demand in the global marketplace.

The prior policy for farm programs has been that the United States Government has got the capacity to backstop individual farmers to protect them from the worst ravages of loss when prices fall through the floor. The last farm bill changed all that. We no longer afford our farmers any price protection. We have protected the Treasury of the Federal Government but we have left the fortunes of individual families out there on the farmsteads completely exposed to the ebb and flow of market prices.

The Asia financial collapse has absolutely destroyed commodity prices in this country. Small wonder. Japan, our number one export market for small grains, down 10 percent; Korea, number 4 market, off one-third, and so it goes.

So we have much more supply relative to market and prices' fall, and this time without a safety net. Small wonder in year two of the new farm bill its critical weakness was already glaringly exposed and exposed to such a dimension that in a bipartisan way we had to quickly get some money out of the Treasury and commit it to farmers in the shape of a disaster bill passed last fall in light of the national dimensions of the crisis in agriculture we had seen.

We have more to do this Congress. Do not think for one second that that disaster bill passed in October forestalls a total catastrophe in farm country without further action.

The first thing we must do is pass the supplemental. The White House has advanced an appropriations request that will afford absolutely critically needed loan money and guaranteed loan money available so that a number of farmers can get in the fields this spring that otherwise will not have operating capital to do so and that for others still they will be able to restructure their financial situation in such a way that they will be able to cashflow, whereas otherwise they would not be able to cashflow.

Let me say something about cashflow, however. In my neck of the woods, given the commodities we produce, primarily small grains, one can get in today's market prices enough at the elevator to cover the costs that have been invested in that product. Therefore, lenders this spring are engaging in what is called equity lending; equity lending.

It does not sound all that bad but let me say what it means. It means that farmers are reducing their net worth. They are having to capitalize their assets because they cannot even make enough on the sale of their crop for what it takes to grow the crop.

We need to come back and visit this whole safety net for farming issue. We need to make some changes in the farm bill. It has fallen short and we now see where. Farmers need price protection. We need to make certain that there is a measure of price protection restored. Otherwise, we are going to be in this situation spring and fall every single year. Mark my words on this. We are going to have emergency supplemental bills in the spring and we are going to have disaster bills at harvest time trying to prop up America's farmers.

Let us not leave them hanging on the next action of Congress acting in such an ad hoc way every spring and every fall. Let us restore a safety net for America's farmers. Anything else will be catastrophic for the family farmers of this country.

THE RUMSFELD COMMISSION

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, this special order hour by the Republican majority is one occasion upon which we will take the opportunity to discuss the issue of national missile defense, particularly as it relates to legislation that is expected to pass on this House floor tomorrow, certainly to be debated, and we will kick off that event with an unprecedented joint bipartisan meeting on the House floor, at which we will receive a briefing and a report from the commission known as the Rumsfeld Commission.

The Rumsfeld Commission is one which was commissioned by this Congress to look into the issue of national ballistic missile defense, to ascertain the complexity of the threat that looms over the United States of America from a potential intercontinental ballistic nuclear missile attack.

Most Americans are unaware that the United States possesses no capability or capacity to stop a single incoming intercontinental ballistic missile. We cannot stop it. If any of the rogue nations that we are concerned

about were to launch an attack of a single missile against the United States, it would take approximately a half-hour for that missile to reach us and there is nothing we would be able to do to stop it. That is an alarming reality that the Rumsfeld Commission report exposed and used as a basis to warn this Congress that we must begin to move forward on implementing a national ballistic missile defense policy.

The report is also one that we took to Russia over the weekend. I am joined by one of my colleagues who was part of an 8-member delegation that left for Russia on Friday, had an opportunity to brief the Russian Duma on the status of nuclear missile threats from rogue nations and also to address some of the opportunities for misinterpretation, I should say, that should be expected by our Russian counterparts in the legislative branch in Russia.

Our purpose was to do three things. One was to walk them through the Rumsfeld Commission report, to give to them the unclassified version of the briefing that we will receive here tomorrow and to do that prior to the vote that takes place. That was remarkable in and of itself. I think the briefing went a long way to helping the United States and Russia maintain the strong bond of friendship that we have established but do so in a way that allows us to continue to move forward with protecting the American people.

The second thing we hope to accomplish, and I believe successfully did, is to suggest to the Russians that our efforts to move forward on a national missile ballistic defense program is not motivated by any fear or concern about the Russian people or any hostility by the country of Russia.

The third item that we focused on was to suggest to the Russians that in an age of rapid technological advances, there is much to be gained through cooperative efforts to try to reduce the missile threat around the world; to, in fact, move us to that day off into the future that we all envision where nuclear missiles, intercontinental ballistic missiles, can one day become a thing of the past, where we can effectively, through the advances of technology, diplomacy and partnership, render nuclear missiles obsolete.

Now that is a distant dream but one that is imminently possible, and I think it was an important opportunity again, first of all, to explain our legislation to the Russians before we cast the vote on the House floor, and we actually accomplished that before the Senate voted just yesterday to pass their version of the measure off of the Senate floor, and finally to reassure the Russian Government and our counterparts in the Duma that the extension of friendship and partnership that we have really strived to establish since the fall of Communism in the old Soviet Union is something that we are serious about and we can maintain that friendship and, as I said earlier, go forward with establishing a missile defense program for our people.

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I will not be able to participate during the whole hour but I do want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), for entering into this special order. We are going to be joined by my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) in a few moments and perhaps others.

My friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) has made a number of very important points. We are going to have an important debate tomorrow afternoon in this House of Representatives on a real threat against the United States and against the citizens of our country, and I think the American people will be watching us in this debate. I want everyone in this body to understand how important it is.

Also, as the gentleman says, we have an opportunity as House Members, tomorrow morning at 9:30 eastern time, to have a very important briefing. It is a closed briefing, but I would say to my colleagues that are within the sound of my voice we may have constituents coming in, we may have subcommittee hearings, and I know that we will be pulled at from many, many areas, but there is no more important place that my colleagues could be tomorrow morning at 9:30 than to hear former Secretary Rumsfeld and the members of his bipartisan commission about the very real threat that we have from incoming intercontinental ballistic missiles where our United States cities, our United States citizens, now have absolutely no protection. Hear me. We now have absolutely no protection from these incoming missiles.

We now have a threat that has changed, the world situation has changed, and the briefing that we will have from Secretary Rumsfeld will be very important tomorrow.

As the gentleman from Colorado mentioned, he and I just returned last night from a long weekend trip to Russia, where we met with members of the Russian Government, members of the Russian parliament, the Duma, to brief them on the unclassified portions of this Rumsfeld report. We were joined on this trip by former Secretary Rumsfeld and two other members of his commission, former Director of Central Intelligence, the former director of the CIA under this administration, under the Clinton administration, Jim Woolsey, and former Under Secretary of State Bill Schneider, who served in the Reagan and Bush administrations.

This is a bipartisan delegation that represented the Rumsfeld Commission in Moscow just this past weekend, and the entire Rumsfeld Commission, consisting of 9 members, was bipartisan, patriotic Democrats and Republicans, who were unanimous, Mr. Speaker, unanimous in their bipartisan conclusions that the United States faces an imminent threat from missiles coming in principally from rogue nations.

□ 1645

Nations like North Korea which has already shown us that they can launch a multi-stage missile. They have shown us in recent tests. Countries like Iraq and Iran whose stated policies are hostile to the United States of America.

So we do not need to be alarmists in this Congress, but we need to tell the American people the facts, and I think the American people who listen to our debate and the Members of Congress tomorrow afternoon who listen to our debate will conclude that this bipartisan commission of people who have been there, who know what they are talking about, who have been on the frontline in Republican administrations and Democratic administrations, protecting our Nation against foreign threats, these people are telling the truth. The threat is very real; it could come within 5 years, where cities are subject not only to intentional attacks from rogue nations, but accidental missile launches or unauthorized attacks.

So I am pleased to join the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) in this discussion. As I say, I will probably not be able to be here for the entire hour, but I believe we have a message that perhaps has not sunk in with the American people. But there is a threat, and this Congress will act tomorrow to begin to answer this very real threat.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado, and I would echo the sentiments of both the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, in the beautiful preamble to the Constitution, a Constitution we have sworn to uphold and defend against all enemies, foreign and domestic, there is the mission statement, if you will, to use the parlance of the late 1990s, that it is the role of we, the people, to provide for the common defense. And there is no clearer mission and no clearer mandate than the current world condition as explained by the Rumsfeld Commission.

The gentleman from Mississippi is quite right. Republicans and Democrats, acting foremost as Americans, evaluated the threat of rogue States such as North Korea, Iran, Iraq, and came away with the chilling evaluation, as widely reported in the press, though perhaps not with the emphasis in hindsight that should have been required, that within 5 years time, these rogue nations would have at their disposal weapons of mass destruction; specifically, intercontinental ballistic missiles, that could strike at the heartland of the American Nation, and this is what we confront.

My colleagues also mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the assumption and the false impression that exists in the minds of many that the continental United

States and Alaska and Hawaii are already protected from such an attack. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, that is not yet the case. I should pause here, especially given the tenor of the times and the revelations of unauthorized transfers of technology to the Chinese government, and sadly, the alleged political misconduct of the Clinton-Gore administration, to underscore what has happened, because in the parlance of the politically correct, sadly, our commander in chief from time to time is factually challenged. Mr. Speaker, he stood here at the rostrum 2 years ago in his State of the Union message and said to the American Nation, who looks to its President for reassurance and truth, two qualities, Mr. Speaker, that sadly have been sorely lacking, the President offered a classic Clintonian statement when he said, quote, Tonight, no Russian missiles are aimed at America's heartland, or words to that effect.

That led the distinguished Democratic Senator from Nebraska, Mr. KERREY, in a subsequent appearance on NBC's Meet The Press to say well, yes, that is true, but those missiles can be reprogrammed in a matter of minutes.

I acknowledge that reality not to cast aspersions on the Russian Federation or members of the Duma with whom my colleagues met this weekend, but to point out that sadly, in this age of presidential leadership, all Americans have to parse the statements of our commander in chief.

So we are faced with this dilemma: How best to provide for the common defense and protect our citizenry from attack from any quarter, but especially the threat of rogue nations. And indeed, the headlines today ring out the irony of a curious state of conduct with the outlaw Nation that is North Korea.

Indeed, as the gentleman from Mississippi will recall, before we were sworn in to the 104th Congress, as part of this new common sense conservative majority, the then Secretary of Defense William Perry came to brief us at a breakfast sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and I was privileged to ask the first question of then Secretary Perry, and I asked the Secretary why the Clinton administration was insistent on sharing any form of nuclear technology with the North Koreans. And to sum up the Secretary's reply to me: I needed a further briefing.

No, Mr. Speaker, I did not need a further briefing. It is common sense that if the stove is on, one does not put one's hand on the eye of the stove or one will get burned. One does not play with matches, one does not play with fire. And continuing this curious indulgence of the North Koreans is now the announcement heralded by this administration that the U.S., at long last, will be granted inspection of sites in North Korea. But, there is a caveat there, because the grand leader of the North Koreans, Kim Jong-il, has a Nation wracked with famine, and while this great constitutional republic has proper humanitarian impulses to help feed people of the world stricken by disaster inside that closed and sadly retro Stalinist state, Kim Jong-il and his military leaders continue apace their development of intercontinental ballistic missiles, and as my colleague from Mississippi pointed out, now the North Koreans possess technology that can strike America's heartland.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Arizona has made a number of absolutely correct statements about the missile threat, both from the former Soviet Union, now the Federation of Russia, as well as the rogue States. But it is important for our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, and for all Americans to understand that the missile technology, the intercontinental ballistic missiles previously owned by the Soviet Union and aimed at us have not been utterly destroyed.

I think a lot of people perhaps even listing to the President of the United States in his speech from this very room might misunderstand the situation. Those missiles are still there, and they can be reprogrammed as the Democratic Senator, responding to the President of the United States, correctly pointed out. So that threat is still there.

Now, we have every reason to be optimistic about our new relationship with the Soviet Union. We have some joint initiatives with them on housing, hopefully which will constitute a win/win situation with the United States investment community, the Russian people, and stability worldwide. We are involved in some joint efforts with Russia on space technology, and I applaud that.

But the missiles are still there, and elections are going to be held in Russia in December of 1999 for the Duma, the Russian parliament. We hope that people who support our continued openness and steps toward friendship will be elected in December of this year, but we do not know that. Presidential elections will be held in the federation of Russia early in the year 2000. We do not know the result of that election. So we are still in a very dangerous world and the Russian missiles are there. But it is not because of the Russian missiles that the Rumsfeld Commission has come forward. And we were there, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) and I, and a bipartisan delegation from this body, we were there to point out the true facts to our colleagues from the Russian parliament, that the United States is threatened by rogue nations and perhaps by an unauthorized or accidental launch.

We also pointed out, Mr. Speaker, to our colleagues in the Russian Duma that we are asking for the very type of missile shield which Russia presently has around its capital city of Moscow. Russia presently has the technology that we are asking for to protect our cities, and it is only fair and only right, and it is actually our constitutional duty, as the gentleman has already pointed out, to take the necessary steps under the changed world situation to protect Americans from whatever threats as they arise.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is something that of course our delegation knew, but I think it was reemphasized during this visit, is that the Russians have been engaged in an incremental strategy over the years of deploying ground-based radar stations, missile interceptors, as well as a civil defense network designed to protect the capital city of Moscow.

Now, this is really one of the weaknesses of the ABM Treaty that we are under, because we here in the United States, under that treaty, are restricted from constructing a missile defense system that is comprehensive in nature, that can protect the entire country. In Russia it is a very different story because the majority of the Russian people live in the capital city. In fact, the defense structure that they have established it is estimated can protect upwards of 70 percent of the Russian people. But the ABM Treaty only allows us to protect a point, a place. Would it be Washington, D.C., would it be New York, would it be Denver, would it be San Francisco, would it be L.A.? Imagine the political difficulty in deciding which part of the country we would defend in a similar way that the Russians are able to. It is a very perplexing question.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is saying that 70 percent of the population of Russia is now protected by a missile defense system and not one American city or citizen is protected by a similar system.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the case. It is only the reason why, as the gentleman from Arizona mentioned earlier, last summer it was when our satellites were beaming down immediate data to our analysts in the Air Force primarily, in the space program, they watched in almost horror as they were watching in real time data being transmitted on a missile launch that we detected from Korea that was of a heat signature we had never recognized out of North Korea. It was a trajectory we did not recognize. It was at a speed we did not recognize. They instantaneously realized and came to the conclusion that North Korea had a 3-stage rocket which had not been announced to the world. Our intelligence community had failed to warn the United States or even to detect that North Korea had this capacity. And with a lightweight warhead, that Taepo Dong missile, as it was soon to be called, has a radius capacity of about 6,000 miles. That means North Korea announced to the world that day the ability to land a missile on the North American continent within about a half-hour of launch time. Now, that shocked us because we cannot stop it.

But over in Russia, however, 70 percent of their people are potentially protected from that kind of a launch. And the North Koreans are not stopping at the Taepo Dong I missile. They are now working on the Taepo Dong II missile which will also be of similar design, a 3-stage rocket with a heavier payload, and continue to possess the ability of longer range and more precise targeting over time. That is a very real threat.

I might also point out that members of the Russian Duma had heard information before. They know, for example, that North Korea, Libya, Iran, Iraq are countries that are moving forward on development; they know that Pakistan and India have experimented with underground detonations, but they have never, as members of the legislative branch in Russia, they do not have the leverage that we do in the United States Congress to demand this kind of information to inform themselves about these threats.

The information we took over to the Russian Duma and delivered to the Russian parliamentarians was quite an elaboration that I do not think they were prepared to hear or expected to hear. I think in the long run, let us be frank, the Russian parliamentarians are not thrilled to see the United States move forward in a policy direction that would have us defend ourselves. They like the current imbalance. That is to their strategic advantage.

□ 1700

But I think we did a successful job, one of erasing some of the misinformation and the misinterpretation that is possible with the vote we are going to take tomorrow, and, secondly, alerting them to the very valid reasons that we as Americans have over the emerging threat of these rogue nations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and others, including our very good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who lead the delegation to the former Soviet Union, the Russian Federation.

Again, I think it is important to underscore the unprecedented nature of such a visit, American legislators meeting with their Russian counterparts to explain and cut through the haze of disinformation and other impulses that may linger from the Cold War that, in the situation which we find ourselves, there is a legitimate stake in self-defense for this constitutional republic, for our American Nation, and for the American people.

I might also point out, as genuine as the threat is from North Korea, the area in and around the Persian Gulf remains an area of grave and great concern. Given the proximity of Israel to that region of the world, indeed given the Scud attacks on Israel, this administration proposed a few years ago that the Israelis might want to have a missile defense.

That begs the question, Mr. Speaker, if it is good enough for the Russian people, and as my colleagues have pointed out, some 70 percent of the Russian population is effectively covered with this type of missile defense system, if our own administration and State Department, Mr. Speaker, would say it is good enough for the Israelis and they should work on a comparable system, then certainly the American people deserve such protection. We must underscore the fact that it currently does not exist.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the fact that there continues to be a somewhat curious debate in the realm of international law about enforcement of a treaty such as the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, or ABM Treaty, from more than a quarter century ago ratified by the United States Senate.

In our new world situation, we call that entity with whom we dealt at that time now today the former Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has ceased to exist and, indeed, in everyday parlance, just as marriage vows customarily end with the term ''till death do you part,'' when one entity is dissolved, it is my belief, and I believe a reasonable test and a reasonable assumption and assertion, that that treaty likewise or at least the involvement with the Soviet Union and the strictures of the ABM Treaty ceases to exist because now we are dealing with a new Russian federation.

But, again, I want to salute my friends who took the time and had the courage to go talk to our Russian counterparts in a spirit of candor.

We might also point out, Mr. Speaker, as relevant again as today's headlines, there have been reports of the possibility of a similar computer crisis that we hear about in this country under the guise of Y2K. There are concerns about Russian computers.

We welcome the chance to break down the barriers and ensure that there would be no unintended launch from any type of computer malfunction. But if it were to happen, is it not the role of this Congress and the American people to make sure that this Nation is adequately protected? Sadly, on this day, at this hour, in this Chamber, we have to point out that, for the American Nation, no such missile defense exists.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) to expound on the point of the relevance of the ABM Treaty to the vote tomorrow because the ABM Treaty has acknowledged weaknesses.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona has begun a discussion which I think will continue for months and even years in this Congress and in this Nation concerning the ABM Treaty. I think he has made a very logical point in that the Soviet Union no longer exists.

Other very learned scholars who have looked at the issue have concluded that the deployment of our missile defense program in the United States would not violate the ABM Treaty. That is to be decided later.

We do need to point out for the sake of our colleagues that will be voting tomorrow that there is nothing in the legislation tomorrow that has anything to do with the ABM Treaty at all. Indeed, it does not discuss the ABM Treaty, yes or no. It simply says, very, very simply, in a very short piece of legislation, that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense system.

I think it is also important for us to point out that, despite the niceties of the ABM Treaty, we are going to take steps in this Congress to protect our people, to protect the citizens and cities and communities of the United States and provide for the common defense.

If the ABM Treaty eventually has to be renegotiated, if there has to be further diplomatic conversations between these signatory parties or between new states that have sprung up in place of those signatory parties, we will do that.

But our first and foremost responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is to realize the threat, as the Rumsfeld Commission is going to point out to us in our session tomorrow and as we will be learning in the debate and, having realized that threat, to do our duty, our duty to provide for the defense.

The gentleman from Arizona mentioned the Middle East and the very real conflict that we have seen there in recent years. Certainly we know we wish it were not so. But we know that Saddam Hussein is the sworn enemy of the United States.

Here is what Mr. Saddam Hussein had to say about the United States of America, ''Our missiles cannot reach Washington. If they could reach Washington, we would strike if the need arose.'' Saddam Hussein, 1990.

Listen to this quote from Abul Abbas, head of the Palestinian Liberation Front: ''Revenge takes 40 years. If not my son, then the son of my son will kill you. Someday, we will have missiles that can reach New York.''

Mr. Speaker, this House, this Congress, and I hope this administration is going to take the necessary steps to answer these threats, to answer the very real facts which will be presented to us tomorrow, and to make sure that our people can live as safely as possible in this very dangerous world.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to add one more quote from an American. This is a student who just e-mailed me the following message yesterday, and I want to share it with my colleagues.

It says, ''Dear Congressman SCHAFFER, I do not know if this has come up

to the floor yet,'' and how timely that it will come to the floor tomorrow. ''I do not know if this has come to the floor yet. However, I have become aware of the existence of this bill and wish to encourage its support.'' She referenced the bill a little earlier. ''The bill entitled the American Missile Defense Protection Act calls for enacting stronger measures to protect our magnificent country from missile attacks. Please research this issue and act and vote in support of it. Thank you. God bless.''

This is a constituent from Fort Collins, Colorado, my district back home. This letter is indicative of what most Americans feel about this topic when they learn the details of our current state of military readiness and defense preparation, when they learn about the issues that are at stake, when they learn about the imbalance that is swiftly balancing against us.

I think these are the voices that need to be heard on this House floor, particularly tomorrow, over and above all of the hesitations, the concerns, the placations that are coming out of the White House right now and others throughout the country who believe that this defenseless posture that we are in today is something that should continue. We have the opposite view.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for sharing that message from his constituent in Fort Collins. Mr. Speaker, it points out the unique nature both of this special order and the ability that our constituents have, not only from our individual districts, but indeed from coast to coast and beyond to e-mail, fax, phone their Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker, Republican or Democrat, we are all Americans, to ask their Member of Congress to move forward with this missile defense system. It is vital. It is necessary. It is long overdue.

There is nothing better than the input of those concerned citizens rising to this cause, Mr. Speaker, and alerting their respective Member of Congress in much the same way as I would take this time, Mr. Speaker, again to invite Members from both parties tomorrow to listen to the classified briefing on this floor from former Defense Secretary Rumsfeld and others who join him on the Commission.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I just point out the timeliness of the announcement we just heard from the Committee on Rules in bringing the bill to the floor for debate. This is very relevant matter that we are discussing here today.

Members of this Congress and citizens throughout the country need to come to grips very quickly with the question of what is it we are going to stand for as a country when it comes to defending our borders.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for filing that rule so that that debate can take place on this House floor tomorrow.

The world remains a dangerous place. Even as media outlets such as the capable news network offer their, at times, controversial documentary treatment of the Cold War as if it is and anachronism or a relic, the fact is the world does remain a dangerous place.

The rogue states, as the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) pointed out, the avowed enemies of this country who make no bones about their yearning, their desire to deploy weapons of mass destruction against the world's lone remaining superpower and the very ideals this constitutional republic embodies.

So, again, in full view of the oath we take to the Constitution of the United States and our trusted responsibility with the American people as their constitutionally elected representatives, we must answer this clarion call and make provisions for a missile defense system.

Because, sadly, again, as shocking as it may be to the American people, despite some flowery phrases, there is currently no such system. This Congress will have to take steps tomorrow.

I would also point out to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), as he is well aware, the developments again echoing through the headlines of the major newspapers, the unlawful transfer of technology to the People's Republic of China, and the fact sadly that reports indicate the Communist Chinese have been only too eager to share this technology with rogue States.

Mr. Speaker, this time on the floor affords us not only the responsibility and opportunity to communicate with all of our constituencies, and indeed with the American people, but, Mr. Speaker, this also affords us the time to speak to those who monitor the proceedings on these floors who, quite frankly, wish us ill or fail to understand that the very freedoms we cherish in this society are not, in fact, weaknesses.

□ 1715

The despots of this world look at free and open debate as a form of weakness, a form of inertia, of immobilization that would somehow prevent or abridge our proper responses.

I think particularly of the Communist Chinese. I think of the bellicose threat from the Chinese defense minister of a couple of years ago with reference to the Taiwan question when the Chinese, in provocative fashion, as the Taiwan government was holding free and fair elections, the Chinese conducted exercises and shooting missiles just off the coast of Taiwan, and the provocative statement, Mr. Speaker, by the Chinese defense minister with reference to our great Nation, saying, oh, well, we believe the Americans value Los Angeles more than they value Taiwan.

How are we to interpret that statement, Mr. Speaker? How can we interpret that but as a threat to this Nation?

As I explained to the consul for the Chinese government from Los Angeles, who visited Phoenix and sought me out for a meeting expressing his goal of friendship, I said, Mr. Speaker, to the consul, then let us speak as friends.

And let there be no mistake, none of our adversaries around the world, in any regime, in any place, should ever confuse the will and the resolve of the American people once fully informed and rallying to a cause. This is such a cause. This is such a moment, to take legitimate steps to protect our Nation.

And though at times, because of previous actions and whatever reluctance on the part of this administration to follow through effectively in dealing with foreign governments and others, make no mistake this Congress takes seriously, Mr. Speaker, its constitutional role and its oversight of the executive branch and the need to protect the American people. And this constitutional republic will prevail because we understand that in a free society the eternal price of liberty is vigilance.

I yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The gentleman is precisely right about the importance not only of our efforts to contain the flow of technology and missile-related components in and among other countries, but it is our own participation in the proliferation of missiles which is something we should be concerned about as well.

Let me raise something that came up at the meetings in Russia just 2 days ago in Moscow. I was part of the delegation that was meeting with members of the Duma.

We had several meetings, but the most memorable one took place Monday afternoon, and we were talking about the concern we have for the transfer of technology from the Russians, either willingly or outside of their own laws, to some of these rogue nations. One of the scientists who was there said to all of us, well, it is our impression that it is the United States that is contributing to the proliferation of their own enemies and the enemies of Russia as well.

This took us aback for a moment, until we realized the validity of his concern. We could certainly understand his point of view. And this goes back, and it has actually been documented in the Rumsfeld report, goes back to February 15 of 1996 when a Chinese Long March space launch vehicle, carrying a western satellite, exploded. The post-failure review involving U.S. aerospace companies led to the transfer of sensitive information regarding rocket engineering.

That was an effort by the United States to send information to the Chinese to help them perfect their long-range launch capability.

It goes on to say that in the spring of 1996 the United States sold supercomputers to China's Academy of Sciences, which historically has participated in that country's effort to develop missiles. In 1996 we sold supercomputers to the Russians for a nuclear weapons design lab.

It was no surprise, I suppose, or should have been no surprise to our President that the symbolic gesture by the Chinese took place on July 1 of 1998, just last year, when China tested the motor of its new DF–31 intercontinental ballistic missile during the visit from our President. They tested the motor of this new-age missile while our President was there in a symbolic gesture to show that they are emerging on an international, and not only emerging, but they are moving forward very dramatically and drastically in the development of new missile defense technology.

I see I am joined by another member of our delegation who was there, and it might be instructive at this point to talk a little bit about the Russian Duma itself and the members of the Duma, how they relate to us as a country. Because for too long, frankly since the fall of communism, our relationships with the emerging republic of Russia have been at the executive level, our President and State Department relating directly with the Russian president, Boris Yeltsin and his administration, ignoring wholly the importance of the democratically elected members on a representative basis of the Russian Duma.

Now, in relation to what we understand and know here through our system, the legislative branch in the Russian government is less powerful and has less direct influence over the day-to-day lives and affairs of Russian politics, and there is tremendous strain between the presidency of Russia and the Russian Duma.

Our real hope, I think as Americans, for reaching out to the Russian people and forging a relationship that promotes free markets, that promotes true democracy, that promotes the kinds of economic reforms, such as property rights, homeownership and so on, is through a relationship with this body, the Congress of the United States, and members of the democratically elected Russian Duma.

The Russian Duma is where we will find the rising Democrats. This is where we will find the individuals who are in favor of these kinds of market driven reforms. It is also the place where we will find the folks who most vehemently reject the old ways of communism that we find so prevalently in the Russian presidency today. That is where many of the old Communists went after the Soviet Union fell apart.

It is the Russian Duma that really could use some support and assistance in elevating the stature and their prominence in the role of Russian politics, and it is where we should look.

It is why, I think, the visit that we made, an historic visit, was so important. Because it really did involve the Russian Duma in an important national issue for themselves in a way that they have never been afforded before. And I think it will go further in our efforts as a country to assure the Russians that our desire for long-term partnership and friendship, and to see the Russians move forward in the economic reforms that will result in peace and stability are, in the end, not only in their best interests but in our best interests.

It is important to understand that within the context of this bill passing tomorrow that the President of the United States prefers to deal with the President of Russia and the old line Communists that are part of that administration, the old way of doing business in Russia, which is resented by the majority of the Russian people and rejected by the majority of the Russian people. Our effort in this Congress should be to reach out to those new Democrats, the new free marketeers that are getting elected with greater frequency in the Duma.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER), who joined us in that delegation returning last evening.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his time and indulgence and the point he makes, along with the gentleman from Arizona, that this was truly an unprecedented journey and an historic journey.

As the gentleman pointed out, we are in the process of exposing the Russian Duma to more and more Members of Congress. This was my first time ever to visit that great country of Russia, to talk to them very frankly about our need to defend our people from a possible limited nuclear strike by some rogue nation.

It is as a result of our discussion with Duma members, by our recognizing the Duma and dealing with the Duma, who very similar to our House of Representatives are elected by democratic process by their constituents in their regions, and represented in other ways according to their constitution, which is vitally important, that we recognize the importance of a constitutional form of government and Democratically elected representations as a vital part of that government. The Duma can see, just like themselves, that we represent our constituents. We are representative of the individuals.

I tell people, when they ask me about this job, I tell them that if they want to know what America is like they should just look at the U.S. House of Representatives. We are a picture of America. And if we look at the Duma the same way we will see what Russia is like. And very many times, when we see this executive branch to executive branch dialogue and discussion, we miss that from time to time by not seeing the elected representatives from the various regions.

The meeting was vitally important because it is necessary that the Duma understand our resolve to join them in the belief that it is the obligation of the Federal Government, both in Russia and in the United States of America, according to our Constitution, Article I, Section 8, to defend the United States of America. And that is what H.R. 4 tomorrow is all about, to make it the policy of the United States to develop and deploy a national missile defense system.

It is important to note, and I am sure the gentleman has already done this in this discussion, that Russia already has such a system that is ABM compliant, a ground-based system situated on the outskirts of Moscow, and that has the capability of protecting a majority of their citizens.

I made the point in our press conference yesterday, and the point has been made time and time again on this floor by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), whose single-handed activity in this area, with the support of a lot of the rest of us, and especially the chairman on the Committee on National Security, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), and other members on that committee, that we have got to move to a situation where we at least do what the Russian government has done for their people, and that is to try to defend and protect American lives.

Not one U.S. citizen residing in the United States of America is protected at all from an accidental or other type of launch of a ballistic missile against the United States of America. Not one person. We do not have a system. The American people believe that we do.

One reporter asked the question, as the gentleman from Colorado remembers, at the press conference, the reporter from the Baltimore Sun asked the question that if Russia has this capability, and they have for years, and the United States of America does not have that capability, and it has been the policy of the United States of America and the Federal Government in the past to not protect our people from ballistic missile attack, who in the world made that decision?

It is this debate, this special order that is going to bring to light as we begin to head back to our districts during the April recess, where we get to talk about important issues that may be on the front page from time to time; the budget, which is vitally important, maintaining a balanced budget, reducing the tax burden on American families, doing the right thing with regard to Social Security, but adding another issue to the vitally important issues that we deal with in this country, to make sure that the American people know where we are and where we need to go from here.

I thank the gentleman for his time and hope to continue this dialogue.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Well, the press conference that we had yesterday was in Moscow, yesterday morning, 8 hours earlier than it is here. And the gentleman is precisely right, that is the ultimate question that the American people need to ask is, well, where was it along the lines we decided to stand back, while the Russians were able to see off into the future enough to construct a national missile defense system for approximately 70 percent of their people, that we decided to do nothing?

It is faith that has been placed, for about 6 years in Washington now, in the notion that our intelligence gathering capacity and our diplomatic cooperation with other countries was all we needed to prevent these kinds of hostilities from taking place. But it was the five detonations in Pakistan, when we were looking right at the site and our intelligence community had no idea that those detonations were about to take place; the inability for us to prevent similar kinds of retaliatory tests in a friendly country, India, the largest democracy in Asia, when we could not stop that; and then also, on top of that, the launch that we spoke about earlier, the Taepo Dong missile from launch out of North Korea, which we had no idea even existed. Those events, stacked upon one another, opened our eyes in America.

□ 1730

That is what my colleagues will find in the Rumsfeld report that shows very clearly that we significantly, as a country, underestimated the threat of these rogue nations, we have severely misrepresented the threat to the American people and understated the threat that confronts us.

Frankly, if we had started this project back when President Reagan suggested it, deploying a national missile defense system would have been cheaper, first of all, and it would have been in place today with technology that is superior to all, second to none. And we do not have that now. Here we are, in 1999, headed into the new century with, as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) mentioned, the ability for us to stop not a single intercontinental ballistic missile.

Yesterday it was announced by the White House that they changed course and are willing to support a ballistic missile defense system as designed by the Senate. This is a remarkable change. The President did stand up at the roster right behind the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) just earlier this year and said, ''we need a national missile defense program,'' but he has opposed early drafts of our versions here to at least set a policy to actually move the country in that direction, move beyond the hollow words that can so easily be spoken during a short visit.

I ask the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), what do you make of the traumatic transformation, the turnaround of the President of the United States, as the Senate overwhelmingly adopted on a bipartisan basis the Senate version of a missile defense policy bill?

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Let my say to my colleague the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) and my friend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER), Mr. Speaker, that we welcome this intellectual elasticity within the administration. We saw it a couple of years ago with reference to historic welfare reform. We saw it last year when it came to the Taxpayers Bill of Rights and cleaning up through oversight the Internal Revenue Service that indeed 30 minutes prior to the Secretary of Treasury coming to our Committee on Ways and Means, on which I serve, that the administration changed course.

And we welcome it. We understand that the burden of international leadership rests uneasily on the shoulder of this President. Perhaps it is because so often his rhetoric fails to square with reality. But we welcome this change of heart, even if it is what is in essence the last nanosecond of the eleventh hour.

But while we welcome that, let us also reassure the American people, Mr. Speaker, that we offer these grim realities not to promote panic or fear but a policy change and a conviction that we must adequately defend our Nation against all threats but especially the growing threat of a rogue state or an accidental launch of an intercontinental ballistic missile.

And so it is in that spirit, even given the dramatic changes in attitude from the administration, perhaps also prompted in the wake of media revelations about the problems in China, we welcome this change and we look forward to working with all Members of this House, Republicans and Democrats, to act first and foremost as Americans and provide for the common defense of.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, in the final few minutes I have left, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) to sort of wrap up our special order and I will close in the last few seconds.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I would just add that the journey that several of us made, a bipartisan delegation to Russia, to talk about these issues is vitally important. Because, as the point was made, that when the former Soviet Union decided to deploy such a missile, they did not, neither were they obligated to come to the United States of America, to Washington, D.C., to sit down with Members of the House of Representatives, sit down with Members of Congress, to inform us that they were going to do it and why they were going to do it.

That is what this Congressional delegation did just this past week in taking members of the Rumsfeld Commission, Chairman Rumsfeld, former CIA director James Woolsey, and Dr. Bill Schneider to show the Russian Duma, and therefore the Russian people, that we want to be open with them because we see tremendous opportunity, tremendous prospects and potential for a growing relationship, both economic and otherwise, with the people of Russia.

And the way that we are going to do that is to be more open with them. But while we are more open with them, as the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) so appropriately pointed out, we are to remind them that it is our obligation to follow the Constitution of the United States and defend the people of the United States against any threat that may be over the horizon. That is our foremost obligation according to the Constitution.

Plurality of the delegated powers of Congress deal with that national defense. We will do that and we will do that, hopefully, with the cooperation and understanding of our friends in Russia. But we will do it nonetheless.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) for this opportunity to talk about this vitally important issue not only to us today but to our children tomorrow.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I will close with the following thought and in an effort to urge our colleagues, all of our colleagues, to be here on the House floor tomorrow morning for an unprecedented briefing on the nature of the missile defense or the threat to the United States and say that the administration has dramatically changed its perspective when confronted with the truth and the facts of this report.

The same administration which opposed a national missile defense program just this year said the following, the Secretary of Defense: ''There is a threat and the threat is growing, and we expect it to soon pose a danger not only to our troops overseas but also to Americans here at home.''

That change of heart was inspired by the Rumsfeld Commission report, which can be summed up in the following way: ''Concerted efforts by a number of hostile nations to acquire ballistic missiles with biological or nuclear payload pose a growing threat to the United States, its deployed forces, and its friends and allies.'' That is the seminal statement of the report of the Commission to assess the ballistic missile threat to the United States, which was unveiled July 15 of 1998.

This is a vitally important issue. This is one of the most critical issues confronting our country. It is one that I call upon all Members to view and to consider with great seriousness and in great detail before casting not only the vote to establish policy, which we expect to accomplish tomorrow, but to then be prepared to follow up with the secondary and tertiary steps of moving this country forward toward providing the same kind of defense that the Russian people have seen fit to provide for

themselves, a national defense program to protect the American people.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, DECLARATION OF POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES CONCERNING NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE DEPLOYMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS (during the special order of Mr. SCHAFFER), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–69) on the resolution (H. Res. 120) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THE WOMEN OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, Democratic women of Congress are so concerned about the potential for harming Social Security that we will see during this hour a number of us come to the floor to alert our colleagues and the women of our country about the very high stakes for them as to what we do with Social Security.

Let me emphasize that this is the highest stake game, if I may call it that, of all during the 106th Congress because we have a chance to protect and secure the most popular and one of the most important programs that our country has ever had the good sense to create.

I approach this issue from the peculiar perspective of an official who served as chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission under President Carter, a post that gave me a very special concern about the gap between men and women's wages.

When we are speaking of Social Security, of course, we are speaking first and foremost of women who have smaller wages than men and, of course, women who have no wages whatsoever. For that reason, we have introduced a resolution in the Congress that recognizes the unique effects that proposals to reform Social Security almost surely will have on women.

Three-quarters of unmarried and widowed elderly women rely on Social Security for over half of their income. So when we deal with Social Security, when we tamper with it, who should be in our mind's eye first and foremost are women because they are so disproportionately affected.

Everyone is aware of the low statistic that is used over and over again that we who are women are, according to what year you look at, in the 1990s, 70 percent, 74 percent, 72 percent of men's income. I want my colleagues to look at the 1997 figures. $24,973 for full-time, year-round wages for women, compared to $33,674 for full-time, year-round wages for men. Those figures are very important for what women can do with their disposable income today.

But I want to focus us on what that means for women 20 years from now, 30 years from now, and longer. Because it translates directly into too little money to live on when they are elderly; and for that reason, it means that today, at least, those women can count on a progressively structured Social Security system that will keep them from abject poverty. And in case we believe that that is crying wolf, let us not forget that most of the credit for cutting poverty for the elderly really belongs to Social Security.

As recently as 1959, 35 percent of the elderly were poor. By 1979, we had gotten it to only 15 percent. And in 1996, it was 11 percent. And when we say the elderly are poor, who we are really talking about are elderly women.

I have given my colleagues the wages for full-time, year-round workers. But only 56 percent of women are in this category at all. Seventy-two percent of men are in this category. And we can see how that would translate into retirement income.

In essence, we are not talking about retirement when we talk about Social Security; we are talking about a family protection system. Because not only are the main beneficiaries women who have almost no work history, but they include disabled family members and deceased family members.

For all of the talk about private accounts, there is almost no talk about how to deal with people who have no accounts or people whose accounts would be very shallow because they have so little work history.

We need to protect Social Security in the name of America's women, not change it. We need to shore it up, not shift it. It is structured now to help the elderly who fit the profile of the average elderly woman. That is who we have in mind. That is why it is progressive. That is why it is inflation adjusted. That is why it has lifetime benefits. That is why it has dependent benefits.

The shift to personal accounts, of course, takes away the progressivity that has been critical to lifting elderly women out of poverty. And in personal accounts they get what they put in, if that, plus what the market gives them, if anything.

Let us start with where women are. Women put in less as workers or of course as housewives, where they stand to lose altogether. The progressive formula now in place for Social Security means higher benefits to low earners. That translates into women.

I do not think we want to say to America's women we want to have them depend on the market when we consider the fluctuations up and down in their income. If we say that to women, we in effect are saying to women they lose.

□ 1745

And homemakers, above all, beware, because this system has you in mind even before it has working women in mind of any description, including those who work part-time. It is homemakers, women who have spent their working life caring for a family, who are the major beneficiaries of the present structure of the Social Security system. Above all, we should remember that the market has no spouses or widows benefits.

Women have two characteristics that mean that they must insist that any new system retain them when any new structures are put in place. One, of course, is less earnings. And the other is living longer. Imagine, living longer can hurt you. It certainly can hurt you if you have a system that is different from our own because you could exhaust your retirement income. You can never exhaust your Social Security income. Moreover, less earnings is going to be true for the foreseeable future. We hope not forever. Women spend 15 percent of their careers out of the labor force.

Finally, let me say that I am sorry to inform you that the gap in life expectancy between men and women is not likely to decrease. By the year 2030, for example, the actuaries tell us that there will be almost no decrease in that gap, which means that women are going to continue to live longer. Men may live longer as well, but this gap is going to be here and that gap translates into a need for income from somewhere. We are not going to get it from the market. We do get it now from Social Security.

Any change in the Social Security system ought to, therefore, be sure to bear in mind that it is a system that involves your mothers and your grandmothers, your aunts and your female cousins. We want to protect men every bit as much, but the demographic facts of life, the actuarial facts of life, are that it is women who stand to be the biggest losers.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, when I last rose to speak, I told you a little bit about my district. I represent southern Nevada which is Las Vegas, Nevada. I represent the fastest growing district in the United States. I have the fastest growing veterans' population. I also have the fastest growing population of women seniors in the country.

Women comprise over 60 percent of all Social Security beneficiaries. Therefore, women in Nevada would feel significantly the impact of any changes to the current Social Security system. It is my job, it is my responsibility to ensure that their financial security is not undermined. Instead, that it is strengthened.

Like most Nevada women, I fear that privatization of the Social Security

system would risk the retirement benefits of millions of female beneficiaries throughout the country.

As an example, I would like to profile someone that I have known since I was a young girl, a woman that I represent who lives in Las Vegas. Mrs. Lois Olsen is currently existing on her and her husband's Social Security benefits. Sadly, her wonderful husband Fred is suffering a life-threatening illness, a toxic reaction to his medication. He is in the hospital as I speak. During this difficult time, Mrs. Olsen is thinking about how she would live if she were to lose her husband and half of her benefits. Will she be able to afford the upkeep of her mobile home? Will she have to choose one day between buying food to eat or prescription drugs to live? While these are agonizing concerns, Mrs. Olsen knows that the current Social Security system will not allow her to plummet into poverty. Mrs. Olsen, however, is not so sure about the future, not so sure how privatization of the Social Security system would affect her daughters and her granddaughters. She fears privatization, because it lacks the built-in protections for women that our current system now has.

There are reasons why our Social Security system is the most successful social insurance program in the world. It provides a guaranteed benefit that lasts as long as you live. It is a guaranteed benefit that is risk-free. And it is a guaranteed benefit that is annually updated based on the cost of living adjustments.

Strengthening Social Security based on these fundamental components may not be easy, but the majority of southern Nevadans believe that a risk-free, guaranteed benefit is worth fighting for. It is worth working for. They all cannot be here to fight for this issue and to work for this issue. They have sent me here as their voice. That is why what we do not want to happen is have a privatization solution that puts women in particular in uncertain and unstable situations during their senior years.

There are substantive reasons why women fear privatization. Women earn only about 74 percent of what men earn. Based on this factor alone, women like Mrs. Olsen would have much less to invest than any other Americans. We also know that women spend roughly 11.5 years out of the workforce caring for their children and their families. This reduces retirement benefits once again. Finally, it is well known that women live an average of 7 years longer than men. These factors dictate that women would receive far smaller monthly retirement checks should we privatize the Social Security system. Without Social Security benefits, the majority of elderly women in our great Nation would be plummeted into poverty.

At this time, when Congress is considering Social Security reform, it is important that we remember the spirit and the reason for which it was created. It is a guaranteed benefit to ensure that when someone like Mrs. Olsen retires, she will not live in poverty. It is a guaranteed benefit to ensure that when heart-wrenching circumstances like death and disability, when they occur, and they unfortunately do, that the surviving spouse will have means to survive.

I urge my colleagues to stand firm, to protect and strengthen our current Social Security system that President Franklin Roosevelt vowed would defend Americans against a poverty-ridden old age. When one realizes that two out of every three seniors depend on Social Security for more than half of their income, it is easy to understand why we must strengthen this program. It is our Nation's most successful social program. It is worth saving. It is worth protecting. It is worth fighting for. Let us prove to all of our constituents, to all Americans, that we can work together for the common good. Let us protect women, seniors, the disabled and our children, all of whom depend on this very important program.

The people of my district, the people from Las Vegas, like to gamble. We are used to it. But Social Security is an issue that they are not willing to gamble with. Privatization of the Social Security system would be like playing Russian roulette with their lives. Their lives are important enough and valued enough for us in this country that we must not play Russian roulette with them.

My constituents have sent me a message loud and clear. They tell me, Do not privatize Social Security. Do nothing that will take the ''security'' out of Social Security.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my esteemed colleague the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for yielding, and I am so pleased to participate today, because as we grapple, and we are, and we will and we must, grapple with this issue of Social Security, one of the most critical aspects of the analysis is recognizing the unique role that this wonderful program, securing the lives of our seniors, plays in the lives of women. As has been stated, more than half of the recipients of Social Security, 60 percent, are women. And we women depend on these benefits for a longer time and for a greater proportion of our income than do men. In addition, the poverty rate among women over 65 would nearly triple if Social Security were taken away. For these reasons, we must think very carefully before radically changing Social Security from a government safety net to a private investment program. Social Security is especially important to women senior citizens during this discussion for several reasons. The bottom line is that the benefits are disproportionate. Currently, women receive fewer benefits than do men.

This is for several reasons, as I mentioned. First, women continue to earn less than men. Currently the average woman earns about 75 percent of what the average man makes in annual earnings. Second, the man's connection to the workplace is very strong and firm. The woman's connection to the workplace is much more tenuous. Women are much more likely to interrupt their careers to stay home and raise children, or to stop working in order to provide care for elderly parents and other relatives. On average, women spend 11.5 years out of the workforce during their working lives. These two factors mean that building a personal savings is more difficult for women. Recent studies show that on average a woman's pension is worth only slightly more than half of a man's pension. Women also live an average of 7 years longer than men do and therefore run a much higher risk of exhausting any personal savings and, therefore, must rely on Social Security for almost all of their retirement income in so many instances.

The underlying idea behind Social Security has been that in concert with a company's pensions or today's 401(k) plans and personal savings, Social Security should be one of the three legs for a family's retirement stool. This remains as important today as when this program, Social Security, was started in the 1930s. Converting the program to just another retirement program based strictly on earnings would do a disservice to millions of women and increase the already high rate of poverty among elderly, single, widowed women.

I am committed to working with my colleagues who join us on the floor today, and we are determined to ensure that Social Security is made solvent for the long term, and that any reforms take into consideration the very unique role of all of the women in our economy.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman for those comments and yield to yet another gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) for all of their work on strengthening and improving our Social Security system and paying particular attention to the needs of women.

Right now, we have a plan from the President to strengthen the future of Social Security. In contrast, the majority party supports a plan that would replace Social Security with a complicated system of individual accounts that would benefit high-income individuals, particularly men, and endanger the parts of Social Security such as the standard of living index that are so very important to women.

Being just a few years shy myself of legal retirement age, I have a good idea

how women across the Nation are feeling about the safety net of Social Security. I know that many retired women count on Social Security income to meet their basic needs, food, clothing, shelter. Twenty-five percent of unmarried women rely on Social Security benefits as their only source of income.

□ 1800

A recent GAO report showed that 80 percent of women living in poverty were not, and I would like to emphasize ''were not'' poor before their husbands died. Because a woman lives an average of 7 years longer than a man, the danger of her golden years turning into years of poverty and struggle is very real.

In this great country, women earn 76 cents for every dollar a man earns. In fact, women earn much less than men over their lifetime because even those in high-paying positions tend to leave the work force to give birth, to raise a family and to care for parents. This means many women must truly depend on their Social Security benefits. If we privatize Social Security, as some people want to do, this could cut spousal benefits by at least one-third because women earning less over the course of a career have much less to invest. Also, because women generally live longer, annuity companies could shrink their monthly benefits and privatization would not adjust benefits annually for the cost of living.

This is not the first time women in Congress have gathered together to talk about the special needs of women, and I am sure it will not be the last time. But with Social Security the stakes are high and the issues are complicated. We cannot proceed with reforming our Social Security system without addressing how each and every proposal will affect women. We need to seize this day to ensure that Social Security reform includes the unique and overwhelming needs of women in this Nation.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for her comments, and I yield now to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, to my great colleague from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and the other women who have come together for this special order on women and Social Security, I thank them very much. As a newly-elected Member of this body, I welcome the opportunity to speak to this most important issue.

As a member of the baby boom generation, I have benefitted from social changes that have made it easier for women to achieve success in the work force. Women of my generation have enjoyed opportunity never realized by previous generations in this country. Blessed with the ability to pursue my goals and dreams, it is my pleasure to join my colleagues in this debate to ensure the security of our mothers, grandmothers, our own daughters and granddaughters.

Women typically outlive their mates. This is not ground breaking news, but it does mean that there is a greater population of single women over 65. These women live an average of 19 years past the age of 65 and need expensive prescription medicines, deserve quality care from physicians and still must make ends meet at home.

A comfortable retirement is something every American looks forward to and deserves. For many women retirement years are not what they expect. Unlike most men, women of a retirement age do not usually have a pension on which they can rely. Women who do earn a pension find their income is significantly less than men on the average of nearly 5000 annually.

Here is the problem:

The average income of women over 65 in 1996 was nearly $9300, while a man over 65 in 1996 had an income of about $16,200. For those who cannot tell, men over 65 in 1996 earned almost twice what women did during the same time.

We all know there is a difference in pay between men and women, but having such a difference in retirement pay is dangerous. I commend President Clinton for addressing the pay and equity in the State of the Union and look forward to his action.

We talk about a surplus exhaustively, but at the same time there are single women in this country living in poverty. The percentage of women living in poverty who are either divorced or separated is nearly 28 percent, and those who have never been married living in poverty is above 23 percent.

The problem is not going to fix itself. Although wages for women have increased over time, they are still less than most men. Data shows that of 1997 women earn 74 percent of the wages of men for full-time work.

There are several programs we consider to help older women on Social Security and Medicare. As a body, I urge my colleagues to strengthen the survivor benefits aspects of Social Security. Today nearly 74 percent of the widows receive benefits based upon the earnings of a deceased spouse. We must not take away a widow's benefits in our efforts to alter Social Security and the Medicare system. We need to prevent proposals seeking to withdraw Social Security and Medicare dollars prior to retirement.

The women we talk about living on Social Security and Medicare are mothers and grandmothers. In some case we are talking about women who are providing primary child care for grandchildren or other relatives. In other cases women work several jobs simultaneously to provide for their families over the years.

Unfortunately, these jobs might have been either part-time or for short periods of time, not allowing for a pension. The traditional role of woman as a caregiver for both child and parent means that many women are now at a huge disadvantage. This is especially true for minority women. African Americans and Hispanics over the age of 65 are 2 to 3 times likely to be living in poverty.

Part of the reason for this race poverty rate is the fact that their income has been traditionally less for minorities. For every dollar a white household has earned, the black family earns 27 cents while Hispanic families earn 30 cents. This history of inequity makes retirement extremely difficult on minority women trying to live on Social Security and Medicare. These women have cared for their families, and now we must provide the care they need.

We urge our colleagues to give them better Social Security and Medicare benefits. We must ensure that they can eat, that they are healthy and that they are able to afford the things needed to live and continue to mother us. By helping women on Social Security and Medicare now we will help those women who will be on the rolls in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for the opportunity.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The balance of the hour allocated by the minority leader may be controlled by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to say thank you to my colleagues, my colleague from Ohio. Let me say a thank you to my colleague, the delegate from Washington, D.C., who took the charge of this special order with my having to do something else for a few minutes, but it is a great turn out of Members on this floor today on an issue and an area that is critical particularly at this point because we are at the threshold of discussing where Social Security is going for the next 75 years, and, as part of this effort, women, and the effects currently of Social Security on women and what happens when the Social Security system changes is incredibly important and critical to women in our society. So I thank my colleagues so much for participating and for their good words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deepest appreciation to the Women's Caucus for taking the time this afternoon and engaging discussion on Social Security.

Somewhere along the line of our political discourse the whole subject of Social Security has become one of enormous breadth, there is a sense of urgency that hangs on to this issue as people discuss it, notwithstanding the fact that I often tell my constituents who are most worried, and these are generally the elderly women that come together in various organizations; I tell them that Social Security is perfectly safe now, it will be probably in some fiscal strain in the year 2014, but it is the year 2032 when the whole system

will come to a financial standstill because there will be insufficient moneys. For the first time Congress has an opportunity to really look at this issue, and to debate it and to come up with some long-term solutions for the financial security of this system.

I am here today because I know that the elderly women in my State are very deeply concerned about this issue. They receive mail, they belong to all sorts of elderly organizations that continue to tell them about the crisis, and they have this mounting fear that truly they are not being dealt with fairly. Their number one concern, of course, is that we do nothing to jeopardize the stability of the benefits they are now receiving on a monthly basis. The benefits may be very low and insufficient, but they do not want any sort of discussion or formulation of a new plan which will in any way jeopardize their opportunities to survive, and this is what brings us to the floor tonight to debate this issue, because women across America have the greatest stake in this whole debate on Social Security. They are the ones that are most dependent upon the Social Security monthly benefits. It may not be very much, but they depend upon it, and therefore we have to pay special concern to this population and make sure that whatever formulation arises out of this debate, that that very minimal, modest monthly benefit that they are now enjoying is in no way jeopardized.

So when we get to the discussion of privatization, immediately their concerns are even more exacerbated because they are concerned about what this means. Putting the assets of Social Security into a private sort of investment; how are they going to be able to handle it? What do they know about the stock market? And how are they going to be able to make the decisions should that be the course that we take? So, they feel very much in jeopardy, and we need to take into consideration the fact that whatever plan we come up with does not leave this very large group of Americans in quandary, in jeopardy, in fear of losing the benefits they now enjoy.

Social Security today pays cash benefits to 44 million retired, disabled and other dependents and survivors. That is a very large constituency that we are affecting every time we talk about a, quote, solution in the long view. One out of 6 Americans receives Social Security. Social Security benefits make up half of the income of 66 percent of Americans over age 65. That is a very large part of our constituencies, and the important thing to remember however we feel about the system, that it has kept these individuals out of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, if we did not have Social Security, these individuals, at least 50 percent of them, would be in poverty today, and those are the individuals for which we must have special concern. Sixty percent of all Social-Security-aged recipients are women, and so we stand today here as members of the Women's Caucus of this Congress because we have a special responsibility to acknowledge our debt, our obligation, our responsibility to the 60 percent of these recipients who are female. Seventy-two percent of the Social Security recipients aged 85 and over are women, and the population is aging, women live longer, and therefore the older our population grows. The women basically have lower benefits because for many, many years they were child bearing, child rearing, they could not get a job, and what jobs they could get were very low paying, and therefore the benefits are very low, and therefore they make up the lower sector of our benefit scale.

So overall the history of the women's participation in the Social Security program is as very low income beneficiaries, very much on the verge of the poverty category, very vulnerable, so whatever proposals this Congress deals with, we plead as special representatives of this constituency, as spokespersons of the Women's Caucus, that this House pay special heed to the concerns, considerations, agonies and concerns of the women of America.

□ 1815

To this point, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for yielding me this time. I hope the Congress will heed the words of the Women's Caucus.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) for her comments. If I might, the gentlewoman pointed out some very specific issues that face women directly and talked about some statistics. I think it is important just to get a few more of those statistics on to the record here that are truly incredible about women's dependency on the Social Security system. Women make up roughly half of America's population. They account for 60 percent of Social Security beneficiaries.

As has been pointed out, three-quarters of widowed and unmarried elderly women rely on Social Security for over half of their income. The median income of women over 65 in 1996 was around $9,300. Men over 65 have a median income of approximately $16,200, twice that, almost twice that, of women.

Older white women had a median personal income of $9,900. Older black women's median income equaled approximately $7,100. One-fifth of older black women received less than $5,000 and nearly three-fourths had annual incomes under $10,000. Older Hispanic women's median income equaled around $6,400. Thirty-two percent had personal incomes under $5,000, and 80 percent had incomes under $10,000.

Women are so dependent on this system that at their peril, and our future peril, if we are not mindful of these kinds of statistics and how we have to have a system which allows for women today to be beneficiaries of a Social Security system, and that if we change it radically and we move to this privatization effort, that women will, in their older years, be placed further and further and further in poverty, because women are living longer and they earn less and they are in and out of that work force because of family needs. Whether it is for their children or whether it is for their older parents these days, women find themselves caught in between.

So I thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, another important point, a lot of women feel, well, we are getting ahead, equal opportunity. We are going to college, we are getting better jobs, but the statistic that is really glaring is that the average female college graduate earns less than the average earned by a male high school graduate.

Now that shows the income disparity. We all know that the formula for Social Security is based upon income. So right off, the women, even the college graduates, are getting much less under Social Security than the men and therefore our special concerns have to be noted.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and the gentlewoman from District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for making sure that women are put front and center in this debate on Social Security.

So often women have been really an afterthought in the public policy debates of this United States Congress.

In his State of the Union address, President Clinton vowed to use a major portion of the Federal budget surplus to strengthen Social Security. The President has given us a plan which will secure Social Security to the year 2055. Now, I wholeheartedly endorse the President's guiding principles in reforming Social Security. He said when we judge any plan to save Social Security, we need to ask whether it cuts the poverty rate among single elderly women and other groups in our society that are at risk.

Social Security has been instrumental in reducing poverty in the United States. It often has been the

only source of income which has kept the elderly women and people of color out of poverty.

As was pointed out earlier, 60 percent of older Social Security recipients are women who earn less than men and are more likely to depend on Social Security for most, if not all, of their retirement income. Thirty-one percent of elderly African Americans and 28 percent of Latinos have been lifted out of poverty because they received Social Security benefits.

Privatizing Social Security should not be an option. We have witnessed the stock market go up and down. It makes no sense, in fact it is wrong, to put any portion of a person's Social Security subject to the whims and the uncertainty of the stock market.

We also must not forget that Social Security is an insurance program, not simply a source of retirement. The system provides life and disability insurance, which guarantees protection for families and workers. Without this protection, many American workers, especially women and people of color, would be doomed to live under poverty conditions.

Social Security is the essence of America's social insurance program. This Congress must pass a plan to preserve Social Security for women, for people of color, for all Americans. Our mothers, our grandmothers, our great grandmothers, our aunts, our sisters, our nieces and, yes, our daughters are relying on us to secure their future.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her remarks and especially her last commentary, which was really eloquent. This is a responsibility that we have, and those of us who are engaged in the debate which is happening now, and part of the reason for the special order, is public education. I am not sure the extent to which the public knows that we are engaged in a very serious and will be in a serious debate about the future of Social Security, and I am not sure that there is a great body of knowledge out there that understands what the risks are for women and that whatever problems we may have with the Social Security system, if women are left unprotected because the current progressive benefit formula is no longer there, and that is people earn less who now have more and that women are dependent or likely to be dependent and that will go away if there is privatization and there is, in fact, a cost of living every single year on Social Security and if it is privatized and money goes into an account, there is no longer a cost of living, it is at the whim of the stock market that they will be engaged and, in fact, that over the lifetime of retirement that every month they get that annuity that goes away as well.

For all the difficulties that people may have, again, as the gentlewoman's commentary stated, it is just our sworn obligation and it is the valves that we hold that make this so important an issue for women in this country. I thank the gentlewoman very, very much for participating tonight.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois, a new Member of this body, not a new Member to these issues, and someone who is not afraid to stand up and be counted on a whole variety of issues.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the gentlewoman says that this is really an educational process because I have to say as I have myself been looking into this issue I have found so many really startling facts about the way that Social Security has changed the life of women and how women in our society depend so heavily on Social Security.

As the gentlewoman mentioned, this is a woman's issue. Sixty percent of the Social Security beneficiaries are women. In my district, I have the largest concentration of elderly people living alone. Most of those people are women and they rely heavily on Social Security.

We know that one out of every four unmarried older woman relies on Social Security for all of their income. That is a pretty startling fact right there. That we are talking about Social Security, everybody knows we do not get rich off Social Security and yet one out of every four women is relying on Social Security for all of their income. Imagine if there were any cut in that what would happen, how the poverty level would soar.

We know that despite recent gains that women are still discriminated against in terms of income. Women earn 74 cents for every dollar that men earn, but in Illinois it is even worse. Women earn 72 cents for every dollar that men earn.

Women are more likely to have gaps in their employment, and I did not know this but the average woman spends over 11 years out of the work force on average because women still bear the majority of responsibility for caring for children and family members with illness and chronic diseases. So their employment history is more spotty.

Women are less likely to receive private pensions. Only 38 percent of women have pensions compared to 57 percent for men, and even when women do have pensions, private pensions, they are liable to be much lower.

Women are more likely to be part-time workers, work in service and retail industries that do not offer pensions, change jobs more frequently and therefore they are less likely to be vested in pension plans.

Older women are less likely to be wage earners. Another surprising fact to me, 37 percent of women beneficiaries have no earning history at all. The majority, 63 percent of women beneficiaries, receive wife's or widow's benefits on their husband's earnings. So what we find is that the Social Security system really does work for women.

Social Security benefits that women receive are guaranteed for life. Unlike private individual accounts, Social Security benefits are safe, reliable, guaranteed for life.

I think it is worth pointing out that never in the history of the United States has a Social Security check not shown up for lack of payment by the government. It may not show up for other reasons at the post office box, but it has never not shown up because the government has not issued a Social Security check. This is a totally reliable system.

Social Security benefits protect against inflation as many other plans do not. Because of the cost of living increases that are built into Social Security, women have an anti-poverty protection right there. Private investments do not protect against inflation or devalued investments.

Women live an average of 7 years longer than men. Private accounts place women in danger of outliving their accumulated funds. Under private accounts, women could live their most vulnerable years in extreme poverty.

So I am just so glad that the President has made as a top priority using the surplus funds to make sure that we have a Social Security system that is going to be there when I retire, that is there for many of us in the baby boom generation who are worrying about elderly parents, making sure that those benefits are going to be there for them.

As my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) said, as to our daughters, and our children as well, we want to make sure that into the future that women can rely on that. Obviously we want to see those wage gaps closed. We want to see women earning as much as men. We want to make sure that women can rely on Social Security being there when they retire.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for her comments. An issue that we are not talking about here tonight but we will sometime very soon is all about pay equity and the Paycheck Fairness Act, a piece of legislation that is there which the President has endorsed, which talks about women only making 74 cents on the dollar. That is true for professional women, for all women.

Women have to work an extra four months in order to make the same amount of money that men do; clearly not fair. These things are not separate and because women earn less, in fact that if we went to a system where there was investment that they are going to have less money to invest because of the way our system is structured today.

□ 1830

So that is an important issue, one which we will talk about at another time.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is true that because of wage discrimination during working years that women carry that disadvantage with them into retirement years, and that is why Social Security is so important. Also, as the gentlewoman said, the fact that it has a progressive system of payment helps to ameliorate somewhat the fact that women have these lower pay scales.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I have an 85-year-old mother and she once said to me, and not too long ago, she said, you know, Rosa, these were supposed to be the golden years, she said, but, they are the lead years.

She was just generally expressing the frustration that many elderly women face. But it is not only my mother, my mother's generation, it is our generation, it is our children's generation. And they are not women's issues, neither the paycheck fairness bill nor what we are talking about tonight with Social Security and its effect on women. These are family issues. And it in fact speaks to where our values lie, because if one does have an elderly parent, an elderly mother, and if this system works against them, where do they turn? They turn to their families, if they have families, and hopefully they do, that they are not out there by themselves; they turn to you, they turn to me, and they turn to others. They are going to need help.

That means that we owe an obligation to our parents to be able to take care of them. Our children are going to owe an obligation, feel an obligation to us if this system changes. We all want for our children the very best so that they are able to make their future and their lives and to be able to succeed. No one wants to be a burden or a drain, the same as my mother feels that way, and I am sure the gentlewoman's folks do. We do not want to do that to our kids. We want to maintain some dignity, some independence, and that is what Social Security has meant to people in this country, and particularly with what we are talking about tonight with women in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman again for sharing in the Special Order with me this evening.

We are going to try to continue this effort of raising the issues that are important, and particularly with regard to Social Security, over the next several months. This debate will be ongoing.

I have introduced a resolution in the House which has now been cosponsored by 108 Members to keep the spotlight on this issue. The resolution calls on the Congress and the President to take into account the unique obstacles that women face when considering proposals to reform Social Security. We are also going to ask all 108 cosponsors to join in signing a letter to the Speaker of the House and to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to help us to bring this resolution to the floor of the House for a vote, because what it does is to elevate and talk about the importance of this issue.

Each of us, and men and women in this body, I believe, need to take this message, not only deliver it here on the floor of the House, from the well of the House, but we need to take it each to our own districts. We have an obligation to engage the public and to be involved in a public education campaign about Social Security and about its effects on women. That is what we are going to try to do over the next several months in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say for the reasons that have been talked about here tonight, it is critically important.

I now yield some time to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

BUDGET FOR VETERANS SERVICES

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes today to talk about the budget for veterans services. Today, before the Committee on Veterans Affairs, the Disabled American Veterans expressed their disappointment with the dangerously low funding levels for veterans services.

As the latest issue of DAV Magazine tells us, we are in a budget disaster. DAV is a member of the Independent Budget, which has helped us in finding the places in the proposed VA budget that are dreadfully underfunded.

I agree that the flatline budget in a period of serious health cost inflation is a budget reduction, and a flatline budget with important new initiatives is also a budget reduction. We are all talking about giving away the budget surplus. Let us keep in mind that there is no surplus when all of the bills have not been paid. Let me repeat that. There is no surplus when all of the bills have not been paid, and we owe our veterans.

This budget leaves $3 billion unpaid, and we in Congress bear the final responsibility for this. This past Monday, those of us on the committee who saw this need, spelled it out in detail in our ''Additional and Dissenting Views and Estimates.''

Just last week, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, attempted to introduce a proposal calling for and adding $3 billion to the administration budget and was not allowed to do so by the committee majority. This is not a partisan effort. It is simply a statement of dollars and common sense, and we would welcome Republican support.

We do need $3 billion more for our veterans who put their lives on the line for our freedom and only want what is rightfully theirs. A lot of us talk about how we support the veterans, but talk is cheap. It is important that we walk the walk for the veterans who have given to us in their prime their service to the country. It is time for us to stand up for the veterans.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we discuss various plans for saving Social Security, we must take into account the specific concerns of women. Women represent 60% of older Social Security recipients. Women must be able to depend on Social Security as a foundation for economic security.

Any proposals for Social Security reform must maintain the safeguards for women. Changes in the guaranteed benefit structure would make women more vulnerable to poverty.

The poverty rate for elderly women is higher than that of men. In 1997, the rate for women was 13.0% compared to 7.0% for men. Among elderly unmarried women, the poverty rate is 19%. Without Social Security benefits, the poverty rate for elderly women would be 52.2%. For women of color, the poverty rate is higher than that for white women. Approximately 30% of African American women 65 years and older live in poverty. The percentage for Hispanic women is 28% compared to 11% of older white women.

Women are living longer than men at an average of six years and exhaust other retirement income resources sooner. Thus, women become more dependent on Social Security as they get older. Three-fourths of unmarried and widowed elderly women rely on Social Security for more than half of their income.

Although working women earn more than past generations, women earn an average of 75 cents for every dollar earned by men. There is a disproportionate effect of the wage gap on women of color. While white women earn 71.9% of the earnings of white men, African American women receive 62.6% and Hispanic women receive 53.9%. Women also tend to work in traditionally lower-paid occupations such as sales, clerical and service positions. Women of color are highly represented in these low-wage earning occupations.

Women spend an average of 11 years out of the workforce to care for children or elderly parents. Because of these care giving responsibilities, women change jobs more often than men. Overall, this means that women typically receive less than Social Security when they become eligible for benefits.

Women work more part-time and temporary jobs than men and are less likely to receive a pension. When women do receive pensions, their pensions are worth less than those received by men.

Social Security must make women feel secure as they approach retirement. We need to propose changes such as a benefit formula that is generous to low-wage earners, yearly cost of living increases, and survivor benefits for the lower earning spouse. We must consider these concerns as we propose to reform the Social Security system.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to today to address the needs of women, especially young widows, as we debate the future of Social Security. I know personally what it is like to be widowed at a young age. My husband, Dennis, was killed by a gunman and my son was seriously injured when I was 50 years old. I spent weeks taking care of my son in the hospital nursing him back to health. At

that point the last thing on my mind was my future income security.

But as my son's condition improved, the financial consequences of my husband's death became more and more real. I had worked for many years as a nurse, but took time off to raise my only child. I thought to myself, will I have enough money to pay my son's hospital bills? How will I get by once Kevin is back on his feet? How will I pay my mortgage, buy groceries and make car payments?

These are thoughts that thousands of women have each year when their spouse dies young, be it from violence or sickness. Think of the two widows of the Capitol police officers tragically killed here last summer. If it weren't for the fund established by our Capitol Hill community, would they have the means to provide for their children and pay their bills? Scores of women everywhere ask themselves this same question every day.

As we debate the future of Social Security, it is critical that we take the different circumstances of women into account. Women are more than half of the population. They are also a significant majority of those 62 and over. And when it comes to Social Security, we are often left behind and at a disadvantage. Many women take lower paying or part-time jobs that do not provide pensions. Women earn less than men. Women do not spend as much time in the workforce as men. Women live longer than men by an average of seven years. And the list goes on.

The unique challenges faced by all women are even worse for young widows. For example, many women take time off to raise children and work at lower paying jobs or part-time jobs. They expect their husbands to work enough time to establish their retirement. It's part of being in a partnership.

This is not a Democratic or Republican issue. We should not let politics get in the way of doing what is right. Millions of women—those on Social Security right now and those who will depend on it in the future—are depending upon us to keep this program strong and accessible. We must address their needs.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and for her passion with regard to what is happening to veterans in our country.

Mr. Speaker, with my remaining time, let me just say that we will continue to focus our time and effort on talking about issues that we believe are relevant to the people in this country and focus our time and attention on Social Security and its effects on women.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND ITS IMPORTANT BENEFITS TO WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Social Security is this Nation's foremost family protection plan. As the 106th Congress considers proposals to reform the current Social Security system, it is critical that we take the different circumstances of women into account.

I have several examples of women that have faced problems in their elder years and have relied heavily on Social Security. I am just going to put them in the RECORD. But I would like to point out that women earn less than men. For every dollar men earn, women earn 74 cents, which translates into lower Social Security benefits. In fact, women earn an average of $250,000 less per lifetime than men, considerably less to save or invest in retirement.

Women are half as likely than men to receive a pension. Twenty percent of women versus 47 percent of men over age 65 receive pensions. Further, the average pension income for older women is $2,682 annually compared to $5,731 for men.

Women do not spend as much time in the workforce as men. In 1996, 74 percent of men between the ages of 25 and 44 were employed full time, compared to 49 percent of women in that age group.

Women spend more time out of the paid workforce than men do in order to raise families and take care of aging parents, and this is reflected in their Social Security payments. Women live longer than men by an average of 7 years. Social Security benefits are the only source of income for many elderly women. Twenty-five percent of unmarried women, widowed, divorced, separated or never married, rely totally on Social Security benefits as their only source of income.

Not only will these women find themselves widowed, they are likely to be poor. A recent report by the General Accounting Office showed that 80 percent of women living in poverty were not poor before their husbands died. The financial outlook for elderly women is pretty grim. The poverty rate among elderly women would be much higher if they did not have Social Security benefits.

In 1997, the poverty rate among elderly women was 13.1 percent. Without Social Security benefits, it would have been 52.2 percent. For elderly men the poverty rate is much lower at 7 percent. If men did not have Social Security benefits, the poverty level among them would increase to 40.7 percent.

Social Security's family protection provisions help women the most. Social Security provides guaranteed inflation protection, lifetime benefits for widows, divorced women, and the lives of retired workers. Mr. Speaker, 63 percent of female Social Security beneficiaries aged 65 and over receive benefits based on their husband's earning records, while only 1.2 percent of male beneficiaries receive benefits based on their wive's earning records. These benefits offset the wage disparity between women and men.

Mr. Speaker, as we move forward with reform of our Nation's Social Security system, we must remember that women face special challenges. It is my hope that many of the contributing economic factors, such as pay inequity, will soon be eliminated. In the meantime, Congress must take the economic well-being and security of women into account when discussing reform.

Women are clearly at a disadvantage when facing retirement, and poor, elderly women have the most at stake in the Social Security debate. Any reform that is enacted must keep the safety net intact. Our mothers, our daughters and our granddaughters are counting on us.

Mr. Speaker, I have additional documents that I will submit for the RECORD at this time.

Social Security is this nation's foremost family protection plan. As the 106th Congress considers proposals to reform the current Social Security system, it is critical that we take the different circumstances of women into account.

Lucy Thomas' story illustrates many of the key issues.

Mrs. Thomas is 83 years old. She worked for 35 years as a waitress, earning less than minimum wage. At the same time, she reared two daughters, and cared for both her father as he became increasingly disabled with rheumatoid arthritis, and for her grandmother, a farm woman who had virtually no income. She now depends solely on Social Security—$650 a month. At age 71, she moved in with her daughter, Marilyn, because she could no longer work outside the home to supplement her Social Security income.

As a waitress and a bartender, Thomas and her husband barely made enough money to pay for their daily living expenses. Mrs. Thomas does not have a pension, nor does she have income-generating savings. Her current income consists of about $8,000 a year from Social Security. She is one of the nation's elderly poor. Of that amount, $1,600 is used for secondary health coverage. Last year she paid an additional $1,000 in medical costs and another $1,400 for a hearing aid. In the fall, a bout with stomach ulcers forced her to pay over $200 for prescription drugs. Her daughter purchased most of her clothing and paid for her room and board for the past 12 years. Social Security is a real factor in her ability to survive with some dignity in her old age.

Mrs. Thomas' story is not unique. Many women come to rely heavily on the Social Security System when they retire, for a number of reasons:

Women earn less than men. For every dollar men earn, women earn 74 cents, which translates into lower Social Security benefits. In fact, women earn an average of $250,000 less per lifetime than men—considerably less to save or invest in retirement.

Women are half as likely than men to receive a pension. Twenty percent of women versus 47 percent of men over age 65 receive pensions. Further, the average pension income for older women is $2,682 annually, compared to $5,731 for men.

Women do not spend as much time in the workforce as men. In 1996, 74 percent of men between the ages of 25 and

44 were employed full-time, compared to 49 percent of women in that age group. Women spend more time out of the paid work force than do men in order to raise families and take care of aging parents.

Women live longer than men by an average of seven years. Social Security benefits are the only source of income for many elderly women. Twenty five percent of unmarried women (widowed, divorced, separated, or never married) rely on Social Security benefits as their only source of income. Not only will these women find themselves widowed, they are likely to be poor. A recent report by the General Accounting Office (GAO) showed that 80 percent of women living in poverty were not poor before their husbands died.

The financial outlook for elderly women is pretty grim. They poverty rate among elderly women would be much higher if they did not have Social Security benefits. In 1997, the poverty rate among elderly women was 13.1 percent. Without Social Security benefits it would have been 52.2 percent. For elderly men, the poverty rate is much lower, at 7 percent. If men did not have Social Security benefits, the poverty level among them would increase to 40.7 percent.

Social Security's family protection provisions help women the most. Social Security provides guaranteed, inflation-protected, lifetime benefits for widows, divorced women, and the wives of retired workers. Sixty three percent of female Social Security beneficiaries age 65 and over receive benefits based on their husbands earning records, while only 1.2 percent of male beneficiaries receive benefits based on their wives' earning records. These benefits offset the wage disparity between women and men.

As we move forward with reform of our nation's Social Security system, we must remember that women face special challenges. It is my hope that many of the contributing economic factors—particularly pay inequity—will soon be eliminated. In the meantime, Congress must take the economic well-being and security of women into account when discussing reform.

Women clearly are at a disadvantage when facing retirement. And poor, elderly women have the most at stake in the Social Security debate. Any reform that is enacted must keep the safety net intact. Our mothers, our daughters, and our granddaughters are counting on us.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 1129

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii, Mrs. MINK, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill important to all students—H.R. 1129. Last Congress we passed legislation that allows students to deduct interest paid on student loans. The reason we did so was to make it easier for all Americans to bear the enormous costs of a higher education, and I supported this effort wholeheartedly.

My bill improves this law by removing the current 60-month limitation period for deducting student loan interest. Currently, you can deduct interest on a student loan only if it is within 60 months of when the loan first came due. Simply put, this limitation means that if the student loan is older than five years, you cannot take a tax deduction.

This limitation needs to be removed. Higher education has become increasingly expensive and is creating a financial burden on graduates well beyond the first five years of graduation. In just the last 10 years, total costs at public colleges has increased by 23% and at private colleges by 36%. According to the General Accounting Office, this means that over the last 15 years, tuition at a public 4-year college or university has nearly doubled as a percentage of median household income. Thus, it is becoming harder and harder for students to graduate from college or graduate school without the help of student loans.

Students that graduate with student loan debt start out a few steps behind those without it. It is harder for them to save for emergencies or to invest money for their future. And it is harder for them to meet day-to-day expenses. This tax deduction will help.

We, in the Congress, can send the message that we value higher education and recognize the financial responsibility students have made by allowing the student loan interest deduction for the life of the loan.

This will do two things: It will encourage individuals to go to college or graduate school, and it will reduce the cost of an education. I believe very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that the way to achieve the American dream is through education and that everyone should have this opportunity.

It is absolutely essential that we continue to invest in our most important asset—our children. I urge my colleagues to support my bill, H.R. 1129.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PITTS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of illness.

Mrs. MYRICK (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of illness.

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:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CARSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STENHOLM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POMEROY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CALVERT, for 5 minutes, on March 18.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, on March 18.

Mr. FOSSELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GARY MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

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

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

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H.R. 540 (S. 494).—*To amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit transfers or discharges of residents of nursing facilities as a result of a voluntary withdrawal from participation in the Medicaid Program.*

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 18, 1999, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1082. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program Notice of final priority and invitation for application for new awards for fiscal year (FY) 1999—received March 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1083. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Determination That Pre-existing National Ambient Air Quality Standards for PM–10 No Longer Apply to Ada County/Boise State of Idaho [ID23–7003; FRL–6237–9] received March 2, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1084. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and

Promulgation of Implementation Plans: Oregon [OR–61–7276; FRL–6307–5] received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1085. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky; Approval of Revisions to Basic Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program [KY108–9904a; FRL–6307–8] received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1086. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval of Section 112(1) Authority for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Chromium Emissions from Hard and Decorative Chromium Electorplating and Chromium Anodizing Tanks; State of California [FRL–6236–9] Recevied March 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1087. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan; Illinois [IL180–1a; FRL–6308–2] received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1088. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and promulgation of Implementations; Ohio Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Ohio [OH121–1a;] received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1089. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Reasonably Available Control Technology for Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) from Wood Furniture Coating Operations and Ship Building and Repair Operations [TX99–1–7389a; FRL–6239–5] received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1090. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (St. Mary's, West Virginia) [MM Docket No. 97–245, RM–9202] received February 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1091. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Sheridan, Wyoming and Colstrip, Montana) [MM Docket No. 98–134, RM–9271] received February 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1092. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Policies and Rules for Alternative Incentive Based Regulation of Comsat Corporation [IB Docket No. 98–60] received February 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1093. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the United Kingdom [Transmittal No. DTC 54–99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1094. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the FY 1998 security assistance information for the annual report on Military Assistance, Military Exports, and Military Imports; to the Committee on International Relations.

1095. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting the Comptroller General's 1998 Annual Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1096. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting a list of General Accounting Office reports from the previous month; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1097. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1098. A letter from the Secretary of the Commission, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Hart-Scott-Rodino Act Formal Interpretation 15: Limited Liability Companies—received March 2, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1099. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Unemployment Insurance Program Letter [No. 13–99] received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1100. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Rules for Certain Reserves [Revenue Ruling 99–10] received March 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1101. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Administrative, Procedural, and Miscellaneous [Revenue Procedure 99–18] received March 2, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 1141. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–64). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 15. A bill to designate a portion of the Otay Mountain region of California as wilderness (Rept. 106–65). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 449. A bill to authorize the Gateway Visitor Center at Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–66). Referred to the Committee of the While House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 120. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense (Rept. 106–69). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 509. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the personal representative of the estate of Fred Steffens of Big Horn County, Wyoming, certain land comprising the Steffens family property; with an amendment (Rept. 106–67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 510. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to John R. and Margaret J. Lowe of Big Horn County, Wyoming, certain land so as to correct an error in the patent issued to their predecessors in interest (Rept. 106–68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 1141. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. POMBO, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BONILLA):

H.R. 1142. A bill to ensure that landowners receive treatment equal to that provided to the Federal Government when property must be used; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. GOODLING, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. GREENWOOD):

H.R. 1143. A bill to establish a program to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. CHENOWETH (for herself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. BONO, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. MICA, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SMITH of New

Jersey, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. COBURN, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. THUNE):

H.R. 1144. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that all meat and meat food products, whether domestic or imported, bear a label notifying the ultimate purchaser of meat and meat food products of the country of origin of the livestock that is the source of the meat and meat food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. BONO (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. HORN, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KING, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEACH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MICA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEY, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. QUINN, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STUMP, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 1145. A bill to require that perishable agricultural commodities be labeled or marked as to their country of origin and to establish penalties for violations of such labeling requirements; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. NEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. POMBO, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mrs. CHENOWETH):

H.R. 1146. A bill to end membership of the United States in the United Nations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1147. A bill to sunset the Bretton Woods Agreement Act; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1148. A bill to abolish the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks, to repeal the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SANDLIN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 1149. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to expand and clarify the requirements regarding advance directives in order to ensure that an individual's health care decisions are complied with, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREENWOOD (for himself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. UPTON, Mr. TALENT, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. ROEMER, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 1150. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H.R. 1151. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require air carrier baggage liability to be not less than $2,500 per passenger; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 1152. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to target assistance to support the economic and political independence of the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 1153. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a taxpayer may request a receipt for an income tax payment which itemizes the portion of the payment which is allocable to various Government spending categories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KASICH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WAMP, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. DUNN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. REGULA):

H.R. 1154. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate any portion of their income tax overpayments, and to make other contributions, for the benefit of units of the National Park System; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1155. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the Attorney General to provide for special consideration concerning the English language requirement with respect to the naturalization of individuals over 65 years of age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1156. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a Board of Visa Appeals within the Department of State to review decisions of consular officers concerning visa applications, revocations, and cancellations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. MINGE, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 1157. A bill to require appropriate off-budget treatment of Social Security in official budget pronouncements; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HILL of Montana:

H.R. 1158. A bill to provide for the preservation and sustainability of the family farm through the transfer of responsibility for operation and maintenance of the Flathead Irrigation Project, Montana; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. HORN, Ms. DUNN, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1159. A bill to improve the Federal capability to deal with child exploitation; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 1160. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish headstones or markers for the marked graves of certain individuals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEACH (for himself, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 1161. A bill to revise the banking and bankruptcy insolvency laws with respect to the termination and netting of financial contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and 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. LEWIS of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. FLETCHER, and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky):

H.R. 1162. A bill to designate the bridge on United States Route 231 that crosses the Ohio River between Maceo, Kentucky, and Rockport, Indiana, as the ''William H. Natcher Bridge''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 1163. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for expenses for providing an appropriate environment on the business premises for employed mothers to breastfeed or express milk for their children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 1164. A bill to provide for assistance by the United States to promote economic growth and stabilization of Northern Ireland and the border counties of the Irish Republic; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCINNIS (for himself, Mr. SCHAFFER, and Mr. TANCREDO):

H.R. 1165. A bill to redesignate the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument as a national park and establish the Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 1166. A bill to authorize the President to enter into a trade agreement concerning

Northern Ireland and certain border counties of the Republic of Ireland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 1167. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide for further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KLINK, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. METCALF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. REYES, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TERRY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. WISE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FORD, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Ms. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 1168. A bill to authorize the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to make grants to fire departments for the purpose of protecting the public and firefighting personnel against fire and fire-related hazards; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. SABO (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 1169. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require the offering of children-only coverage to dependents of participants under group health plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SABO (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1170. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make available under the health benefits program for Federal employees the option of obtaining coverage for self and children only, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SABO:

H.R. 1171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for public financing of House of Representatives general election campaigns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SABO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FROST, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORD, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1172. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against income tax to individuals who rehabilitate historic homes or who are the first purchasers of rehabilitated historic homes for use as a principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT of North Carolina (for himself, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1173. A bill to provide that States may use redistricting systems for Congressional districts other than single-member districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 1174. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce from 24 months to 12 months the holding period used to determine whether horses are assets described in section 1231 of such Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DELAY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. TANCREDO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COX, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. MARTINEZ):

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BARR of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a postage stamp should be issued honoring the 100th anniversary of the Junior League; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. JOHN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. FROST):

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution recognizing the importance of veterans to the United States and expressing support for the goals of Veterans Educate Today's Students (VETS) Day; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KING, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution condemning the brutal killing of Rosemary Nelson; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. FROST:

H. Res. 119. A resolution designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma:

H. Res. 121. A resolution affirming the Congress' opposition to all forms of racism and bigotry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 2: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 38: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 45: Mr. SHAW and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 48: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 50: Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 51: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 73: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 106: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 107: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 110: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 111: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H.R. 133: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 205: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 206: Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 230: Ms. CARSON, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 274: Mr. WYNN and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 275: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 324: Mr. BURR of North Carolina.

H.R. 372: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 403: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 425: Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FROST, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SABO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 461: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 464: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 516: Mr. FLETCHER.

H.R. 534: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 537: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 538: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 547: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 548: Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 573: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. COOK, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs.

MYRICK, Mrs. BONO, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 575: Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 576: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 577: Mr. SHOWS and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 580: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 586: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 589: Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 590: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 629: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FROST, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 632: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 670: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 679: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 685: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 691: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 701: Mr. WYNN, Mr. RILEY, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 741: Mr. LARGENT.

H.R. 798: Mr. HOLT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 815: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 817: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 833: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. LINDER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 841: Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 850: Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 860: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 872: Mr. SCOTT, Mr. FROST, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 881: Mr. EWING, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 886: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 894: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 896: Mr. SHOWS and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 900: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 914: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 924: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 932: Mr. FROST, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 950: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BORSKI, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 957: Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. GOODE, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. RILEY, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. JOHN, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 969: Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 987: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PORTER, Ms. DUNN, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 991: Mr. BROWN of California and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 999: Mr. HORN.

H.R. 1000: Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1001: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 1003: Mr. SHOWS and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1005: Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 1008: Mr. BUYER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 1011: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1032: Mr. STUMP, Mr. NEY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1053: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 1080: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1082: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ.

H.R. 1097: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1111: Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 1113: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H. Con. Res. 7: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. NEY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. RILEY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WELLER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. GORDON, Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. OSE, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. FARR of California.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. FORBES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. GILMAN.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. BERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 54: Mr. LANTOS, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BERKELY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WU, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MOORE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. SALMON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HOYER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H. Res. 16: Mr. LAHOOD.

H. Res. 41: Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. HAYES, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H. Res. 59: Mr. GOSS, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H. Res. 79: Mr. HYDE.

H. Res. 82: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 89: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. GORDON.

H. Res. 94: Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HILLIARD, MR. PASTOR, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 99: Mr. PORTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. GOODLING.

H. Res. 107: Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. KIND, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. FROST.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4

OFFERED BY: MR. ALLEN

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That it is the policy of the United States to deploy, subject to authorization and appropriations, a ground-based national missile defense that—

(1) has been demonstrated to be operationally effective against the threat as defined as of the time of such deployment and as projected for a reasonable period of time thereafter;

(2) does not diminish the overall national security of the United States by jeopardizing other efforts to reduce threats to the United States, including negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces; and

(3) is affordable and does not compromise the ability of the uniformed service chiefs and the commanders of the regional unified commands to meet their requirements for operational readiness, quality of life of the troops, programmed modernization of weapons systems, and the deployment of planned theater missile defenses.